EN

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, folks. Welcome to the 60th plenary call of the CCTRT review team. Is there anyone that's on the phone and not present in the Adobe Connect? Does anyone have an updated statement of interest? All right, sounds good. Let's dive right in, and I'm going to hand the microphone over to Laureen to hopefully drive things to conclusion on the DNS Abuse paper. Laureen, take it away.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Maybe Jean-Baptiste, we can get the review paper up. I keep thinking that -- whereas John would [inaudible], he keeps coming back.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Laureen, do you want the team version or the red-line version?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think the red-line version, so people can see where the changes were. Because I thought we actually had achieved consensus on one through three, but then there were some last-minute changes to small parts of three. And I believe we had a mixed consensus on the fourth recommendation with the view that we would present at of having some, but not unanimous fourth. And can you give us all independent scroll rights?

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.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. No problem. I put you as a presenter before I can do that --
system.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, great. So I wanted to get to recommendation three, because we
already have consensus on recommendation two. And I am going to
zoom up for that. This has been circulated by Drew, and I believe he got
some responses from Jordyn and I. Jordyn, I'm not sure what your
response was, mine was general agreement other than a nitpicky
comment.   But, as I understand it, we have consensus on
recommendation three, however there is this additional language at the
end, and that's what I want to make sure we have consensus on before
we move to close out recommendation four.

So the new part is highlighted here in the red-line.   This
recommendation concerns further study about the relationship specific
registry operators, registrars, and DNS abuse, and it's asking for ongoing
data collection and references ICANN DART initiatives.   Also
recommends, for transparency purposes common that the information
be regularly published in order to identify registries and registrars that
need to come under greater scrutiny and higher priority by ICANN
compliance. Waudo, I am on page 12 of 16, and I'm at recommendation
3.

And so the only new language here, we've discussed this already and
achieved consensus, the only new language here is the following:
Furthermore, ICANN should consider providing API access to such data

to further enhance transparency. Upon identifying abuse phenomenon, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, remediate problems identified, and define future ongoing data collections. So that is the language that has been added. And again, we are on page 12, recommendation 3. Jamie, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah, I have no problem with the substance of either of these sentences, but I renew my concern about the prescriptive language, or prescriptive text in the second sentence. Rather than directing ICANN staff to do something, it should direct the ICANN Board to consider it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jamie. Other questions and comments? Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Laureen. It's just a quick response to Jamie's concerns, but I don't want to be glib about it at all. I feel like we just need to, and this has come up several times, that we need to figure out what our standardized language of this is. And I guess it was my understanding that we should write these in the form of resolutions, and the board is going to consider all of them. That we don't need to ask the board to consider anything, that they simply are going to do something or not do something, and that we're writing in the language of the board.

But it's something we need to make a universal decision about, but it's something we need to do across the whole paper. We've had this

conversation, Jamie, and I'm concerned that it keeps coming up. But I'm wondering if it means that you think this is a special case or if it's just something you feel differently about or something like this. I guess I'd like clarity from you, Jamie. What concerns you, specifically about this, as opposed to we need to standardize our language across all of our recommendations?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sure. So my understanding was -- we had talked about this a number of times, and it was put off until a later date to consider what the language should be. And unless I missed a meeting, I don't think we've actually had that. So my assumption was that there would be a review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're right, that we have not had that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Again, my concern is not with the substance, but under the new bylaws the ICANN Board does not have the ability to modify any recommendations. It has a binary choice of either accepting and following them or rejecting them. My concern is that they might -- no inside knowledge about this at all -- but they might see some language like this and other language, in effect, and feel like they have no choice but to reject it because it's written in a really prescriptive manner. And so, if it's at least clear that they have the ability to consider it, they would then actually do that.

But you're right, we do need -- this whole exercise is to give recommendations to the board to consider. But maybe I'm just anal, but it seems to be helpful to establish clear lines about whose role is what. And if that, ultimately, doesn't matter, then I'll let it go, but it would probably be good to get someone with experience with the bylaws and the obligations of the board to weigh in on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And that's the plan. Thanks, Jamie. It sounds, though, it isn't something specific for this recommendation, but it's you putting your stake in the ground in terms of what you think the overall structure of our recommendations.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Correct. This issue has come up in several other recommendations where we've talked about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. That's right. Okay, thanks. Sorry, Laureen, I didn't mean to break your flow, I just wanted to clarify [CROSSTALK] something specific.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no, no. This is a valid point. Well, I guess at some point, and maybe the Abu Dhabi meeting is a good place perhaps to take this up, we do need some consistency and clarity regarding which Viewpoint we are going to adopt, i.e., whether we are going to write this in language that the board can adopt or reject, or whether this is going to be written in a

more "please consider" type of language, which I thought we were veering away from. But, I guess, we haven't reached consensus on that. So, that's the place [CROSSTALK].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Part of the reason that I raised it with Jamie is of specificity is because I could see us using both if, in fact, we want to invite the board to come up with their own specifics. Which may be part of what Jamie was suggesting, is that if we are trying to make a vague recommendation, then asking the board to make it concrete, then the consideration would make more sense.

But Jean-Baptiste, maybe make a note that one of the things that we should add to our face-to-face is this discussion and include somebody from staff that can give us some guidance on what the right language should be for the recommendations, and we'll just get it resolved while we're in Abu Dhabi. Thanks, Jamie. Thanks, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn, you had a comment.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, Laureen, it sounds like you didn't see my previous email, but the general gist of it was, why do we keep editing this section when we are already overdue?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I don't know. I'm with you on that. I was asking last week when it came back edited.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so, I have a principal objection to adding this language at the last minute when we already have consensus and there's been plenty of time to propose this. I think more generally, I don't really think it makes sense to single out this particular data-gathering recommendation as needing API access. I think if we want to do that it should apply to all of the data that ICANN collects, and the various recommendations that we have.

