
LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, folks who are on the line, for participating this morning. I'm hoping we're also going to get Carlson here. I know that Drew is going to be a bit late, so perhaps the best thing to do would be actually to start with you, Carlos, to talk about your recommendations for consolidation. And I'll also note that the recommendations that you tackled also were on other people's slates, as well, so we're probably going to open up the discussion for the other folks who were also the pen holders on those recommendations to see what can be consolidated and what makes sense on a group of recommendations that were basically in many different places in the report. But I will turn it over to you, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. This is Carlos, for the record. Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Hello? OK, thank you. Thank you, Lauren. I made some comments some time ago and put them on an email to you that I just grabbed out, and I just want to make some opening statements, and we can jump into that discussion, as you said, because it includes more people. First of all, as we did with all the recommendations, I think that they got separated badly from the other ones, and we should consider at least discussing them together, because they are related. The second

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.

comment is more related to the wording that we use. Of course, we need more data, but I think, in this case, we have to go a little bit deeper. What we need is a better understanding of the restrictions themselves, because the way they develop, they develop by different ways, and I think what we lack is not only data, we lack a framework, a perspective. And this is my—hello?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We can still hear you, although there's some static.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I don't know if it's coming from my side, if I should do something here. No, it's gone now.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, Carlos, I had to mute, so our line had some static.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Oh, it was Jamaica. OK, so my proposal here for discussion is more focused on the way the restrictions came about to exist and if they were effective or not. And as far as the first point, it is obvious that the restrictions didn't come out from policy. They didn't come out from the AGB. They came out from comments, from worries, from later ad hoc conditions, etc. So, the first thing that I want to put on the table is at least to have clarification of the different type of restrictions, and second, to ask questions, very, very specific questions, if those restrictions help to reduce abuse, if these restrictions ended up

reducing registrations, if these restrictions can be effectively tested a long time, things like that. So, in the end, we would end up with the same recommendations, just away from the pure data approach, and have more specific questions and restrictions, and hopefully gear the discussion towards the subsequent procedures and say, “OK, if there are going to be restrictions, they should be, A, policy-based and well-thought, why we want them, and not just our own restrictions. Anybody can’t throw in restrictions and not think about the effect of their restrictions.” So, I leave it there for the moment. The note I prepared is attached on an email to Jean-Baptiste this morning. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, it’s currently on the screen, Carlos.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Carlos, do you have access to the Adobe room, so you can see what we’re seeing?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, I am sitting at home, and I have access to the Adobe room. I’m not going in today. Thank you, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: OK, good, so thank you, Carlos, and thank you for your thoughtful work on this. I want to break it down a little bit, and I want to actually start, not with the proposal to consolidate everything, which I admit that I’m

struggling with a little bit, but start with your first point, which is it would make sense to identify the registration restrictions at the starting point. And that strikes me as an excellent recommendation that could be added, for example, perhaps to 16, since I think that's the first recommendation that deals with registration restrictions. So, I think that that's a very good point.

I wanted to get a sense, starting with that, whether people are in favor of that discussion, of that addition, because you're right, the registration restrictions really were, at least a good number of them were, the result of GAC advice on the regulated and highly-regulated gTLDs, but then there were also registries that went beyond the GAC advice and took even more—I'm trying to find the correct word—decided to impose even more restrictive restrictions—I'll be repetitive—than what's called for under the ICANN contracts. And some of the correspondence surrounding that issue, particularly from the GAC, expressed concerns that restrictions perhaps might unduly restrict competition.

So, we have these two issues that are at play. One is restrictions being put in place because of concerns by the GAC that highly regulated gTLDs pose additional risks to consumers, and then a corollary there is that sometimes restrictions can also have an impact and perhaps reduce competition, so we have those two different things going on, and I think that's the landscape where these recommendations and registration restrictions come in. And then the other factor here, and I think when Drew joins us, we'll talk more about that, is the relationship between DNS abuse and registration restrictions. So, it's actually a rather complicated landscape. That's just setting the stage, but let me go back

to my original question, which—I think Carlos has made a very good point about having as a starting point either ICANN or the TGP subsequent procedures, for it to start off by identifying the current registration restrictions. Let me put that on the table. Do people have comments about that? Carlos, go ahead. I see your hand is up.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes, I think it's necessary that we get a general classification of restrictions, and I think I, as the holder of the contracts, would be the right source of these classifications. And I would be a little bit wider. I fully agree with you that we have these two groups, but also on the extreme, we have the closed generics, the brands that are going to use their gTLD just for private purchases, because it is their brand, and that's what we know as closed ones. And on the other extreme, we have the lovely ones that we know who's going to use it, and maybe for that reason, they never got approved, some community gTLDs like a bank or—you don't know what kind of restriction applies to that or how you're going to approve it.

