LAUREEN KAPIN: I want to welcome everyone to our plenary call. This is one of our additional plenary calls scheduled so that we can allow the team to make sure they have the opportunity to weigh in on all the parts of our preliminary report. This is just going to be for the hour, and I appreciate everyone making additional time in their schedule to join us. Jonathan, unfortunately, could not join us this morning.

Does anyone have any updates to their Statements of Interest?

Okay. Not hearing anything. First up on our call is going to be Drew, who's going to take us through his DNS abuse paper. Thanks to Jean Baptiste for uploading this.

I know this came up yesterday. Folks, since the print may be very small on your screen, you can actually press the little plus sign on the bottom to make it bigger if you need to – one of the few technological pieces of advice I can offer.

With that said, Drew?

DREW BAGLEY: All right. Thanks, Laureen. For everyone, I'm sorry that I did not create a clean copy with the Google Docs that still shows I retain as suggested edits, but essentially this placeholder right now serves the purpose of giving background on the DNS abuse landscape and why the DNS abuse-oriented technical safeguards came to be. The purpose of that context is so that our readers can understand why the safeguards came to be and what the state of DNS abuse has been like according to some studies –

I've shown some studies in there – and then create the groundwork for why we launched our study.

With that said, I expect that this will be a lot longer and have a lot more in it once we actually have the data from that study.

With that in mind, there are no actual recommendations at this time. Instead, this just focused on, like I said, the background on the technical safeguards and, going forward, defining what we expect to learn from our study.

Once we have the study data, among the things that we'll so is we'll be looking for any correlations we can perhaps [inaudible]. The study itself, of course, will show rates of abuse broken down by TLD. From there, you'll be able to see it broken down by registrar as well. We can see what correlations there are, but also we'll be able to then maybe tell if new gTLDs have lower rates of abuse, higher rates of abuse, or whatever and then map the corresponding safeguards to see if there is any correlation at all, even though we wouldn't be able to tell causation from that.

For this version of the chapter, I guess Waudo provided some feedback last night that I've not had a chance to look at, so I do need to look at that. But from what I've gathered so far, a lot of the changes I needed to make that I have made were in explaining things a bit more or stylistic because, as is the struggle with all of these chapters, this was created as a Frankenstein from bits and pieces of other discussion papers written by many different people.

I will continue to try to smooth the style, but I'm wondering if anyone has any additional feedback. Waudo, if you're on the call, I've not had a chance to actually read your latest input yet, but for some of these I know I've created a few placeholder footnotes because I need to find definitions for some of the terms. Does anybody have any feedback?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Drew, this is Laureen. This is just a general comment about definitions. I know Stan in particular is concerned with defining things and certainly definitions at precision. One note of caution I would sound is for certain terms, there are many different definitions out there. There isn't necessarily agreement, and I wouldn't want us, in the quest for defining everything, to be taking a stand on defining a term in a rigid way when actually it's debatable.

So I just add that note of caution because we don't want to presume to say, "This is the one and only definition, and the Review Team agrees on this, and ICANN should adopt it." That's not what we're saying. I'm just sounding a cautious note for being careful how we – in our quest to make this precise – to not box ourselves in when something actually is subject to debate, not even just in the ICANN community but in the world at large.

DREW BAGLEY: Thanks, Laureen. I'll definitely heed to that caution. I think many of the things so far that I've tried to define based on Stan's input and the input from others has been things like: what is wildcarding? What's DNSSEC? Things like that of which there are universal, precise definitions, rather

than attempting to simplistically define DNS abuse or something like that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Exactly. That was the example I was thinking about.

DREW BAGLEY: So everyone knows, I have attempted in this chapter to explain why we our study is looking at the aspects of DNS abuse that we're looking at because, of course, we are looking at the parts of DNS abuse that are easier to measure because they're not depending on content judgement – something is either part of a botnet or it's not and things like that. Obviously you can make mistakes and people might flag things wrong and there can be errors in threat data, but nonetheless, we focus on the things that are more universally and technologically definable for the purpose of what we're focusing on with DNS abuse.

With that said, after we get back all this data, with this chapter we might be able to do a better job explaining, as we come with our recommendations, other parts of things that people consider DNS abuse that should be looked at in the future. But for our baseline study and our baseline report, that's what we're focusing on.

