
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks everyone for participating. Looks like we have a small group today. What I wanted to focus on was our efforts to consolidate the recommendations and you'll see I sent around an email yesterday that is actually up on the screen which sets forth some of my own recommendations.

Okay, so we still have this person calling back in. I'm sorry whoever you are, but you do need to identify yourself for attendance purposes and if you elect not to do that, you'll continue to be disconnected. So we're happy to have you with us. We always welcome observers, but you do need to identify yourself. So I'm gonna give a pause so you can do that and if you elect not to do that, I'm gonna ask Brenda to disconnect the line once again and keep it disconnected. So happy to have you, but please tell us who you are.

Okay Brenda, so I'm gonna ask you to disconnect that line again. And I'm gonna take a pause so that can be executed. Thank you.

Okay. So moving on, what I'd like to do is go through the recommendations for these consolidation recommendations. Are we gonna keep doing this? Brenda, is there a way just to block this person who seems to not want to identify themselves? [AUDIO BREAK]

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.

BRENDA BREWER: I cannot block the number, Laureen, but I'm trying to identify it in another manner. So you may continue. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I guess I will for the record express some exasperation that someone wants to participate but not identify themselves. If you want to participate, the appropriate thing to do would be to tell us who you are.

Okay, so moving on, we're going to discuss the attempt to consolidate these recommendations. We can start -- I'm trying to gear this towards recommendations that implicate the people who're actually with us on the phone. Drew, I know some of the consolidation recommendations affected your --

DREW BAGLEY: Hey Laureen, can you repeat that? I just joined. I had issues connecting. I just heard the tail end of that. What were you saying?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So in my last email I had made some recommendations about things being consolidated including some that involved the DNS abuse recommendations and I wanted to get your response to that.

DREW BAGLEY: Sure, yeah. I agree with --

LAUREEN KAPIN: If you've had a chance to look it over, I'm sorry.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh yeah, I have. No, no problem, I did look at that. Yes, so for combining recommendations 19 and 34, I agree with that and I think that the new recommendation should be worded in words that just to make a nicer one but something like, "The DNS abuse study should be repeated and enhanced with analysis focused on additional correlations including those between registration restrictions and abuse, registry and registrar agreements on abuse," and then anything else we can pull, I guess, from other recommendations we already have, though there might be some overlap there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That makes sense to me and maybe, Jean-Baptiste, can we put that up as an item? I see you are already typing which is great. What did you think about the suggestion to combine the registration restriction recommendations?

DREW BAGLEY: Oh yeah. I was wondering what you meant by that where you said an alternative approach number 4 above.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure and the reason I said that was that 34 was mentioned in both of them and there's an overlap between our recommendations on registration restrictions and then your recommendation which relates

the DNS abuse studies and calling out certain studies to be implicated on registration restrictions.

DREW BAGLEY:

Yes. So I guess it depends on -- I think it's better suited in the abuse section so that we, you know -- obviously, a lot of these things are kind of overlapping than diagrams to a degree. But I think we should be very specific with what a future abuse study should entail and it should include an analysis such as registration restrictions.

Whereas the way we word, you know, the recommendation 35 and expanding that, I think it's something where we then have a sentence that says, "Weighing the costs and benefits of implementing various registration restrictions, including any potential insights drawn from DNS abuse studies," or something like that where we [inaudible] the other group of recommendations but not to where we are saying that the future cost benefits study on registration restrictions should include this analysis.

And I say that because the DNS abuse study, the original one, of course, was a very big undertaking. The future one will still be a significant undertaking even though it won't be as significant as the original, and so that's not just something that gets thrown into a jungle cost/benefit analysis like what we're talking about, which would be other factors for registration restriction.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I see we have some hands up, so I wanna let folks ask questions. Okay Brian, you took your hands down, so I'm assuming your questions been answered, you're lowering yours. But Jean-Baptiste, you've your hand up, go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, thank you, Laureen. It was not a question, but just to ease the discussion, I just wanted to ask whether you would like me to put the recommendations on screen maybe? And I've placed the different suggestions that you have in the notes pad, so just wanted to know if that would help the discussion.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You know what would help that actually I wanna ask Drew, but do recommendations 19 and 34 have the same priority? And I have like a hard copy cheat sheet so I actually can answer that question. 19 is high and 34 is also high, so they have the same priority.

