RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Morning, good afternoon, good evening. And welcome to the fiftieth Plenary call of the CPT Review. Is there anybody that's on the phone only and not visible in the Adobe Connect? [AUDIO BREAK] And does anyone have an update to the statement of interests? [AUDIO BREAK] Okay, well, why don't we jump right in and have Brian talk to us a little bit about what's going on with the DNS Review Study.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi, good morning, Jonathan. I hope everyone can hear me all right. Yes, the DNS Review Study is finally here. We haven't had much chance to really digest it. I doubt anyone here has as well. It's pretty technical. There's quite a lot of charts and data going into it, but I would just sort of emphasize a few points as you all take it in. It is an intermediate report, so a lot of the data that's been processed, it's just come in and hasn't quite been organized into the body of the text. So you'll see a lot of charts at the end, which are representative of new data feeds we've acquired in the past two months.

I would also point you to the basic breakdown of their calculations is between absolute numbers of abused domains and rates of abuse which is based on an abused domains per 10,000. So there's two different kind of metrics there, and I would just sort of point you to that difference between the charts as you kind of analyze the results. I've

---

only- like I said, I've only been really able to eyeball it.   It doesn't look like there's any kind of smoking gun or large abnormalities. There are spikes in some of the charts that we don't have explanations for necessarily.

So I imagine some of you will be asking that to yourselves: "What do these spikes mean?" We don't know yet.   But that's one of the interesting questions for future discussions and future research. That's really all I have to say about it, other than it'll probably take a few reads to take it all in. There's a lot of interesting stuff that I think the team will be interested in. So, happy to try to answer any questions. Like I said, it's still pretty new to me too. But otherwise, I'll leave it to you to discuss.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Brian. If anyone's got questions, go ahead and raise your hand and I guess Brian, do you have a ten thousand feeling about the study. When you say there's no smoking gun, does that mean [CROSSTALK].

BRIAN AITCHISON: Well, yeah, Jonathan. It seems that if you look at the absolute counts of abused domains, it's relatively constant in legacy TLDs. And of course you see a sort of expected jump right at the beginning of the new gTLD program when new gTLDs were delegated and therefore started getting abuse to some extent. So you see in terms of absolute counts, you see a climb of abuse in new gTLDs, but when you look at the rates, you see a bit more sort of spikiness, I guess. But still lower rates of abuse in new gTLDs compared to legacies.

EN

So again, that's sort of my eyeball reading of it. We're still waiting on a fairly large abuse data set from SDF. And one of the things I'd like to do, I don't know if it's possible, if there's a more rigorous trend or quantitative analysis we can do because you've got to kind of squint at the charts and take the scale into consideration. We're talking about very large numbers here, so kind of hard to see. So I'll see if there's a better way to display the data. But, short answer to your question, Jonathan, I hope I covered it. Rates seem to be lower in new gTLDs. Absolute counts, you see a climb over the three-year observation period, but I think that's sort of expected. And they're naturally still lower than new gTLDs given lower registration volumes, I would think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess my other question is that—I haven't looked at the report yet, so I apologize…

BRIAN AITCHISON: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are there any correlated effects. In other words, are there particular new gTLDs with higher rates of DNS abuse that we might be able to compare to other factors to look at indicators or—I know you hate me using the word causation informally, but some sort of cross-tab associated with this so that those that see a wrong done by in the new gTLD program, we might be able to cordon off what the actors of that are—at least begin to do that exercise?

BRIAN AITCHISON: Well, yeah. I think so. I mean, you'll see, I mean they do list the sort of most abused TLDs and registrars. So I think you can start looking at that. It's sort of the usual suspects, from what I read in the abuse literature that's out there. So yes, take a look at that. And then you can really start asking those correlated questions: What explains that variation in abuse? Why are these guys the most abused guys? Is it something they're doing? Is it something the bad guys are doing?

So there's not really explanations in here; as I've said before, this is really just the descriptive statistics. So, that's I think a lot of the questions that would be prompted in your head, Jonathan, would be questions we ask down the road and request more depth probative research questions. That kind of thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Does anybody else have questions or comments about the report? [AUDIO BREAK] I know throughout this entire process, in the past year and a half, I've quietly wished there was more smoking guns than there have been. [CROSSTALK]

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah, no easy answers.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No easy answers here either.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I don't see anything in the comments. Thanks Carlton for the page reference, figure reference. I guess we'll go over this in more detail in our face-to-face when everybody's had a chance to read it. But, Jordyn, do you want to weigh in and talk a little bit about the current state of the parking paper?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. This is probably another late breaking development that I don't know if people have had a lot of time to look at. But, a couple of things have been added to the parking paper. So the first happens—just for context for everyone—is that with the help of staff, we made some attempt to see whether or not we could find a correlation between parking rates and renewal rates. And, this was done in an effort to support or validate the hypothesis that we've been talking about but one of the reasons we might care about the parking rates is that these domains would renew less, and therefore if a TLD had a high parking rate, it might look like it had a larger share of the market than would really be sustainable over time with a lower renewal rate. We might expect that TLD to shrink, or grow less quickly relative to others in the market.

