
JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome to the CCT Plenary #38. Is there anyone that is on the phone and not in the Adobe Connect to be counted as attendees?

DAVID TAYLOR: Hi, Jonathan. I'm on the phone. Not on Adobe.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, David. Thank you. We'll add you to the list of attendees.

Is there anyone who has had a change to their Statement of Interest?

Alright. That's great.

Similar to the last Plenary call we're really trying to limit this conversation to fitting the recommendations into a kind of expected timeline and assigning timeframes to each of the recommendations. And so the low and high designation has to do with how quickly we think something needs to be done. The "high" recommendations we've been saying something along the lines of 18 months. And then we've been saying something like three years for "medium" and before the next CCT Review for "low." And then there's a final designation which is "prerequisite" which is a variable timeframe but basically says that this recommendation needs to be implemented prior to any subsequent procedures before the DNS is opened back up for more applications.

Are there any questions about the categories or the process that we're going to try to go through? That's the purpose of this meeting.

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.

Alright. Great. Perhaps if folks don't mind, I would love to skip ahead to the... Go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Question. I have a question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Please go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: The one that you said was along the [inaudible] which is coming before the next CCT. That's what you said? The longest term one is coming before the next CCT RT?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's correct.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Are we assuming that the timeline for the next CCT RT, that means we think the next CCT RT will be after three years?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I believe that these reviews have been spaced out to five years under the new Bylaws after the accountability reforms. Maybe somebody on staff can confirm that, but that's my understanding is that it's about a five-year turnaround time now between reviews.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, Jonathan. It is.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. I'll take that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank you.

Any other questions? Perfect.

So if folks don't mind, because I'm in the middle of another ICANN-related meeting here in Reykjavik this week, if we could potentially go down to Recommendation #50 – 53 and look at these recommendations first, then when I drop off I won't leave anybody hanging. Okay?

So the first here is to, "Set objectives for applications for the Global South." And that was targeted at the community to make some affirmative decisions about what we want to accomplish in terms of applications from the Global South because our efforts will stem from whether or not we're trying to be proactive or simply equitable, I think will be a function of those objectives that are set by the community. And the sense, there was a lot of wheel spinning before the last round without a set of clear objectives and in terms of what the community was trying to accomplish. And I think that that's still a question for the whole community and not us.

So that's the very first recommendation, and that's my recommendation that that be set as a prerequisite because it will determine how the rest of the Applicant Support Programs, etc. are designed.

Any discussion on that?

Waudu, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

What's the sub-group PDP – what is that?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's the Subsequent Procedures PDP. Those are the folks creating the next Applicant Guidebook basically that's being Chaired by Jeff and Avri and both, I believe, Calvin and Carlos are on it.

Any other questions or any objections? Are we voting – I see some green check marks – I get the feeling there's consensus. So just vote "disagree" with a red X if you think this shouldn't be a prerequisite to subsequent procedures.

I don't see any so we'll move on.

"Expand and improve the outreach to the Global South in terms of information –"

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Jonathan, you do have one red slash mark – Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think that...that was on before we started talking.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That mark actually means that [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: That means, "Step away, Laureen." I think not –

LAUREEN KAPIN: It was a slash mark but now it's gone so never mind. Oh, I see. Never mind. I'm misunderstanding.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem. So the second recommendation is about expanding and improving the outreach to the Global South which is described in more detail but talks about trying to put together some case studies, business model information, etc. and again, I think that this is a prerequisite in that it's design will be a function of the first recommendation, and so we're not saying anything specific has to be done here but that the expansiveness of this will be dependent on the outcome of Recommendation #1.

Again, I think this is a prerequisite. Again, is there anybody that has questions or discussion they want to have about that recommendation? Is there anybody that disagrees that it should be a prerequisite to

subsequent procedures? I think that's just Jordyn stepping away. He's on the go he said today.

Alright, so we're going to label that as prerequisite.

"Coordinate the pro bono assistance program." If you recall there was in fact a kind of ad hoc matchmaking service between people willing to help applicants and applicants requesting help, and we have literally zero data about whether or not any connections were made or if anybody was actually helped. And so the recommendation is for ICANN staff to play a coordinating role so that we have a sense next time about whether or not this program was effective and where it didn't work.

Again, I think this falls into the prerequisite category, but I open that up for discussion.

Is there anybody that objects to it being a prerequisite?

And then finally, "Revisit the applicant financial support program," which was the subset and again aimed at the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. And I believe that's a prerequisite as well. That's about the financial assistance or the discounts on the application fee, for example.

Any questions –

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Hey, Jonathan. I'm having a hard time raising my hand because the app and my phone are not agreeing.

So the last two, I wonder if these falling into the category, “We don’t really know anything but we also don’t know if there’s actually a problem,” so I’m wondering if they actually fall into the prerequisite category. I feel like the position we’ve taken in a number of other places where we’ve just needed more information because we don’t know whether things worked or not but we don’t really have any evidence that there’s a problem necessarily, we’ve tended to say those might be high priority but they’re not necessarily prerequisites because they’re not targeted at solving a specific problem.

I guess here we could argue there are so few applications from the Global south that we know that the things that – it seemed like stuff didn’t work but it also seems like gathering more information on programs that we think didn’t work isn’t necessarily going to be that helpful in addressing the problem. I don’t know. I ‘m just mulling over how we avoid making everything a prerequisite or and/or high priority.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And I’m with you and I don’t want to be the guy that says everything should be a prerequisite. I think in this particular case, the decision could be made from Recommendation #1 that it is not in fact an objective to increase the number of applications from the Global South, that our time is better spent on facilitating infrastructure of other types of getting more registrars. Whoever knows what else. But that applicants for a [inaudible] – this isn’t the priority. If it is, I think it will render a lot of the rest of the moot. If it is, all we’re making prerequisite is actually the design of these programs, Jordyn, not... these aren’t data collection exercises.

So the coordination of the pro bono assistance program isn't to go back and look at the old program. It is in fact to make sure that it's coordination a future program if it continues such that we will have the information in the future about whether or not it was a success and make sure that the people that wanted help are in fact matched up with the people offering help. We just don't know that any of that happened.

So the recommendation had to do with about staff being engaged in the process from the application process. It's not just a data collection exercise. Does that make sense?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah. That's fair. I guess somehow it would be helpful in these recommendations to indicate that they are recommendations of, "If you do this thing again, then this is how you should do it," as opposed to, "You have to do this in order to proceed with the subsequent procedures." Because the alternative thing I could imagine is that we can decide as a community this is important but this was a totally wrong mechanism. In that case we still wouldn't make sense to [gauge] on this particular item because no one would think it was a good idea.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Yes. We can try to add some of that conditional language to these because in some ways they're all determinant on Recommendation #1 and potentially discussions that could take place about them. But to the extent that we reviewed them, these were things that we found wanting about them like the lack of coordination from ICANN staff in the case of the pro bono assistance program.

