
RECORDED VOICE: [THIS MEETING IS NOW BEING RECORDED]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, everyone, and welcome to the Competition and Consumer Choice Sub Team of the CCTRT call. The meeting today is not (inaudible) the Chair of the Sub Team. Do we have anyone who is only on audio and is not in Adobe Connect (inaudible)?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. I'm on audio only.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You're on audio only in a way we can (inaudible). Okay, great. And why don't go ahead and get started then. We have an agenda for today which is to go through the status of various recommendations. We have some new updates texts that were sent out this morning I think. And we can otherwise see what is going on. So, why don't we go ahead and dive in. For Recommendations 2 and 3, I sent around some proposed revisions today. Jean-Baptiste, I don't know if you got those in time to be able to...

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I did. I'm going to project them now.

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.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Okay, thank you. Okay, as folks may remember a few weeks back we talked about how to approach the wholesale pricing recommendations. I had originally suggested that we just consolidate those into a recommendation that we add the requirement to participate in economic studies to the legacy gTLDs. But I think other folks on the call, particularly Jonathan, were concerned that we be able to collect specific types of data that we had called out, and was trying to balance that against the concern in the purchase that the Registries had raised in our sessions with them.

So this text does replace Recommendations 2 and 3—2 was about legacy gTLDs and 3 was about transactional data—into a single recommendation. And as you can see, the recommendation now just says that we want to collect additional pricing data for gTLDs, and it talks about both legacy and transactional data. And the details around this are basically that we should expand on the existing model using the third party studies as analysis we did, but then just make sure that whatever contractor is working is able to get data from legacy gTLDs and at least a sample of transactional data.

We talked about the types of applications of transactional data that would be useful here and we added some text around making sure that data was protected. Part of that's by making sure that it is handled by a third party. Part of that gives a specific example of how she did a non-disclosure agreement since the Registry pointed out it wasn't really clear what was meant by adequate protection.

And then it also says, as I think we have discussed on our previous call that it would be to just have this all work out through the existing

contractual framework. The Registries will voluntarily go along, but if not, that it may be necessary for ICANN to adjust the agreement. So, that's the rough gist of the change. I wanted to consult with the group here today and see if there is feedback from the members of the Sub Team on these changes.

Megan, on chat, says it's okay for her. Jonathan, on the last call, the last time we had discussed this you had mentioned, I think I wanted to propose we just consolidate it into used third party data sources and add economic cooperation, that you were afraid of missing some fidelity there. Does this set of changes address your concerns? Are you happy with them?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It does, thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. Just to be clear, the other thing I tried to do here is just be a little bit clear about how the data would be used and does address the concern that the Registries raised. I still gave some specific examples on that. Alright, any other feedback from the group? Sounds like most of you are positive so far. Anyone have some concerns about these changes? Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. I'm wondering about the wording for the rationale that is it binding. There. It's not flowing for me. It starts off, "The lack of data from legacy gTLDs and transactional data." Does that indicate that data

from legacy gTLDs is mutually exclusive of transactional data? I think it's completely different. That wording there is not quite flowing for me.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I can see your point so I can definitely make an edit to make that clear. It's two different types of... like the way the (inaudible) is the lack of number 1, data from legacy gTLDs, and number 2, transactional data will continue to frustrate the CCTRT, so it's two different—

WAUDO SIGANGA: That's the data from the new gTLDs? From both?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, and this is why the (inaudible) cannot be removed?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's fine, I can draft that up. Do you have any other concerns about this, Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA: That's okay, thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Alright, it looks like we've generally got consensus around this. So, I'll work with Jean-Baptiste to make sure these get incorporated. The other thing I noticed, I didn't have time to do this, but I think as a follow up action item, and it's just everyone that's working on changing the recommendations, is that we should look back to the actual texts preceding the recommendations to make sure that we don't need to make adjustments there as well, now that we're adjusting the recommendations themselves. So, I think that will be a follow up. I'll take that for these two items and I think that will be relevant to perhaps some of the other recommendations as well.