And so, when, for example, we've previously done our analysis on parking rates and made parking adjusting numbers for market share and

market concentration, this was sort of done on the premise that these parked domains might have a different way of contributing to competition in the marketplace. So, you get a very rough sort of swag at this. We had only a limited set of data, which is that we had parking rates for all TLDs from gTLD stats from December of 2016, so we really only had that one month in time for parking rates. That one month does represent the parking rate across the entire TLD, though, so it's pretty broad sample.

And similarly, ICANN has some data; they don't actually have renewal rate data, but we came up with a metric that we thought was a pretty good indicator of renewal rate which is essentially the number of renewal transactions in that TLD divided by the sum of domains that were renewed and those that were deleted, outside of the grace period. And we think that, in most cases, should roughly represent the set of domains that at the end of the domain's validity period, it can either be deleted or renewed. In theory, a small number of domains might be deleted at other times, but most people are not going to delete their names when they still have validity on them.

So I thought that was the certainly the best theory that we have to stand in for a peer renewal rate number. And so we calculated that renewal rate for each TLD as well, for a six month period on the theory that that renewal rate only the domains that are eligible in each month would be renewed or not. That might be quite a volatile number and affect a smaller population, so we did that over six months to get a broader sort of spectrum of that particular TLD.

And so, then we looked to see whether that parking number from December 2016 correlated with the renewal number from the last half of 2016. And, based on a very primitive initial correlation, we didn't see—the linear regression that the staff ran -- we didn't see a correlation between these two numbers in either new or legacy TLDs at the 95% confidence percentile. So one thing that we've added to the paper is that statement that so far we haven't been able to see a relationship between the parking rate and the renewal rate. It's theoretically possible that a more sophisticated analysis with controls for other factors, looked at a broader set of data would find one. But based on the set of data we had available, we weren't able to see a correlation between the two.

So, as a result of that, I then went back and scaled back some of our discussion of the parking adjusted numbers. Because it didn't feel responsible, to me, to include a large discussion of these parking adjusted numbers if the hypothesis behind them wasn't proved based on the data that we've had so far. And so there's—we still include those numbers just to point out that if you did the parking adjusted calculations that the market share numbers in particular would change quite a bit. But now we've also included a section saying but the reason that you might do this we don't really have very good confidence in that hypothesis.

So that's one set of changes that were made to the paper. And then there's a second set of changes that were made to the paper, which was just do include some discussion of geographic differences in parking behavior. For one thing the number of inactive domains and the LAC study looked lower than what we see in most of the other studies.

Either previous papers on parking or the NTLD stats numbers on park numbers.

So, we pointed out that that was a regional difference that it seems to be less in fewer inactive domains in Latin America. They didn't look at parking specifically; they just looked at active versus inactive. And then Stan and Kaili had previously put together -- so Kaili just asked about this, so it is in the paper, you'll see on pages four and five, Kaili, I think. Yeah, pages four and five. We also included some discussion that the facts that in the Chinese language TLDs, in the top 50, we actually see very high parking rates. Much higher than typical across the new gTLDs.

And in fact, for example the jin, has a 93% parking rate which is very high. And we don't really have any explanation for that. Kaili has talked about some of the factors that happen in China, and to the extent that Kaili wanted to add some text with citations. That might be appropriate here too, but at the moment, we just call out the difference, and point out that there seems to be some regional differences in parking behavior as well so it may be useful for future regional studies to take a look at parking in particular. So that's how the paper has changed over the last couple of months. And I guess I'd open it up to have any questions or comments that people may have or suggestions on other improvements we might make to the paper.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hey, Jordyn. First of all, thanks for the paper. I have questions and a comment. In reading the paper, and I will admit to have read it quickly, but it seemed to me—at least one statistic jumped out at me where if you take the parking rates into account, the percentage of overall registrations per new gTLDs seems to diminish by about half. Am I recalling that or characterizing that correctly?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It decreases by about a third. So yeah, it's a significant decrease.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, a significant decrease. So I'm just wondering—it didn't jump out of me what we make of that, so to speak. In fact, my overall comment for the whole paper is: There's a lot of information, but not a lot of sign posting and conclusion, so it actually is a very difficult read. It's not lengthy and the words aren't complicated, but it's a data dump.

And I think we need to make this something more than a data dump, which is why I started with that statistic, because that statistic to me seems to be one of the most compelling statistics that we found. But either way, I think that we need to orient the reader as to what this is and why it's important, and where the deficiencies are. Or not deficiencies, but where there's work to be done.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. So I don't know what to make of that number either, because it's just a number that we calculated. And if it were the case that we thought that there was a correlation between the parking rate and the

renewal rates, then we could potentially project out and say, "Okay as a result of this lower renewal rate that we're expecting from these TLDs, the effect on competition and market shares might be muted in the future relative to what we're observing right now."

But, since we haven't actually been able to affirm that hypothesis, so far we haven't been negative in favor of that hypothesis, I think it wouldn't be very responsible for us to say, "We should expect that these TLDs are going to have lower renewal rates." Because so far that doesn't' seem to be the case based on the parking rates. So I'm not sure what to do with that number. We basically performed a parking adjusted calculation based on a hypothesis that so far we don't have a lot of evidence for. If I ran the world, I would probably take out those parking adjusted statistics, because for precisely this reason. Because it's numbers that it's not clear what they mean or what to do with them. They're just a calculation that we performed because we had the data.