Thanks, Laureen, for that feedback. Does anybody have any other feedback? I see that Carlton in the chat says, "So we must not go all techie and structural." Yeah, I think that's good to keep in mind both ways where, on the one hand, you'll find maybe adding so much technical information, as far as technical definitions – and on the

flipside, the other things that stops us from becoming so techie is that we are defining some of these highly technical terms so that your average reader can understand it.

Okay. It looks like Brian is echoing that. Yeah, it looks like maybe there's a lot of edits since last night, since I was still working on this yesterday morning. So I'll have to go back. It looks like, fortunately, they're just to enhance the style of the chapter, which is great.

CALVIN BROWNE: Drew, Calvin here.

DREW BAGLEY: Hey, Calvin. Calvin is the star of this chapter, by the way, because he came up with much of the technical analysis that was incorporated into it. Go ahead, Calvin.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. I went through it again, probably just a couple of hours ago. You asked a couple of questions and I answered you in an e-mail, or at least an e-mail to the list.

I made a couple of changes. What I was finding was that thing was getting quite complicated and difficult work through with all the different changes and so forth to it, and I was wondering if we plan to maybe start from scratch again or from a clean sheet again sometimes or not.

DREW BAGLEY: I'm sorry. Could you clarify? You said, "Do we plan to start from scratch again?"

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. Well, in a [nut scratch], rather than start from a clean sheet, accept changes – I'm not sure exactly what the terminology is, but something like "accept the changes" [inaudible]

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, okay. Got you. Yeah. I thought you meant writing this all over again. I was like, "Uh, no. we're not doing that."

CALVIN BROWNE: No, no, no, no, no.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, that's a great point, and that's something that I think Laureen was emphasizing we should all do yesterday. What I can do is I can go ahead as the penholder and accept all the changes and make this cleaner because I think that'll help make it easier to read.

Thanks for going over this again. I still need to incorporate the language from your latest e-mail to me into the group [inaudible] that you sent to all of us.

EN

Perhaps you can help me. I still need to figure out a source to cite. You're included in this group with the technical people who know the most about this. I'm wondering if there's something we could point to or even a series of things we could point to in the footnotes to explain how monitoring the wildcarding would work. Either way, I'll put that new language you provided in, and then I would like something to cite. That way, a person unfamiliar with this can understand how you would go about monitoring wildcarding and why it would be that a technical operator should notice if that is occurring.

Even if we have a few sources that just explain what happens when a DNS query is made and how that query is resolved that way, we could cite that as we're explaining this wildcarding phenomenon.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. Yes, like I said, I sat down with my techies. They quite quickly showed me [inaudible] offline and in that e-mail that I sent you. So what you're saying is to maybe look at making an e-mail a little bit more points-oriented so it could go as a footnote.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, we can keep the language you [inaudible]. We can put in the body then if you could just help me come up with footnote sources. Otherwise, Brian is pointing out that we could just cite the conversation itself. So we could just say, "On such-and-such date, one of the Review Team members had a conversation with this Technical Team, and this is the explanation provided."

So worst case, that's what we'll do. If you can think of any other sources we could put into the footnotes, just let me know.

Thank you again for going back and speaking with your team about that.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. No problem. I look forward to a clean copy. I have done a couple of changes earlier on about our [inaudible] going in through it, but I was finding it extremely difficult to [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. So yeah, I will prioritize doing that. That way, you and anyone else can make changes easier going forward.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Have we lost audio? Drew, we can't hear you speaking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I hear Eleeza and Pam.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is Laureen, and I'm continually having my sound cut out from the phone. This is the second time I've recalled. I'm wondering if Drew is having the same problem.

Drew, we know you can hear us. Hang up and dial back in, and I will send an e-mail to tech support.

DREW BAGLEY: Hey, guys. I've called back. Yes, I could still hear you guys, but I guess no one could hear me.

I have no idea at what point I was cut off, but basically, in response to Calvin, I will do my best to make a clean copy out of this by accepting all the changes that should be accepted. I'll try to keep comments. You know some comments are deleted if they're tied to changes you're accepting, but I'll go through and do that.

Then I was wondering, from Calvin and from anyone else, that, other than maybe some minor edits for clarity – especially, Calvin, do you think that overall this chapter is okay, acknowledging that we need to add some additional language?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. It looks like it's going in the right direction to me, but that's [inaudible] clean copy and then just run through it because I was really being [inaudible]. So we're going in the right direction.

