RECORDED VOICE: THIS MEETING IS NOW BEING RECORDED.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, welcome everyone to our 49th Plenary Call. Goodness, we're about to have a milestone for our next call. We'll have to do a virtual celebration. So before we get started I wanted to ask if there has been any changes in Statements of Interest? I will note that Megan stated for the record in the chat that she has updated her Statement of Interest, I assume to reflect her new position.

But is there anyone else who has any updates to make to their Statement of Interest? Okay, I'm not hearing any. So I will assume then that we can proceed. Jean-Baptiste, did you want to discuss the ICANN 59 agenda?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, thank you, Laureen. So there are not so many changes since last week but I just wanted to have a quick final with you, with the Review Team on the agenda and see whether the agenda as it stands can be approved. So you should all have it on screen now. So the few changes is that we were able to move the SIDN Presentation to Monday morning. And we felt that the Presentation on the DNS Abuse Study Intermediary Report, the results of the study could fit into the discussion that we would have on the public comment received that will follow that day.

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.

Also then that, so as a consequence we moved the INTA Survey Results to Sunday and the rest of the other sessions, Sessions of Interest and also (our three? - 00:02:16) sessions, are still the same on the agenda. So first, I wanted to ask whether this version can be considered as final and whether it can be publicly shared from now on? And also, if you have any questions, please feel free to ask. Yes, Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, this is Carlos for the record. I'm not 100% sure, you said we have a presentation of the results on Monday, but Monday we have a full set of meetings. I don't see it in the schedule. Or did I get it wrong?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: On the first day of the face-to-face meeting.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Ah, on Saturday. Sorry, I got it wrong. Thank you very much.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No problem. Any other questions? Okay, hearing none, can this agenda be approved and shared with the community?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, Jean-Baptiste, I have one quick question. Did we ever get any more information about what specifics we were going to be discussing with the Registry Stakeholders Group, and forgive me if I missed something?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, it's okay, Laureen, I more than happy to reply to your question on that. In fact it was part of this one question I had after we reviewed the agenda, is to work on which updates we will provide to each of these constituency groups. And so for the Registry Stakeholder group, so as you can see on the third page of the agenda, the Chair Update is quite short, it's only 15 minutes from the (inaudible). So I guess here, my suggestion there would be maybe to provide quickly some thoughts on the comments that were received from this group.

And also I know that there was a request from Florian to see whether we could maybe have a quick but longer meeting with the Registry Stakeholder Group to extend this discussion on the input received. But I guess, in 15 minutes, it's really just to react on the comments received and maybe ask, if needed, some clarification and to that extent it would be interesting to have each of you review their input and maybe share any questions that you may have on their input.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That makes sense. Okay, thank you, that's helpful. And in addition to the Registry Stakeholders Group meeting, do we have any other Stakeholder Group meeting requests that are going to populate the schedule, that we know about, because right now that's the only Stakeholder Group it looks like we're meeting with. And I just wanted to know if there were other meetings in play?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Unfortunately not. The two other meetings that we have where we'll be providing an update is the GAC session that same day and the other one is with the Non-Commercial Users Constituency Group on Wednesday.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And I guess I have the same comment for the Non-Commercial Users, so that's a half hour time slot, so again it would be -- are we speaking for that whole time or are we speaking for a tiny slot within that session?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, there we have half an hour. And the session is public, and there is only on the ICANN 59 schedule one other session, so I hope that it will be well attended so that people can hear our update.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so that is just going to be then a general update that we are making to that constituency group and the public at large?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, I think I'm not in a position to answer your question, it's more a question with the Review Team on whether you would like to have a discussion on input received or whether you want to provide an update on the face-to-face. But on that side I assume that they are looking for answers on input that they provided, but again, I would leave you to discuss that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. And do we have people who have connections to the Non-Commercial Users Constituency Group, so we can get a little more intel?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: This I'm not sure.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: We have six members of the NomCom in our group. So the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is divided by Intellectual Property Business Constituency and Non-Commercial User Constituency. So if you ask that way, I'm Non-Commercial User Constituency which is part of that bunch. I don't know if that answers your question.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It does. I didn't realize that that was an umbrella term that included the Business and IT Constituencies. That's actually good to know.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: And the Non-Commercial User Constituency which is comprised of two groups and, well, whatever.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, thanks, that's very helpful, Carlos. Okay, thank you.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Most welcome.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, I don't have any other questions, Jean-Baptiste. So it sounds like you wanted to get approval of this?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, correct.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, does anyone have any objections to this schedule?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Carlos, I assume it's an old hand in the Adobe Room?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, sorry, I will bring it down. I'm moving, I will bring it down in a second.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay well, seeing and hearing no objections then I will assume that this is approve, Jean-Baptiste, yes?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Perfect. Thank you, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Okay. Now we're going to move on to discussion of the public comments which, first of all -- yes, go ahead.

| JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: | Just to close the ICANN 59 discussion, so one thing again, we will facilitate each of the discussions with the group, including our discussion with the Board, with the GDD and the groups that we have mentioned before, but what would be really helpful to kick off the discussion with each of these groups is to maybe share questions on each of their public comments so that we can kick off the discussion, that would be great. |

| LAUREEN KAPIN: | That makes sense and just from going through the public comments via the very helpful Excel spreadsheet you've provided certainly there are questions to be asked. So, one ask that I will have for the entire sub-team is to use the Excel spreadsheet that Jean-Baptiste just recirculated this morning to come to review it and ask the questions, come prepared with questions, so that we have a path to go forward. So we need to actually come up with those questions so we can get the information we need in order to assess whether and how we will formulate our final report in taking into account those comments. |

So that's going to be an action item and maybe we can list that as an action item. Jean-Baptiste, I see you're typing. So that's going to be one action item, to review the public comments and use the Excel spreadsheet as a tool, because it's very helpful in looking at each recommendation and seeing which public comments address that

EN

recommendation. So it's a very helpful organizational tool and you can also, of course, look at the public comment itself as a whole.

But this slices and dices it by recommendation so it's extraordinarily helpful. So I would add, review the public comment, the Excel spreadsheet, and the comments themselves. But the more specific action item is to formulate what questions you have for each entity that submitted a public comment. And it may be that it's very self explanatory and you understand exactly what they mean. But I can tell you from reading some of these, sometimes it isn't so easy to understand exactly what they mean and this is our opportunity to ask questions.

So please use this opportunity to go over the comments and come up with questions. Before we get into the nitty gritty on that, does anyone have any questions about how to access the public comments or what spreadsheets you're looking at? Okay. Calvin, I see you're slightly confused. Can you tell us what you're confused about and maybe we can answer and ameliorate your confusion, and if you're confused I'm sure others are confused as well.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay, great, yeah. Look, I've got the URL to the public comments. I'm looking at the spreadsheet and I was trying to, you know, there's a whole bunch of tabs here and I'm trying to just tie it back to that. Tie the spreadsheet back to the public comments, these (inaudible). Yeah, the spreadsheet is very complicated, so okay, on page two, the second sheet, we've got all the 24 comments that have been submitted, that's correct, there you go.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Calvin? If you don't mind, what I suggest is that everyone follows, I will share my screen and go on these public comments cells so that everyone can follow at the same time? Is that okay for you?

CALVIN BROWNE: Thank you. Yeah, perfect, that would be great, thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, just a second.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. I'll describe this also orally because I have the Excel spreadsheet up on a separate screen.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, and to mention, I sent the latest version before the call so everyone should have it in their inbox.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, so use that version because that is the more complete version than the one I had sent around to my sub-team. But basically, Calvin, and this is just the way Excel is. It's complicated, it's not so user friendly, but it is a good way to sort and and keep track of a lot of information. So I understand the other side of it even though I'm not a huge fan. But basically on the bottom of the Excel spreadsheet, and you

can see it written very small letters. First of all, yeah, thanks, can we make that bigger and then do you have a pointer you can use, Jean-Baptiste, or not really?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Unfortunately not, not when I'm in the Excel itself.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. That's fine. Can we make it even bigger?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, well that's at least a little better. If you look on the bottom, Calvin, and the tabs on the very bottom, you'll see Recommendation 1, Recommendation 2, Recommendation 3. Are you at Recommendation 1 now, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I am. Yeah, correct.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, and tell me if I'm mis-describing this, but as I understand it our very helpful staff have extracted from every comment received the language that pertains to Recommendation 1. And I think that that's the way to think about these things. You can purse this any way you

want, but I think at some point you're going to want to look at these recommendations by recommendation rather than public comment by public comment. So that's what the Excel spreadsheet is extremely useful for.