However, I know that other folks on the review team have felt quite strongly that they should be included, so maybe I would defer to others who think those numbers should be included to explain what they think they represent, and how we could signpost them. Because to me, it's just a calculation we performed that doesn't have a particular meaning associated with it, which is why there's not really text explaining what to do with it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I would say that's problematic. I think we either need to make the call to include this and tell people why we're bothering to include it.

And I don't think it's enough to say, "We had data so we performed this calculation, but there are clauses so we don't think it means anything." I think we either need to not include it, or include it but we have to give it some sort of context. Some more informational context, even if it's: "Here is the data we have but we can't draw conclusions because…" Because otherwise just to include it bare bones is almost—I'll go back to my word 'problematic'.

Because people who aren't immersed in this -- and I am a little bit immersed in the parking issues just by way of being in this review team, but people who are just looking at it will see that number and from what I'm hearing from you, Jordyn, will draw the wrong conclusion. So, in that sense, we'd be misinforming if we don't do a better job of putting this into context.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks. Thanks, Laureen, I tend to agree with you. I guess we can see what the consensus of the review team is. I see Kaili's raised his hand, so maybe we can get his perspective.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, thank you, Jordyn. Yeah. Thank you. Just about the [inaudible] Chris has just raised, I agree that the reason for this report from persons with background [inaudible] they might inquest as why do we include parking. I think that originally we can tell them that originally we came from the competition perspective. Because the parking, such a high parking rate, half or nearly half of those domains being parked can literally affect our calculations.

EN

And our conclusions on the competition side, that is where we start from. And that is our team's job to analyze the situation regarding competition. And also in doing this study, we also noticed the high parking rate also has other side effects which were they affect the customer trials and such. Although, may or may not be for the new gTLD, but also for the legacy gTLDs. But we realize that this parking phenomenon is important for the [inaudible] industry.

So therefore, we [inaudible] through this parking and [inaudible] in our report. However, we did firstly did not have sufficient data, and secondly, the favored study of the parking sect is not our team's own mission. So therefore, we provide the conclusions within our scope of study, and also by providing what we already have been collected for future studies if ICANN ever decides to. So I think that would be my answer to those questions. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Kaili. So, actually let me -- Jonathan has raised his hand for me. Jonathan and I had a couple of thoughts. Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. Just taking off the chair hat and just speaking as another member of the review team, I find your discussion of the viability of this compelling, that all we're going to do is raise questions instead of answer them. Because even in our very broad definition of parking, we're including a number of things that are conceivably pro-competitive that involve forwarding for marketing purposes, or

investments that help sustain smaller TLDs to help get them over the hump to greater sustainability.

There's nothing but complexity there, associated with a discussion about the implications of parking, and we don't have any data to support a hypothesis about—and from the previous discussion over the DNS's use report, we don't have support for the notion that there's a contribution to a lack of consumer trust in this area because of parking in the new gTLD program. And I think we always need to look back and say, "What were the impacts of the new gTLD program?"

My concern with having it as an overall thing to be considered, I can agree and say that ICANN should study the parking phenomenon further or something like that. But that this review team does not have the data to support a conclusion about parking, or a parking-based phenomenon brought on by the new gTLD code. I'm entirely supporting the notion of dropping those market share calculations and just including some of the work we did to try to find correlations and to find theories to support hypotheses about parking. And that it didn't ultimately work, and that explains why we don't have them. Rather than spending a year having people throw different numbers at each other based on the underlying, unsupported assumptions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Thanks, Jonathan. I think that's roughly where I was going to end up after taking Kaili's feedback. We know the fact, at least based on the way that NTLD stats confused it, that there is a differential in parking rates between new gTLDs and legacy gTLDs. That's a fact. It is also the

case, as we point out, these geographic variations seem to happen as well. And so some areas there seems to be quite a lot of parking, and some areas it seems lower. Those are all facts that we've discovered and some of them pertain to the difference between new gTLDs and legacy gTLDs. What we don't really have a handle on is what the impact of parking is.

And I think—it's interesting Kaili's right: It's a global phenomenon. And so therefore, I find myself agreeing with Jonathan. It seems reasonable to point out that there's a difference between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs, that we observe the difference, but we don't really understand the impact of parking at this point, and therefore, to the extent that this is an interesting question, it's probably something that deserves some study, as opposed to being wedged into the CCTRT.

So that is roughly support for taking out the parking adjusted numbers, but perhaps leaving roughly the rest of the text in. Saying that we tried to figure out if this was meaningful, but couldn't figure it out; and maybe in the future, people will want to look at that. But it's not related to new gTLD production. I see Kaili's raised his hand again. So go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are those new hands from Laureen and Kaili, or old hands?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Kaili's hand is new, I think Laureen's is old. Kaili, we can't hear you if you're trying to talk.

KAILI KAN: I muted myself. Sorry. Yeah, I didn't quite understand why we want to take that out, the calculations concerning the parking effect, because we are dealing one calculation from and what they identify us as, including parking, is with our reports.   So, especially this because [inaudible] officials speaking, gTLD and the legacy ones.   So that's [inaudible] related to our mission. So I don't quite understand why we want to take that part out.   Thank you.   Or maybe I am misunderstanding something? That suggestion of Jonathan to take that part out?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Kaili, I think what we're talking about is taking the market share calculations out. Imagine we had the data to suggest that the majority of new gTLDs were purchased by people with blonde hair. Right? And so we found out that fully a third of all new gTLD registrations were made by blonde people. And therefore we could program a market share adjustment calculation that controlled for blonde people because they make up such a big part of the market. And I think --

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] loves people.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That begs the question what an impact does that have on competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. And I think that's where the issue is that we've failed to come up with a rationale for describing

EN

[inaudible] domains as somehow less competitive or more harmful. And so given our mandate to look at the impact of the new gTLD program in the framework of competition thrust and poise, we don't have a reason to control for parking, because we don't have a supported hypothesis for why parking has a negative or positive effect on competition thrust or consumer choice.

