

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, folks. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the 48<sup>th</sup> [inaudible] CCT review. Is there anyone on the phone that is not reflected in the Adobe Connect?

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Carlos Gutierrez, Jonathan, please. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Carlos. Anyone else? All right. And has there been any updates to anyone's Statement of Interest? All right. Let's dive in. Not positive what the best way is to approach this. Should we bring up the Public Comment spreadsheet? Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: You would like the spreadsheet to be on screen?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess so. I'm trying to think what the best way is to discuss these comments. Did you have a plan?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: No. It was part of the question that I asked leadership on how [we're going to] discussion.

---

*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.*

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I'm happy to take responsibility for not having a good idea how to go about discussing these, but maybe the [plenary] is the way to go to look at the categories, the comments that have come in.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Okay. Let me put that on screen then. One second.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Folks had a chance to look at these in relation to the issues that they owned in the draft. It's going to be one of those late night radio DJ calls [inaudible].

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Okay, Jonathan, I think there's issue with my Excel. Can we move to the other item agenda?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. There's a draft report thing that was... since that's Stan's presentation... but he's not on the call. So, do you want to talk about ICANN 59 briefly?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Sure. I'll [get] that on screen. Well –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are you walking us through this, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: You mean... Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, now I can.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Okay, yes, sorry. Hold on a minute but I just learned that on Stan's paper, there were no comments received on my side and I checked with Stan and he did not put any input on his paper.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, that's an easy agenda item, then.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: So, I'm just curious whether we need to resubmit his paper for discretion at a later stage or whether we can consider his paper and edits and incorporate them into the draft report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I liked it. It sounds like Megan liked it, so maybe we incorporate it unless people had comments on it that they didn't submit. [inaudible] raise your hand. Say we incorporate [inaudible].

---

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Okay, perfect. So, moving on to the ICANN 59 agenda, so what you have on screen you should be able to navigate. So, we have drafted this agenda and what's appearing right now is so the face-to-face meeting day one, so we have a different presentation that has been set up for face-to-face meeting.

But on this first day, what we'll start with the discussion on the INT server results and determine whether there are any updates needed to inside of report. And then it will be a thorough review of the different public comments received in order to check where updates or investigations need to be brought within draft report in preparation for draft final report.

So, what we recommend is to have all through the day to divide the review of public comments per recommendation, so we'll have a look afterwards at the Excel sheet but what we have prepared is a public comment [shell] where we indicate for each comment and for which commenter what was the input received. So, the idea would be to go recommendation for recommendation just to keep an eye at what needs to be edited on each part of the draft report.

This would be for the first day of the face-to-face meeting and on the second day, so we have set up a presentation with the global domains division, so we'll have [inaudible] who will present so this now has been confirmed, so it will be one of our presentations and discussions with the Review Team.

---

And then it will be followed by a presentation from an SIDN on the DNS study [intermediary] reports and based on that, there will be a discussion on how we can incorporate this resource into the reports.

And in the afternoon, we have to keep in mind that at the end of the day from 5:30 to 6:30, we have a meeting with the ICANN Board, so the idea is to have two hours within our meeting to prepare for that meeting, and deliver an update to the ICANN Board. And then from 3:30 to 5:00 before the meeting with the ICANN Board, we would use that time, the roadmap to a final report with drafting [the action] items and thinking about our next steps.

Also, we have been sending out different mails to other SO and AC groups and subgroups to have Jonathan providing them with an update on where we are and what our current discussion is on. And so we have the different meetings that are set up. We still expect some feedback from some of these, so we have meeting on Monday, the 20<sup>th</sup> of June, with the Registry Stakeholder Group.

In the afternoon, we have half an hour with the GAC and then on Tuesday, we have noted expression of interest for the Review Team. It's a cross-community discussion on geographic names at a top-level session, so this is one session. There is another one on Thursday and between those two, we have an update to the NomCom [inaudible] constituency from 5:00 to 6:30 and this is a public session and, unfortunately, there is only one other session at the same time on the ICANN59 schedule, so we hope to have people attending the session. Also we invite other ICANN constituency groups who did not have time in ICANN59 to join this session to receive the updates from Jonathan.