For Recommendation 1 the spreadsheet has now extracted all the language from each comment that pertains to Recommendation 1. So you can see, at a glance, the different groups that support it, that disagree with it, that have suggestions or that are neutral. And I guess if they're totally neutral on it they won't even have an entry. But if they have something to say about it they'll have an entry and then you'll see an Action Item column. Although there, Jean-Baptiste, I don't see the text I've put in for Action Items, which is what I sent earlier on yesterday, I don't see that reflected here.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, what you sent me I saw Action Items for Recommendations 12-15.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, it had text on all the recommendations that I had comments about, which included Recommendation 1 and maybe some of the others also. If you look back at that document you'll see that I have language there, particularly on Recommendation 1. And I'm going to want to discuss that also, Jean-Baptiste, so is it possible to get that up? And maybe you can send around the new version when you've had a chance to catch up on that language. I can understand that you may have thought I was only doing it on the safeguards in particular, but I also did it on some of

the general data recommendations because that's a Plenary issue that we're all concerned about.

So I started from Recommendation 1 and really only skipped recommendations that were, in my view, solely petition or choice issues. So just to let you know how I approached it. But anyway, to your question, Calvin, that's how you use the spreadsheet, you have to click on those tabs at the bottom so that you can go recommendation by recommendation, and then what you're seeing is an extract of each comment that speaks to that recommendation. So is that helpful?

CALVIN BROWNE: That's very helpful. I got it a little while back when I put it together there, and yes, now I understand what's going on here. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. And also the other…I don't claim to be an expert on Excel, I'm not, but the other tip I will give you if you yourselves are wanting to fill out action items or put in comments in a field on the Excel spreadsheet for your own use, make sure when you're putting the text in the field box that you click on WRAP TEXT. Can you demonstrate that, Jean-Baptiste? Because that to me was a vital thing to do otherwise your text is all over the place and it's totally unmanageable.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, can you say that again please, Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, if I started typing into, say, Action Item, Site Domain Mondo, and just started typing and I have long text, it doesn't automatically fit within that box. I want to make sure people know how to click on WRAP TEXT so their comments fit into the box. Otherwise it's a mess. So maybe if you could just demonstrate that or if there's an easier way to do it, that's fine too? But I want to make sure people know how to work with this document so that they can save their comments and go back to if afterwards.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I mean, if you want to WRAP TEXT I don't think you have an option directly.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You actually have to type it, it won't appear. It's in the home screen and you have to start typing in the box and then it'll.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, I see it here, I don't know if everyone see it? But if you have a long text and you just want it to fit into the box, you just need to click here on WRAP TEXT. And I know that another option is you can right click on your cell with the text, so let's say it's this one, for example, and go to FORMAT CELLS, but that's a longer step.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, don't do it that way 'cause that's a pain.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: And then ALIGNMENT and then you have WRAP TEXT.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no, no.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Otherwise it's on here, just under your home screen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just do WRAP TEXT. So anyway, I just wanted people to know how to do that so that when you're working with Excel you can work with it in a way where you could type your comments and they're going to be in the box you intend, and also more importantly or equally as important, everyone else can read it. Okay, so that's my technical advice, a rare bit of technical advice from me. And Waudo is asking you to send a little more detail about that, Jean-Baptiste, so maybe you can just do a quick How-To in the follow-up email.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, I know that you're on the call, Jordyn, did you want to discuss feedback around Recommendation 1? Or do you have a problematic connection? Okay, so I'm not hearing anything or seeing anything. So

I'll assume that that's a problem for you, in which case I will lead that discussion. So, let's talk about Recommendation 1. I'm wondering, Jean-Baptiste, why don't we go to Recommendation 1 on the spreadsheet and I'm going to look at my -- okay, you have it online now, great. So let's just click up to the very beginning. Good. And can we make that much, much bigger, so that people can read it. Maybe even bigger. Okay.