And again I feel like I could come up with as many theories for why [inaudible] parking was so competitive as you could come up with for why it was anti-competitive. And so control for that market share as a result becomes arbitrary even though we somehow want it not to be.

KAILI KAN: Okay. So as I understand now is that we do not have conclusions about where the parking phenomenon is positive or negative. We do have concluded that the new gTLD program [inaudible] including the parking effect where competition is [inaudible] without considering the parking effect. So that is a phenomenon that we have discovered during our study and I believe that we're not having as good a start [inaudible] pointed out the fact.

And so, I think there's some kind of [inaudible] included in our report and used by future studies. So I think including that calculation [inaudible] because that is [inaudible] gTLD program, that it is perfect, okay? With the how to measure it, whether it's good or bad, we could not reach any conclusion. For that I don't think we need to pick them out, just [inaudible] there and that's something we have left for the future. [inaudible] any harm.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But there is a harm. There's an implication, like by including the calculation, there's an implication that somehow parking is anti-competitive. Including that calculation and market share, we're suggesting that it's not real competition. It's by definition harmful to suggest something for which we don't have a proof and it will have an effect on policy, it could have effect on the discussions that we're having going forward.

I mean, I could be supportive of an appendix or something like that where we just have a broader discussion of the issues, the extent that we have support for. But I mean anyone is free to do the math that they want to, but I suggest we shouldn't include what amounts to an arbitrary calculation in our [inaudible] if we don't have a guiding hypothesis to include. It is [CROSSTALK]. It will affect --

KAILI KAN: Here I think that we're using assumptions that [inaudible] assuming the concentration ratio of the [inaudible] itself. It's simply the equal to competition [inaudible]. Certainly, concentration ratio itself is not equal to competition, is it? So I think we are jumping through at least two facts here, and so I included that calculation in our report.

I do not see how pointing fingers and implying that [inaudible] is bad because I wouldn't draw that conclusion whereas as far as those parked domains do not harm the end-users of any constituency's interest. No, just leave it there. We're only stating the facts so we shouldn't just assume ourself that [inaudible] concentration ratio is equal to

competition and competition is always equal to [inaudible]. With that understanding, I think that I could not see how to include that in our report is harmful. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I appreciate your input and I don't mean to be glib about it. I am just concerned that we just included a calculation. I made a kind of a joke about people with light-colored hair. So let's say that we made an observation that a lot of the registrations, new gTLD program came from China. So let's include another calculation that talks about market concentration if we exclude registrations from China. We should [CROSSTALK].

KAILI KAN: [Inaudible] military where you just fight back [inaudible] something that China needs to consider. So I think just include that part about China [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I see in the comments that George is gonna try to re-draft this based on something similar to Carlton's suggestion and I'm in agreement there. Is there anyone else that wants to speak up in favor of continuing to include that market share calculation? Please raise your hand. Cause we're gonna still include the facts and include the observations and maybe even include the discussion of some hypotheses that we attempted to test. So all that will be in there but we won't throw out a number that has no meaning. I think that's what

thus far Jordyn, Laureen, Jonathan, and Carlton and David have concluded that we shouldn't include a number that we don't have a justification to include.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan, I was just gonna suggest too, we may want to figure out with staff how we can -- like I do think we should preserve the work just if some future team decides they want to look at this again, figure out the calculations and the data and so on. I think we could work with staff to create like an archive of like other projects or something like so that a future review team or someone looking into parking wouldn't have to start from scratch and could pick up our work. At least it's just a little bit different from including it in the body of the report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree with you.

KAILI KAN: Maybe in the appendix?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. As Jonathan suggested, I'd prefer more detail not in the appendix but just have like a place where staff can store repositories or some of our calculations and projects that we've done in much more detail than are gonna be included in the report generally just so that future work will be able to [inaudible]of that and not just off of the text included in

the report which often sort of boils down the project work. [AUDIO BREAK].

KAILI KAN: [Inaudible] really hard to find, as I understand.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I agree with you, Kaili, that we may want to work with staff to figure out how to organize this. Thanks Eleeza for pointing out that it's on the wiki. I agree with Kaili's sentiment, the wiki's not the most user-friendly environment, but there's probably just ways we can do some way pointing to get people to that data.

KAILI KAN: Also, if we believe that this is something worth further studying in the future, I believe [inaudible] that we help raise awareness of this issue.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, Kaili, like I said, I'm going to redraft this a little bit, once we have that new text, why don't you take a look, and I think that's going to be the intent, writers to say, "Hey, we found this phenomenon, it's pretty interesting, future people may want to look at it and do a deeper dive than we were able to."