I guess that's more the question. The whole program could be eliminated in which case it wouldn't need to be coordinated. But we're saying if that program is there, that it ought to be coordinated by ICANN staff.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yes. This is really like a prerequisite for doing this particular thing again as opposed to doing a new subsequent procedure. And number one, the first of your recommendations, the real prerequisite for proceeding we've got to decide if we're going to do these things or not and then for each of these items... I can suggest some language to make this clear. I just want to make sure we don't... I don't know.

With due respect to the staff, sometimes when there's confusing recommendations from policy bodies or review teams or something like that, it takes a long time to unmuddle things after the fact. So I just think getting some clarity in the recommendation now will be helpful in making it clear when it doesn't apply as a prerequisite.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I agree. So let's take that offline and just straighten out the language.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: David, you seem to be typing something even though you're only on the phone which is magical. If you want to just speak up? Okay.

Alright. Thanks, David.

Alright. So those [inaudible] to the application and evaluation process. As I said, the Recommendation #1 under the Data Analysis chapter I think we specified as "high" not as a prerequisite. So why don't we return to our regular scheduled programming which is Jordyn at the top of the list.

Okay. I see here it's listed as a prerequisite, and I think we changed that to high – the data analysis thing – #1 at the top of the list here on the last Plenary – the one before it actually.

Let's continue on with #2 with Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I really, really, can't read this on my phone. Maybe either Lauren or staff could just read through them. I'm happy to talk through what they are, but I totally can't read what these are on my mobile device.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The first one is, "Collection of wholesale pricing for legacy gTLDs."

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think we talked through these. I think we got down to some higher number last time, didn't we?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are you talking about the red ones [are] the ones that we need to discuss?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, Jonathan. We can move back to #34.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then that's Lauren that's leading this discussion.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Drew will do #34 to 36 and David, the suggestions for RPMs are going to be #37 to 40 so you would be up next after Drew.

Drew, do you want to start with Recommendation #34? I need five minutes before I'll be in front of my computer.

Okay, then David, would you like to start with Recommendation #37 which deals with the RPMs #37 to 40 deal with the RPMs.

DAVID TAYLOR: Hi Laureen. I can try and do that except I don't have access now to the computer so I'm [listening to] my mobile device and I can't read anything [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: I can read it to you.

DAVID TAYLOR: If you could read it out [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Recommendation #37 for the RPMs is, "A full impact study to identify actual costs incurred by trademark owners," and I'm trying to scroll across to see what priority that is. I don't think that has an assigned priority so I think that's part of the purpose of the phone call. And I see you actually put that it does list that being a prerequisite if I'm reading this correctly.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So take it away.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you for your [inaudible]. That was basically because it's almost an easy win because it's happening with the INTA Impact Study

[Inaudible]. We'll have the results by the next round. So that made it [inaudible] as a prerequisite which [wouldn't] be problematic for anybody because I think it would be something which all the [IT] community would want as a prerequisite anyway.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So do we have any discussion or questions for David dealing with the prioritization for #37, "The full impact study to identify actual costs incurred by trademark owners" and that's identified as a prerequisite?

My quick question is, do we know when that study is going to be concluded?

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yes, it should be concluded, the results are all due in by the 28th of February, and then Nielsen I think we're spending a chunk of March reviewing so we'd have the results at some point during March, end of March. So it'll be we won't get the results before Copenhagen. We might have some initial ones before then which we can fish out which we'll try to, but we won't have the full report and the full results by then.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Jordyn has a question for you.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Sure.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's only like eight clicks to get off mute.

I guess I have two questions. So if we think the INTA Study fulfills this as a prerequisite, does that mean that we expect that it won't be a recommendation in the final report because it will already be complete? And if so, I think we should probably flag that in this report.

DAVID TAYLOR: Good point. I think this is what I've tried to cover with Recommendation #2 which was saying there that it was something that needs to be repeated so it's kind of blending the two. I was trying to get one recommendation in this report and the Recommendation #2 is probably the one which will stay in the final report where that's saying that it needs to be repeated at 18, 24 months or something I think I said in that. But I agree with you. I think we could put some in this Recommendation #1 saying that this should be completed prior to [when] we do the final report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Okay, thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm not sure that the note captures what we just said – "Flag that results in incomplete." I'm not sure what that means. Are we just wanting to note that that recommendation will be complete by the time of the report? Okay. Pending the survey. Okay.

Eleeza also has a question for you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. I'm a bit confused because the recommendation is to both INTA and ICANN and I'm not sure which is which. Are we requiring INTA to do this study as a prerequisite or that ICANN should find a provider to do the study? I think it just needs a little bit more clarity there.

DAVID TAYLOR: Got you. I suppose I was really trying to back track or back capture the way this happened being an ICANN study and INTA and who is going to pay for it, who wasn't going to pay for it and all those issues and trying to capture it in a semi-eloquent way. So hence saying, "ICANN should commission with the participation of appropriate associations," is the [inaudible] the recommendations that was the idea of [appropriate and while] INTA may not be appropriate next time around one would assume yes but there may be other associations or it may be widened or ICANN may feel that they can go ahead and do it themselves. So I wasn't sure how the best way to capture those because it seems like [we've] got a few options.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: But just to be clear, ICANN didn't commission the study at all. We just happened to be in the right place at the right time to benefit from INTA's work. So I just wanted to make sure that distinction was clear.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sure. Yeah. And I think that's what I was trying to get in Recommendation #2. My recommendation would be that ICANN should commission such a report. With this one it was a mixed the way it happened, it just evolved and arrived, shall we say.

Again, it's hard to capture and the reality and cover the future sort of thing when [factually] we've got something which is a little bit different and that was what I was trying to get to in Recommendation #2.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So is there a suggestion, Eleeza, for greater precision and clarity about the fact that this is serendipitous that we're able to benefit from the INTA study but to make sure that we're clear in David's chapter about the fact that this was not a study commissioned by ICANN?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think that's clear in the report itself. I just wonder about in terms of the recommendations, if we're making a recommendation to INTA requiring them to do a study I don't know. I just think that comes across a bit odd. But the other thing is, you haven't even seen the results of the study yet so you don't know how helpful this particular study is going to be. I know that they're having some trouble getting people to answer the survey so they're not sure yet how much data there will be for you to consume there.

It almost feels too early to lay these out as recommendations. I feel as though you could include just one of these. Perhaps just a recommendation [in] the full impact study to ICANN and leave it open

as to who does that and how it gets commissioned. Perhaps refine your recommendation after you see the results of the survey that's underway right now.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Okay. That makes sense. I was just going to say that under the recommendation I've got was that, "ICANN should commission with the assistance and participation of appropriate associations," so that under #2 was "ICANN and relevant associations," so again, I wasn't necessarily saying directing INTA to do it, although obviously here INTA has done it so they're not going to say no. But it's a historical recommendation which [we're] sort of living through, shall we say, so I'm not quite sure as I say, how to best capture that. It's certainly Recommendation #2 is the one where we're that's directed at ICANN and when we look at that, that's where again, that's a look into the future.