DREW BAGLEY: All right. Thanks, Calvin. I'll try to get that clean copy done as soon as possible, hopefully today, as far as going through all the comments and incorporating them.

I guess we can move on. My final question to the group is: is there anyone who, acknowledging that I will accept any changes anyone has

added, opposed this chapter and is not comfortable with this going into our draft report?

Okay. I don't see any objections. The only thing I see objections to is the quality of Adobe Connect. With that, I will pass this to – I don't know who's speaking next. Jonathan? Oh, no, Jonathan is not here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, because Jonathan couldn't join us. Is it going to be staff that is speaking about the next two papers of background on the Review Team and history of the New gTLD Program?

Okay. And is anyone speaking now? Because once again, my sound is cutting out.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I can hear you, Laureen. This is Eleeza.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, good.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We're just trying to figure out who could speak to these papers. Brian, I think you composed the bulk of this paper. Is there anything you want to mention about it? We used a number of different sources from ICANN.org and from our own staff to construct an abbreviated history of the program. We mentioned the DNS. I'll let Brian speak to that. Obviously there's no recommendations or anything in here.

EN

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi. Can you hear me? I'm just coming off mute.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. I don't think there's much that we need to spend time on with this. I think it's pretty straightforward. If there's any additions or glaring issues you see, please go ahead and let me know. I think it's a pretty straightforward chapter. There's a few minor edits that it looks like Margie made. Other than that, I don't have too much to say about it, unless anyone has any comments.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'll pass on my compliments, Brian. I thought this was a really nicely done history – succinct but having all the key components.

BRIAN AITCHISON: As much as I love to take credit, it's, again, like a Frankenstein of different histories that we've taken off different sources. But thank you very much, Laureen. I did organize it, and Margie did make some good comments. Thanks.

                         Does anybody object to anything in this chapter, or is there any reason we need to go back and look at it?

Seeing none, I will go through and accept comments and so forth.

DREW BAGLEY: I think it looks great.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. Good. I think we [inaudible] –

DREW BAGLEY: You could write the other chapters, too. You could write the whole thing. I have confidence in you.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah. Just don't tell anyone else.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Nice try. So can we consider this approved?

BRIAN AITCHISON: It sounds like we can.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm not seeing any objections to this, so I think that's right.

BRIAN AITCHISON:	Okay. I imagine people are scrolling through it quickly now, just to make sure there's nothing. If there is nothing, I think I will pass the baton to the next presenter.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	That would be for the background on the Review Team.
BRIAN AITCHISON:	Right.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Who's going to read –
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Good morning. It's Jean-Baptiste on the phone. Good morning, everyone. This paper is really about the genesis of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team. It's quite general. It's an introduction on who started the review team and how it was formed. As for the previous speaker, there are no recommendations in this document. Please let us know if you have any comments on this paper.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Jean-Baptiste, this is Laureen. When I saw the title for the paper, "Background on the Review Team," I almost thought from the title that you were going to be talking about the Review Team members. What I see the paper really talking about is the background not of the Review

Team but of the review. So I would just suggest that that title change – "Background on the Consumer Competition blah, blah, blah Review" – because "Team" makes me thing you're going to focus on the individuals. But it's really a procedural history of what came before the formation of the formal review.

JEAN-BAPTIESTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, I get your point. We can change that. Thank you, Laureen. Are there any other comments?

LAUREEN KAPIN: The one other question/comment I had is regarding the metrics because I know from our earlier discussions that ICANN didn't gather data on all the metrics, and not all the metrics were the subject of, for example, the studies. I don't know quite how we want to handle that, but I don't want to create the misimpression that those metrics that were recommended have all percolated into the actual data that's being gathered in the review efforts. It's my understanding that that's definitely not the case. I'm not sure there's clarity on that point.

Margie and Eleeza and Brian and the folks who are much more familiar with this can jump in if I'm misunderstanding.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Laureen. This is Eleeza. In terms of the references to the metrics in the other studies, those were compiled for the Review Team and with the Review Team in mind. I know that you've looked at some of them. I don't know that all of them have been used or been used very much,

but I do think it's worth referencing the fact that we have been collecting and publishing those pretty regularly. So that's why we probably should include in the Sources Available here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. I'm not debating including it. I'm just concerned that we may be creating this misimpression that all of those metrics have set into everything because we are aware of them, we've looked at them, but I can't say that we've picked up the thread of all of them in these papers. I think that's where my concern is.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, I think that would be reflected in the papers themselves. There's no finding or data that's referenced in the paper that doesn't include a citation. So I think that's certainly referenced.