KAILI KAN: [Inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I will have a new version of this before the face to face for discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn.   Anyone else have any comments or suggestions, or before we toss this back over the fence, and to Jordyn to sort of gather our thoughts?   [AUDIO BREAK] Right, thanks everyone, and thanks Jordyn for your efforts on this paper, I think it was a critical discussion.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Happy to help.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And then, our next topic on the agenda has to do with preparation for our updates that we'll be providing at ICANN 59, so maybe Jean-Baptiste, if you want to lead that discussion?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi Jonathan, yes, let me put something on screen so that we can read from --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Could you maybe speak up; your voice is a little bit faint.   [AUDIO BREAK]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, so this should be on the screen now. So it's a summary of the different sessions that we have scheduled on our ICANN 59 agenda. So here would be important now is to receive from you some guidance and input on the different materials needed to deliver your message to each of the [inaudible] groups. So I've divided the sessions in two parts. First one is on the different sessions that we have during our face to face meeting, and the second one is regarding engagement sessions during ICANN 59.

So what I did is that I reported how much time we have per session and also which information we have received from the group on what type of feedback or discussion topics they are expecting. And the other thing is as well, so you have received guidelines from the leaders last week to review the different public comments received and see whether there were any questions based on these comments, any trends, and any discussion or points that you would like to ask to those who have submitted public comments during this session. So here, it's very important that we have an idea on our side on the materials that are needed that we can already prepare for this session and if you could guide us on that. Thank you. [AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Have you posted our thoughts about what materials or the organization of the materials for ICANN 59? [AUDIO BREAK]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Jonathan, sorry. It's Eleeza, thank you. I just wanted to point out for the session with training and [inaudible] and Maggie on the ICANN org input, we had put that they had offered to come and speak with you about any questions you might have about the feasibility inputs or if you wanted to discuss, you know, anymore about costs and the rest of that assessment with them, so that's what we noted on there that no [inaudible] be provided, we're really hoping that this would be a discussion based on questions that come from the review team, so it's really just providing you a chance to talk through that input.

So I just wanted to point that out and see if there's anything in particular we can prepare beyond the output that was provided in the public comment that was [inaudible]. [AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eleeza. I think that makes sense. I think what we want to probably do is let folks whose recommendations are most impacted by that lead that part of the conversation, that ICANN.org and my guess is that our discussion of those comments in particular during the face to face will probably generate a kind of a depth for discussion purposes when we have our meeting with them.

I don't have our schedule in front of me, Jean-Baptiste, but how does it work out in terms of this discussion with ICANN.org and our ability to discuss that in advance, if that question makes sense? Like when is the meeting with ICANN.org and do we have time in our face to face to prepare for it?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, our meeting with ICANN org is planned -- I will put the agenda so that everyone is up to date; so it's planned on the second day of the face to face meeting on Sunday, and it's the first item we have on the agenda.

And if I look at what we have right now -- so yes, it's starting at five past nine, on Sunday, and if I look at the day before, we have a long discussion on the public comment received, which is followed by determining updates on it, on the report. So, we could use some of this time to prepare for the ICANN org input, but I think the time will be limited, so as much as we can prepare beforehand, that would be ideal. [AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I just think that there's some practical limitations to our ability to prepare for that in advance, and so, I think we probably need to reserve some time because it's a long meeting with them and we don't want to sit in silence. They're not going to present their concerns, they're [inaudible] questions back from us, and so we need to get our ducks in a row, as we say, for that discussion.

I think this whole cross benefit of discussion is going to be a significant one, and so we should make sure that we don't get lost in the details recommendation by recommendation, comments, and make sure that we're prepared to have that conversation with ICANN.org on the following day.

I welcome other people raising their hand, and talking about this and I know Marine, it's going to affect -- and Drew it's going to affect your

EN

discussion with compliance and things like that, so my feeling is that we should be prepared for that meeting.

[AUDIO BREAK]   And nobody's raised their hand.   So, absent of any objection, I'm going to, I guess, try to coordinate with staff to make sure that preparation for this particular meeting on day 2 has some time set aside on day 1.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other questions or comments about that? Then let's go back to our list here.   [AUDIO BREAK]   And when do we meet with the Board Caucus group, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, it's just the third [inaudible] the end of our face-to-face meeting at 5:30 on day two. So we'll have the ICANN input at the beginning of the day and the Board Caucus at the end of the day.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. And the expected topic of that meeting is, in fact, the issues raised by ICANN org, right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that's part of it and discussing the draft recommendations. I just would like to remind the review team members who might have not seen that communication, so the Board Caucus group is a small group of Board Members with expertise and interest in our review team. And so, the goal of the Board Caucus group is to create an interactive environment and get [inaudible] to discuss with us and report to the Board.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, but [inaudible].   Do we know of other substative topics of discussion? You say, discuss the recommendations. I don't know what that means.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: We don't have more information on this. As far as I can see, I think it's -- they will review the ICANN org input and discuss the feasibility assessment as it is described on this paper, but we don't have more information than that. Eleeza, your hand is raised but I think it is an old hand. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so. Okay, so, I'm just lumping the two of those together. We may need to do two different decks because of the difference in the amount of time. And Carlton, I agree with you. I think [inaudible] is at the center of that, so I think that's got to be a big part; a big theme of our discussion. And I know Jordyn has some thoughts on how to think

about that but, I think we need to be very prepared to discuss cost-benefit for sure. Not only in these meetings, but going forward during the ICANN meetings; we'll make sure that's part of our discussion. So, thank you.