I'm quite happy to amend this as you want to amend it on Recommendation #1 to get it the right feel.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Hey, David. I think I would pivot in the opposite direction that Eleeza's suggesting. I do agree the current – it's totally confusing – the current recommendations but I would think that because the first one is basically already in flight and we don't expect it to be in the final report, that maybe we just eliminate #1 and, just as we do with the DNS Abuse Study we just acknowledge that it's going to happen in the report and then say, as we've done in a number of cases, say "This useful study that's going on should be repeated on a recurring basis," as a

recommendation going forward. That sort of matches what we actually recommend, for example, the DNS Abuse Study as well as with a number of the economic surveys, etc.

That's how I would recommend it. Just be consistent with what we've done elsewhere and then we don't have to worry about making a recommendation to do something that's already in flight, which seems a little bit weird.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, that's a good way around it. Maybe if it disappears, I/we could use some of the language, the details, of the recommendation, that part which I've put in the recommendations for #1 and blend that into #2 and we just concentrate on #2.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that would make sense.

DAVID TAYLOR: [In light of it] being repeated. That makes more sense. I'm fine with that if everyone else is.

LAUREEN KAPIN: David, Kaili also has a question for you.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Lauren. I still about the Recommendation #37 or #38, I thought we were talking about these being prerequisites, and now sounds like we're not making any judgements but instead we refer them to RPM Group. Is that what we're suggesting recommending? I'm not sure if I understand what are the consensus for #37/#38.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry, #37 and #38, is that my old Recommendation #1 and #2 because I haven't got those in front of me. That's #1 for this study and #2 for the future studies?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. That's right.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm not sure, Kaili, I'm fully understanding the question. I think these studies are really just to get data to the costs associated. That's the goal of getting the costs and then we've obviously got the analysis by Nielsen, etc. So I'm not quite sure I'm following that you are –

KAILI KAN: My question is that I did not fully understand what is going on with #37 and #38. It seems like #37 and #38 are no recommendations or valid description of the recommendations or they are #1 or something?

DAVID TAYLOR: I think we've decided we were dropping #37 because it's actually ongoing and happening so it's not going to be a recommendation as [we'd] make in the final report. So it's a valid recommendation for the draft report but not necessarily for the final so we'd potentially take that out as a recommendation and just blend some of that wording into the Recommendation #38 which is the one basically saying that this sort of study to get this sort of data should be repeated every 18 to 24 months.

KAILI KAN: Okay, so #37 is taken out and #38 will be high priority. Is that correct?

DAVID TAYLOR: I think that would have to be high priority on the basis that [we couldn't] make it prerequisite because it would be 18 to 24 months out.

KAILI KAN: [Inaudible] high priority [so it is] prerequisite. So #37 is taken out and #38 is a prerequisite. Is that correct?

DAVID TAYLOR: [No. Well, to discuss] #37 was a prerequisite because I knew we'd have the results before the next new gTLD launches, shall we say. Recommendation #2 I put as "high" because we're pushing that out 18 to 24 months, or suggesting after the CCT Review Team final report so it didn't seem fair to be trying to say suddenly it's a prerequisite to have something done which is 24 months after our final report which by

definition could be holding things up so I thought it just had to be a “high.” But happy to be taking any discussion on that.

Obviously if we say an INTA Survey should be redone in six months after our report, then it’s quite feasible that that could be a prerequisite to have the results back before the future round. It just depends on timings that felt tight to be doing that so quickly after this survey.

KAILI KAN: I’m not sure if I fully understand – now we’re saying #37 is prerequisite?

DAVID TAYLOR: #37 was a prerequisite, yes. But we don’t have #37 anymore. So if we don’t have #37, it’s not a prerequisite.

KAILI KAN: We do not have #37 anymore but if we have it, it will be prerequisite. Is that correct?

DAVID TAYLOR: You’ve got me lost now. I’m sorry. I’m not sure what you’re asking.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can I try and jump in here? I think the suggestion was from Jordyn to treat the currently ongoing INTA Survey in the same way that we’ve treated references in the report to the data analysis survey which is to reference that it’s going on but not have a specific recommendation for

the study because it's already going on so we don't need to make a recommendation for it. And then for consistency, what we would do is have a recommendation which David does in #38, which is to make sure that a study of this type is repeated periodically and that would have a high priority. It wouldn't be a prerequisite.

So as I'm understanding it, we would be eliminating Recommendation #37 and keeping Recommendation #38 with a high priority, and Recommendation #38 would reference the fact that there's already this ongoing study and some sort of study akin to this should be done periodically in the future. Am I capturing that accurately?

DAVID TAYLOR:

I think so, yeah. I think that's what it is. And with #37 [inaudible] whether Eleeza's thought is restructuring the way it was phrased or Jordyn's was to eliminate it. So I don't know whether we've had a consensus vote on that. I can see advantage and disadvantage of both but I'm more than happy to have it [matched] [inaudible] DNS Abuse so we can match things and keep consistency I'm happy to go that way as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Waudu has a question for you also.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Hello.

DAVID TAYLOR: Hi.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello David. Can you hear?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, I can hear you okay.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. As we're looking at the priorities, I'm looking at prioritizing. I'm also worried about the – where we are addressing this recommendation to, because it's [inaudible] INTA-ICANN. I think I'm not very comfortable about addressing recommendations to outside entities that are outside the remit of ICANN.

So, I'm wondering, is it possible to perhaps make this recommendation to ICANN and let ICANN see how they can be able to implement the [inaudible] on trademark costs. It doesn't necessarily have to be through INTA. It could be through INTA if ICANN approaches INTA and they agree, but we could leave implementation out.

[We can] just address it to ICANN. If ICANN wants to engage another –

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, I'm not sure –

WAUDO SIGANGA: Entity from outside to do the... Hello?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, Waudu, [inaudible] I fully agree with that. I'm not sure why it says – if it does, I haven't got that [inaudible] sent in on Sunday. It was just addressed to ICANN, so it wasn't saying ICANN-INTA. So I'm not sure why that says ICANN and INTA. But exactly the reasons you pointed out.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, I think it should just be ICANN alone, because [you can then see] how the implement it. Okay, thank you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, it should just say ICANN. Yes. And I did – in the text of it, I was mentioning it that ICANN should commission with assistance and participation of appropriate associations. So again, I believe that was the whole thing. It may or may not be INTA, as I mentioned in the beginning. I assume it is, but [inaudible]

WAUDO SIGANGA: It could be associations or it could – It couldn't be just as a – sorry.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, no, it could be [inaudible]

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, thank you.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm not intending to limit ICANN's hands in who they go to or something like that at all.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, it's combination. Could be anybody. Let them know how to implement it. Yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: Anyone who'll have the data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so just in the interest of time, because I want to make sure we get to the things we need to in this phone call, I think what we should do is call for consensus on the approach to 37 and 38, which would be to eliminate 37 but reference in the report that says this study is ongoing, and then have 38 be a recommendation to ICANN to commission a study that covers these topics on a periodic basis with a high priority. So, that's what's on the table. If folks disagree with that, then they should register their disagreement, but that's what's on the table now. You could register disagreement.