So I don't know why we would put it here, in particular, as opposed to just including that in recommendation one from the overall report that says ICANN should have this data science thing and presumably ICANN will decide the right times to provide API access versus not depending on what the data-set looks like.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Forgive me since I was unavailable last week, I don't know what generated this. Was it a discussion last week? Or was this just via suggestion on email? Does anyone know?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, Laureen. David. I can talk to that, if you want.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go ahead. Thank, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, thanks. Yeah, this was a discussion on the plenary last week, where we were talking about the recommendation itself. And rather than just having it as some sort of action plan, it was to make sure there was some sort of response to the studies or that the problems were remediated. So it wasn't just something where there's a review and it's looked at and left on one side. So this language was actually what -- and Jean-Baptiste, correct me if I'm wrong, because we said, "Jean-Baptiste, can you capture it?" And you started capturing it.

So we had agreed, effectively, what was going to be in there on the call. And either -- on this bit, I don't whether it was Drew or Jean-Baptiste who put that together, or whether Drew just amended what Jean-Baptiste had done -- but we were in doing the plenary stuff. That's where this recommendation three edition came from. I'm not talking about the rest, just this one.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So listening to Jordyn's point, I do wonder whether this issue about API access, even though it's an ICANN should consider, that strikes me as sounding like an implementation type issue. that does, as Jordan raise the point, that does occur to me when he raised that point, that this could be something that actually is more of, if this gets adopted, this is how it could be implemented. At least that sentence.

I don't know how other people view that. The last sentence, notwithstanding the issue about how derisive we should be, does seem to me to be tied to the nitty-gritty of recommendation three. So I don't have a discomfort with that. Other comments or questions? David, go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks, I put it in the chat as well. I was just saying, I agree with Jordyn on that about the API. It seems a little bit bizarre having it put in here and it not being elsewhere. So we should be consistent. Either it's a general thing where we suggest something about API access, which may be put in. But otherwise, or regardless, I think it should probably drop out of here. But I think it is worth considering whether we mention that more generally.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's a good point, that maybe the place this goes is the general point for ongoing data collection. That when we're recommending that, one of the things that could also be considered is application program interface. So I would tend to agree with that. Can I, then, make a suggestion that we remove the "Furthermore, ICANN should consider," sentence here? And ask if people are comfortable with that suggestion by signifying whether they disagree with that. It's my negative option that I'm giving you.

If you disagree with removing the "Furthermore, ICANN should consider providing API access" sentence here, please note your disagreement by using your vote button or raising your hand to speak. So David is

agreeing with that. I'm getting agreements. Nobody liked my negative option, so I'm getting the positive agreements. That's fine, too. Tell me that you are agreeing. I'm seeing all green checkmarks. I'm not seeing any disagreement. I'm not hearing disagreement. Okay. Jean-Baptiste, can we remove that "Furthermore" sentence?

And now, what I'm going to go onto is the entire recommendation three. With this additional sentence, "Upon identifying abuse phenomenon," please let me know if you are agreeing. If we have consensus on recommendation three, as modified, i.e.: we're taking out that "Furthermore" sentence. If you are agreeing with recommendation three, please signify, either verbally, in the chat, or by using your vote button.

Again, I'm only seeing green vote buttons. And Waudo is pointing out, as Jordyn is also pointing out that we had consensus last time and we had consensus two weeks ago. Deference to previous consensus. So we have consensus on recommendation three. And if we can note that, that we have consensus on recommendation three, with removing the "Furthermore ICANN" sentence. Let's move onto recommendation four.

And my goal is to move through these quickly, because I think the real place we need to focus on is the INTA paper. And that's where I really want to spend most of the time on this call.

So let's move to recommendation four. Which we've also had a lot of discussion on. Now, just a question, Jean-Baptiste, because this is all in

purple. Just for clarity, this is still the same recommendation four that we've been debating in previous calls. Is that correct?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. And as far as to consider, we're only formatting -- this was made on this recommendation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's just formatting? But there haven't been substantive change?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, it's the same. Okay. As I recall, so we don't have to reinvent the wheel here, we did not achieve full consensus, but we did have more folks in favor of this than not. And I believe the approach we agreed upon was to present it that way in this next iteration of the draft report with these new sections. That we would present it as something that did not achieve full consensus by the team, but that the majority of the team supported this.

And also, give anyone who wished to write a dissent, or a disagreeing statement, the opportunity to do so. If anyone wants to edit my statement, correct it, or amplify it -- Jonathan, Jordyn, or anyone else on the call -- speak now, because that's my recollection. Okay, David is agreeing with my recollection.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Laureen, I think there were two issues with this recommendation that we were thinking. And the first one was the one that you have just mentioned, where the people are agreeing with it or not. And the second one, whether it should be published.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And my recollection -- so Waudo, what I heard you say is one, whether there was agreement and two, whether it should be published. And you're correct. My recollection as to items one, was that there was majority agreement, but not full consensus. And two, that it should be published along with given the people the opportunity, for example Jordyn, to write a minority statement expressing what reservations they have with this approach. So I think we've reached that agreement.

I think what we really just need to do now is memorialize that in the decisions reached. Because we have already done this, so I don't want to spend time redoing what we've already done. I'm going to adopt what David has said in the chat. Majority agreement, not full consensus. We agreed to publish it, noting reservations. That's where we are.

So unless anybody thinks that that does not reflect the decision we've already reached, that's what I would like reflected in our decision reached. And I'm open to comments or questions if this doesn't fully reflect our prior decision. Waudo, do you still want to speak? I see your hand is still up.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry, that is an old hand.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So that said, if we can put this in the decisions reached. Jean-Baptiste, recommendation four has majority but not unanimous consensus. Let's put it that way. And that Jordyn intends to write a minority statement. And with that, I guess, Jordyn, given our timing concerns, better to do it sooner rather than later.