---

So that's mainly for now for the ICANN59 agenda. As I said, we are still waiting for [a few] answers and we also have certain SO/AC who have required to receive an update at a later stage, so we'll try setting up meetings with this group to provide another update one of their calls.

I also placed in the notes [stack] the link to the ICANN59 schedule for your interests. This is not public, so you can have a look. And I see that Laureen, you have a question. Go ahead, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Hi, Jean-Baptiste. Thanks so much. Can you tell me do we have a topic for the Registry Stakeholder meeting or is just more of a general update? Especially because they are asking for slides way in advance, which I think will be challenging, I'm wondering what are we talking about to them during that meeting.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ:

Thank you for question. In fact, when we contacted them, we just informed them that what was on our agenda for ICANN59 and we sent them that [inaudible] to provide them with an update on that. So, they did not come back to us with like specific questions on what they wanted to hear from us but more with the open question, we would like to know in advance what you will be discussing so that we can ask question on that.

So, I think it's more about us agreeing on what needs to be delivered during that meeting because there is no specific question at this stage

---

from them. They are more waiting for what we will provide us in update before asking any specific questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, it seems to me like follow-up would be there needs to be a discussion about that, so this we can prepare properly and I don't think we have a game plan yet, so I would add that to our to-do list.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Yeah. I mean, my assumption is more than that we will provide them maybe with an update on what we worked at ICANN 59 and maybe try to tailor some subjects that are more targeted at their [group], something like that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, that makes sense.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Jordyn, you have a question?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. I was just going to talk to the point of the Registry Stakeholders Group, which is I don't know if people have seen, but the Registry Stakeholder Group is quite a lengthy public comment –

---

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Jordyn, your voice is really low. I don't know if it's the same for those in the Adobe room.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It is.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is that better?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Not really.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Not really.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: My mic is close to my face as I can get it, so hmm. I'll type.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: I just heard that you wanted to talk about the meeting with the Registry Stakeholder Group.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right. I think they submitted a very long public comment, responding to basically every one of our recommendations, and so I think we should use this as an opportunity for engagement and dialog with them because there's a bunch of pushback on many of the recommendations. I think we should really look at this as an opportunity for engagement with them over the comments they submitted more than just giving them an update from our perspective.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Okay. I don't know if everyone heard but Jordyn suggested that we just react on the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That makes sense.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: [inaudible] draft report, which is a good idea. We can do that. Thank you, Jordyn. Are there any questions regarding the ICANN59 schedule or any other updates that I would have missed?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hey, Jean-Baptiste. Hopefully, you can hear me. I put this in the chat but the one thing I'm hoping to do on the schedule is adjust it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Looks good.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, we can do the DNS abuse update any time other than Sunday morning.

Sorry?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I said I think the schedule is good.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Yeah, but I think there was Jordyn talking.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, I'm going [inaudible].

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Oh, is there [inaudible] discussion any time other than Sunday morning? Well, about that, it's going to be difficult to move it, considering that they will be providing presentations to other groups, as well, on Sunday. So, I will need to look whether this can be moved on day one, but it's going to divide... First thing I look at their availability and second, it's going to divide the discussion on the recommendations. I need to look into that. But Sunday afternoon seems difficult because I know that they have other presentations.

Thanks, Jordyn. Any other questions? Laureen, your hand is up again.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. I'm sorry if I missed this – what is Akram and the Global Domains division folks, what's the topic that they're going to be discussing with us?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: It will be a review of the ICANN org input, so of the public comments that we have received from ICANN org.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, thanks.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Any other questions? Okay. We'll move back to the first item [inaudible] discussion then on public comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I have a quick question maybe for Jordyn and related to the schedule, which is whether or not we have enough time in the schedule to really engage with the [inaudible] Registry Stakeholder Group or if we need to make [inaudible] more of [inaudible]. I mean, is there a... have more extensive discussion or we'll be able to accomplish it at the meeting. Is anybody hearing me? Most quiet call ever. Can you not hear me?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: I can hear you, Jonathan, while I'm driving. I can speak a little.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. People heard me. Okay. Good. I guess the question is this is a constrained meeting in many ways and [inaudible] in enough time to interact with the Registry Stakeholder Group or should we be trying to schedule a call with them? Jordyn, what's your thoughts?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let me try to ask that question of them this week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. Laureen, is that a new hand?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, it is. I have not read their public comment yet but Jordyn, did I hear you correctly? [inaudible] responding and I assume when you mean responding, you mean in some way raising concerns about each and every recommendation. Did I hear you correctly? Are you hearing me, Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I did, sorry. Adobe Connect mobile app is the worst thing in the world.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Is that a yes or a no?