I'm not joking. I'm serious about the continuum between very clear, very defined restrictions, to very far-out restrictions, but difficult to define, highly regulated, because although everybody knows the banks are regulated, highly regulated, the banking laws are different in different jurisdictions. Then we go to the restrictions that we include on their documents, which are more or less voluntary restrictions, like ONGs/NGOs. We have a case of the registry that defined a very peculiar path of restrictions, and right now they haven't gotten any registrations, and there are other examples like that. We need, again, some

community approaches to define a community, but we're not able to put any clear-cut restriction to that, so I guess the applications got into competing applications, and nobody could solve it. So, I think these initial classifications of restrictions by how thorough they are or how well-defined they are is a necessity, so we can jump to the next step, which is what is the effect, positive and negative, of the restrictions. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Carlos. I'm actually taking some notes here. So, other thoughts on this? And thanks for giving a little more analysis of the reason why you're recommending this. Jonathan, in the chat, for anyone who's on the phone, has noted that brands may be a separate category. Is there anyone who's just on the phone? If everyone has access to the chat, I don't need to share it. OK, other folks with comments on that? OK, is there anyone who disagrees with adding this suggestion that there be a recommendation, that our recommendations on these registration restrictions first start with some guidance about identifying the current registration restrictions in place, doing some sort of collection and classification? OK, I'm not—Carlos, is that an old hand?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Sorry, it's an old hand.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's OK. OK, I'm not seeing any folks who disagree. I see that somebody is typing, but I'm not sure if that relates to this or is a side conversation that's going on in the chat. So, let me move on, then—OK, David, now your hand is up. Go ahead. I am recognizing you in a timely manner. You are noticed.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thank you, Lauren. I was just trying to type a reply into chat there for the discussion we've got over there. Brands are a different category, as we consider them to be so restricted, and I was just typing something and figured it might be easier to say it. I do think they're a separate category, but my view is that they haven't been considered, within the utility program, as a separate, as in a dot brand. You can apply for a dot brand, and this is a category you desire to expand in the community, and there's no dot brand, per se. I see them as being a very restricted, or the most restricted, category of clothes as connoisseurs, so that's why I'm erring onto that side of the discussion, which is going on in the chat, but I just wanted to throw that in for you.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Did we lose sound?

DAVID TAYLOR: I can hear you.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I was wondering. We didn't lose sound. Did we lose David?

DAVID TAYLOR: No, I'm still here. I'm just finished. Did you hear what I said or not?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sorry, folks. I thought, Carlos, we should hear from you about why these recommendations should all be consolidated, and I admit to being a little apprehensive about consolidating all of them, because although they all deal with registration restrictions, they seem to approach it from different angles. For example, 34 really looks at this through the lens of just the DNS abuse studies, which is sort of its own thing. And perhaps 35 and 36 can be combined, and 16 seems to be more of an introduction to the topic. But I thought perhaps, Carlos, you can talk more about why you think they should all be combined.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Probably "combined" is the wrong word. I just analyzed the level of support, and the level of support of the different recommendations—it's different. 16 flies on its own. From 34 to 36—35 is the key one, but when I look at the comments on 34 and 36, it's not a clear-cut support, so what I'm recommending is putting the recommendations by themselves under the same argument or discussion line, so that we're presenting them as a bundle, and not analyzing Rule 36, and then there are people who really hate 36, and there is no great support, or 34, so if somebody takes a raw look at the level of support of the comments, I see a big difference in the level or the level of understanding of the comments. So, my recommendation is probably not to put them all

together, but my recommendation is to use the same argument, the same framework argument.