And just to clarify, that this will be published in the report. We rule that minority statement be placed. I leave that to the experts on how the report is formatted. I think, probably, Jean-Baptiste and/or our great staff can probably give us some information about where these typically go. It's usually placed in the appendix. So we will note in the body of the report that there is a minority statement. We want to make sure that is transparent. Yes, David, you were right. Then, I think that closes out the DNS abuse paper.

And what we should do is move on to David's INTA paper. And David, you know how fond I am of you, but nevertheless, I'm going to put you on the spot. Because you are now our critical path between getting this published and possibly trying to get this published in time for Abu Dhabi or not.

So, I know you wrote this in your email, in terms of what remains to be done, but can you give a sense of timing of what remains to be done. To, at least, let the team know whether we have a shot at getting this

published before Abu Dhabi.   Go ahead, David.   Oh, is there recommendation five? Did I miss something?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, I was just to say, I've got my hand up for that. Before that, you've got recommendation five, which is being added in on the DNS abuse.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, I'm sorry.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm not trying to delay my INTA further, I'm just pointing that out.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.   You're still on the spot in a few minutes.   My apologies for skipping this. Yes, everyone is telling me about recommendation five. Sorry, folks.

Recommendation five. ICANN should collect data about, and publicize the chain of parties responsible, for all domain name registrations. And, David, perhaps you want to speak to this, because this recommendation emerged in my absence.   And maybe you can give us some of the background here.

DAVID TAYLOR: To be honest, I'm not sure I can, because this may have come from my emails with Drew. But, he added this recommendation five in with his

email he sent around on Monday, and I haven't read it. I'm just reading it now. So I'm not actually sure whether it mirrors what I was saying, or whether it's something new. So I'm actually just reading it. So my apologies.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Let's look at this together. It is not a complicated recommendation, so, perhaps, we can go through this together in short order. So this is a recommendation about publicizing the chain of parties responsible for all domain name registrations. And, I believe, this gets to an issue that we have actually discussed in prior discussions about identifying the parties involved in DNS abuse and the issue of resellers.

Although there is information that is collected that identifies registrants and registrars and, of course, registries, the resellers are an entity for which there is not data collected. And so you have this part of a chain that remains, sometimes, anonymous and hard to identify. So this recommendation is speaking to get FS problems. And you can see the rationale here, present there is no mechanism for determining all of the ICANN contracted, and non-contracted operators associated with the domain name registration, and a lack of clarity, and who is distinguishing between registrars and resellers.

And there's also the point made, that even the DNS abuse study couldn't distinguish between resellers and registrars. So this is directed to the board and to several stakeholder groups looking at the Next Generation registry directory service, the current WHOIS system, this is

directed to those groups. Because this would be an extra element of data that would be collected. And then you can look in the details. Basically, the goal here is to be able to identify this entity, the reseller, which previously hadn't been necessarily able to be identified, because there is no requirement for it.

So that is the recommendation. Do people have questions, comments, concerns about this recommendation? I'm opening up for questions. David, your hand is still up, I don't know if that's an old hand. Okay, it's down. Jordyn, you're up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, thanks, Laureen. I'll just do a brief recap of the email I sent, which is first, I don't think we should be adding this now, it's too late. This was supposed to be done a month ago. I object on process to adding additional recommendations at this point. Secondly, I don't think this is a data-driven recommendation, I don't think that there's anything in the DNS abuse study that indicates particular resellers, or registrars that are associated with resellers, have a particular high incidence of DNS abuse.

And third, this is an issue that has been discussed, is being discussed, elsewhere in the community. Has nothing to do with new gTLDs in particular, these reseller issues and tracking thereof, or present and legacy gTLDs, as well. There's no evidence that this problem became worse, or exacerbated in any way by the new gTLD program. I think if the WHOIS RDS wants to look at this, if the stability review team wants to look at this, there's all sorts of people that can take a look at this. It

doesn't seem particularly germane to new gTLDs, and I think it's too late in the process to add it at this point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn. And, again, apologies that I missed that email where Steve set this out very eloquently as well. Other questions and comments from folks? Jonathan, your agreement is with Jordyn. It's sometimes hard to tell from these timestamps what the comments relate to. Jordyn, did you have another point or is that an old hand? Okay, that was an old hand. David, do you have a comment?

DAVID TAYLOR: I was thinking Jonathan was agreeing with my old hand. But, obviously, he's not, he's agreeing with Jordyn. And I'd probably agree with Jordyn as well on that. Because I think, recommendation five, it is a bit late coming in. And I think it's something, maybe useful, but probably needs full consideration. It's just a bit late in the day to do that now. I agree. I kind of like the way it's going, but I'd still agree.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And Calvin is expressing concerns also. And I, process wise, have to agree with Jordan that it is rather late. And although we have discussed this issue, and there's a strand of it in the DNS abuse analysis, I'm not as comfortable with the timing on this, and our opportunity to really delve into the data that would drive this recommendation.

Before we get to your question on recommendation two, which we already have consensus on, David. I'm just going to remind you,

because I feel like we've been backtracking here. My sense is that we do not have consensus on recommendation five. Given that we don't have consensus on that, I think this should be deleted from the next iteration of the report. Because we don't have consensus on that. If anyone is championing this, now would be the time to speak.

I'm not hearing anything, or seeing anything. Well, yes, I'm sure Drew would. Unfortunately, Drew is not available. But I'm not hearing consensus on this, so I don't think we can include this in the final report. Not the final report, the next iteration of the draft report.

What I do think we should have as an option, is for Drew to include this recommendation as a minority statement in the appendix. Just as Jordyn is registering his disagreement with recommendation four. The appendix of the appendix of the appendix. If he chooses. So this is something that Drew can consider. So maybe we can add that, Drew to consider whether to include this recommendation. Thank you, Jean-Baptiste.