And to just scroll up to the… this is just the Action Item. So, I'm just wondering what the best way to do this is. From an overall perspective, just in terms of the big picture, all permissions were 22 and I think that's the total of our public comment period, and correct me if I'm wrong, Jean-Baptiste. And then we have four comments that supported it, two against, two neutral, and then most of the folks didn't weigh in. So what we have then, I'm just going to summarize this at a high level. You know, I'm going to have to pause for a minute.

Unfortunately, because I can't see the whole document on the screen, Jean-Baptiste, no blame, just an issue, a fact, I actually have to get up my spreadsheet so I can see this. So I'm going to pause for a moment, I'm still with you, but I actually need to see this on a bigger screen, so hold on one moment. Okay. So, the first comment that I think we need to pay particular attention to is from the ICANN Organization. And here I think, actually we're going to have some questions for the ICANN Organization. They have some questions for us about being more specific. I'm sorry, I'm still navigating this.

Okay. I was in the wrong part of the spreadsheet so disregard everything I just said. Okay. Let's start with the Registry Stakeholders

Group, which is in the 6^(th) cell, Registry Stakeholders Group. And essentially, they are asking us to further categorize our general recommendation to create a position for gathering data and to do this in a systematic and formal way. And what the Registry Stakeholder Group is asking is for us to further define this into separate categories. And so I think we as a Review Team need to consider that, and I assume we're going to have more discussions about that in Johannesburg. But the other question I have is, is this also an implementation oriented question. So that's something that we need to think about.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Laureen, there's a question from Carlton.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I'm just looking now. Comment in action related to implementation priority. No, I don't think it's related to priority, Carlton. I think the Registry Stakeholders are saying this is a very broad recommendation and to separate it out into subject categories. But I don't see, at least the Registry Stakeholder's comment here, as talking about priority. But certainly that would be an issue in terms of implementation. So moving on, we also have the Business Constituency weighing in and one of the themes of the Business Constituency's comment is for us to gather more data about parking. And of course that's something that has been discussed in the Review Team quite a bit.

And I have some pointed questions here for David, since this relates to a lot of intellectual property issues, and I think these will also feed into

EN

questions we have for the Business Constituency in terms of the specific data they're asking to be collected about Park Domains and how you would collect it, how you would measure it, and also a little bit more information about why it's important. For the Cum Laude and (inaudible) comments, there's concerns about maintaining the confidentiality of any sensitive data that's collected. And this was also a theme by many of the public comments, particularly from the Registries regarding cost information, that certain information should be kept confidential.

And then you had other groups submitting comments that are taking the very opposite point of view saying, this information should all be open to the public. So that's something, as a Review Team, we probably want to discuss and weigh in on, because the comments received are at totally opposite poles. And there's also a comment about whether collecting DNS Abuse, particularly in brand registries, that that's the recommendation from this comment, and I have a question here too about whether this would be useful and why.

Since I know in general we're looking at DNS Abuse and I don't know why we would exclude brands, but if we were just collecting it in a certain group I'm not sure if we would want to confine it to brands. And I'm not sure that's really what they're asking for, they're just really focused on making sure it's collected within the brand. For Domain Mondo, this --

DREW BAGLEY: I was just going to chime in real quick about that. Because I think it's relevant as we go through any of these comments, whether it's DNS Abuse or what not. I think when we get criticism like that we should still look at, you know, how much extra effort is exerted. So with the brand stuff, if what we're looking at is how many of these brand domains end up being on blacklist, then that's not any extra effort than looking at these blacklists for all these other domains anyway.

And so in general, as I've gone through all of these recommendations that are research focused, I think a lot of them, they say, oh, why are you wasting our resources on such and such? And I think to the degree that as we tweak our recommendations, to the degree we can actually better explain in methodology, then I think that would probably lead maybe to people not having the same concerns, if they realized, oh, there's no actual extra effort to also produce this analysis too.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jordyn, you have your hand raised? Okay, it seems as Jordyn has connection issues. Okay, he will send an email about it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so let me try this way instead of on my phone. Does this work?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, we can hear you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, things keep dropping in and out. So I was just going to say, I mean, frankly, a lot of these comments are just somewhat, oh, it's fine to collect this data for other types of registries, except not my kind of registry 'cause that would be annoying to me. And/Or, you know, having to collect data because they find it annoying or sensitive, whereas the (BC? - 00:38:09) doesn't bear any cost and, you know, they might benefit from it.