And then, on the engagement session, 15 minutes with the registry stakeholder group. I know Jordyn will -- discussing the desire to have a broader meeting with them and to use the 15 minutes less as an overview presentation but instead to begin the conversation with the registry stakeholder group. Do you have some thoughts on how that discussion should begin in 15 minutes? I know we're trying to get a longer meeting, but how does your suggestion translate into the first 15 minutes? Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so that's a good question, Jonathan. I guess I would imagine the first 15 minutes would be pretty [inaudible] in that it would be like, "Hey, you guys submitted a lot of comments. We want to take them seriously. How do we engage together?"

The follow-up meeting being perhaps the like clear -- like that being just the call to action to the follow-up meeting and then whatever we think is appropriate post Joburg as well. But, you know, I feel like if I look at the public comments, you know, we have the input from ICANN org and we're going to be engaging with them on Sunday. It may be that there's appropriate follow-up there as well.

The other, I think, highly impacted party from the recommendation is likely the stakeholder group, and then to a certain extent the other

PDPs that we make recommendations towards -- sort of like, if you think whether the recommendations actually hit, those are the parties and so just figuring out how we make sure that we have effective engagement across all of those effected groups makes sense.

Now, I know that others, so I would imagine folks like [inaudible] would imagine that they're indirectly affected as well. And they submitted quite a lengthy comment. So I guess like do we just take -- I guess my overall question is like how do we set up ways to appropriately sort of understand and react to sort of the bigger comments, not the ones that are relatively focused or that don't express particularly strong points of view, but the ones where there's quite a lot of thought put into the recommendations?

And particularly I noticed when I was going through the [inaudible], I don't know, [inaudible] can correct me on this, but I would guess that the majority of our recommendations are not supported by public comments. And, I think, just thinking about what to do with that, does that mean we should be engaging more with the community to figure out how to tweak them or something else?

But in any case, with the registry in particular I think it's just a matter of sort of saying, "Hey, how do we engage to sort of address some of the concerns that you've indicated and/or to make sure that we're finding recommendations in a way that address the concerns."

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Jordyn, I think that approach makes sense and that should be the core of our meeting. Do you think in addition to this sort of, "Hey, we're

not just throwing them over to the [inaudible]" message, is there anything at a high level that would describe their comments which is unduly burdensome on them or something like that or slow down the introduction of further gLTDs? It's two or three high level messages that you feel that they could deliver that you might want to acknowledge having heard? Does that make sense?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, Jonathan. I can probably work with you and pull together some content around that. The other thing I think is probably important to call out is that there's some individual [inaudible] and/or sort of other groups of registries that I think are largely constituents of the registry stakeholder groups. In any case, those views -- the verge from the official stakeholder group comment. And so, other point we could raise would be, how do we sort of reconcile where there's divergence in opinion between you know the -- there's like something like the verified PLD group. Right?

Like they really like the suggestion to incent verified PLDs whereas the registry sort of -- they don't quite say no, but they sort of raise a bunch of concerns about it. So, I think it would be good to sort of highlight that and at the same time acknowledge a couple of the specific sort of classes.

I mean, one of the concerns is roughly just a high level cost-benefit analysis statement. Like many, many of the comments are basically like, "You don't explain why this is worth doing." And so, that's one that we

can clearly call out that we're doing something about and then we can identify maybe one or two more as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, yeah, just so that in addition to saying, "Hey, we want to talk to you more," give the impression, at least, that we received some concrete messages from them. So let's try to go back and forth, maybe on email on how to deliver that message.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Laureen, do you have a sense on the GAC and what the best approach is to that meeting?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I have to give it some more thought. GAC comments were generally supportive, so I have to think about what would be our best approach there. I think we'll probably want to leave some time for questions, because I anticipate that different people will have different questions.

I think one of their issues is going to be how this affects the timing of the new gTLD program. And indeed, that was one of the themes I see in the public comments, especially those favoring our recommendations; that some of this information really should be a prerequisite. And, how

EN

does that affect timing, especially if there's not sufficient time to carry out the activities we recommend before a new program begins.

I think, 1) We need to be open to questions, and 2) We need to be prepared to get questions specifically about the timing. But, the GAC comments was generally supportive. I don't see particular things that we need to tackle, in terms of you don't support this, here's something we can say to explain further or illuminate our reasoning. That's not the tenor of the GAC response.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Implications for timing and things like that is a topic of proactive discussion, and you're going to noodle, a little bit more, other issues that we might want to prompt a discussion on. But, otherwise, just be available for discussion.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, that's my take right now. I'll refine it, however.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I get the only time constraint within that is getting staff out to prepare any kind of deck we want to use --

LAUREEN KAPIN: You know, --

JONATHAN ZUCK: -- prepare a timeline. Go ahead, sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Honestly, I don't know that a deck is, especially, going to be helpful. We are so formulaic in how we handle these things, "Oh. We need a deck," even if it's just a give-and-take conversation. I don't know what we would have as a deck. They've seen our report. We're not going over our report. They've given their comments, which basically is supportive. To me, it's an opportunity for a conversation and an interaction. In many cases, I feel our default to going to a deck of slides is actually not conducive to a give-and-take. Because, as soon as you have slides, what happens is you're clicking through the slides, they're watching the slides, you're talking at them, and there's not interaction. I don't think we actually need to use slides and, therefore, we're not going to be putting our staff in a time crunch.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen, I think those are great points, and my only caveat might be that, if there's a couple of questions, that we anticipate that might have visual responses. I don't mean, necessarily, putting together a bunch of bullet points to talk at them.