If you want to, we could include a line to the effect of, "The primary sources for this review team included X, Y, and X," and list those you did use more frequently; for example, the surveys and the economics studies and so forth. So that could be one way to tackle it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Megan, any other questions?

EN

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. Sorry. I made a comment about Bylaws. It's withdrawn because I found the reference.

But I have something which I'm a little bit concerned about it. I don't know what page I'm on, but I'm… Well, anyway –

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible] some of the –

MEGAN RICHARDS: It says, "Producing recommendations that are as deep and fact-driven as possible. Its fundamental goal is the review." I'm just a little bit concerned about the way that is written. It's true that we wanted to be as data-driven as [evidence-based] as possible in our [inaudible] and in our review. I'm just a little bit concerned about the way it's written because, in many cases, as everyone knows, we didn't have the data that allowed us to make recommendations. It didn't allow us come to as many conclusions or recommendations that we might have had.

So it's just a question of a very slight rewording of that phrase. I'll tell you what. I'll try to put something in the chat. Maybe that will help. I agree with the idea. I'm just a little concerned that typical readers will criticize us all about the recommendations not being data- and fact-driven because often we're missing data [inaudible]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Megan. Yes, if you can put some inputs, we'll take it into account.

I don't see any other hands. No more questions?

Okay. Thank you, everyone. We still have 25 minutes. I saw that there were a few comments, but I'm not sure [if] they were with regards to the first paper we discussed today. But I'm not sure that we need to go back. Let me check.

Okay. So we still have 25 minutes to discuss another paper. As Jonathan is not here, we won't discuss the application and evaluation. I was thinking, Jordyn, that I didn't see any new modifications on your paper, and I was wondering if we could discuss it now.

Jordyn?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn, we're not hearing you if you're talking.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Excellent.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think Jordyn needs to dial back in also, based on the comment.

Are there any other staff papers that we can discuss? I'm trying to find the e-mail with the schedule of papers because it would be good to use the time where we have everyone on the line because it doesn't necessarily sound like Jordyn's is the best candidate here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, Laureen. Hopefully you can hear me now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Now I can hear you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Who knows what's going on with the bridge today? In any case, we discussed the consumer choice paper in the past, and I don't think I've seen any follow-up feedback since then. So I feel a little bit like a discussion would be duplicative of the past conversations. But if people feel like it'd be worthwhile, I'm happy to roll through it again.

I guess we could look – no. Like I said, I'm happy to roll through it again, but I haven't seen any discussions since the last time we've discussed it, and it hasn't been substantively modified since then.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, this is Eleeza. One thing we've been waiting on, because we've been working on formatting papers in parallel, is the formatting of the recommendations in this paper and in the competition paper so that they're all in that standard format that we've agreed upon.

Do you have anticipate having that anytime soon?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, sure.   That's a relatively minor tweak, but I haven't seen any feedback on the actual recommendations. So I don't think they'll change in substance, just in form.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The reason I raise it is because I think it helps to see the recommendations in that format and to discuss the rationale behind it. I don't know that we've entirely discussed each of the recommendation in that level of detail [for this] paper.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Yeah, we could do that. That's obviously not done yet, so that wouldn't be good for discussion today either.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Agreed. Just pressing that point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I think it may just be that, without Jonathan's paper to discuss, we may be out of backlog for the moment.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm wondering if there's any possibility, since we have Megan and Dejan on the phone, that there's any interest in discussing the registry policies paper. I know I'm springing that on people because we have this extra time, so I understand if there is not a willingness to do that. But since we have 20 minutes and that's a discrete paper, as I recall, on the shorter side, is that something that's a possibility? I totally defer to Megan and Dejan here, if I'm putting you on the spot.

I see that Megan's typing, so we'll see her response.

"Hi. For me, the recommendations are missing, which I'm hoping Dejan will be able to add." Dejan, do you have any thoughts about that? Eleeza is typing, too.

That's a good suggestion, Eleeza: to have Dejan give his thoughts about that. Does Dejan has audio? Because I see a little circle with a red cross through it next to his microphone.