So I think somehow we're going to…one of the topics I wanted to speak to you was how we do some sort of cost benefit analysis through all of this, because I think that's something we haven't really considered and something that the ICANN comments make quite clear, as well as the Registry comments. That there is quite a bit of cost collecting some of this data and I think we want to be clear about what the benefit are to make sure that they're well balanced against the costs, as part of our next sort of phase.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's a very fair point, and absolutely the theme running through the comments. In fact, ICANN's comment is, tell us what we're not doing now so we can figure out what else is needed. I think in a sense, our Report is telling them what we perceive them not to be doing now, because we made the comment in response to a lack of systematic data collection. But I think to the extent we can be even more specific, that's a fair point. NewStar is pushing for a cost-benefit analysis, that reinforces the point that Jordyn made.   And the United States Government is also considering the costs and asking us to consider them too. And also to use the data when considering potential further

expansion of the gTLD program, and that's another theme you see in the comments in general.

People are very attuned to whether something is a prerequisite for further expansion, and whether the data should be used to assess that decision. So that's another theme of the comments. So that's Recommendation 1, which was one of our biggest recommendations. So I'm going to take a pause here to ask whether people have questions or comments. Jordyn, I see your hand up, I'm not sure if that's an old hand or a new hand. But if it's a new hand, go ahead, and then Jamie is next.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's new. I don't know if Questions 1's the right place to have it, but I want to think a little bit about that cost-benefit analysis question and try to get at how we start to capture that. And you know, we can either have this as a side discussion or I was just going to say, maybe one thing that we should start to do on each of the recommendations, is explicitly delineate those costs that are identified through the comments. It's very helpful, especially when ICANN Organization has done that from their perspective, as well as other commenters. And then benefits, either in terms of what emerges from the comments or what we thought the rationale for the reason was.

And then we can start to do some sort of balancing… I don't know, I'm not 100% sure how we're going to get at that analysis, but at least spreading the document with both the cost and the benefits as part of this path through the recommendations, might be a good first step that

EN

we could start with. With number one I think it's going to be the hardest because the other thing that is being asked for here is a little bit more definition and we'll have to have a conversation around how much of that is implementation versus (inaudible) spent. At the very least, starting to get cost-benefits across all of the recommendations, like, just starting with documenting it would be a good starting point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn. I mean, I think you raise a fair point in terms of identifying first. It think ICANN's one of the only commenters, at least in my current look, that has been really specific about documenting costs. I'm not sure we're in the best position to document costs, unless we were actually going to be speaking to vendors and registries/registrars, the folks that would have the numbers for these costs, and whether we would have sufficient time to even do that.

So I raise that as an issue that it may not be the simplest thing for us to document cost. I think we certainly could discuss the benefits that drove the recommendations in our view, the potential benefits. But others might be better situated to document the costs, to engage in a true weighing. Jamie? Oh, go ahead, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, I was just going to say, we might just do something initially like high/medium/low. Like, depending on sort of the tenor of the comments, either from ICANN Organization or if the Registries are saying, like, this is very cumbersome or burdensome, or someone else is saying this is complicated. Then we might just sort of try to flag that

