AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, welcome, everyone. I wanted to follow-up on our good work in Abu Dhabi, where I think we made some good progress, and talk about our path forward for trying to get everything completed so we can produce our final report in January.

In that regard, I think in our reading we came to a to-do-list that doesn't involve a whole lot more work, but does involve, I think, work from everyone on the sub-team to make sure their particular sections are in the form that we need, and at least everyone has thought about what responses are appropriate to the public comments.

So, I thought it would be productive, first of all, to go over the list of items that we came up with, then also allow for questions, in case people are unclear, and then finally move towards the schedule that gets us to where we need to go.

With that said, I thought we could start with Jean-Baptiste's list of to-do-items. I will also note that for action items - and maybe you can add this, Jean-Baptiste - in looking through our draft report it occurred to me that even with the good work that everyone's done, many of us, including myself, need to add success measures, and to the extent necessary, details regarding the recommendations. Candidly, I'm more concerned about the success measures, and the details - I think folks need to take a look at the recommendations and see if they need to add more details

as appropriate, but, the success measures are something we're trying to be consistent about to, basically, portrait 'what does success look like if these recommendations are implemented'. I want to headline that as a to-do item - to add success measures and details if that's missing in your assigned recommendations.

I had sent out and email right before the Abu Dhabi meeting, on 10/27 - actually, I'm sorry, I sent it out on October 20th, a week before the Abu Dhabi meeting, which gave a read-out of the recommendations that everyone was assigned to, and what the status was. We definitely had made some progress, but I will resend that for convenience, just to make sure everyone knows what recommendations they're responsible for. That way, you know what you'll need to look over when you're revising them to add success measures and details, and then this more specific list that's up on the screen. That will be on my to-do-list, I will resend that, just so folks have that at the ready.

Those are the very general details. We're going to move to more specific ones, and in that regard, I also want to emphasis that at some point we're probably going to be putting together a response to the public comments that's separate and apart from our final report, and I want folks in their revision process to be making sure they're going to be teed up to contribute to that document, that response document, because all of your changes, and all of our consolidations, really are with an eye towards responding to these public comments in our next and final version. Make sure you are keeping the materials you are going to need to contribute to whatever document we end up providing as a response to these public comments. That's just a heads-up. Maybe the action item here is to be prepared to contribute to our response to public

comments - that's work that you've already done, so to speak, by making changes to your draft recommendations, but I want to make sure that you're - as teachers say - we show our work and save our work, so that people can be teed up to contribute to that document. So, the action is to be ready to contribute to a document that indicates our response to public comments received.

Okay. At this point, before we go into the specifics, does anyone have any questions?

Okay, it doesn't look like it, it doesn't sound like it. Calvin, to your question, looking for the email - that was an email that was sent on Friday, October 20th to the whole CCT safeguards review team. That's the date it was, but as I've just said, I'll resend it, so no worries if it's difficult to find.

So, this is just looking at the issues for face-to-face - the to-dos regarding the draft report are, of course, the first draft report that we've already done. We went through, I think, a pretty good discussion of, perhaps, what can be further consolidated, and in terms of the to-dos for us on the safeguards side, that's really going to start with 13, 15, and 33, and there we had really talked about changing the language to be talking about a survey rather than a study, and I have a to-do there - to see if there's a way to fold this into our overarching recommendations about the single end-user survey. That's on my to-do list.

Then there's also a note, I think, for Jordyn and I to think about the distinction between an overall registrant survey, and an end-user survey - if there's a way to consolidate that.

Moving forwards - recommendation 14 is assigned to David. I'm just looking for, that is, we want to focus on rewriting that to include removals of barriers to diversity, which is a little bit vague on this paper, but what we were talking about was more niche TLDs. I remember that discussion. I think that needs to be fleshed out a little.