Okay, David, you had a question about recommendation two? David, do you still have a question about recommendation two? Or can we move on?

DAVID TAYLOR: Can you hear me now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, now I can hear you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry, I was talking, I didn't realize I was on mute. I was looking on recommendation two, and it might have been something I misunderstood when we were going through this initially. Because I know we got consensus on it. But I thought that we got recommendation one, that was essentially encouraging and incentivizing to prevent abuse. I thought, and this is where I think I misunderstood it, that recommendation two was suggesting technical measures to prevent.

So one was incentivizing and two was preventing and then three was where we went with the new recommendations, which is where I was getting more involved in the data collection being ongoing and acted upon, etcetera. And then we've gone to four and dropped five. But when I reread two, it only seems to apply to registrars and not to registries, so that might be intentional. I just suddenly thought, is it an omission.

And the reason I was looking at that was when I just circulated before, because I was at this interesting session this morning. So I couldn't have put it in any earlier, because I've just discovered it. Where EURid, which is the registry for dot EU, putting in place this delayed delegation system. So they, basically, got artificial intelligence, which will look at domain names as they come through, and identify, based on the machine learning, whether or not they think that this is something which is phishing or malware or DNS Abuse.

And if it is, it actually gets delayed for three days, so it's not activated, which, thereby, prevents it from being used for malware. And a lot of these domain names move quickly after three days, and then it goes in. So it doesn't prevent the registration, effectively, it just delays it. I put a link into the paper there, because I thought, "Wow, that's really interesting, that's a technical means of minimizing DNS abuse. What a good idea that seems to me."

Obviously, we haven't discussed it, because they've only just sent it around, and we just found out about it. But I was looking at the OYO, so where would that come in as an example? If we said something like, "We note that systems may be in place, and perhaps this should be considered by the wider community." If we put something like that, I thought, well which recommendation would that come under?

And I thought, obviously it's recommendation two, because recommendation two is measures to prevent DNS abuse. Which is when I then thought, I know that recommendation two is just registrars, so it doesn't fit in there. So that's my question, I suppose it's two-fold, is one, if I just misunderstood recommendation two? And if it is, what's the reason why we only remitted it to registrars? And two, do we want to have a look at this thing from EURid? Because it seems really on point on preventing DNS abuse. So that was why I sent it around.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, David. I remember that we did have this discussion about whether to expand this to registries. Perhaps Jordyn can shed some light on this, because I believe he spoke to this point. Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I was actually going to make a slightly different point, which was, I actually think the EURid example is a really good example of the type of anti-abuse mechanisms that we'd like to encourage through recommendation number one. So recommendation number one basically says, ICANN should create incentives for registries to do things that mitigate abuse. And the EURid example is the type of mechanism that would like to see, that would be a good example of the technical mechanisms to be adopted and that ICANN should be incentivizing through recommendation number one.

Recommendation number two is really Just about I can enforcement, giving them the ability to look at systemic abuse, as opposed to just start playing whack-a-mole and going after each individual case and saying, "Oh, did you look at this case? If so, yes, okay you've done your job," then move on to the next one, see if there's a pattern of abuse within a particular registrar.

And I think it was originally limited to registrars, because that's what the correlation of the DNS abuse study showed. It showed that some registrars were hot beds of abuse, but we didn't actually find the correlation to registry operator. Although there may be some correlation to TLDs. So I think we may have discussed including registries as well. I would defer to Drew as to why that did or didn't get included in the language. But to answer David's question about EURid stuff, I would say that falls squarely in recommendation number one.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So David, I think that -- your hand is now up. Go ahead, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry, Laureen. I was just saying that I would talk next, but finish what you were going to say.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I was just going to say, I think you would need to loop back with Drew. Because, I do remember, and I think, in fact, I was one of the people who suggested should we expand this to registries, and you actually may have been the one too, I don't remember. I just remember speaking to this. But it doesn't appear to be where we ended up. And I think Drew would be the person who has the most detailed memory of why we ended up this way. You may want to touch base with him.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay, thanks. Two additional things on that, and then I will agree with Jordan, because I'm liking that at the moment today. but I was just reading the recommendation, is it correct where we're saying, and I've noted what you've said Calvin, that's very helpful that registries have it in their contract already.

But this ties into, yes, I think, we were looking into registrars and that was the hotbed, but then this discussion gave birth in many ways to the other recommendations, where we were staying, there is this link between registrars and registries controlling interest etc. So it's the bad practice which may actually be coming from the registry via registrars.

So I don't want it to be limited too, but as Calvin said it's already in the contract, so we may be okay on that.

But recommendation two, as I read it, considered directing ICANN or in its discussion with registrars to negotiate amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement and registry agreement to include --

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's internally inconsistent, I agree with you.

DAVID TAYLOR: So that's something that's not right. It looks as if it should have been registrars and registries to negotiate amendments, where not already present. But it's talking about Amendment to the registry agreement, so then, as Calvin mentioned, it's already in there. So it seems something's wrong, half of it points to registries and half of it seems to exclude registries, and then we're on the basis that it's on the contract. So I just think it's one of those areas where we think, yeah, that's confusing enough to never have anything done about it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think you're right, because I'm also looking at the rationale, which also speaks about high rates of technical abuse with both registrars and registry operators. I think you raised a very good point, I think we need to, unfortunately, take this back to Drew for some clarification, because this really does seem to speak to both registry and registrar abuse. In both of the rational and the recommendation, but registries seem to be

missing from that first sentence. So I think we need to get some clarification on this.

DAVID TAYLOR: Just to pick up on what Jordyn said, when we were talking about the EURid example in recommendation one. Seeing as how we are going to go back to Drew, and we're going to check on this recommendation two, so we have a little bit of time on this, obviously, not a lot, because we don't have to sign off on this.