And I'm not seeing any and I'm not hearing any further questions, so that will be our approach. And if we can make sure the action items reflect that, so the text for 37 would be to eliminate that but to make sure the report acknowledges that this is an ongoing study.

And then we would move on to 39 and 40, and David, those are simply a review of URS and review of TMCH, so maybe just explain those briefly.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sure. Yes, so –

LAUREEN KAPIN: And to find their priority. I think you still have those both still labeled as a high priority, not a prerequisite.

DAVID TAYLOR: I've put them in prerequisites, but maybe they've become high.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, you have? I didn't see it. It's not on the chart this way if I'm reading it correctly.

DAVID TAYLOR: Maybe that chart hasn't been updated since the document I sent in on Sunday.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That could be –

DAVID TAYLOR: [inaudible] 23:59 deadline, but perhaps that's in the report somewhere but not in the table you're looking at.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so I'll let you speak to it then, because you'll have the most [accurate] information.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sure. I've got that now. So I've got one mobile device in my left hand and one in my right hand.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Glad you're not driving.

DAVID TAYLOR: I know, imagine if I tried to drive my tongue. That would be quite interesting. Recommendation #3 is – so that was a few view of DRS should be carried out and consideration should be given to how it should interoperate with the UDRP.

And then this is an addition to where we'd been the last time, however given the PDP review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs which is currently ongoing, such review need to take onboard that review when published and indeed may not be necessary if that report is substantial in its findings and if the report fully considers potential modifications.

That is I'm not exactly sure how this all fits together, so I'm trying to do many things with one recommendation, but I do think that it seems pretty clear that there should be a review of the URS, but we shouldn't be doing it having multiple URS reviews all going on in parallel. So, I'm cognizant that if we can have one which is a good one, then we're all

good and everyone's happy with that. So, that's not the point on recommendation #3. So, as long as there is one – and hence the prerequisite, I think that needs to be done before we have a new round or new opening, and it looks like that if it is ongoing, there's already been one [partial] review anyway by ICANN staff, which is [last year], isn't it?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, so the recommendation is that these would be a prerequisite for the next round. Any questions for David on these recommendations with 39 and 40?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

It's [inaudible] and my Adobe Connect has now crashed so I can't even raise my hand. I guess I'm curious, as David has mentioned, there has already been a TMCH study, so I don't understand what the sort of blocking item here is. With the URS at least, I know that's on their slate for consideration by the PDP, but the TMCH just seems like this already happened. So, I'm a little concerned that we're making a prerequisite out of it, sort of implying that here's more work to be done when we might have already completed it.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Sure, I'll take that one. So, agree on the URS side. On the trademark clearinghouse, yes, there has been that review, and I think the issue I've got when I was reading, I went back to that actually over the weekend,

and it was clear now that the [inaudible] they were unable to make definitive conclusions to data limitations.

So, when you've got those issues that they're the same as data limitations, it seems to me we have to get the proper data in on that. And it may be we have some through the INTA study. The clearinghouse wasn't a major part of that, but it is a part of it. It is part of the survey questions, so that's the thing that's concerning me. And it's indicative [somewhat] as well of the trademark clearinghouse review.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I guess I'm just concerned –

LAUREEN KAPIN: You just dropped out, Jordyn. We can't hear you anymore.

DAVID TAYLOR: I thought it was me as well. I'm certainly looking at my phone and I'm thinking I can't hear Jordyn. [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, how about now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Now we can hear you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sorry, my phone decided to arbitrarily go back on mute. But in any case, I was just saying I'm a little concerned about making these prerequisites when we're basically – I'd rather these be sort of stated as we want to encourage the PDP to make sure that it looks at these issues, or something like that, as opposed to... Like as David phrased it, it roughly says, "Well, we want someone – unclear who – to sort of decide that the PDP or the TMCH did a good job and then it's okay to proceed," but that seems totally unimplementable. So, it just seems like we need a clear boundary for – some objective person has to be able to read this and figure out whether or not it's been satisfied, and from the conversation, I don't know how I would interpret that and I'm pretty close to the work, much less how the Board or someone would.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Sure, and it's a good point. To my mind, the clearinghouse, when I read through the last report, the 25th of July 2016 review, when it says that quite clearly it can't make definitive conclusions due to these limitations, that to me meant, okay, we need to resolve that and get the right data," because of most of the recommendations in there not being particularly helpful.

So, that's where I think we need the precision, so hence I do think – that to me points to either a second review or a further review, a follow-up review on that. Something has to be done to where we get that clearly put out there and decided.

Again, the PDP review is ongoing, and that I think is due in January 2018 the report, and I think they're starting to look at the clearinghouse now.

It was either the URS now or the clearinghouse now. I can't remember which, but [we haven't got] their input on the clearinghouse as well, so I was kind of keen to get that as well to see how that would refine our recommendation.

But as it stands, for the recommendations, me, I've voted those yes [it does] need to have clarity on the scope and we need sufficient data. So, that was [in the] review. I think the recommendations, specifically the one I've put in [for] the clearinghouse is there's a review of the clearinghouse and its scope should be carried out. It provides us with sufficient data to make recommendations and allow effective policy review.

[inaudible] looking for how can we do that? Someone gave me that as an implementation recommendation team, [inaudible] I haven't got the data. That seems to be missing.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: David, if I can jump in, I've put a couple of comments in the chat –

DAVID TAYLOR: Please, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: But the TMCH review is under discussion in the RPM PDP Working Group, and they have actually discussed their results of that report with Analysis Group who are one of the lead authors on that study, and there is a slightly revised version of that that's coming out because there were

recommendations to find additional data. They didn't get a whole lot, but they're going to be [inaudible] I would say and we're actually planning on publishing that, if not this week then likely next week.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I would suggest we make this clear that – I just don't want to second guess the work of some other PDP that's going on right now and have some arbitrary – the Board or something trying to reconcile recommendations we're making here versus what actually happened in that PDP, so I just think we should make it clear that that PDP should consider these issues and they need to actually do so prior to the subsequent rounds, subsequent procedures, but that we're not trying to create some further [dealing] of it other than the fact that the community in the form of the PDP concluded the issue.