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: They react to each of the recommendations. Some of them are supportive of. Many of them, especially the data gathering recommendations, they basically [inaudible] better cost-benefit analysis around them. [inaudible] there's pushback on pricing and things that we think are important, they say this is sensitive data, we don't really want to share it with you, so there's quite [inaudible] in there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, based on that, it strikes me that the time allocated is not going to be sufficient to do a deep dive into their concerns and it might be productive to figure out a way to schedule a time to talk about this that allows for a deeper back and forth about these, so that's my observation. Now whether that happens before the meeting or after the meeting or in another session during the meeting, I don't have a view on that other than that it needs to happen with sufficient time for us to take into account before we generate our next iteration of the report before the final comes out, so that's my only comment.

But if there are concerns or reactions or that expansive and that to that degree of concern, that to me signifies there's going to need to be some discussion and give and take, and that's not going to be able to come to close with an hour time. That's my weigh-in on your topic, Jonathan, so we don't have total radio silence on that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, I agree that we're probably not going to be able to get through everything in an hour. Having said that, I do feel like face-to-face interactions are usually a lot more productive and constructive than

---

other mechanisms. So, I don't think we would start with that hour and use that as a springboard to future discussions as opposed to eliminating that hour.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, I wouldn't argue to eliminate it at all. I'm thinking that we need more, not less.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. And maybe what we could do from there is like form – they might be able to identify some volunteers to work more closely with us to work through their concerns as opposed to engaging the whole stakeholder group. In any case, I would suggest that we use the hour to sort of like have a high-level engagement and then figure out next steps and addressing that concern.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Jordyn, can you hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Hi.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: What I want to mention is what is reported here is the length of the session whereas... and maybe I would report it so it makes more sense to [inaudible] that but the time within the session for Jonathan to make the Chair update is only 15 minutes. I think you might want to have

---

another time if you want to provide some more consistency to your date.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Like I said, I'll talk with leadership of the Stakeholder Group and see what they think that, but I think some initial time to just get off the ground. Like, I wouldn't use it as a Chair update; I would just use it strictly as an opportunity for engagement with the Stakeholder Group and figure out how to deal with the issues that they raise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This makes sense. I think we just need to try to see if we can... and you're already going to [inaudible] try to get more time than the 15 minutes. That's all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Will do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This dead horse has been beaten. Any other questions about the schedule or meetings you think we should be trying to have, folks, that we need to put staff on time to [inaudible] arrange. All right. Thanks, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Thank you, Jonathan. Shall we move back to the first point of the discussion? Would you like me to upload the [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK:                    Yeah. Do you have a way to throw the [inaudible].

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ:        Yeah, sure. I'll just share my screen. Can you see my screen?

JONATHAN ZUCK:                    Yes. We need to make it bigger, though. Yeah. So, this is a pretty comprehensive shell and so we need to I think come up with a strategy for folks to adjust these comments. My inclination and I welcome Jordyn and Lauren's feedback on this is that use this document to identify areas of concern raised in these comments and then have the subteams go back and read those sections of the comments, address them specifically, and then make presentations back to the plenary. Lauren and Jordyn [inaudible]. Does that make sense to you?

LAUREEN KAPIN:                    Can you repeat that one more time for me, Jonathan? I just want to make sure I'm understanding the game plan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                    Sure. My inclination on this, and it's the inclination stage as opposed to the manned stage, which is to use this document as a categorization tool and the subteam should go through this document to identify the portions of comments that are specific to the subteam's work, and then

---

go back and read the original comment for those sections, and then draft responses back for presentations for plenary.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, Jonathan, all of that makes sense but I need more clarification on the last point. When you say draft responses, are we intending in our final draft to basically react to every comment received or it seems to me that that assumes we're going to react to everything and I'm thinking that that actually is probably deserving of some discussions.