Why don't we move along now to Recommendations 7 and 8, and those are from Dejan. I think he sent out a new draft this morning as well. It looks like Jean-Baptiste is trying to show this. Alright, great. That's the one from me. Why don't we jump to 12. Oh, that's fine, we could have done that. That's the one that Dejan sent out and 12 is the one I sent.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You still want this one, Jordyn? Otherwise I can move back to the other one.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Either way is fine.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, let's move to 7 and 8 then, as you suggested. This won't take long, it's loading.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. This is 7. So, Dejan, do you want to talk us through the change here?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, yeah. There are just a few minor changes. The main change is that the Recommendation 7 and 8 are now compiled into one recommendation, but we didn't discuss that on the previous call. It will reflect the numbering of all recommendation reports, so is that complicated? Do we want to do that? We didn't discuss about it. If it's not complicated to follow later, we can do that, but if it will be for people who gave their comments maybe it will be a bit. Since it's only one number it's not that complicated, but I don't know. Do you have any opinions on that about changing the numbering of all recommendations?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's a good point, Dejan. I did the same thing with 2 and 3, they're now consolidated into a single recommendation. I don't know, Jonathan, if you have an opinion about this, but for the moment I would say let's keep our existing numbering and then when we get a little bit more firm in terms of all the changes that are being made, we'll have to go back and renumber those recommendations. But for the moment let's keep them as they were previously.

DEJAN DJUKIC: So we'll keep them as two recommendations or we'll make it as one?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I would leave it as one. For Recommendation 8, I think maybe we'll have to keep a mental placeholder that it doesn't exist anymore, that it consolidated with 7.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Maybe you could keep the numbering but delete the recommendation, that's also the option. So, there are just a few changes beside that, that it's compiled as one recommendation. So, I had decided that based on our discussion on the previous call I had referenced to the LAC Study and it is related to counting the registration by country and TLD. So, that's short. And priority is the same, it's the whole.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: (CROSSTALK).

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I also have something about the wording, if we're going to talk about LAC Study, I think we need to be a little bit more specific than just putting LAC Study. Is there going to be a footnote, and if there is, which LAC Study are we talking about? That's what worries me, we must be very clear. For now I know what we are talking about but after a short while that could be seen as LAC Studies.

DEJAN DJUKIC: No, we are mentioning LAC Study in the report in a few places. I took a look today. So there is at least three places and it is described and that there is a full name of study. So we can do --

WAUDO SIGANGA: That's okay, but because this is a recommendation (inaudible).

DEJAN DJUKIC: It is part of the report. We are mentioning it—

WAUDO SIGANGA: It should be stand alone.

DEJAN DJUKIC: In that part of the report it's mentioned a few times. LAC Study is in footnotes. I'm not sure, is there a link to report to the study, but there is the full name of the study, and we are using the short name in the report, LAC Study.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right. And what we did previously, with regards to referencing these other studies, is that we're going to use some canonical names that the staff is going to work on, and then we'll do a

global consistent reference to any of these other studies in the same way, and then we'll have a bibliography or something so people will be able to look up what we're referring to.

It may need to have a footnote to the specific portion of the LAC study that we're referring to here. That's the one thing where I might say a footnote would be helpful if they talk about their methodology or something like that they, maybe it makes sense to point to that particular section of the LAC Study.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, I'll add that footnote here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Dejan. As with last week I have a couple of maybe minor wording change but I can maybe work with you on that offline as well.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Any other feedback on Dejan's proposed changes here? Okay, so it looks like this looks good as well. So, subject to the footnotes that Dejan's proposed and any minor text, I will get these incorporated to the draft report as well or into the next report as well.

Let's move on to Recommendation 9. Actually, this action item on this that I've failed to follow up on, so maybe we can do it on the call right now. Recommendation 9 is to periodically redo the Registrant Survey, I

believe. Yeah, it is indeed to conduct the periodic Registrant Survey. I don't think anyone's actually done the analysis of the public comments or taken a look at whether any revisions have been made to this document.