DAVID TAYLOR:

I agree with that. I think you've got – and Eleeza you've got all the wordings in the document again that I've circulated on Sunday and the rationale, that's exactly what I cover in there because that's how I put it, I've got the wording of it is we need to await the final report of that independent review – this is the trademark clearinghouse independent reviews – to finalize our recommendations.

It's hoped the INTA impact study will also provide useful data in that respect, and then the PDP review of all RPMs which is running in parallel to the CCT Review Team will contribute to this consideration, and those working groups will of course need to be considered to set the scope for any review and potential modifications. So, that's what I was trying to

cover and that's in the rationale, so maybe bring some of that wording up into the recommendation. [inaudible] on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: David, Margie also has a question for comment.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, hi. My question relates to who this is directed to. You've mentioned the subsequent procedures PDP, but is that really what you intend, or should it be the PDP on RPM? Otherwise, I'm not sure what the subsequent procedures PDP would be expected to do.

DAVID TAYLOR: You're right on that. I'm not sure why I've got the Subsequent Procedures Working Group in there. I was [inaudible] I wanted to go through all the other reviews and figure out where we were all directing things, because again, that seemed to me to – where do we direct the review of the trademark clearinghouse? Is that ICANN and the Board at the end of the day? Are we pushing all of these recommendations to Board, or is this to somebody else?

Because again, I wasn't sure whether we shouldn't be recommending or putting that to the PDP RPMs if we're waiting on them as well to include – I'm just not quite sure how the jigsaw fits together and where we

[inaudible] going on recommendations with dog wagging a tail. As long as it all fits together nicely, I'm very happy.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Is the recommendation then to keep these as a high priority but direct them – I'm sorry, keep these as a prerequisite but direct them to the working group on RPMs rather than subsequent procedures? Is that the revised [inaudible]?

DAVID TAYLOR: That sounds fine to me. I'm happy [inaudible] for either the Board or the [inaudible] PDP. And I think actually, having said that, I think on this draft one, because it's the draft report, I think it makes more sense to put it on the RPM PDP to ensure – and then we can get [a big] team of them to ensure that they are doing this to the extent they're doing it. That would affect our final recommendation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so should we then call for consensus on Recommendations #39 and 40 to – can everyone hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can, yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, because I'm getting a message to join the audio conference and I'm wondering why I'm getting that. So, the recommendation is to have

39 and 40 as prerequisites but directed to the PDP on RPMs. So, if people disagree with that, please register a disagreement in the Adobe.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm somewhat concerned about making it a prerequisite, but it somewhat depends on what we see from the INTA study, so I'm okay making this provisionally a prerequisite, but I want to see whether there are actually problems we're trying to solve. The URS might clear if there's an actual issue there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, well it sounds like then that's something that would be taken up between now and the final report, but not for the preliminary report. Correct?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's right, I just want to make my concern known.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, you have a statement on the record. Okay, so I'm not seeing any disagreement, so we can register consensus on 39 and 40. And now, I'm hoping – thank you, David. Thanks for jumping in.

DAVID TAYLOR: That's alright. I'll go back on mute now. I'll go on mute. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so now I'm hoping that Drew can take over the three Recommendations #34, 35 and 36 on the Public Interest Commitments.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, I can now. So, I'm not mobile right now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yay.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. So, for the voluntary PICs, we have three recommendations, and the first one relates to the fact that while the PICs are technically available for viewing on ICANN's website – these are the registry agreements – they're not actually – they do not exist in their own separate PICs, voluntary PICs database.

Therefore, anyone wanting to draw a comparison between the PICs of different registries to better understand what safeguards that the registry operators are putting in place, how they're working and whatnot, they would have to individually go through every single registry agreement and extract them, which is what ICANN staff have to do for us.

So, this recommendation I think should be done before the next round because of the fact that there will presumably be an option for voluntary PICs in the next round, and I think it would be helpful for even applicants to see what – in a more centralized way – what applicants have done in the past.

With that said, going with the notion of not everything being the highest priority, I would put the other two PICs-related priorities. I think those need to be done sooner than this one perhaps, and they're easier to do than this one for implementing. So, can you remind me again, what does the medium priority mean in terms of the timeline?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's 36 months after the issue of the [inaudible] report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Three years.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, so I would say that this could be a medium priority, and so I'd love to hear any feedback on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just for clarity, Drew, these would be prerequisites that are medium priority? I just want to make sure I understand it.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, sorry, all three of these would be prerequisites, and the first one would be a medium priority prerequisite.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, can I jump in really quickly?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, go ahead.

DREW BAGLEY: Of course, please do.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We've been treating these four categories as mutually exclusive, so it's either a prerequisite, high, medium or low.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, that's true.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Did I misunderstand that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think, Eleeza. I think it is how we've been treating it. It's a little bit weird in that prerequisite is a sort of indefinite timeframe, but it's just a prerequisite, whereas the others are specific timeframes. So, I think if you make a prerequisite, then that just means it has to get done before there are any more subsequent procedures.

DREW BAGLEY: Right, so I would not make this one a prerequisite. I would put it medium, because worst case if it doesn't get done before the next

round, applicants could still go through individual registry agreements. It would not be this comparative analysis and whatnot. So, [it's] certainly value added, but I don't think it should bring everything to a halt if it's not done before the next round.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, so that just means it's not a prerequisite but it's just a medium priority.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, yes. Sorry about that, it's not a prerequisite. Medium priority. Does everybody agree with that, or does anybody disagree with that, rather? The easier question to ask. Anybody have any comments before I move on to the next one?

Okay. The next one would be a prerequisite, which is future gTLD applicants should state the goals of each of their voluntary PIC. So, assuming that the voluntary PICs application would take the same format as now, we would be requesting that they also state the goal of each of the PICs that they're proposing that they will do.

That way, it's easy for the community to understand what the intended goal is during the review period before the application gets accepted. And so this would be a prerequisite. This would allow just – it would also complement number three, which is a prerequisite too.

So number three | just so we can kind of discuss these two together – so the number three is the voluntary PICs should be submitted during

the application process to allow for GAC review community and [LTO] objections.

If you recall, for the initial PICs, just as the nature of the way things were going along, applicants had fewer than 30 days to come up with voluntary PICs, and so we're suggesting that it's a prerequisite that voluntary PICs are submitted during the application process itself. That way you can get this review.

And then that previous recommendation is that the goals of the PICs should be stated with any proposed PIC. That way, during this application period, there would be more information as well as enough time for people to weigh in one way or another, and that way we're not prescribing any specific form that PICs should take or anything like that, but instead, we're just making as much information available to the community with as much time as possible so the community could weigh in, and that would be a safeguard to prevent [them] from being bad PICs or perhaps to improve PICs and whatnot. Does anybody oppose either of those two being prerequisites?