We need the framework, and then we need to ask smart questions about these restrictions, not just data for analysis, but we want to analyze how this and that affect Y and Z. This is my recommendation, so let's look at them together and not throw them all under one new bucket, to use our internal language. I think they need to be related together, like 16 we need, and the type of knowledge we want to do—we have to be much clearer, so we get a constant level of support of the whole set. That would be my rephrasing of the recommendation. The level of support, or the level of comments, show that there is not a clear understanding what the difference is between 34, 35, and 36, so it's a red flag. We need to work it out. We want to keep them, and we want people to get a clearer message. It's not the general data or sorts of banalities. No, we need a framework, and we are going to analyze the relationship of this level of registrations to issues A, B, and C, so we can develop recommendations that the next round take restrictions as part of the policy development. We cannot let—and here's my personal bias. We cannot let a new round go on and let everybody choose restrictions in the middle of the delegation process. Restrictions are too important. We have too high hopes of the restrictions. They should be part of the PDP. This is Carlos Gutierrez's personal opinion. I don't want to bring it into the report as such. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Carlos. It sounds like a lot of what's driving your concern is that there was more public comment/critique of the later recommendations,

34, 35, and 36, and that you want to make sure we're more explicit in our rationale and what problem we're trying to solve in these recommendations. So, I think that's a fair point. I took a stab at recommendation 16 to try and address some of the public comment concerns, and maybe we can get that up on the screen, to see if this might be a step in the right direction, and I think, Jean-Baptiste, you have the document that I'd sent to you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, I do. I can put that on screen, if you wish.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, just to look at the first part, 16.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, one second.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Maybe we can make that bigger.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I have changed the properties so that anyone can zoom.

LAUREEN KAPIN: OK, great. I would suggest that people zoom. Let me start with the public—and everyone has individual scroll control, also?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, they do.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect, so let me start with the public comment feedback. People can scroll down. For recommendation 16, let me go back and give people a little more context, also, so we know what text 16 related to. Bear with me for a moment. OK, so recommendation 16 immediately followed our first discussion of consumer trust, which really focused on the findings of the Nielsen Consumer and Registrant Surveys and the findings there that had, first of all, recognition that people trusted new gTLDs less than legacy gTLDs, and also factors that related to trust, more specifically, that registration restrictions, contributed to trust. And I believe that the findings about the relationship between registration restrictions and trust are what drove more specifically recommendation 16, which is really trying to get a little—which at least started out by trying to get more information on this relationship between registration restrictions and trust. And so, we got some public feedback on that, more support than disagreement.

I'm going to focus on the comments that were not supportive. So, the ICANN organization, and this mirrors your suggestion, Carlos, asked us to be more specific about what we mean by restrictions. And Carlos has pointed out that actually, there were quite a range of restrictions that were imposed, so that was ICANN organization's comment. The non-commercial stakeholders' group were concerned about content regulation, particularly when we were asking about the relationships

between registration restrictions and DNS issues and their concerns about the lack of definition of DNS abuse and what that would entail. And then, finally, Neustar had two very practical observations. One, they said our recommendation assumes that there's even a familiarity on the part of the public with registration restrictions, and I assume they mean the greater public, because the people who were surveyed did find this connection, but Neustar, I think, implicitly makes the observation, "Well, you may have gotten survey responses, but the general public at large may not even know much about new gTLDs, much less what gTLDs have registration restrictions." And they also pointed out that restrictions may not be appropriate for truly generic gTLDs, and when you're talking about restrictions, that really depends on the type of gTLD involved. And this isn't something Neustar said, but if you're going to take that argument further, you would, I think, argue that it doesn't make sense to have registration restrictions on truly generic gTLDs like a dotcom, for example, or something else that would be very generic.

So, what I did is took a stab at responding to some of these concerns, and I'll start with the rationale and related findings, which I think could be bulked up a little bit, and you'll see the language there, so it's the changes I suggested. I'll read it aloud for anyone who's still in the chat, but "ICANN consumer research and registrant surveys indicate that the public expects certain restrictions about who can purchase domain names and trusts that these restrictions will be enforced. The survey results also indicated the presence of such restrictions contributed to consumer trust. However, it would be useful for those developing future policy to have more data on how aware the public is of

registration restrictions and the impact of registration restrictions on consumer trust. It is also important to obtain information on the cost of registration restrictions on the relevant parties, so that benefits (perhaps in terms of increased trust and decreased DNS abuse) can be weighed against any restrictions on competition.”