On our last call I was going to try and find a volunteer to do so, but then I immediately went on vacation for the entire time 'til today. So, I'm wondering if we could find a volunteer on today's call, of someone who could take a look at the feedback, the public comments for Recommendation 9 and see if there's any adjustments that we need to make. And I see Waudo has his hand up. Oh, I thought Waudo did have his hand up.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

I can volunteer for that, Jordyn. I'll look at Recommendation 9 and then look at the public comments about it. Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Alright, so recommendations 10 and 40. David and I have had conflicting vacations and haven't had a chance to work into consolidating this, although I don't think we're going to.

Recommendation number 11. I think Megan and I were supposed to talk which we haven't yet. Can we look at 11 quickly? Megan and I are both on the call, we'll just do it in front of all of you folks for just a minute. Megan, I think you had previously taken a look at the (inaudible), is that right?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, I had looked at this, all the public comments, and I had updated this, as far as I recall.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that may be right, and we talked about that on the Plenary call.

MEGAN RICHARDS: And whoever was taking notes during that discussion was going to do the final update of the revised version that I had made, plus the comments that were made during the Plenary.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, and unfortunately I missed that first portion of the Plenary. Alright, why don't we just follow up? We'll follow up with staff on what's going on there. Sorry, Waudo, I see your hand up. Is that an old hand or do you have a comment? Okay, looks like an old hand.

So, let's jump to Recommendation 12. Okay, so we can ignore 7 and 8 from this presentation and just look at Recommendation 12. You'll see here the purple is my proposed changes and the orange is Dejan's changes. I edited Dejan's change a little bit. And this just clarifies the language from Dejan's recommendation to say the GNSO should create a Policy Development Process to look at the privacy, to create a baseline privacy, that expectation across all gTLDs, and in particular look at the (inaudible), data without consent of the Registrants. Dejan, do those edits look okay to you?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yeah, I agree with your proposed changes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Any other feedback?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Not from me, that's okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, or from anyone else? Okay, then we'll consider Recommendation 12 fairly well baked. So, Dejan, can I ask you for Recommendations 8 and 12, as I recommended earlier, just to look back at not just the recommendation but the preceding text to see if we need to change anything in the body of the report, given that we're changing the recommendation?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, I'll take a look once again.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, but otherwise these recommendations are looking pretty solid at this point. And maybe at the next Plenary call we'll make a time and we'll review the final language and ensure the entire Review Team is happy with them. We should probably send them out this week hopefully.

And then jumping ahead to Recommendations 47 through 48, which are not actually in our section. I think these were discussed in the last Plenary as well. So I'm not sure we actually have anything to cover here. And that's also true for 50. Actually, I'm just going to skip those. They don't actually appear in our section of the report and they were discussed on the last Plenary call.

Okay, and then the next major bullet item is number 2, which is, discussion on the .NET price increase changes. We've had some proposed text circulated which we discussed on the last call. Jean-Baptiste, can you remember?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think I have the pen on this, Jordyn, and I didn't get a draft ready for today.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so we'll block that on Jonathan today, so we'll hopefully get that soon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. And maybe Parking as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That is true, Parking as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll circulate something this week.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so for the next two topics we're waiting for revisions from Jonathan on both of them.

Okay. We ran out of things to talk about. But I think this is mostly good, I think we're actually closing in on having our recommendations updated, relative to the public comments, which is the goal of this process. Unfortunately we have fewer public comments on the other Sub Teams, so it's going quickly. So I think at this point Dejan and I in particular will be taking a look at some of the text related to the recommendations, and we'll look to finalize the last few recommendations hopefully on our next call.

So, unless anyone has any other business, we'll wrap up with another short call, but hopefully a useful one. Alright, thanks everyone. We'll wrap up today's call and look forward to speaking with you all again soon. I think we're trying to figure out whether next week's call is going to be a Plenary or a Sub Team call and we should have an update on that for everyone soon. Alright, thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]