and say, oh, this is more complicated than we expected, it might be a high cost one. Versus, oh, this seems really doable, it should be low cost. At least some sort of like swag like that versus like a really detailed government style cost-benefit analysis.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think if we can do that, you know, based on information, that would be great. I guess I don't want to put us in a position where we don't have a basis for that assessment. So as long as we have a basis for it I think that would be fine and that would be a more doable task to put it in the general categories. I just want to make sure we have something to base it on when we say high/medium/low. So, Jamie, you're next.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks. Just picking up on what Jordyn said and what was said earlier about DNS Abuse. Cost benefit is important and understanding what the costs are. But just because the cost of something may be zero or near zero, I don't think should be a reason to move forward. So we were talking earlier about looking at abuse of use data on brand TLD's. The cost may be zero to collect that information or near zero, or at least for ICANN, but if it turns out they are virtually never a vector for abuse, collecting the data would seem to be unnecessary. So I think it would be good to look at not just what if something costs a lot but whether it actually yields data that's going to be helpful for future analysis.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thanks, Jamie. You know, one thing that your comment makes me wonder about is whether things like rates of abuse remain static over time. Because while it may not be a problem in one time period, it could be a time problem in another. And I don't even know how you would know the answer to even your first question unless you got the data in the first place. But I take your general point which is, just because it costs nothing doesn't necessarily mean it's a sensible thing to do and we should at the threshold issue decide whether it makes sense to do it in the first place. I think that's the general point you were making and that seems like a reasonable point to me.
JAMIE HEDLUND:	Right, and on the issue about understanding where it is right now, I mean, there are reams of data right now on DNS abuse and where it comes from, registries/registrars/domain names. And if a look at that data shows that an IP, I don't care whether brand TLD's are included or not included, just to make a point that brand TLD's don't show up on any of these, that it might be a better allocation of resources to focus on those where there are problems and then if it does show up in the future, then of course you would include it.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	That makes sense. Other questions/comments? So I think this is basically the process that we're going to need to go through regarding these recommendations. And I think for our face-to-face meeting, folks are going to need to look at these recommendations and focus on the ones that pertain to their sub-teams and really come prepared to

debate and discuss these issues. I don't see it as the best use of our time now to go through these one by one by one, because I'm not sure people have had the opportunity to look at these in detail.

But what I will ask folks to do, is in preparation for the meeting, use the Excel spreadsheets and for action items, or even under column H, which isn't labeled, you can use that as your own internal comments, to actually use this as a workbook, as a worksheet, to come to Johannesburg ready to weigh in on these issues.

And the specific things I want people to think about is, do you have questions for the organizations that made the comment and then do you have action items that you think the team needs to weigh in on in Johannesburg in order to come the final version of the report that takes into account the comments that we think need an action item in response to. So, Recommendation 1 I went through slowly by way of example, because I think we're going to need to do that work for the recommendations. So Drew, did you want to give any sort of high level discussion of the comments received regarding DNS Abuse?

DREW BAGLEY: Sure. Yeah, I mean I think a general theme of it was everyone, like the US Government in particular wants to see price data. And I definitely saw someone else who was interested in price, I'm lost as to which⸺do you recall the recommendations off the top of your head?   The numbers? Yeah I'm just going off of memory of reading through these last night, but that's one of the general gists.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	For example, Recommendation 19 talks about collecting abuse rates in domains under due versus legacy Registry/Registrar agreements. Or are you talking more about a price specific one?
DREW BAGLEY:	No, that was the one I was talking about. I was looking right now in 12, 13, 14, trying to find this. Okay, so earlier though, one of the other recommendations not specific to abuse, I know the US Government was one and I saw another, that said that we should factor in price. And the US Government one was made in a much broader context in general related to a recommendation about ICANN collecting…it was something, I'd have to go and find the exact one, but it was a broader data collection recommendation we made, then that also factored in how it would relate to DNS abuse.

And then there's a lot of interest of course for Intellectual Property, for those who count that as abuse whereas what we focused on was the technical abuse for our research. And so there's a focus on what our terminology is, so we need to be more specific in our recommendation itself instead of just saying repeat collection, comparing abuse rates, we need to define that even in the recommendation itself. So that came from the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. And then ICANN Organization, you know, they had another recommendation that comes back to cost and, you know, how we should factor in cost and then estimate a timeline for the study.

But like you said, Laureen, I don't know that we're necessarily best suited suited for that just because it costs however much money to do

this study the first time around, which used years worth of historical data, doesn't mean covering the Delta would cost the same amount. So we'll have to kind of maybe just figure out again, I guess to my point from earlier, how we can be more specific with our recommendations in describing a methodology and that could help people better understand how costs would or would not be allocated.

And then Intel provided feedback too and I'll have to re-read that one to recall specifically the nuance, but they agree with us and they support this recommendation, but they think that it doesn't go far enough, and that goes back to what I just said about us needing to kind of expand out and describe the methodology when we make a recommendation like this. And so what their criticism's going to looking at 3.18 of RAA and the ambiguity that some of that language potentially has, and to I guess match that up with the abuse data as to how the registries and registrars are dealing with abuse.