David, I know you're on the phone, and I see Jonathan has his hand up - is that about this topic, Jonathan, or did I know see your hand earlier?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's about this topic.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is a little bit of a crossover issue, because we just discussed on the last call that it might behove us to bring up this notion of perpetuation of mono-culture, which is how we came to summarise it in our update tour, and that it might make sense to make it a part of the updates of the choice section as well - either instead of, or in addition to doing it in trust, and then rewriting the recommendation to be about enabling a more business model experimentation, which would include restricted TLDs.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	So, you're thinking about a recommendation that would fit both within consumer trust and consumer choice, or you're thinking of- [INTERUPTED]
JONATHAN ZUCK:	That's right. So, we're thinking of putting in there the findings for choice, now that there's been a bit expansion in the number of strings available, the new [UNKNOWN] program has done little to change the mono-culture of business models that exist, then it could go into some examples of this whether it's [UKNOWN], or communities, or restricted TLDs, and then when we get to the recommendation, the recommendation could be a choice recommendation, or it could be a trust one, or both, but the idea being 'let's look at ways to facilitate or get out of the way of experiments in niche TLDs', and then we can make reference to the fact that there's a consumer expectation for more [UNKNOWN], as one of the rationales for it.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Mhmm, so- [INTERUPTED]
JONATHAN ZUCK:	So, we could do it in both places, but I think we're going to do it in choice at least.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Okay, that's what I wanted to loop back to. What I think would make sense, then, is perhaps - well, would it make sense then for you and

David or someone on the competition side and David can confer about this, because I think we definitely would want to repeat this recommendation, or refer back to this recommendation, in our consumer trust section, because we certainly have a discussion about how the names of the TLDs create a user expectation about it's content. That's what drove this recommendation on the consumer trust end in the first place.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I'll co-ordinate with David, because I got the assignment from the competition team.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, then, as our to-do there, let's adjust that to have a to-do for Jonathan and David to confer on the… What are you referring it to? The mono-business model, or? You used that phrase.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Mono-culture.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Mono-culture! Oh, okay. But you're really talking about an anti-mono-culture - [OVERLAP] - initiative.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Recommendation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right? More diversity.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Another was, the findings of a perpetuated mono-culture - the recommendation was to find ways to address that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And is there a current recommendation in consumer choice on this point, or no?

JONATHAN ZUCK: There isn't, so in some respects, this is way to address concerns from NCUC and others that look like we were trying to go out in favor of business model, particularly one they didn't like, and instead it says that what we're trying to do is let all flowers bloom better.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, it incorporates the semantic web question, together with the [UNKNOWN] question, right?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so then let me see if I can phrase this in a way that triggers these issues, at least to my ears, more clearly. So, Jonathan and David to confer on a recommendation to promote a diversity of business models for new TLDs - does that capture it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, and you can put in parenthesis 'remedy mono-culture', or 'mono-culture antidote'. Maybe that's better.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Laureen, I'm on the phone, so I cannot raise my hand, but I want to collaborate on that small segment, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure, Carlos, thanks for chiming in - and anyone else who's on the phone, just chime in if you'd like to speak. So let's add Carlos to that - Jonathan, David, and Carlos - and let's note that this relates to recommendation 14, and it will ultimately result in a recommendation

that's going to be referenced in both the consumer choice and the consumer trust sections.

Does that sufficiently capture that, Jonathan?I don't know, if that's an old hand, or a new comment, but go ahead if it's new.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Old hand, sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It does capture it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good. So, moving along now - any other comments on these recommendations thus far? Okay.

So, then, recommendation 16 - that's a to-do for Carlos and I, to refocus that recommendation on the data collection needed for our next - I say 'our' in the very loosest sense - for the next review team, rather than a study. So, Carlos and I will both be taking a look then at recommendation 16. And just - I know Carlos is on the phone, and not in the Adobe room, so - recommendation 16 was really focused on, at least in it's prior iteration, on a study to collect data on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains - this is really a registration restriction question, that seeks to gather information on the relationship

between registration restrictions and consumer trust, DNS abuse, cost and benefits, and enforcement.

So, I think that the idea here is to position this as data collection for the next review team, rather than a specific study.

Okay, that's recommendations 16. We have a to-do here to reach out to subsequent procedures leadership to find out where they are in the highly regulated strings discussions so we can figure out our priority level - and it says ICANN.org, but do we mean staff there? This is an informational to-do, as I see it, that will inform our prioritisation for recommendations 25 to 30, but does anyone remember - who was going to be reaching out to this subsequent procedures leadership?

JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hi, Laureen, it's Jean-Baptiste. Yes, that was assigned to staff.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, okay, so maybe we can rephrase that as 'ICANN staff to reach out to subsequent procedures', because sometimes when I see ICANN.org, I don't necessarily consider that to be synonymous with staff, but that just may be me, but either way that would make it clearer for me.

For recommendations 25 to 30 - that's another example where measures for success and necessary details need to be filled in, but that's an overarching to-do.

We don't have a to-do for 32 and 33 - those are staying as is.

So, one of the things we talked about in your absence, Jamie - you're still on the phone with us, I'm assuming?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I am.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. Was deleting 35, pending your review, and 36, and really trying to include the rational about those recommendations in recommendation 14. I think the general observation here in 35, for your recollection, is costs and benefits of registration restrictions, and 36 is the impact of new gTLD registration restrictions on competition. I think the sense here was that many of our other recommendations also relate to registration restrictions, and those should be consolidated in other places, rather than be the topic of a standalone recommendation.

But, you weren't at the face-to-face when we had this discussion, so we didn't want to move on this without you having a chance to weigh-in, and I'm not sure you've had the chance to even think this through yet, so, maybe that's something you can either respond to, if you've had a chance to think about it because you've seen this to-do list, or get back to us with what your thoughts are.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, yeah, first of all I apologise for not being able to attend the all day session in Abu Dhabi - I just couldn't do it - but on 35, simply removing the text doesn't seem problematic. We've had lots of discussion about the challenges of doing cost/benefit analysis in the past, so, obviously

we would want to see how that gets [UNKNOWN] into the rationale for 14, and getting rid of 36 because it's represented somewhere else seems to be absolutely fine as well. Is there a revised rationale yet, or is that still to be completed?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, that would still need to be completed and where it would be completed, I think, is going to be for recommendation 14, my sense is.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Because that's going to be the overarching recommendation here that's going to be referred to. So, would it make sense to add you, then, to the recommendation 14 team, Jamie? So that you can be in on the drafting and the confering on that?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, let's do that - Jamie's name on recommendation 14. It now has the benefit of four great minds.

JAMIE HEDLUND: And me too!

LAUREEN KAPIN: [laughter] Right, exactly.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Alright, thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think the challenge here is basically we're going to be having one recommendation carrying the weight of text from these different sections, that it's really going to need to be comprehensive enough to fit in these different places. Recommendation 35 and 36 really focus squarely on the registration restrictions, and recommendation 14, I think, is a little broader than that. I just want to make sure that the recommendation 14 team gives enough attention to the sub-issue within that, which is the impact of registration restrictions.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Right, okay. Sounds good, thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. Okay, David, I want to make sure I'm getting your comments in the chat - '33 is in there earlier, then 33 with 13…' I'm not sure I understand you. Your comments… I think for 13 - are you saying that to your recollection, our discussion is that they shouldn't be consolidated, and that they should be separate?

'33 is in twice at bullet 4 and 8' - oh, I see. Okay, well that is inconsistent, so let's have a to-do to figure out whether 33 is actually going to be consolidated or staying as is. Thank you, David, that is inconsistent. Let's give that to me, to figure out whether 33 gets consolidated with 13 and 15, or stands alone. You can just add that to the recommendation 13, 15, and 33 bullet, Jean-Baptiste, in your action items. I'll take that as a to-do for me, or I'll allocate it to see whether 33 is consolidated or stands alone. Thank you, David. See, it take a village, folks!

Recommendation 40 is Jordyn, so I'm not going to focus on that. I assume, Jean-Baptiste and Jonathan, did recommendation 40 come up in your calls? Because that's a to-do for Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Laureen, it did. I think it's a to-do for Jordyn to co-ordinate with David.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, then let's- [OVERLAP]

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, that sort-of got resolved on the [UNKNOWN] call.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. So, let's add that then as a to-do - recommendation 40, Jordyn and David to confer to capture the discussion on the registrant survey

with inter-survey - honestly, I think I'm not remembering that discussion very specifically, but I hope that David does. I'm looking at my notes… Uh oh, my screen just went dark. Okay, back again.