Okay, and then Eleeza, just for clarity, we need to state that it's a high, medium or low priority prerequisite, but it's still a prerequisite, or is prerequisite enough for a category because of the –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's enough.

DREW BAGLEY: What was that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's enough. Sorry, prerequisite is enough.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, great.

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

DREW BAGLEY: Alright. That's it for me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, for clarity, 34 is a medium priority and 35 and 36 are prerequisites. That's what we've come to consensus on.

DREW BAGLEY: Correct, as of our [last] discussion.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. So, I think the next recommendation is consumer choice, and then we have three on benefits versus confusion. Megan had taken ownership of the benefits versus confusion. I'm not sure if there's

anyone on the call who could really speak to those. Jonathan, do you have any thoughts on those? Maybe we should consider those on the call tomorrow?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, Laureen, I have been –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I will –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh. Go ahead, [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go ahead, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Either way, I think both Jordyn and I are kind of looking at those documents to clean them up while Megan's on sick leave, and so I think between us, we'll figure out how to discuss them for tomorrow.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, that sounds good. Then consumer choice. Jordyn, is 41 one you can speak to?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Is 41 the one on the – consider the RPMs for the –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, costs related to defensive registrations for a small number of trademarks, registering large numbers of domains can be reduced –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, so this is as everyone may recall, I think our analysis so far – once again, this is contingent on learning more from the INTA study – indicates that we see sort of a binomial distribution in terms of defensive registration costs.

Most brands are either not registered in new gTLDs or registered only in a small number of them, whereas there's a small number of brands or trademarks that are registered in a very large number of new gTLDs. So, the recommendation here is as opposed to just sort of thinking about how to address the general problem of defensive registrations, that the subsequent procedures PDP takes a specific look to see if there are mechanisms that could be put in place to address the issue of these larger – or of these trademarks that are registered in a large number of TLDs. Because I think that's an insight that the previous policy work in this area didn't have access to, because [inaudible].

So, that's the recommendation. That's a prerequisite as it needs to be considered as a policy element prior to the release of additional gTLDs. And I can't see Adobe Connect so I'll have to totally rely on someone else to deal with the moderating queue.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Waudu has a question for you, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, I'm wondering, I thought there was a term we considered some alternatives to this high costs for defensive registrations, and I remember that it was blocking. So, how does that relate to this particular recommendation? That they already had alternatives.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So Waudu, if I understand, I think you wrote this on the e-mail and by e-mail as well. In general, I think my view at least – and I think it is what's reflected by the data – is that for most brands, the costs are not that high.

Now, David has made the point that we don't have full information and also that it could be that not that high is still double their previous costs, if they only had three registrations before and they have to get three more, but in absolute terms that's not particularly high cost.

But there are some brands that are registering on literally hundreds of TLDs and bearing a significant dead weight cost. So, the idea here is just to look specifically at those brands that are bearing a larger cost and see if there's a specific set of recommendations we could make around them. It's possible that there's not, there's nothing different that we can do, but the idea is to try to separate.

WAUDO SIGANGA: No, Jordyn, I think I was asking something slightly different. I was actually not replying to the binomial issue. Asking about the fact that already some [relation] to this problem of high costs for defensive registrations, there are already some alternative ways of countering that. I'll give you the example of blocking, and now we're making a recommendation here that –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] Waudo, I understand. Yes, I would imagine that it would be reasonable for the PDP to consider issues like blocking. We could certainly include in the rationale a statement that that sort of solution might be considered. I just don't want for us to prescribe a policy solution to it, because that's what the policy group is supposed to do.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, I'm just worried that you could be asking for a solution to be sought when already there are some solutions available.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that makes sense. I think we should make a reference to the blocking solutions in the rationale.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn, [inaudible] have any other comments.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so if that's the case, why don't we go ahead and see if anyone disagrees with the notion of making this prerequisite to have the subsequent procedures PDP consider this issue prior to a next round as a prerequisite?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so if anyone disagrees, either speak up or register that in your voting button. And I'm not seeing any –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Is someone speaking?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, yes, I should have raised my hand.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Now I see it, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The recommendation is just to the subsequent procedures PDP [because I see that] it's also in our chart we have it with listed to the RPM PDP as well, for both.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I think this – I think either one of them can, I guess, but I would imagine it would make more sense for subsequent procedures, but I guess we don't have a strong – I think any policy body, a policymaking group should consider it prior to the next round, so I guess it could be either. We will leave it up to the GNSO to determine which PDP was the right one.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So, should we leave it to the – make the recommendations to the GNSO Council?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I think that's right. Let's do that. I think they can [inaudible] arbiters of which policy work is supposed to go where.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Alright, we'll note that. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so we have consensus on that. The next one is on registry policies, and I think Dejan, I think this is actually one of the papers that you had helped author. Do you want to present this recommendation?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes, I can. Do you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay. I think with this recommendation that the policies regarding privacies would be more strictly, it doesn't necessarily be that ICANN should develop some particular privacy policies. It's necessary to add just minimum of restrictions. In order to cover cases where the registries doesn't care at all privacy policies or in cases when they have that policy, we find few of them in this analysis.

Case structure, sharing and selling private personal data should be at least covered with this and a few sentences within policies and those cases should be forbidden. Also, another recommendations here I recently add that the next service registrants and consumer service would include more data regarding the privacy.

In my opinion, it shouldn't be a prerequisite. I think that medium priority is quite okay. Since the next year, the GDPR are coming into force next year so three years from final report which is I think quite okay. That's in short.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, questions or comments for this recommendation dealing with privacy? It sounds like we have one more recommendation to add to the chart to reflect a call for more information to be gathered on this issue. And also, that this would be designated as a medium priority. So, questions or comments on Recommendation #45?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry. Can you just restate it? So, are we saying that there's 45 is as it reads whereas the 46 that it's medium priority? Are you saying both are medium priority?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, we're only talking about 45 now. We jumped because Megan is not here to discuss 42 through 44.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. No, I understood. Sorry, I'll just ask the 45 later. Something like you said there's an additional recommendation. What do you mean? I guess I'm just trying to understand that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. There will be an additional recommendation here on the chart but it's not here already so I don't want to change the number [inaudible].

JORDAN BUCHANAN: You're strictly just talking about the current one. Yes, that's fine.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Actually, as I understood it, there's a recommendation in the Dejan's paper that includes this recommendation to gather more information. Am I hearing that you'd like a little more information about that?

JORDAN BUCHANAN: I'm trying to understand in terms of prioritization, are we trying to prioritize both right now or just the one that's on the chart right now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I believe both right now. What I heard with the cases would be medium. Do you want that part about the recommendation that's done on the chart repeated?