But I'm just wondering, obviously everyone has not had a chance to read that, and I haven't read the paper, it's actually a paper by a university that it's linked to, in the link I've sent around where they're looking at this. So it seems to me really on point, and it would be such a shame if we miss this, then potentially referring to it.

And as I understand it, from my discussion this morning with EURid, is the way they're doing it, which seems to me makes a lot of sense, is they're putting in a test bed for six months, where they're going to identify all the names that come through, which they think will be fishing. They're going to not do anything with them, but they're going to pretend that they would have moved them into this pen, where they delay the actual activation of the domain name, not the registration, but the activation.

And then when it is activated, they're going to look and see if it's fishing. And they're going to do a test to see how much they would have picked up on and what the effect would have been over a six-month period. And if they find that yes, they would have prevented large-scale DNS

abuse, then they are going to implement it in six months' time. And it just seemed to me an incredibly sensible way of going about doing something, which should be either a measure to prevent abuse.

So exactly as Jordyn has said, that it's to incentivize, so potentially, in recommendation one. And I don't know if we should refer to this as, this is an example, and I don't know if there are other examples out there, but we refer to it [inaudible]. That's all.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So Jordyn is pointing out, and I think this is a sensible suggestion, perhaps David, you can draft a footnote to cite to this EURID initiative to provide an example. And Jordyn also has pointed out XYZ's anti-abuse mechanisms. And maybe, Jordyn, you can send a cite for that to David, so that he has it all in one place. Great. I think then, this clarification on recommendation two, is really our only to-do item. I will reach out to Drew and ask him about this.

It seems to me, basically, that this recommendation is intended to involve both registries and registrars, as written, and that that has been left out. So for recommendation two, the action item is that David is going to draft a footnote to reference the EURid initiative, and Jordyn is going to provide a cite to David on the XYZ anti-abuse policy, so that his footnote can include both.

And I have an action item too, and we can put that first. The first action item is going to be for me on recommendation two, which is that Laureen is going to confer with Drew to verify the phrasing of recommendation two, as it applies to registries. Right now it appears

that registries have been left out of the first sentence. So we want to verify that.   Once we clear this recommendation two, and get this footnote drafted, I believe we will be closing out the DNS abuse paper.

So with that, then, I think we should move on to the INTA paper. Unless there are any further questions or comments on the DNS abuse study. So, David, I'm going to turn the baton over to you and then, again, start with my question about what we think the timing is here. And then move on to the substance.

DAVID TAYLOR: So, thanks, Laureen. Can you hear me okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, yes. Very good.

DAVID TAYLOR: On the timing on this then, and just so you know what the amendments are in there, without going into the details, so you've got the high-level on this. We finalize the INTA impact study paper, so that's what we've been through, we finalized that a couple of weeks ago. So I integrated that into the RPM section, as we discussed doing. So that was on my list of the aspect where would that best fit in.

And, obviously, it needs a little bit of top and tailing, with some introduction to it. And, obviously, the report we needed to take out, in the references, where we were talking about we were waiting for this study and what we were expecting from it, etcetera. So that needed

some integration, and the text to be refined. But the actual text itself is out-agreed on the course, no changes whatsoever in the INTA impact study section.

What I did have to do, which you may recall, the ICANN statistics, which we had for the draft report when we were working through these. They didn't add up. Namely, I was getting statistics from WiCo, which were pointing to RIS, and statistics from ICANN which were pointing to [inaudible]. And this is in dispute. So you think, okay, that's a little bit conflictory, and what's going on there?

And then when you add it up, it just didn't make sense, there was something wrong with the data. So that data is being reviewed so there's new data, which is available on the ICANN site. But that obviously meant going through all of the back section of the RPM to change that data to work with the data and figure out what the trends were. So that's the line share of what I was doing over the last week and a bit. So that's what the amendments to the report are, basically, if you look in and you see that. So I wanted to get that round.

I haven't completed the RPM section, because I wanted to make sure that we've got a chance to look at them, everyone's got a chance to go through them and see. I thought, hopefully, people can go through them over the next day or two, and that gives me time to finish the rest of it, which I don't think we'll be problematic. And I think we'll agree on them quite quickly. But the remainder I've got to do, once we've got input back from everybody.

So whether we get that today, or whether that's something people need a day or two to go through this and just comment on it, which is probably going to be easier. I can't imagine everyone has read this since yesterday. If you have them we can probably do this today. But, give them a chance to read that, so we get the input back.

And then I need to finish off, basically, the Trademark Clearinghouse section. Right at the end, there is one paragraph on that, which is the revised Trademark Clearinghouse review, which was in February, which was after we'd done the draft report. So I worked through that in about March or April, and I haven't done it since. So I'm going back to that again. But that will affect what I'm putting in on the Trademark Clearinghouse paragraph. I do need to go through on typos, which I think I put then.

And then the actual recommendations themselves, we talked about the recommendations, and I don't think there was any discussion internally on changing them. And we said, substantially, they'd be the same. The findings are clearly showing that the disputes are going up. We kind of found out before that they were going up slightly. It's more obvious, shall we say, now with the proper statistics. I don't think it changes the recommendations themselves.

But having said that, bearing in mind the DNS abuse study, we were almost final and then we've had of month of, subject to recommendations and discussions coming in, that we could end up changing these. But, my intention isn't to change them, they're staying, substantially, the same. Unless we are all looking at this study, and

everyone says, "Well actually, David, look. We think this recommendation should be different. Or we should add something in."

And if something comes up, without having read the rest of the report, then I'm certainly open to consider adding in another recommendation. And I may well tweak these, because when I finish up, I will go through it again and just see whether there's anything we should be doing.

So that's on the timing. So, I'm rather open to you, we can do it. Ideally, I'd be sitting there thinking we'd finalize this next week on the call and we'd be done. I certainly think I'll have the rest of the language finished before the call, and probably circulate that on Monday. Then if we do a call on Wednesday, we'd be finalizing it.