I could see, for example, a situation where we don't react to everything but we do react to three pivotal issues. I'm just saying that by way of example, absence from the specifics at all.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Laureen. I think this may require the instruction of a response document or build responses into this. I think we need to particularly after the new accountability framework, kind of create a response to the comment in some form. I don't think that every comment needs to result in a change to the report, but we need to signify that the comment was absorbed, understood, and what the resolution of that comment was in this stage [inaudible]. We disagreed with it. It's not we thought it [inaudible] to something else, or that we made a small change to accommodate it, etc. I think that we need to go through this document that has things parsed out and make sure that we indicate each of those comments was absorbed by the team, even if it didn't result in a change to the underlying [draft].

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's a really helpful distinction and that makes good sense to me for that certainly we are reading and analyzing and considering our response but that that's not everything may result in a change to the report. I think that's a good approach.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exactly right, and in fact, the response to multiple comments that are similar may be the same once you get going and address one person's version of a particular concern, then you can cut and paste what the reaction to that concern was across multiple comments. I just think we need to be thorough in our ingestion.

Jordyn, you're correct. I don't think the report [inaudible] contain the reactions and beyond where they've inspired a change or an update. And even then, it won't be specific to a comment. It'll simply be a change and so captured separately will be what the team's reaction of the comment was. So, does that make sense to everyone?

So, what that means the takeaway of that is, is that this particular shell is now a divide-and-conquer document that each subteam should look at and divide up based on the issues raised and recommendations addressed, and it may require the [inaudible] of subteam calls to discuss this particular area, but I think it would make most sense the subteam should deal with the things that make sense to them and then report those things back to the group. Any objections to that approach?

---

All right. The acquiescence of silence here has ruled the day. I don't know a productive way to sit on a plenary and go through these things one by one, so I guess we don't recommend that approach. So then my only other question is maybe back to staff and whether or not there's a sense that there's a way given that these things are parsed out by recommendation.

I guess that's a good an organization it's going to be for now, so I think it's now a homework assignment for the subteams to find the comments that are relevant to the recommendations they make. Any questions about that?

The only other thing that might be worthwhile trying to do in the plenary... So go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

What I was going to say is I think then it would make sense, perhaps, for Jordyn and Drew and I to be reviewing these and then sending out something preferably this week to our subteams that flag this issue relates to your topic will be talking about this via e-mail or even during a subteam call, if we decide one needs to be scheduled, just so that we make sure this gets done within the short amount of time that we have now before the next session. I actually think we need to very specific about our communications now, so the subteams get to weigh in and where the point we need to be by the time we get to the plenary.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think you're right. Jordyn just posted a comment about the staff helping to divide things up by subteam. They're divided by recommendation, which I guess has might do that, but I'm not sure. But the other thing that would probably be useful is Jordyn's had a [inaudible] papers, is there a way to...

Say what you mean by that, Jordyn. Is that linked in this document back to sections of Google Docs or something like that? That could start to get difficult, but maybe a page number or something like that. Is that what you're thinking? Go ahead and speak up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry. I'm talking as loud as I can. I was just thinking just if staff could say, "Oh, this recommendation originally stemmed from this paper," then we could associate. It would just make it easier for us to associate back to the original authors and help. Currently, administrative work but just in the interest of getting it done quickly. That seems like a useful bit of staff support as opposed to having [inaudible] Drew and I try to do that mapping.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Back to the original sub-papers within the draft.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, exactly.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jean-Baptiste's and Alice, does that seem feasible?

ALICE JANSEN: Jean-Baptiste, would it be possible for you to show the first tab of this sheet so we can see what's mapped out? Thank you. Thank you.