JORDAN BUCHANAN: No, that's fine. If that's medium, I'm fine with that prioritization.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Other questions or comments? Okay, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks, Lauren. I don't see a second recommendation. Is this something we're adding to this paper? I'm looking down. I'm looking at your paper now and I do see one recommendation at the end, that happened or something.

DEJAN DJUKIC: I had recently in my paper but if it's too late, I think we can delete it. But I think it would be very useful to have that more information regarding privacy.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Dejan, did you add it to your Google Doc?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes, Google Doc. Yes. It's the last sentence in the recommendation.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I see. It is embedded in the recommendation. It's not a separate recommendation. Are you suggesting [we do that the] first recommendation or just keeping it within this recommendation?

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's not separate to me.

DEJAN DJUKIC: I think it's okay to me. Yes, it's not separate. Yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry. I thought you meant that it was a new recommendation. But I see the language in there. I understand.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: But I'm wondering even for the paper if that should stand alone because analytically, those are two different things. One is an information gathering and one is a consider. And actually, if I were going to be looking at the paper, I would say you might even want to flip them to gather the information and then in light of what you've already found and the information you get to consider stricter mandatory regulation such as, take that as a suggestion.

Other questions or comments? What we have then is for 45, we have that as a medium priority. Does anyone have any disagreements about these issues regarding the way information is protected, privacy issues? Any questions or comments or disagreements with that being considered a medium priority? Okay, I'm not seeing any disagreement. So, we have consensus on that.

I'm going to go to the Consumer Trust recommendations now. Consumer Trust recommendations are 46 to 49. We've actually talked about these quite a lot so I'm hoping we can just move through these rather quickly. The first one is to conduct a study to assess why and to what extent the public trust new gTLDs. I'm scrolling. It's very hard to see this.

In fact, I would make a recommendation that although Excel spreadsheets are very useful for categorizing information, they are singularly not useful for looking at things with these phone calls. So does the data in some other more easily readable format wherein we do things like this again.

This would be a prerequisite for subsequent procedures, the rationale being that right now, the information tells us that there's still a considerable lag in levels of trust for new gTLD versus legacy gTLDs. So, the proposal is that this would be a prerequisite. Questions or comments on this recommendation which is Recommendation #46? Questions or comments?

JORDAN BUCHANAN:

Could you just reinstate what the deliverable you say? What actually needs to be completed with the prerequisites?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

The deliverable would be a study that gets much further into this issue of why and to what extent the public trust new gTLDs. In the current surveys, we have this report that they trust them less and we have very broad concepts of familiarity and reputation being cited as the factors. But we don't have a lot of objective data. And we also don't have a lot of information about what is reputation and familiarity really mean.

So, the deliverable would be to try and get at more useful and actionable information about what's driving trust levels for new gTLDs for the next round.

JORDAN BUCHANAN: Yes. Okay. I guess I'm just trying to wrap my head around how that would be, this is the idea that the Subsequent Procedures PDP would [consume] that information in their process.

LAUREEN KAPIN: The subsequent procedures and also future applicants. Hopefully this sort of thing would be publicized and that the community of folks who are deciding whether to purchase apply for new gTLDs could consider that information as they're making their decisions about what to pursue and why.

JORDAN BUCHANAN: Okay. I understand. I'm a little concerned about making that prerequisite but I'm okay. I understand there's [strengths and] [inaudible] will withhold objections.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn. Other questions or comments? Okay, then I'll call for consensus on this Recommendation #46 being a prerequisite. Anyone who disagrees to that, please register that in your voting button. Thank you, [Sal]. I'm not seeing any disagreement. I'm only seeing agreement. So, we have consensus on 46.

So, 47 is "To create incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet consumer user expectation." This is a recommendation to the PDP Working Group. This is also designated as a prerequisite because these

are the sorts of incentives that could be implemented as part of the application process. And more specifically, this was a recommendation to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations regarding the relationship of the gTLD, its name, restrictions as to who can register a domain name in certain gTLDs based upon five messages of trust conveyed by the name, particularly the five or sensitive regulated industries and the safety and security abusers personal and sensitive information including health and financial information. This actually syncs up with Dejan's recommendation.

That is the recommendation as a prerequisite. Questions or comments on that recommendation? I'm not seeing or hearing any questions or comments on that recommendation. So, I will assume then that we have consensus on Recommendation #47.

Now, we are on Recommendation #48, "Repeat selected parts of the global surveys, look for an increase and familiarity with the new gTLDs, [inaudible] of new gTLDs, perceive trustworthiness." Again, I'm trying to scroll across. Actually, I'm going to go to my paper because this is too hard to see on this chart.

That we have as a high priority but not a prerequisite. The idea here is again, to just have a baseline that we have a baseline but to have that baseline repeated in regular intervals so we can have that as an assessment. Eleeza, I see your 47. 47 is a prerequisite. That's the recommendation. And now we're in 48 which is not a prerequisite but is a high priority. Eleeza, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you, Lauren. I have a question on this one. I think you agreed that 46 is a prerequisite which seems very similar to 48. Actually 48 seems like it's part and parcel of 46 but now we're assigning them different priority levels. If I were to implement these, I think there's a number of recommendations that relates to surveys and I would probably want to comply with them together. I'm not sure what priority level you would assign to that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, that's an excellent point. Then I would keep them. Because you would implement it together, I was thinking of them analytically being separate that you would just repeat parts of the surveys but something else could be done separately.

My issue here is that to a certain extent, the Nielsen Surveys didn't get at these issues in a way that I think people could act on them in that it was so subjective and things get really underneath these issues. I'm always wondering if it would be implemented the same since I assume if we were going to repeat studies, we would have Nielsen do it. But it seems to me that there is a possibility that some other entity would do this study for the Recommendation #46 which is why I had them have different priorities.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If I may, certainly, it could be a different entity. There's nothing that would require to utilize Nielsen again. Although I think it might be helpful given that they've had experience doing this twice now. But I would also add that no matter what, this is a very subjective question to

pose to people and interpreting the data, it can be interpreted in a number of different ways. It's a challenging topic to measure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I agree.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Regardless of who does it. You all spent quite a bit of time working with Nielsen on trying to refine the questions to get at better answers. And I think you saw how challenging that could be. Anyway, just some food for thought there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. No, I appreciate that. If we're going to group them together, then I would default to the prerequisite. I would always insight generally if we have these issues, I would default to the higher priority rather than the lower one.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: To combine 46 and 48, you're suggesting?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, we could combine them. I wouldn't combine them but I would just change the priority for 48 to a prerequisite so that it could be implemented together. I do think they are separate recommendations. One is just a repeat. The other is really getting at related but additional issues. But the points you raised are well taken.

Other questions or comments? I'm going to take Eleeza's suggestion to put this as a prerequisite also because in the implementation, 46 and 48 would be grouped together. The recommendation is to also have this as a prerequisite. Questions or comments on that? Otherwise, I'll ask people to vote if you disagree with this. Okay, I'm not hearing disagreements and I'm not seeing any disagreements. So, we'll move on to 49.