                          But timeline, for example, putting the implementation or the recommendation on a timeline to show how it might affect the overall timeline of the program, with respect to other things that stand in the way of the program, such as the subject of the procedure group might be used as a response to a question, for example. Just a question to think about creatively, that's all.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I think that's a fair point. I think, for things we have definite data points for, like I think there is a predictive end to the PDP working group. There hasn't been a firm date set for a new gTLD program. It's all been estimate.   We could certainly put that there.   What I'm wondering how we would do is how are we in a position right now to evaluate how long the data gathering for our recommendations would take?   I think we could populate a timeline with some known data points, but I think that's incomplete. I don't think we're going to be able to say, 'This is going to take long' & 'it would delay, or not delay, it this much.' I agree to be ready talk about timing --

JONATHAN ZUCK: We might get some of that feedback --

LAUREEN KAPIN: Say it again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We might get some of that feedback from clients, for example.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Yes, if we have that, absolutely.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. That's a good turn. Waudo, I saw a discussion about the BC.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I was requesting, if you have a little time on that. That day could pass. Let's give them a little brief, if possible. Then, I can inform them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. I'll confirm to you the time, by email, afterwards.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I might be on a plane, too. But, I'll look and see if we can do it.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. We'll communicate by email after this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Thank you. Do we have anybody on the call that has a sense of NPOC's desire from their meeting? Alright. Jean-Baptiste, why don't we try to reach out to them and make sure that we're delivering

the kind of discussion they want. Thirty minutes is enough for some substance.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's try to get a [CROSSTALK].

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jonathan, for NPOC and NCUC, it was no response to the email that we send them. And I think what they expected was just to have an update on the [inaudible] work, and to also have an opportunity to ask for their feedback. I don't think it's something particularly -- there is more general updates.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. We're waiting to hear back from ALAC. I know there was some exchange back-and-forth with Allen. We'll get back on top of that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: For ALAC, and then for some more information from one of their support staff. I still haven't heard back from them. So, something is to be confirmed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sounds good. I guess the same is true for NCUC? That it's more like the NPOC?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's an open discussion.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Similar to the GAC meeting that Laureen was describing. Great. Thanks for generating this list, Jean-Baptiste.   Does anybody else have any discussions, or know of other people that would like to receive an update? Okay.

Having missed the last Plenary, I don't know if we have a structure for the next thing you have on here, which is "Review public comments received." Is there an order that we were going in, that folks were presenting comments and responses?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jonathan, maybe I can quickly provide an update on that. Each review team member has normally received last week an email from each subgroup leader with assigned recommendations where each review

team member needs to review the accuracy of the public comments and the summary of each public comments and recommendations. The deadline to submit all public summary was to be last Monday. After a discussion, and seeing that we were missing some feedback, we have decided to postpone it.

Now the new date, and that's the final deadline, will be on July 10th. Meaning that it's really important, and also to avoid discussion, [inaudible] that you work on the recommendation that was assigned to you and identify whether there were any issues with the assessment of the comment-whether it was supportive or not, whether the summary of all public comments received for the recommendation is correct, and identifying, also, what would be the action items based on these comments. And, also, a suggestion would be to discuss these action items with your subgroup, so that we can report them, once they are discussed, in the final version of the public comment summary. Again, a reminder, that the final deadline now is on July 10th.

So far, I've received feedback from Fabro, David, Laureen and Drew. I know that David needs to come back with a few more details, and Fabro needs to discuss a few points with his subgroup. Again, if you send back your input to your subgroup leader, I invite you to put that in the piece so that we are informed and we can already work on including that into the public comment summary. Jonathan, I have included all the different comments that were received so far into the public comment summary, if anyone would like to discuss this input now this is feasible. I can put that onscreen. I see a question from Laureen. Please, Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. I will say, in going through the comments, that I did notice some general themes, and I think these are going to be things we want to discuss as a group. Perhaps, even before we wade into the comments. I'm happy to do a brief, one-pager and circulate it about some of the themes that I see. I focused on the issues that were relevant to the safeguards issue, primarily. I might actually also invite Jordyn and Jonathan to then add on to my one-pager, if there are other big themes they see regarding the work that they supervise.

On those themes, in addition to cost/benefit analysis, we got a couple of comments on precise language. Particularly, use of the word 'must' for what should be 'recommendations,' and consistent use of the words 'should' 'must' & 'may.' That might sound picayune, but actually I think those are really important points that we should be very consistent and precise with our language. And, if indeed they are recommendations, the words that would be appropriate might be 'may' & 'should' rather than 'must.'

Certainly, another theme was that the review team lacked data and needs more data, but also consider the cost of such data and the scope of what we're recommending. Suggestions to pare down and consolidate recommendations, and that's something we've talked about but haven't done yet that I think we should. A focus on consider what we really need to be prerequisites, and I think the thought in a lot of the comments was there are too many prerequisites. The PDP group certainly wanted their role more defined in terms of are they free to

EN

accept or reject our recommendations? Do they just consider them?
Can they go in a different direction? That's a whole other discussion.