If everyone has a look today, tomorrow on the content of this, depending on how many people come back saying, change, change, change, change. How long I've spent doing it, presuming there's general agreement, and I think we're good to go a week today. And if we need to we could probably bring it forward slightly. I was handing back to you there, Laureen, or anyone.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm so sorry, I was on mute. Apologies. So my question is -- Waudo, can you mute your line please? Is there any path to publication before Abu Dhabi if we finalize this next week?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks, Laureen. It's hard for me to tell, because until review, there are still two weeks from now, before we are on travels. And then we are

expecting some more input on how much time will be needed considering the meeting is really close on how much time we need for editing and translation. We can only hope for the best. But it also depends on whether consensus can be reached next week on this.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. No, that's a given. Our call is scheduled for Wednesday, which would take us to the 18th.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It's not preventing me from already sending you the other sections, but it's just until we have this one, we cannot send anything for public comments.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right, right. No, that makes sense. Well, I don't want to bifurcate it, I want to get this all in one fell swoop. So, David, I guess we'll ask you to work as expeditiously as you can. I know you, as all of us do, are juggling several different things. But it would be terrific if we can get this published in time for Abu Dhabi. Not only for this part of the report, but also so we can then meet our goals of getting the final report done by the end of the year, which I know everyone wants to meet that goal as well.

I think I'm going to hand the Baton back to David. Maybe you can walk us through this at a high level, in terms of the changes to the extent you haven't already. And let us know the things we need to pay special attention to when we are reviewing this. Go ahead, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm just picking up on timing as well, because I know that's important on this. What might be, with Jean-Baptiste as well, I'm thinking we can do this in parallel, to an extent. I'm thinking, if everyone's got a couple of days to read this, I think we should have any comments back to me by the end of the week, which I think should be fine.

And I can, then, depending on what these comments are -- and again, it's helpful to have them in comments and email, because if I get too many comments in different versions, I can be looking at six versions of a text and then trying to work them into one version, which I struggle a little bit on sometimes. So anything like that, coming back as straight emails, then I can copy paste it as need be. But if everyone can do that over the next two days, so I've got that for the weekend, I can then look at it on Saturday morning and try and put this all together.

And in the meantime, probably Friday, or over the weekend, I'll also try to finish up, and I think I can finish up the other bits. Which I've got the Trademark Clearinghouse and the recommendations. And again, those I'm a little bit dependent on what everyone says. If I get some comments back on the recommendations saying, I think we should change this for this reason, that's obviously where I'm going to focus.

But I, therefore, think we can end up with the copy of this which is advanced. And the key things I've put in there and some highlighted bits, from Jean-Baptist's staff, could certainly help. Because I noticed little things, like the footnotes for the INTA impact study, I put these all as endnotes, and in the main RPM they're all footnotes. So once it's at

the end and one doesn't. And as I've integrated that into the text, they're not matching in mind. So if you can do that, that's great, if not, I can try to get a secretary at our office to put that together, because this is just me putting this together overnight, or in the evening.

So it's those things, I think, could be looked at so that we end up with the document, which I can't see why it wouldn't be, in a finalized form for next Wednesday to have it in place. So that's just on timing. If we do that in parallel it might help to advance. I'm not going to wait for everyone to come back with comments, and then Monday, Tuesday do my own bit and then throw this out for Wednesday, and then have ICANN staff try to help format it. We've got to change a couple of tables in there. I've mentioned the tables need changing. So that's on the timing.

As for high level on the changes, the biggest change is the INTA impact study, which is included in there. So if you move the no changes in the first bit, if you move to page five, page five is where it starts, where we got the title consideration of these mechanisms, where they help mitigate the issues.

So the text changed there, instead of looking forward to an impact study, to actually including it the impact study. And mentioning there that we've got the INTA impact study itself. So I talked about that. And that's word for word, the INTA impact study text going in there. So you go over the next three pages until you then come to the ICANN Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice CCT metrics report, which is on page -- there's no page numbers on this, sorry. So I don't know what page that is that I'm looking through.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Page seven. Bottom of page seven.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, so that's page seven. And so there now, and I put a table in, so you can see it, with the actual totals of the UDRPs and the URSes. So we've got UDRPs and URSes effectively increasing year on year. So that's pretty clear. And you've got quite a substantial difference between the year 2013, which is the year prior to the TLDs, the first one.

So I've included the first cases there, as well, the first URS, new TLDs, and the first UDRP concerning the new gTLD, both of which were in 2014. So we see where those disputes are starting. It's March 2014 and April 2014, so before then there was none. So, basically, they're its treatment and the discussion of that looking at the UDRP, looking at the URS, and looking at them in a combined manner.

So we see, effectively, the URS is pretty static and low at about 5% of disputes, which we can take what conclusions we wish from that about its use and its effectiveness. So there's some little comments on that in there. And that goes through, so the rest of the text is where I've taken out previously, which it's no longer any good.

The only other changes are in the complaints to ICANN concerning implementation of the UDRP and URS decisions. We've got more updated data there. And I've been working out some percentages, which is based on, you can only compare number of URS complaints in

one year, you have to look at the number of actual -- sorry, number of URS complaints to ICANN about implementation of it. You need to check what the Baseline is, and how many URS complaints there were that year.

So those statistics change, because the UDRP and the URS complaint numbers changed in the stats. So those have changed. So again, I put a table in there, which wasn't there before, because I thought it was simpler and we could see it clearly, 2014, 2015, 2016.

And you see there that the relative number for the URS is actually going down. First year there was 8%, and last year was 4%, so it's halved. And the UDRP has been fairly consistent between 5.4 and 6%. So I think we can take a little bit, or take away from there, although it's limited data for URSes, but unlimited use for it in many ways.