This recommendation is a study to collect data on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs. Where is the priority for that? I don't see a priority here. This deals with collecting data on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains and to compare consumer trust levels within the new gTLDs with varying degrees of registration restriction, determining whether there are correlations between DNS abuse and the presence or absence of registration restrictions and assessing the cost and benefits of registration restrictions and how these are being enforced.

This is not a prerequisite. In terms of timing, this has a low priority. I think that's reflecting the time it may take to actually gather this information. Can you remind me, Eleeza, about in terms of timing, what the low priority is?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Yes. That is, it must be considered prior to the start of the next ccTLD.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, yes, which I think would be the right time so that the next [CCT] can assess that. Questions or comments on 49? Questions or comments on 49?

Okay. I'm not seeing questions or comments so I'll ask people to vote. If you disagree with this prioritization, please show that. Okay, Calvin, you have a question or comment? No, you disappeared. Okay, Calvin would agree with this being a low priority. Okay, and I'm seeing checkmarks. Okay. It looks like we have consensus on 49 as a low priority.

I don't know if we still have Jonathan on the call. But I think that the rest of the items 50 through 60 –

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, 50 through 60, I think are still on the set of papers. We've done the application and evaluation so 50 through 53 are done but 54 through 60, I think those are still the papers that Megan was working on and that you and Jordyn are looking at. Are we holding those until tomorrow?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so just because I don't know if Jordyn feels ready to discuss any of these recommendations but I don't feel [I'm on top] of them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I've been working through the docs but I actually find the recommendations a bit confusing. It's fine. [inaudible] a little bit as I'm sure it's not going to make the staff happy but we'll maybe make the conversation later.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Then we will table those for tomorrow. I think what we have left, I'm going to try and take a step at highlighting what we have left. I believe what we have left on the table is 42 to 44 and 54 through 60. I think those are the only things that we have not prioritized. If I missed stating something, maybe staff can jump in and correct me.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: There was one recommendation I noticed yesterday as I was going through the papers that was missing when we talked through the data Analysis recommendation which some of those have now been moved to the Competition paper because they were more appropriate at that section. And it's now on the chart as number seven. It's relating to collection of secondary market data. We never discussed a prerequisite of priority level for that. Is that something we can determine on this call?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn? Jordyn, do we still have you on the call?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It sounded like Jonathan had to dash off as well but he had originally written this into the Data Analysis chapter and then I moved it into the Competition chapter after we agreed that we'd only keep because there was a lot of the repetition of the recommendations that were in there. And the ones here in the subsequent chapter, we've moved that one down there. I can read the bulk of the recommendation or we could tackle this one tomorrow.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'd rather tackle it tomorrow because I don't think we're going to be able to speak to it other than reading it at least for my perspective. I think we need to tackle it tomorrow. It sounds like Jonathan needed to get back to the intersessional.

Does anyone have any general questions or comments or maybe we can hear from the staff about just logistics for how things are teeing up for our dates. I know we're running a little behind although we have managed to get in a lot of the papers I think.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Laureen. We are still expecting the latest versions on Megan's papers. The Executive Summary, may all have received it in your inbox so you're invited to comment it until this Friday at 12:00 pm UTC. Other than that, we are just waiting for a few clarification on the data analysis paper. Once we have the latest version of Megan's paper and the data analysis paper, we can incorporate those in the [concentrated] draft reports and send those to the editor. After a few days, we'll have a first draft which we will share with the review team for minor comments.

Then once the Executive Summary has been revised, we'll include it in the final draft reports.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That sounds good. I just want to say how much I appreciate all the hard work and the wrangling and organizational stuff and fine-combing for inconsistencies and putting insights and all the things I'm not mentioning and may not even be aware that are going on by our great staff. So, a big thank you and a word of appreciation.

Also, I want to strongly, strongly encourage everyone to take a look at the Executive Summary because the reality is a lot of people may not read this report. The only thing they may read is the Executive Summary. If you are going to take a real close look at only one thing between today and tomorrow, it should be the Executive Summary.

Please take a look at that. You actually can comment until the end of the week. If there's any comments you want to make to the group, tomorrow would be the ideal time. I did want to emphasize that.

Does anyone else have any other business to raise or discuss? I was curious about travel issues because if there were any updates about that, I had actually filled up the form and gotten in my request but I haven't seen any response to that so I don't know what the status is of travel plans if anything.

PAMELA SMITH:

Hi, Laureen. It's Pamela.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hi, Pam.

PAMELA SMITH: Hello. I just got an e-mail from Laura Ramirez who handles the hotels. She said all of the hotel reservation confirmations including the staff are going out this week. Now, what they did speak, I don't know. She also confirmed that there will be shuttles from the hotels to the convention center depending on distance.

We know that those things are happening. As I understand it, you should be receiving notification this week as far as travel arrangements. But they did get the travel sheet requesting every one of you get there. We're just not getting the hotel information confirmation until this week.

But look out. I will be to annoy [some of her staff] to make sure I still exist but not annoy her so much that she leaves us to the very last. Prioritization here [inaudible] same way they're treating you, guys. I just remind her every few days that "Hey, we're here." Hopefully, you will receive e-mails with your hotel information and everything else. Hang on.

And actually, let me see because it seems like now that I think about it, the show notes for [inaudible]. All right. Go. She did say that as a group, you're supposed to be held at the [Scandic]. Just let me write this in the chat because I can't even pronounce this. But I'm sure it's one of the approved hotels for the event. And this will at least give you some ideas.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's helpful.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Thank you for that update, Pam. I am sure you have just the right blend of perseverance without becoming annoying that we need. Thank you for doing that.

PAMELA SMITH: You're welcome. Just be on the lookout in your e-mails for a confirmation this week and I will keep gently pestering Laura until we get them.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect. Okay. Then I think that is it. No wonder you couldn't pronounce it. Calvin, you have your hand up. I'm sorry, I didn't see that. Do you have your hand up?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes, I have my hand up. I just wanted to say that I already got my tickets and everything. I hope I would use my passport this time.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We're all hoping that, Calvin. We missed you and we want to see you again in Copenhagen. Did you get your arrangements done through ICANN Travel then?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes, I've had my stuff done through ICANN Travel. The only thing I don't have is the hotel accommodation but I've got the tickets and everything else so I'm all sorted and ready.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. Okay. I guess I'll follow-up with them separately. I don't know why my [inaudible].

PAMELA SMITH: That's good to know and that way, I will ping [inaudible] from the other end saying some of the team members have gotten information and some have not. If we could just make sure everybody have their information.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. Okay. Thank you, one and all. We will talk then tomorrow. Thanks, everyone, for their participation today.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]