This raises a general point that we need to be very clear about who out
recommendations are directed to. I think we've tried to do that, but, in
some cases, I think the reader still thought we weren't clear enough.
Certainly, for some of the recommendations from our team, there was a
caution about not getting into content regulation. In a corollary, to be
careful about recommendations that favor one stakeholder group over
another.

Also, consistently in a couple of comments, making sure that there's an
opportunity for a second public comment of the report, in light of the
new data presented by the DNS review study and the INTA study. I just
wanted to preview those. I'll put it in a one-pager, but I do think it's
good, just analytically, to think about some common themes and big
issues that are raised so that we keep that in mind as we're going
forward with our next version of the report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. I agree completely, and I think we probably want to
work to organize our face-to-face around those big themes. Drew, go
ahead.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. The comments I looked at and scrutinized that were related to
recommendations on which I had worked, I saw the same things that
Laureen just said and just wanted to emphasize that we really do need

to set aside some time to really articulate and maybe do a better job, as far as articulating it alongside our recommendations, and articulate what are mandate is and how these recommendations emanate from that mandate and from the review we've done as part of that mandate. Because, I think that even if we improve all of our recommendations, as far as defining them better in scope and making them more detailed, I think we're going to keep running into that with the PDP and subsequent procedures working groups. I think we should definitely, at least, start to tackle that during the face-to-face.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's an excellent point, Drew. Particularly because, in some of the public comments, I definitely saw recommendations of things to add that really would fall outside our mandate. In fact, in certain cases, would fall outside ICANN's mandate, much less ours. I think that's an excellent point, to make sure we're very, very clear about what we're asked to do, and what's appropriate for us to recommend.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. It ties into all of it. You're right. You're absolutely right, about even other people's comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Makes sense. Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, I noticed when I was going through the PDF document of our draft reports, it wasn't searchable. I was wondering if we had a searchable copy somewhere. It makes life a little bit easier if you can actually go through and look for things.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not sure. Searchable how? Because it's obvious you can do tech searches in a PDF.

CALVIN BROWNE: Maybe I'm just getting something wrong here. It doesn't seem to be -- oh, it is. I don't know, I must've been doing something wrong then. Okay, you can withdraw that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other questions? David, do you wanted, to speak?

DAVID TAYLOR: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're very faint.

DAVID TAYLOR: Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Barely.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, I'm on my computer. That's why I've been typing more than anything. Nothing to say, more than that really.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.   I just saw you starting to type, so that's why I thought I would just -- you should speak up. I wish we could have a single thread going in the plenary, the better.   Any other questions or comments about process? I think we've included we need to look at some of the big questions and make sure we have those conversations face-to-face. And, that we can deal with the specific execution on recommendation-by-recommendation basis, at a sub-team level with approval by the plenary.   But, the plenary meetings, they should be repurposed on better processes going forward on some of these bigger questions.

CALVIN BROWNE: It's Calvin again. The things I couldn't search in the PDF was I couldn't search through the actual recommendations. Those appear to be in a table that doesn't seem to be searchable. I don't know if anyone else is having that problem as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's follow up with staff to make sure that it didn't become an image, or that the table isn't something that is searchable.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Calvin, could you send me an example, via email, and I will try to help you.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sure. Okay, I will.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks. Any other business, questions or comments?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I did just want to pass on, and I've already passed this on to staff, I just did want to mention some safety concerns that folks from the embassy in Johannesburg passed on. Which is to be very careful if you do choose to take a private car, and especially a taxi and Uber. That last two which are recommended against. That there have been a number of follow-on robberies from the Johannesburg airport, where cars are followed and then the passengers are robbed on arrival. This is just a general 'be aware, be observant, be cautious' message.

Also, if you can travel with someone when you are going to your destination, that's also a safer method. I'm just passing on that information. Not to unduly alarm folks, but just to make people situationally aware.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. You were saying that taxis and Ubers were both not recommended?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Not that it's not recommended, they are strongly recommended against. The reason being, at least from my briefing from the US Embassy, is that, first of all, there's some hostility between Uber drivers and taxi drivers and they can get into disputes with each other. The other reason being that there have been these incidents of a follow-on robberies. The strong recommendation, this is on the ICANN website. The strong recommendation from ICANN is to take the train. The recommendation, at least I got, from the embassy is to arrange for a private company to shuttle you, either from the hotel or there's different companies that they recommend. A little bit of inconsistency, but the one thing they are consistent on is don't do taxis and don't do Uber.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a pain. Okay. David, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That is.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks. I was just going to follow-up on something Laureen said there. The train is very good from the airport to [inaudible], so that's a bonus. I wouldn't hesitate taking that.

Just, more generally, about the meeting, if we're going to have our meeting on Saturday & Sunday, and then we've got a few presentations and various people during the week, is it worth us trying to have a sit-down on the Thursday morning, or something at the end for those people who're still there? It might be worth having an hour, hour and a half, together face-to-face, if we are still there. Just a thought.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Or, maybe Wednesday evening.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yep. Yep.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Let's firm that up when we're all together. Any other questions? Any other business? Alright folks, thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Happy 50th plenary everybody.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, happy 50th.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Happy 50th. See you there.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Safe travels, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]