So that comment there might be one that we analyze, and I'll take a closer look at this, and it might be something that we factor into another recommendation or that perhaps just doesn't lead to a recommendation, perhaps we can address the comment in the report in our own analysis of these provisions, these requirements. Because we've done that in the past with our report itself where we say, hey, this is what ICANN requires, this is what goes on, some people have argued, blah blah blah. And that might go into that. So I'll work on that more, that didn't really critique our study itself.

And then NewStar, the size of the TLD, which we're already factoring that in. And the Intellectual Property Constituency strongly supports it.

There's another one that asks us to go further in to the actual policy development processes themselves. So going beyond just weighing up the abuse rates but going into the policy that's related to abuse. So I think that's the big take-away is that we might want to figure out, and that's kind of been intended all along is that we would until we had data to even think about that. But once we have this data, maybe think about what that means in terms of recommendations for the actual ICANN policy.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Drew. Am I correct, are we scheduled for a two hour block or a one hour block, Jean-Baptiste? Am I confused about our blocks of time?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It's two hours.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so we have time. And sorry to lose you, Jordyn. So if I had to sort of summarize based on my current review, I would see a couple of themes emerging. One is a request for more specificity. Two is a request for cost-benefit analysis. And three is questions directed to what should or should not be a prerequisite to future expansions. Those are three themes that I see discussed again and again. So I think those are issues that everyone should come to Johannesburg prepared to discuss, because I think those are general adjustments we may want to consider making to our final report.

But in terms of the path going forward, can we put as an action item, Jean-Baptiste, as another action item, I think Jordyn and I and Jonathan, it would behoove us to assign to certain sub-team members, to have them be discussion leads for particular recommendations. I think that will actually be the best way to proceed in Johannesburg so that everyone has ownership of this discussion and if we can discuss that more on our leadership call tomorrow.

But I would say as an action item that Jonathan, Jordyn, Drew and I actually come up with assignments by recommendation for folks to take the lead in looking at that recommendation, and then synthesizing the comments and leading the discussion on that comments in Johannesburg. I think that's going to be the most orderly way to proceed. I'm open to other thoughts on that but that's my current thinking from going through this process myself.

I want to open this up for a general discussion if folks have particular issues, based on their reading, that they wanted to bring up to the group to discuss now? Thoughts, comments, questions? Any reflections from staff about things we need to pay specific attention to? Is anyone not coming to Johannesburg from the Review Team, that we should make sure we know about so that we can make adjustments?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Stan won't be traveling to Johannesburg. And Jordyn will be arriving on Sunday around midday I believe.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So is Stan planning on participating remotely? Or do we know?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Pamela, do you have more information on that? Did he mention?

PAMELA SMITH: I just had to get off mute. He had told me a long time ago that he would not make the Johannesburg trip just because it's a long trip. I haven't spoken to him about his participation, actually Brian has spoken to him more than I have, but I will inquire of him today and see what the answer is and get right back to you. In fact, I'll email him right now and if I get an answer I'll put it in the chat.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks, Pamela, and apart from Stan and Jordyn arriving on Sunday, are there any other Review Team members that won't be attending in Johannesburg?

PAMELA SMITH: I have not been notified of any others from Constituency, so I think everyone else…

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, perfect. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, that's good to know. And Pam, I had another question for you just on logistics. Are we going to get any further information about transportation from the airport and shuttle buses that may be available?

PAMELA SMITH: Yes, Laureen, you are. As a matter of fact, I'll do it right now, or Jean-Baptiste, are you doing that?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, what I just wanted to mention is that all the information about transportation is also available on the ICANN 59 page.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm actually talking about more specific information about hotels in the vicinity of our hotel that offer shuttle bus service from the airport. That's not on the ICANN 59 page but apparently that information is available and I'm wondering if that's going to be shared?

PAMELA SMITH: Yes, Laureen, that's what I'm talking about. I'm going to extract that from a document that (inaudible) team sent around. Because there are, three of the hotels have shuttle service from the train station to the individual hotels. The hotels are all very close to each other but there are three of the hotels that have shuttle service from the train station to the hotel front. And so the Inter-Continental is one and I can't

remember the name of the other two. But I'll send that around momentarily.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great, so that's not transportation from the airport, that's transportation from the train we would take from the airport to our hotels?