Okay. Well, in the meantime, maybe, Megan, you can walk us through the paper. We can always circle back to it at its normally-scheduled time, but at least we can have a preview right now. Does that seem like a reasonable use of our time?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah. Sorry, I was typing something else at the same time. That's fine for me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Thank you, Megan, for letting me pounce on you.

MEGAN RICHARDS: No problem. Dejan is really the brains behind all of this. He did all of the hard work. I just did some minor editing.

The idea here – this is the point that Dejan was trying to make – was that, in addition to price competition, there is also non-price competition. What he was trying to show here was that non-price

competition between new gTLDs and five ccTLDs as a balance or a comparative group, if you like – I think [30] new gTLDs – to show their privacy and registration rules. It's related to data [protection] [inaudible] privacy. To whom would the registries provide information [inaudible], etc. So he did a very good analysis of this and looked at these top new gTLDs and compared them with five ccTLDs.

His conclusion, which is not there, which I'm making now for you, Dejan – so if you don't agree – was that there were a number of very useful, to consumers – I wouldn't say "useful" because he doesn't actually say "useful" – privacy and protection provisions that existed, both for ccTLDs and for new gTLDs.

I think the main problem that we have here is that we can't prove how competitive those [facilities] were, either for increasing the number of registrants or whether those were beneficial or advantageous to consumers. So I think for me that's the main problem here.

Now, I'm sure there's a way of just showing that these are other factors that can be taken into consideration and that these are bells and whistles [inaudible] to call them, which is a bit rude because they're not bells and whistles. They're just more aspects that give new gTLDs and some [in comparison] is what ccTLDs do – some other added advantages or benefits.

So that's really where we are. Now, there were some comments about the [inaudible]. I think it was Antonietta who suggested that these are [inaudible] of protection mechanism portion – ah, Dejan is back!

Wonderful. Well, I'll just finish my little point here, Dejan, and then I'll let you come in and [correct] everything that I've said that's wrong.

So the point that Antonietta was making was that the aspect [inaudible] rights protection mechanism should go to that [inaudible]. But Dejan's point here is that this relates to non-price competition in gTLDs. So I think some elements of what he has put here are important to that argument and not the rights protection mechanisms, which are a different issue.

So this section could be certainly condensed and made shorter, but I think it's an element that's important in the context of non-price competition.

I pass now to Dejan, and I [will be silent.]

You need to be a bit louder, Dejan. We can hear you, but very – Dejan, we can hardly hear you. Can you speak louder? Maybe your microphone is too far away.

We can hear that you're speaking but we can't hear at all what you're saying. I heard the words "mobile phone," but that's all.

That's better. More, more, more.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: Oh, okay. Well, don't worry about the specific text. I don't know if you've heard what I said. It was about the rights protection mechanism. That's one element that I think could be reduced and condensed in this section because I think it's an important aspect relating to non-price competition; some of the conclusions that you had where the details could go to – okay.

The other point is that probably we need to clarify the recommendations in that usual format that Jonathan wants to have included. I didn't try to do that because, partly, it's really 99% your paper. I just made some minor editing and adjustments to it.

So I don't know if you're ready to make some recommendations or conclusions, or do you think we should all look at it together.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible] very careful [inaudible] try to make it together. But I will [inaudible] through the paper [today] and try to make some recommendations regarding the protection of privacy, especially in the European [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: I think that would be very helpful. It's only four points: the recommendation, the justification for it, the [time], whether people with agree with it, etc. If you could just put those down on a piece of paper – not a piece of paper – [inaudible] to everyone, then everyone will be able to see what is the result of the analysis that's been done here. I think that would be very helpful, and that will help people to

concentrate on what is really there in the paper and also to comment on it.

DEJAN DJUKIC: What I intend to do is to clear all the things, the changes [inaudible] I agree. But I agree to most of it so I'll send clean paper [today] [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay. You better ask Jean-Baptiste about the timing because he'll have an idea of when – the deadline was probably a couple days ago.

DEJAN DJUKIC: I wasn't [inaudible]. My wife [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Congratulations. So you're busy.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Of course. So that's why we haven't seen you so frequently. That's good news. Good news for you and bad news for our – okay.

DEJAN DJUKIC:	[inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS:	Very good. So this is our second CCT baby. We're making progress on the babies. [inaudible]

DEJAN DJUKIC:	[inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS:	[inaudible]. You have to name the baby after one of the CCT members.

DEJAN DJUKIC:	Yeah. There's no [inaudible] here. [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS:	A gTLD name.