Carlton, can I have clarification on recommendation 16, please? Okay, the clarification on 16 was, if you remember, Carlton, we had a general discussion about refining our language to veer away from the notion of commissioning study, after study, after study, and instead trying to speak more in terms of systematic data collection. I think that would be the difference, for example, between commissioning another [UNKNOWN] set of surveys, as opposed to, for example, what ICANN staff are now considering doing with their [UNKNOWN] project, the abuse reporting system that they're considering doing, and the open data initiative. The difference there is actually collecting data as part of a systematic process, as part of a routine process, versus commissioning a stand-alone study. That's my recollection of how we wanted to tweak the language, and that's what the focus is on recommendation 16, in terms of language changes.

In terms of more procedural change, we've discussed focusing the recommendation on information that the next CCT review team is going to need, in terms of timing.

So, going systematic - does that mean we'll define data elements for capture? I think we have defined that, to a certain extent already in the recommendation, because we're asking about data on the impact of restrictions on who can buy new gTLDs. We're talking about the impact of registration and restrictions on consumer trust, and whether there are correlations between DNS abuse and the presence or absence of

registration restrictions, an assessment of the costs and benefits of registration restrictions, and whether and how those restrictions are enforced.

I think to that extent, we're already specific, that I think part of this is just semantics to say not 'commission a study', but to say just 'collect that data on a routine basis'.

I don't know - to answer your question - I don't know if it means additional ones will be defined. I'm certainly open to your thoughts on that, I just think we need to keep it tied to our findings. But, I don't think the gist here is to expand this, I think the gist here is to say instead of doing a one-off or focused-in-time study on this, where you basically take a snapshot, the better practise would be to try to collect this information on a routine basis, so that it's done as a matter of course. Akin, really, for example, to what ICANN Compliance does in collecting information on complaints, and then publishing that at regular intervals.

I know you're still typing - okay. [LAUGHTER] If you have other questions we can talk off-line, especially once I've had a chance to think about this more with Carlos, but that's my sense of what our discussion was.

Okay. So, then we're moving on - let me take a pause here because Carlton may not be the only one with questions or concerns. Anyone else with questions or comments here?

Okay. Let's move towards goals for the final report. This is also an ultimate to-do list. I'm not sure, Jean-Baptiste, that we need to put that as an action item now, though I'm going to leave that up to your discretion, but timing wise, this seems to me to be taking place after

we've tackled all the action items we have now, but, let's say that these action items are phase 1, phase 2 would be these to-dos for the final report, which would be a revised executive summary, which, fearless leader, Jonathan would tackle with input from the team. We would be revising the numbering, because we're now going to have a number of consolidations, and also cross-references, because all the numbering is going to change.

Here is a place in the report where we're going to want to react to public comments and describe the comments that drove changes. We'll have a public comments section of the report, and that's what I've been flagging in our third bullet for our action items - that we're going to need to be prepared to be explicit about that in this section of the report.

We're going to have a recommendations summary showing levels of consensus. Fortunately, we've been in an incredibly consensus successful sub-team - we've had very few recommendations where we actually didn't achieve full consensus, but where we did not, we should be flagging that. We will be adding a column to make sure we show if any of our final recommendations have not achieved consensus.

Then we have some more procedural items to do. Circling back to staff for a cost analysis of the new recommendations, to see if we want to consider, in light of cost, whether that changes our view of whether we want to keep that recommendation or not, and I think that that's our realism check. If it turns out it's a great recommendation, that we're all committed to, but it's ridiculously expensive, then that's something we

surely want to talk about. That is a to-do item before anything becomes set in stone and released as part of our final report.

The review team are to identify any sections in the draft report that need to be updated - I think we're in the midst of doing that right now, and Jonathan, at the beginning of the call, had flagged an issue that may not have jumped onto our collective radar screens, which is that we've been focusing on recommendations and the public comments received on the recommendations, but as all of you likely now, because you've been reading the public comments to do your revisions, sometimes the public comments haven't been on our recommendations, they've been on our findings. As the final part of our process, Jonathan and I spoke about dividing and conquering the public comments, so we could make sure we don't have to make adjustment in the text, or - we want to make sure that we've captured any changes that need to flow from the public comments and captured any changes that apply not just to the recommendations, but to the findings as well.

So, that's going to be a step or an exercise, where we're all going to be going back to the public comments to make sure that we haven't forgotten to deal with any persuasive public comments that deal with our findings, rather than our recommendations.