And what I would suggest, Jean-Baptiste, since we have such a small group and I'm loathe to assume total agreement when we have less than the full sub-team; what I'll say, maybe we can have this conditionally approved 'cause I'd like to circulate this around after our sub-team call to let folks have one more chance to weigh in. And also if we can note that both 19 and 34 have the same priority level of high.

Okay. Any other questions or comments for Drew on consolidating recommendations 19 and 34? Drew, I'll ask a quick question. Do you see that as requiring any re-organization of text, or do you see it more

as a referring back? And if it's something you need more time to think about, that's fine.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, that I would definitely have to think about just because that section is so nascent.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, no that's fine.

DREW BAGLEY: Incorporating the study, so I don't know and yeah, you were looking to commit anything one way or another before we've fully developed that section and seeing what our conclusions really are with all the data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it, okay. So let's move on then to --- let's see who else is on the call. Carlton, you had made some suggestions for consolidation regarding complaints, 21 through 23, and those were adopted in this email that I sent around. Did you have any -- a) are all those of the same priority and did you have any thoughts about any issues that come up if you choose to consolidate these? And these are different priorities. 21 and 22 are medium, but 23 is high priority. Okay, so Carlton says he's calling in now. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, so we're gonna give Carlton a chance to call in and then I'll -- oh, great. So we're still waiting for Carlton to call in. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay Carlton, are you online now?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Hi Laureen, are you hearing me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, we can.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Are you hearing?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. So you're right. The 21, and 22, 23, they actually deal with complaints, the management of it, the recording of it, and the curation of the complaints for further study. You're quite right, they're all directed at the ICANN organization and there's is one slight hitch in all of that, is that one recommendation is considered high, so 23 is high.

I sent you some text of what I thought they should be. Because the first one is about mechanisms to collect and report. The second one says whether or not we have enough -- the contact points are publicized enough and that's about mechanisms. And then the 23rd says what kinds of information should be contained in the complaints and my recommendation is that we reinforce the idea that the contact point,

abuse contact point that is required in contract be publicized in as many channels as possible.

We adopt a format for complaints reporting, which would then institutionalize the type of data that was collected for complaints and we record it so that it is available for further study, and that is to deal with any review team or academic effort to do that. So that's how I saw them being pooled together.

In regard of the recommendation, the priority, I figured that the real intent of the complaints is to have immediate information to see to safeguards. So I would make all of that high priority. That's my view on it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Say that one more time for me Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was saying in regards to the priority, I would prioritize -- the whole objective of collecting and ensuring we collect complaint data is to ensure that we have facts to respond to complaints about breach of safeguards.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

CARLTON SAMUELS: And so since that is the one that is high priority, I would consider the consolidated response to be high priority as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, okay. Any questions or comments on Carlton's approach to consolidating these complaint oriented recommendations? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, I don't see hands. Okay, then let's put in an action item that this is also conditionally approved with a high priority. Perfect, thank you. Thank you, Jean-Baptiste.

And we will move on. As I said, I wanna try and get at the folks who are on the phone. Carlos, I think you're responsible for with 36, which is implicated in the grouping of the recommendations regarding registration restrictions. Were you able to take a look at that and think about whether it makes sense for those recommendations that deal with registration restrictions to be consolidated?

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Give me a second, I'm struggling with the pdf. Give me one round and let me just cross-check it once again. I've written some comments in my version of the pdf. I'm just looking for the document.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So just for clarity, the document here really would be to look at the preliminary report, Carlos, and take a look at the excerpts that list all the recommendations and their priority levels, and then take a look

at the recommendations. So it's not necessary for you to do that on the fly. In fact, you probably want to take a little opportunity to consider it.

So what I'll say is perhaps offline you can get back to us via email in your thoughts about combining 16 and 34, 35, and 36. And I have you weighing in on that because 36 was the recommendation that you were discussion lead for. Okay great, so you'll do it over email. Okay.