The next language is original, basically talking about PDTs and review teams using this data to inform future policy decisions about whether these restrictions should be encouraged or included within standard contact provisions, and then additional language—a measure of success would be a policy decision on whether certain categories of gTLD should be subject to registration restrictions, based upon considerations, specific data on costs, and benefits. I tried to make this a little more explicit, in terms of what we were basing this recommendation on and what the measure of success would be, and also taking a step back, and taking into account the public comments about, one, “Is the public even aware of this?” And I think we can take a step further back, as well, by incorporating Carlos’s suggestion that we start off as an initial matter, also, not just exploring awareness, the public’s awareness of these restrictions, but also identifying what restrictions are currently in place, so that whatever studies take place can be very precise and specific about what’s happening in the current landscape, rather than dealing with this as an abstract concept. So, I’d be interested in hearing people’s views about this additional rationale.

You can see, in the recommendation itself, there’s an example given, and this relates to the ICANN comments. We use the example of registrants possessing the credentials necessary for highly-regulated domains, and there’s also a reference here, in response to ICANN input,

that whatever data collection happens should also include an assessment of current ICANN initiatives, related to measuring DNS abuse. We know there's the start initiative, the health of the DNS. We know there's the health index that ICANN is currently looking at, and also the DNS marketplace, to make explicit that whatever data collection goes on certainly also includes current initiatives and does not have duplicative initiatives going on when it might be best to actually work together and use the information that's already being collected.

So, those are some of my suggestions, and I'm happy to hear folks' views about that. I see a check mark from Carlos. I don't know if that's a wholesale checkmark or agreement to a prior comment, but if Carlos wants to respond verbally, that's fine, and if anyone else wants to respond verbally, that's fine. Comments? Questions?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Just a semantic question, if you allow me, Laureen. This is Carlos.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Absolutely.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I think, at this stage of the recommendations, when we are reading, we should be careful of just stating data. I think we're here at the level—OK, we need a classification, and we need to look for correlations with number of registrations, level of abuse, types of use. We could put very specific—I mean, if I go back to the document, data is the mantra of the whole set of recommendations. But when we go down, let's see if we

can be more specific than just collecting data. And in the case of the restrictions, I would say we need a good classification of restrictions, so we can relate to the different issues we are analyzing. That's it in a nutshell. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Carlos. Basically, you're asking for more specificity. Don't just use a general word like data—get more specific about what information we want, for example, whether there are correlations between registration restrictions and DNS abuse, or correlations between registration restrictions and increased trust, whether we can get more information about what perhaps behavior this increased trust translates into, for example—am I getting at what you're suggesting, Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Exactly, different restrictions have different impacts and effects, yes, different shades of restrictions have different impacts and effects.

LAUREEN KAPIN: OK, so I will go back and tweak this a little more and send it around for 16. Do we have Drew on the line yet? I was hoping that we were going to have Drew discuss 34. Say it again? Not yet. I'm looking at a half/switched screen, because—Drew has—maybe I'll echo Drew a little bit, or maybe we should wait. Well, I guess I'd rather stick with this, and then for the last part of the call, I'm going to turn it over to Carlton to talk about his recommendations to consolidate some of the

recommendations to complaints, in particular. But now I'm channeling Drew. Drew has recommended that we try and combine original recommendation 19, which deals with comparing rates of abuse in domains operating under the new registry and agreements to legacy gTLDs. And original recommendation 34 basically said, "We have this DNS abuse study. We should repeat and refine it to figure out whether the presence of additional registration restrictions correlates to a decrease in abuse in new gTLDs." And Drew's recommendation for consolidation is as follows. Let me see if I can actually put this in the chat. Hold on a second. Let me see if this will work. OK, this is Drew's suggestion for consolidated recommendations 19 and 34. I'll do it out loud, in case anyone is just on the phone. "ICANN must regularly conduct a publicly available, comprehensive analysis of technical abuse in the DNS," and then he defines that, "phishing, malware hosting, command and control, and spam." "Such analyses should build upon the CCT Review Team's DNS Abuse Study and identify the rates of abuse in all legacy and new gTLDs, correlating the rates to registries, to registrars, and resellers, including cross-TLD common entities.