PAMELA SMITH: Correct. And your hotel, I don't know if your hotel offers any other option, we are strongly encouraged to take the trains. Everybody is strongly encouraged to take the trains. Your hotel may offer some kind of car service, but that's up to you and contacting your individual hotel if you choose to invest in that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. That's useful. Calvin, you have a hand up.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, just as being my home airport, if you're arriving during the train operating hours, and that's between I think half past four in the morning to half past nine at night, then that really is the cheapest, quickest and safest way to get to Sandton. And most of the hotels are within an easy walking distance, so literally it's on the same block, and the area there is pretty safe to walk around. But I would strongly suggest, you know, to reiterate that previous sentiment that the train is the way to go. Otherwise I'd recommend Uber or if you can get a direct

	service from your hotel then that also works. But Uber works well in Johannesburg as well.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	So, Calvin, I feel beholden to mention that at least on the ICANN website and also from information I've received from the State Department, they are actually advising against using Ubers and taxis, because of disputes that may arise between Uber drivers and taxi drivers. So people will make their own decisions but I do feel that I need to mention that at least the official guidance is not to use Uber, and indeed, not to even use taxis. So I say that to pass along the information.
CALVIN BROWNE:	Yeah, look, I wouldn't use taxis myself. In terms of Uber, I wouldn't use it directly from the train station. So I would use it from the airport but not from the train station. There's a bit of friction there between the taxis and Uber, but otherwise generally you're pretty safe. It's really just around the Sandton station that there's been issues and that's from somebody who uses Uber at all times of the night and whatnot, and my wife does as well. Yeah.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thanks, Calvin. And also there's a question in the chat from Drew about whether you can use credit cards to purchase train tickets?

CALVIN BROWNE: The answer to that is, yes. It's the preferred way of doing it. So, VISA, Mastercard, should work fine over there. Debit cards obviously have more of an issue and any other types of cards also are a problem, but VISA and Mastercard should be fine.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Any other logistics questions from people? Any other comments in general? So basically where I'm going to leave people with this 45 extra minutes in your life, courtesy of me, is to take those 45 minutes and look through the comments. There actually aren't a huge amount of comments, so even though this is on an Excel spreadsheet that has its pluses and minuses as a vehicle, it's actually a way to save you time and keep you organized.

So please look over that spreadsheet, make your own comments on it, use it as a tool to bring with you to the ICANN meeting in Johannesburg, so that when we get there we can really move through these recommendations one by one by one, and you will know where you stand on this. Whether you have questions, whether you have suggestions for how we should respond, or not respond, in the final report. And what I will say is that as team leads we're going to be talking tomorrow about our plan of action, but my hope would be no later than Friday for everyone to be receiving an email saying, you own this recommendation, you're going to be leading the discussion on it in Johannesburg.

So please look for that and then govern yourself accordingly. Any questions or comments? Jean-Baptiste, when you send around a

follow-up email, can you please also include, again, I know you're doing it in the chat, but for folks who are not on the call, could you also include the link once again in a follow-up email to…

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The link in the comments, yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, perfect, you know exactly what I mean. Any other questions or comments? Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE: Just one from me and it's a little bit irrelevant but basically there is a little rugby match taking place on Saturday, starting five o'clock so we need to wrap it up pretty quickly. Otherwise I think myself and Jean-Baptiste will maybe have to disappear early.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good to know. Are you inviting us all to the rugby match with you, I hope?

CALVIN BROWNE: Well, we're not going to make it in time there because it starts at five but I'm sure there'll be a bar with a TV screen somewhere nearby that we can look at it.

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh good. We can use it as a bonding activity. Okay good. Any other questions, comments? Okay,then we'll wrap up the call and I think we're scheduled for another call next week, is that right, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that's correct, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so that will be our 50th call, so come with your virtual party hats and celebratory attitudes, along with being prepared to talk further about the public comments, particularly those that involve issues regarding your sub-team and issues that are important to the stakeholder groups you represent. So thanks, everyone.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Laureen.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]