And then we get to the Trademark Clearinghouse, which I've highlighted there what I want to look into. I've updated the PDDRP and the RRDRP, just up to date, it's what I've notated there. And the show of summarize registrations, as well, just updated that. And then I put in place a conclusion there, which I thought drew it together, which was part of the text, which was previously a little bit earlier. And then brought out and highlighting where I think that is. So that's what I encourage everyone to look at.

And then the recommendations, I've slightly updated them. Just talking about the surveys being carried out. They are not recommendations which were, we are waiting to review, the INTA survey. I haven't gone into putting any of the conclusions from the INTA impact study into the

recommendations. I don't know if I want to put it in, if it's appropriate, and I just need to think more about it.

I don't think it would change the recommendation, but it might lend some coloring to the rationale when I tie in and read through the INTA study again and see if that changes the rationale to an extent. But the recommendations themselves, I don't think necessarily change. Obviously, I'm open to discussion. And that's what I will focus on a bit more on the weekend.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, David. Any questions or comments for David? And David, I just want to make sure you see Jordyn's comment in the chat.   His suggestion is to try and relate the UDRP number to the total number of domains, so we can see a ratio. Which would, as I understand, Jordyn would provide a little more context, rather than just an observation that numbers are going up.

DAVID TAYLOR: If I may there, Laureen, Jon will be very pleased when he reads this to see that that's in there and I've done that.   I've calculated the number, and I've gone into a little bit more depth on that, which I explained in it. I've looked at total domain names in gTLDs at the end of December 2016 and compared it to the total number of disputes concerning gTLDs and Legacy at the end of 2016 to get a figure to see whether they're increasing more than the number.

Interesting enough -- I don't know. That was one of the things I was going to raise, is the figure that we were talking about when we were discussing this on the draft report was new gTLDs were approximately 10% of total UTLD registrations. And my figures, when I'm comparing this at the end of December, I'm getting 14%. So actually it's quite a lot higher. And that's using the ICANN statistics. If you go through and use various kinds of Statistics, which I did do, I was getting completely different results.

And then I went into the whole thing when I was looking at ccTLDs, as well, and trying to take those out, and I got quite complicated with my figures. But I worked my way through and that is in there, and that conclusions there. And you'll see that in the conclusion itself, Jordyn. I'm glad I answered that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Terrific. Thank you. Any other questions or comments for David? So I think as an action item, Jean-Baptiste, we should get an email out that forward David's latest paper. Perhaps, with a high-priority exclamation point, for folks to review this and get any comments to David no later than Friday. So that David has a chance to incorporate those comments in time for our plenary discussion on Wednesday.

DAVID TAYLOR: And if I could just stress, it would be very helpful to have them in emails so I can go into the master version and do what I'm doing, as opposed to having different versions. That would help me considerably.

And also, I've got Monday and Tuesday, I'm pretty much, full-time meetings, 9 until 7 each day. So I'll have limited time in the evening, which I can do, hence if I can get this by the end of Friday, I can spend my weekend on it. Instead of trying to do nights Monday and Tuesday. So I would very much like it by -- as long as it's Saturday morning, my time, that's when I'll try to kick off on this.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We'll ask people to get it to you by Friday, so that gives you a little bit of a cushion. I just want to get clarity on the format that you want them in. You don't want us attaching a red line? You want just comments in a narrative in an email? I just want to make sure I understand that.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes. It would be more helpful, for instance, I think this paragraph could be replaced by this, or you've got these for typos, one in this bit, one in this bit. It's more helpful, because I can just work through, assuming I'm getting quite a few comments, I can work through everyone's comments.

LAUREEN KAPIN: As opposed to having five different versions. Yeah, okay.

DAVID TAYLOR: Just seven people send me red lines, I've literally got six or seven red lines open and I have to go through one after the other in the red lines. I just find it a little bit more confusing. If what your comment lends

itself to being a red line, then yes, do it in a red line. But if it's specific comments and discussion, then it's easier for me to have that in an email and then just going to the master document.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That makes sense. And I see Jean-Baptiste is already, very accurately, recorded this.

Where are we in the agenda? Final review and sign off on marking paper. Jonathan, I'm handing the baton to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. Folks, this is just a formality on a call that I missed, where there seemed to be consensus change. The title about the marking, instead of whatever other experiment that I had tried to do with the title. So it's, in fact, in reference to mark domains, and we had a discussion on a subsequent call where we said we would try to update all data with whatever the most recent data was available for release of the final report. And so I added that as a footnote in the document.

So those are, literally, the only changes to the document on which, I believe, we already achieved consensus on the pros for submission as one of the interim documents for public comment. So if anybody has any further discussion they want to have on the marking paper, now is the time. But my belief is that the only thing was about the title. All right. I think we're going to call this paper ready for interim publication. I will copy out that we will update data to the most recent data available to us when we put out our final paper.