As you can see, Jonathan, all the recommendations are mapped out according to the different sections and categories of this report. Would that be sufficient or do you need a deeper dive on this? The [inaudible] 2 to 8, sorry, the competition [inaudible] choice analysis related to recommendations, consumer choices 9 to 12, consumer trust 13 to 15. It's all there but if it needs something else, just let us know.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Hey, Alice. What I'm trying to suggest is that we map back the recommendations to the original papers where it came from so that we [inaudible] paper was and I can just map. You can say, "Hey, [Stan], you wrote this section. Hey, Megan, you wrote this section. Here's the comments relative to that part." Just an initial mapping for [inaudible] out the review.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay, so you need names for each recommendation. And names and paper, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, exactly.

ALICE JANSEN:                   Okay. Understood.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                Okay, and then the team leads and I [inaudible] includes me on the application evaluation. We'll go over those and try to map them back up for folks that need to look at them. All right.

So Laureen, to answer your question, I think there's communication then to your Review Team based on that and then probably communication back to staff about potentially scheduling a call. Does that make sense?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ:      Alice, you have a question?

ALICE JANSEN:                Yes. Jonathan, just to confirm, so whose responsibility would it be to populate the different action item boxes on each recommendation that the [tags] that we have? Will we connect that from the leadership directly or should we... How would you like us to organize that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            That feels like the best plan for the leadership to roll up those action items based on discussions with the subteams.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can I weigh in... Yeah. Yeah. I may be irrational. I hate working on Excel spreadsheets. I find it very difficult and confining in terms of the format and my older eyes find it very difficult to read, so I'm happy to come up with text and I'm happy to respond substantively. I am unhappy and unwilling to populate an Excel spreadsheet, so maybe I can work with staff to provide the information and you can put it on that huge expansive document that no one can read and it's hard to manipulate, if you wish, but I think it's a very challenging format.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: I fully support Laureen on this issue. I think spreadsheets were created for numbers, not for reading. Thank you very much, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You support all the time, Carlos.

ALICE JANSEN: Just to clarify, Carlos, this spreadsheet was sent to the list I think it was right after Copenhagen for comments and no one provided input, so if you have any actual feedback you can send our way, that would be great. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alice. [inaudible] this issue about working from a spreadsheet has come up before as a global issue so first the comment on the spreadsheet and just people not having a good alternative for how to address these comments. So, I mean, I think this is unfortunate,

---

Laureen, the way that these seem to be organized and this may need to come up with a communication protocol to... This is really meant to be a map back to the comments, not the way to [inaudible] the comments. I think that's the best way to think about it.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah. My only point is I'm happy to communicate substantively respond to it. My critique is not of the way it's organized or the substance of it and it's in no way a critique of the hard work that the staff has done in organizing this. They've done a great job. My quibble here is that it's hard as a user to use these, and so I'm saying I'm happy to do it substantively but my overall comment is it's very hard to use Excel to ingest information and to reiterate what Carlos said – spreadsheets are for numbers. They're not for this stuff. If we're stuck in the spreadsheet or we started with a spreadsheet, that's fine, but I'm going to be communicating through text to staff and they can put it on the Excel spreadsheet and that's fine, but it's totally unwieldy and very hard to use. And if we're stuck with it, we're stuck with it, but that's my observation.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Other questions about this – the [old] plan of attack? I think that that is basically if for the agenda, you will see how this document is constructed, it's been circulated, and it's just meant, as I said, kind of a roadmap back to the comments that will need to be read directly by those intending to respond to them. Staff is going to help create one more organization of them to facilitate the division of labor there and

---

leadership is going to roll up comments from the Review Teams, or insertion back into the spreadsheet or whatever form of reaction document that we want to prepare that's separate from the draft itself and make [inaudible] suggestions in the form of updates to the draft where appropriate.

Do we have Any Other Business? Jordyn is going to reach out to the Registry Stakeholder Group to come up with a more extensive mechanism of interacting with them since their comments were so extensive. Jordyn, I remember one call saying that you often, your person often ended up leading the comment. Is that the case here, too, or did we caught off guard by the extensive nature of the Registry Stakeholder Group comments? [inaudible].

Okay. I think that's it. I'm sorry to cut things short. I think we shouldn't talk through these plenary one by one, so we need to roll up and do them via some [inaudible]. I will get together with Megan and we'll work on the application evaluation stuff and everything else what they're doing. Expect to hear from your subteam lead. I'm trying to absorb these comments.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Thanks, everyone.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Jonathan.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**