DEJAN DJUKIC:	Yeah. A gTLD name.

MEGAN RICHARDS:	Very good. A third CCT baby.

DEJAN DJUKIC:	Yeah. A third one.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay. So, Dejan, don't expect [inaudible]. I'll turn the microphone back to Laureen or whoever else is looking after all of this, unless anyone has comments. Does anyone have any comments on this? It's just Dejan ad I who have been doing. Maybe someone else has some useful and constructive criticism.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Megan, this is Laureen. As I understand it, the paper is seeking to discuss consumer choice in the context of distinguishing characteristics that are not price characteristics, such as privacy policies and rights protection mechanisms and then comparing some ccTLDs to policies in the new gTLDs. I know there's also mention of the Public Interest Commitment. But basically, it's talking about expanded consumer choice through the lens of these additional non-price components. Is that a fair summary, Megan and Dejan?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, exactly. [inaudible] Sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I just wanted to make sure that I'm understanding the gist here.

MEGAN RICHARDS: That's absolutely true. That's absolutely correct. That was exactly the idea; that one element of competition – because we were looking at

competition and consumer choice and consumer protection. Competition is for something that is supposed to improve consumer choice, to give consumer better prices, better options, etc. We were looking at price competition, but we also wanted to look at some elements of non-price competition. So this was the task that Dejan took on. He was looking at these non-price competition aspects of privacy in particular and data protection.

LAUREEN KAPIN: As I understand it from this discussion and my prior reading, the challenge here is that we don't necessarily have data to show what impact these factors had on increasing, for example, the number of registrants or making, in general, the domain name more used or appealing. Is that correct?

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible]. There is some data [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: There is some data.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible].

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible] their use of [inaudible] registration.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, Dejan. It's hard for me to hear everything that you're saying. But it sounds like what you're saying is that there is some data available.

DEJAN DJUKICK: Yeah. There's some data [inaudible] data are already included but there is [inaudible] part of data also [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Well, I guess the action item is, first of all, for the Review Team to take a closer look at this. Before that happens, though, Dejan, in the midst of more important activities, is also going to add some recommendations here and take a look at the edits so that we can have a discussion finalizing this. I think it's either next week or in our next few sessions. So that would be the action item.

DEJAN DJUKICK: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

DEJAN DJUKIC: In February [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. In early February.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay. Does anyone have any other comments or questions?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Well, I want to thank everyone, particularly Megan and Dejan, who acted within a moment's notice to jump in and discuss this paper, which I appreciate, and everyone else for making time for these extra calls.

The best way for people to weigh in on these papers is in advance with the penholders by making comments and being as specific as possible. It's even better, besides raising questions, to give a proposed solution if you're identifying an issue. So I would encourage people to think about that.

Waudo is asking, "When is the next meeting?" I'm so sorry, Waudo, that you had to stop in the middle of your journey to take the call. What we've settled on to try to push through for the review team to have an opportunity to weigh in on all the sections of the preliminary report is adding phone calls on Thursdays at this time. So our next discussion will be on Wednesday at our usual time for the plenary call.

We will also have discussions now on Thursdays at this time for an hour, just to make sure we can catch up. Those are scheduled through the first week of February. I think February 3rd is the last date for people to get in comments for papers.

Jean-Baptiste, I know you did send something out already, but maybe you can resend out the schedule to the team, just emphasizing that we're adding these Thursday calls. As I said, I know you did send that out, but just as a reminder to folks that we are now having plenary calls on both Wednesdays and Thursdays for the next two weeks.

With that said – okay. Jean-Baptiste is typing. With that said, I think we're going to – oh, and Jean-Baptiste is also reminding me that there are also calendar invites that have been issued. So accept those calendar invites so that'll be on your schedules in everyone's particular time zone. And John Baptiste is also going to share the work plan once more.

Thank you so much, Jean-Baptiste, and the rest of ICANN team, for supporting us as we're pushing through to get this preliminary report out.

Okay. Thanks, everyone. We will speak again next Wednesday. So take a look at the papers on the agenda for that call. Send the penholders your comments in advance, and then we can get through the calls in a most efficient manner as possible.

By the way, if your paper is scheduled for discussion during a time when you know you can't be there, let us know so we can adjust the schedule.

Thanks, everyone. Also thanks to Drew for leading this discussion on the DNS abuse. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]