Furthermore, these studies should correlate abuse rates to registration restrictions, registry and registrar agreements, and other distinguishing variables." So, that is Drew's suggestion for a consolidation of 19 and 34, which both deal with DNS abuse. And again, when we have these consolidated recommendations, I think that the way we'll handle them in the report is to do cross-references, because we don't—the report has a narrative, and things are in a somewhat logical sequence, so I don't think we want to fool around with the sequence of the report, but I do think we can consolidate some of the recommendations. And

where they're consolidated, we can cross-reference. So, this would appear in the text that relates to both recommendations 19 and 34. Do folks have views on Drew's suggestion for consolidating? And if he comes on the line, I'll let him take up the mantle for this, but for now, I'll be channeling Drew.

I see one check mark from David. Carlton, did you have a comment? OK, Carlton, you're not coming in very clearly. It's because there's a lot of static. Calvin seems to be agreeing. Carlton is good with it, and Carlos, I see you are noting that we want to be careful how we're—we want to be precise, in terms of not just treating all restrictions as one lump category. Maybe we can add, as an action item, for recommendations 19 and 34, that Drew will further refine these to ensure that we're clear about categorizing the types of restrictions we're talking about and the types of abuse we're talking about, rather than treating each as one, I don't want to say monolithic, but maybe you can come up with a simpler word—as one broad category, so rather than treating DNS abuse and registration restrictions as one broad category. Carlos, did you have something you wanted to add?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Sorry, could you say that again?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Rather than talking about registration restrictions and DNS abuse as—actually, it should be “as two broad categories”—that's fine. Carlos, go ahead. Is that an old hand? I see your mic moving, but I don't hear

anything. Is there any way to get some technical help for Carlos? Oh, Fabro can hear him. It might just be me who can't hear Carlos.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, I can't hear him, either. Can you try once again, Carlos, please?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Hello? Hello, 1, 2, 3.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, it's working now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: OK, now I can hear you. Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, obviously, 19 and 34 are clear and get very good support. What I worry is that, if we go that way, what happens to the other ones? They are weaker, so don't throw the baby with the water, and let's keep with this note to the question if, by 16, we can save 35 and 36, as well. And then, from my perspective, abuse is one aspect of the impact of restrictions, but also the number of registrations, which is a very, very important value for competition purposes. So, let's keep in mind that, by putting 16 and 34 together, we don't end up killing 35 and 36. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Carlos. And I don't think the intent is to do away with 35 and 36. In fact, 35 and 36 may be good recommendations to consolidate together, because both deal with the costs and benefits of implementing registration restrictions. And even though 36 keys in specifically on whether restrictions have created undue preferences, it focuses more on the competition aspect. In a sense, that's really a cost of the registration restrictions, not a literal cost in terms of money, necessarily, but a possible detriment. So, those can be recommendations that could be consolidated. So, Carlton, you have noted Kyle's recommendation for including 16 in 34. I'm going to confess to not recalling that, so I can go back and look at that. Was that in an email, or was that during a discussion? You say you have it in your notes, so it may have been a prior discussion.

OK, Drew is here. I will say, at least at first glance, I think 16 is dealing with a lot already, and my inclination would be that 19 and 34 are more easily grouped together, and in our effort to consolidate where necessary, I don't want to go overboard, because I think then we're going to have very long, complicated recommendations. It did not get much support, so I'm going to put that to the side for now. Drew, thank you for joining. And I see we're already near the end of our time. Just to catch you up, Drew, we were talking about your recommendation to consolidated 19 and 34, and Carlos had the observation, in general, that we shouldn't treat registration restrictions as one monolithic category, that we should be a little more precise in talking about what type of registration restrictions we mean, and the same thing with abuse. If we're talking about studies, we want to make sure we're not just saying "DNS abuse," that we define it, although I think, actually, in your

suggestion, you did a pretty good job of defining it precisely as technical abuse. But that's sort of where we are.

DREW BAGLEY:

OK, thanks, yeah, so I want to figure out a way to balance those valid points about being more specific about what we're describing with the reality that we want future studies to be able to adapt accordingly, as they need to, because our big point is, one, for this review team to accomplish its work, we needed a study, and then two, for future review teams to accomplish their work, they're going to need the delta of data that will exist, and anyone looking at future expansion of the gTLD will still have to factor in these issues and the data for those issues in policymaking. And so, that's where I know we needed to be more detailed than we were in the initial recommendations, but I don't want to be too prescriptive, to the point that it's restrictive. So, I guess we could define registration restrictions and whatnot with something where we use language that is "including such-and-such and any other restrictions that may evolve from time to time," or something that is inclusive of what we know today, can describe today, but also leaves the window open for correlation that will be important in the future. What do you think about that, Carlos?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Go ahead, yeah. Let Carlos respond.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, Drew, welcome. I have a problem with jumping ahead on what you propose before we make a case that the restrictions came about passively and we have not a clear classification of restrictions that new rounds might need for analyses of the registrations themselves. And then, everything that you said is fine. What I mean, and what we discussed earlier in the call, is that we have different sources of restrictions at different times, and they don't seem to come out of policy for the expansion of the domain name in the last round. And I think it's very important that we start there, to say, "Listen, that's how restrictions came about, out of goodwill that it would help us solve problems, give us competition, and reduce abuse, but the fact is that, if we are going to do a new round, there must be more clarity about the usefulness and the way restrictions are set," and then we can look for the correlations to the abuse and the correlations to the numbers and the correlations to everything else. I just wanted to recap that earlier part of the call, because, when I read the command, all this talk about the studies and data, data, studies, and data, creates some negative views of our recommendations. So, I don't think we want to go away from the studies. We have just to step back and make stronger arguments of why we are going to do more studies and collect more data. Thank you.

DREW BAGLEY: OK, thanks for sharing that. So, then, to clarify, since I did miss it earlier in the call, what you're proposing—do you think that would fit into the rationale? Because I did not create a new rationale for this, even though I did go through the step-by-step questions as I was analyzing the consolidation. Do you think we would add what you're discussing

into the rationale, or do you think we need to be more specific in the actual new consolidated recommendation itself?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I think you put it very smartly. I think we need a rationale before discussing 16, 34, and 35-36. We need a better rationale. We cannot just get up and say, “data studies, data studies.” I think it’s a very good approach, what you just said. We need this rationale of the issue of restrictions, and then it flows better, because as I also said before, 16 gets good support, but the comments on 34, 35, 36 get really muddled up, and so you recognize that people don’t see the relationship between restrictions and what we are saying later on in the recommendations. So, we need a stronger story line, rationale, at the beginning, and what comes next.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just to also catch you up, Drew, and building on what Carlos said, Carlos had noted, when we start off talking about registration restrictions, which I think first happens in 16, we should first be recommending some sort of classification gathering of analysis regarding what registration restrictions are currently even in place. We know what the contract provisions are that have registration restrictions, but we also know that individual registries have instituted, in some cases, their own registration restrictions. So, Carlos’s initial thought was that we should have this recommendation to gather and classify the existing registration restrictions as a starting point, and then make sure we’re

studying those specifically, rather than sort of generically, and I think that's for recommendation 16.

DAVID TAYLOR: OK, got it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, we are now a little bit over time, so I'm going to apologize to everyone, but in particular to Carlton, because we didn't get to the discussion he was going to lead on recommendations 21 through 23, and we'll start off with that on the next call. But in the meanwhile, we do have these action items for myself and Drew, and I think the other action item is further work on 35 and 36, consistent with our discussion today. And Jamie wasn't with us, but I'm still hoping to gather him into this exercise, as well as myself and Carlos and Drew.

So, going forward, what I want to emphasize to people is, as this discussion has pointed out, and I think our plenary call last week, where Jonathan made a very good presentation, is that it's not just our recommendations that are going to change, but the rationale will often need to be more explicit about what the issue is we're trying to address and what the measure of success should be, and also, to the extent we are responding to public comments, we want to make sure that, if we are responding to public comments, we're doing it precisely, especially since we're likely going to be having some sort of report that talks about the way in which we've responded to public comments. So, I want to make sure that people keep those issues in mind.

It's not just the recommendations that are going to change. It's the rationale, and we certainly want to be explicit about what the issue is. We're trying to address why it's important and what the measures of success will be. I'll recommend the recommendations document to everyone, which I think is very comprehensive. I will say I don't think you need to address every single point, but it certainly gives you a good thought process to follow, as you're thinking about revising your recommendations, so make sure folks look at that. Does anyone have any questions or comments before we close out this week's call? OK, so thanks, everyone. We'll be speaking again at the same time next week. To the extent people have anything to pass around, that's always very helpful, so that we can see what specific proposals are and how things change. Thanks, everyone.

DREW BAGLEY: Thanks, and thanks, Laureen, for presenting my consolidation.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

DREW BAGLEY: All right, bye, everyone.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Bye.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Thanks, Laureen.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]