And Hal, I don't want to leave you out, although I -- 13, 15 and 33 -- 13 and 15 aren't recommended to be consolidated with anything, but 33 is. No, I take it back, 33 is not either. So what I'll just ask you Hal, if you have any thoughts about any of these recommendations for consolidation, 'cause I don't think any of yours were implicated here. I don't know if you have speaking capabilities with your connection today, Hal. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, you're typing. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay. She's connected, just challenged with audio. So Hal, what I'll invite you to do is that if you do have thoughts about the consolidation suggestions, agreements, disagreements etc., to let the group know via email. [AUDIO BREAK]

Oh, so you're saying in general -- are you saying that generally, Hal, that you don't think any of the recommendations should be consolidated, or you're saying that just particularly to 13, 15, and 33 which are the ones you were discussion lead for? Okay, the three, 13, 15, and 33. Okay, that makes sense.

Okay. The others we don't have the discussion leads on the phone for. So what I'll do and my recommendations are already reflected in this email. So what I'll do is I'll open it up for general discussion on anyone's thoughts about this proposal for consolidation. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, thank you, Hal. For folks without benefit to the chat, Hal observed correctly I believe, that there's some subject matter overlap between recommendations but not necessarily enough to justify consolidation.

Okay. So does anyone else have any questions or thoughts on these recommendations for consolidation? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay. Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: I have just a general comment that we don't speak to the titles of the chapters once we have the consolidated document, we might have to revise also the headings of the chapters. It's just a formality.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Right now I don't want to get stuck in a discussion on the headings. We shall revise that once we have all these proposals of merger or non-merger, how to best have a good grouping or sequence or however you want to do it.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I agree with you, Carlos. I think that's right. I think we have a couple of different ways to go forward. First what I'll do is I'll ask everyone to weigh in formally on these proposals and, you know, give people a deadline to let me know if they disagree, so that we can make sure we have weigh-in on this.

And second, I think what we'll need to think about is, if by consolidating the recommendations we need to consolidate the chapters in some way. Or do we keep the narrative we have, but basically present consolidated recommendations in our recommendations section and cross-reference noting that keeping the narrative we have may relate to one recommendation which is now part of a consolidated recommendation.

I want to avoid the situation where we're having to revise unnecessarily a lot of text or jettison a narrative structure that actually has made a lot of sense in terms of its sequence. So I don't want the consolidation to muck up our text. This is how I would put it in a shorter way.

That said, if we think structurally that there might be some beneficial changes, I'm certainly open to that. But as a follow-up item what I'm gonna ask people to do is while they're weighing-in on recommendations, if there's a discussion lead for any of the consolidated recommendations, that they take a look at the corresponding text and also weigh-in on whether we think we need to adjust the narrative, whether it's adjusting the headings as Carlos suggests, or whether it's re-organizing in some way.

So if we can put that as an action item too, Jean-Baptiste, I'll try and express that a little more simply. For consolidation recommendations consider whether we need to revise and reorganize corresponding text.

Okay. And Carlos, I'm not sure if that's an old hand or a new hand.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No worries. Okay. So now I'm gonna open it up to any questions or comments that folks have about moving forward. My homework is going to be getting buy-in on these consolidations and then considering what the timing is going to be for our next steps in terms of revising these consolidations and the corresponding text that goes along with it. So questions, comments on the fast forward in our revision process?
[AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, I don't see any hands except Carlos. I think that's still an old hand. Okay, which is down now. Jean-Baptiste, are there any other issues that we need to discuss? Do we have an upcoming call with one of the stakeholder groups that I'm remembering that I might wanna remind people of?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, we do. Let me just -- I will look again at the dates. It's next week, I believe on --

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, it's on the 27th, it's a Thursday and it's with the IPC and it's at 8:00 p.m. UTC.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. But this is with the IPC stakeholder group.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So anyone who wants to participate in that -- did everyone get an invitation for that or was it just a smaller group?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I think it was -- I mean, as it's a leadership update, I think it was sent to you, Laureen, Jordyn, Drew and Jonathan.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. Well, if anyone is interested in participating in that, let Jean-Baptiste know and he'll forward you the specific information for that update for the IPC.

Okay. If there are no other questions and comments, I think I'm gonna end the call early and ask people to take this extra time to look over

these recommendations for consolidation, particularly if you think you may disagree. That is what I want to know as soon as possible so we can consider alternatives. And with that, unless anyone has any other thoughts or comments, I think I'll set people free early to enjoy the rest of their day, morning or evening. Okay.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much, Laureen. I agree.

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, everyone.

DREW BAGLEY: Stay cool and [inaudible] weather.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]