Then I guess the next topic on our agenda is the meeting agenda for ICANN60 for the face-to-face. I don't know, Jean-Baptiste, if you have a tentative schedule there.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, I do, but do you want to keep that subject for the next plenary meeting, considering this might evolve, depending on the new sections and the advancement [CROSSTALK]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that makes sense. And I know that we're going to try to meet with the board caucus, and we're going to try to reach some conclusions, potentially, hopefully with some staff help, on what are your recommendations? And things we just decided on. So I think we're going to be trying to have a process meeting for driving toward our final report. We can push this agenda item. Is there something else, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Sorry for interrupting you. I just wanted to, quickly, what is currently scheduled. So the face-to-face meeting is on Friday, October 27, from 9:00 to 5:30. Then there is an engagement session scheduled on Sunday, October 29. That's a one-on-one engagement session from 12:15 to 1:15 local time. And also, as you mentioned, there is a meeting with the caucus group that is scheduled on November 1st from 3:15 to 4:30. That's the session that I'm putting on the public schedule.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	And also, I'm just going to note, that it looks like the GAC would like to meet with the CCT, to get a presentation. So I just want to put that on the radar screen. The last communication I saw of referenced to have Thursday morning.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Yes, that's correct. [Inaudible] the call after we've met with them. And also, just to let everyone know, Jonathan has been sending out invitations to SMAC and working groups to have individual engagement sessions and there were a few replies. So we'll be following up on that and add those to the ICANN60 meeting agenda. And also, we'll add some sessions of interest that's maybe of interest to the review team.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay. Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. David, you have your hand up. Go ahead.
DAVID TAYLOR:	Thanks, Jonathan. On the schedule, it would just be good to know, I don't know how long I'm going to stay around. As I mentioned this on the last call as well, for ICANN, I don't know whether everyone's got the same email, but I'm authorized to stay until Monday night, so I fly out on Tuesday, according to ICANN. I'm not sure when on Tuesday, so that will limit the time when you can participate. And if we've got a session on November 1st, and GAC on Thursday.

Then I don't know who else is being supported, shall we say, with a hotel, we're not going to be booked, we're going to be flying out. So I've kind of held off on booking my flights, because I wasn't sure when we would be talking until and what days we'd be required on. Interesting on that. If we've got GAC on the Thursday, there's really no chance of either doing that on the Saturday, or the Sunday, or the Monday, or the Tuesday, when we're all there. Because that's earlier in the week, instead of waiting until the end of the week.

Personally, I'm not going to fly out on a Thursday and fly back on a Friday the week after, because that's a heck of a lot of time. I'm well over a week out of the office, so I just can't do that, unfortunately. So that was really the main thing on that. I noticed if we've got the engagement session on the Sunday, which is fine, but then that 3:15 to 4:30 on November 1st, which is already the Wednesday. So that's proposed after our support runs out. I'm just wondering whether the two are actually going to be linked in, and how that works.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, David. Maybe I can reply to this question. The different engagement sessions depend on the availability of [inaudible] and, as you may have seen already, for previous ICANN meetings, those were presented by usually the CCT leadership. And in the case of the [inaudible] group, I think this will be the case as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm just going to also point out Waudo's comment in the chat, because it sounds like his travel does not match the time that it actually makes

sense for him to be at our session.   I'm wondering if someone can intervene to assist Waudo in that regard.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Waudo, can I invite you to contact constituency and send your question to them about that, because that seems strange.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You're asking him to contact the travel folks, right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. If you can put me in copy as well, that would be great.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Waudo, what I would tell you is my back and forth with the travel folks is, they send you an itinerary, but the people sending you the itinerary, they are just the travel contractors. You have to direct them to when you need to arrive. So if you need to be participating in our session on the 27th, you actually need to be authorized to have hotel from the 26th on, for example.

If that's not the case, then I think you need to touch base with travel constituency with a CC to Jean-Baptiste, so that that gets clarified. The whole point of you coming to the face-to-face is so that you're already there by the 26th, ready to hit the ground running for our face-to-face on the 27th. So that's my two cents.

Just for clarity folks, I'm not responsible for the travel folks, but our meeting starts first thing on the 27th. Which means, in the rational world, you're probably going to want to arrive on the 26th, so that you can make our meeting on the 27th. Otherwise, there's actually a tremendous waste of resources here. So if folks can make sure that their travel arrangements reflect actual arrival in time for our face-to-face meeting, that really needs to happen. But you also need to be your own advocate here. If you get an itinerary that doesn't work for you, you need to say, that doesn't work for me, I need to be here the day before, because my meeting starts on the 27th.

And, Carlos, I'm looking at your email. I believe that if you're arriving on Emirates, for example, they provide free shuttle service between Dubai and Abu Dhabi. [AUDIO BREAK]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: David, you have your hand raised.

DAVID TAYLOR: I do. Thanks. I put it in the chat, but then Carlos' taxi discussion pushed me up and off the screen, I think. I just wanted to ask, you were going to mention this, Jonathan, because I don't want to preempt anything, but what are our potential, and I caveat to that, possible timings on the report here, when the final report will be out for public comment. How long, etcetera? Do we have just a very rough idea?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We need to synchronize our vocabulary a little bit, because we won't be putting our final report out for public comment again. Are you talking about the interim or are you talking about the final report?

DAVID TAYLOR: No, sorry, I meant interim.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. We are trying to put that out as soon as we can based on the consensus reached on this call. And so, Jean-Baptiste may be able to share a little bit about the timing, but I think we're trying to have it out prior to the ICANN meeting, which is why we were trying to push to get some final consensus on the call today. Because there's translators and all that sort of stuff that has to happen. Jean-Baptiste, do you want to comment a little bit about time line now that we've, basically, reached consensus on these documents?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks, Jonathan. So I think, looking at where the work is currently, the others would be just before ICANN60. But again, that depends on the input I receive when we send the latest versions of the RPM papers. So I think Abu Dhabi would be the earliest. And if you recall from the last time we had the discussion on the work plan, the initial target was to send the final report to the board by December 2017.

So considering the deadline for the draft report is shooting for a few weeks, as before it was for the beginning of October, I think this will affect, as well, when the draft report is sent to the board. So this

[inaudible] to look into once we have a better idea of when the public comment period for the new sections would be closed. Just to summarize, it's a question mark at this stage. [AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: David, does that address your question?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, it does. Thanks. And the interim report, how long would that be out for public comment? Just six weeks, yeah?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: There was a request from leadership, considering the sections were relatively short, to shorten the public comment period to 30 days.

DAVID TAYLOR: That makes sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, David. Anybody else have any other business for today? All right, folks, thank you. Remember to keep your eye out on the list, and don't wait for the call to participate. If there's somebody on the list, make sure that you're providing feedback as quickly as you can cause we're really trying to drive the release of this report. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]