That's going to be in our phase 2, then also setting up a discussion with folks in the ICANN organisation who can give us guidance on the best language to use so that our recommendations are easily translatable to board resolutions. We don't want to have issues with making things inadvertently difficult to implement, just because we've chosen the

wrong magic words. That's going to be another practical check in our phase 2.

Then finally, probably, phase 3 implementation - we should discuss how a subset of dedicated team members is going to continue on to help with implementation. That will really be, I think, the phase 3, post final report.

So, that's the big picture, the lay of the land. Let me take a pause to see if folks have questions, comments, feedback.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Yes, Laureen, this is Carlos. If you'd put me in line, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, you're first! You're first, Carlos, go ahead!

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: [LAUGHTER] Thank you. Thank you, Laureen, this is Carlos. I don't want to comment, I think it's pretty clear, the overview that you gave us, but the council leadership has asked me for a time horizon of this next few weeks and exercises. They are looking forwards to the approximate date when the final report should reach the board - by that, I understand, I explained to them that we're going to have a final document by the end of the year, then it goes into the last round of comments. We have a big planning exercise coming up in January, for the council, and in that planning exercise we have some important dates in the horizon coming

up next year, and one of those dates is when is our best estimate of the board receiving their Christmas presents - the final ones.

LAUREEN KAPIN: [LAUGHTER] My sense is that our latest schedule - and Jonathan and Jean-Baptiste can jump in - but my sense was, Carlos, it was more of an end of January present, than a Christmas present.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Okay. I just don't know if- [INTERUPTED] Yes, Jean-Baptiste, it's- [INTERUPTED]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlos, the challenge is we still have to do a public comment period on the amendment that we just finished, and that's 30 days, then there'll be Christmas holidays, then there'll be time to incorporate those comments, so it seems likely that it'll be mid-to-late January before we're able to submit to the board.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Okay, it's not a problem when, if it's a month earlier or later, it's just to give our best estimate, so. That would be interesting, because that means we'll be in [UNKNOWN] to take up with the board, like, in San Juan, or something like that. It's just in those terms of the time horizon that they want a good approximation.

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, that- [INTERUPTED]

JONATHAN ZUCK: We'll be completely done with our work and, in theory, the board will have in fact completed it's own public comment exercise prior to San Juan.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Okay, thank you. Excellent, thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. Any other questions or comments?

Okay, so that leaves us with, then, schedule. Everyone on the review team, even if your specific recommendations aren't called out in the list, everyone still has things to do in terms of making sure that their recommendations are in a consistent form which includes sufficient details and measures of success.

Also, as I said, I'm resending that email I sent on October 20th, because some people still had some out-standing items to complete, and that is reflected in that list. So, everyone has homework to do, and what I will get out, along with resending the October 20th email, is a proposed schedule, and I'll send that out where, like our earlier plenary calls, I'll ask certain individuals to present their revised recommendations in advance of the call so that people can look at it and discuss it. That's my proposal of how to proceed - that we'll, basically, hear from a small group of team members about certain recommendations each day.

That'll mean that those of you who have to confer, for example, our team recommendations for teams, you'll need to do that in the margins of the phone call, so things are teed-up.

But, I'll send a proposed schedule, and what I'll ask if folks know they're not going to be able to participate in a certain phone call because of holiday travel, etc., to let me know so I can keep that in mind when I draft a proposed schedule for our next couple of sub-team calls.

David has asked, which is a good question, besides his valid Valentine's day recommendation - which is so tender, David - if there's going to be a presentation of the final report in San Juan. That's a good question - do we know the answer to that question, Jonathan? Jean-Baptiste? Others?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hey, Laureen, I think Jonathan has left the room. I mean, first it's hard for me to answer for David, because I don't know, I'm hoping that the final report will be send before San Juan, but based on what I know for the report, I don't think there is a presentation provided for final reports, but I can look into that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Any other comments, questions, concerns? Jean-Baptiste, maybe you can tell us exactly where we are with getting the next version of the new parts of the draft report out. I know you had sent an earlier email on this, but just to update the team who's on the call.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, sure. So, just so everyone knows, I sent to the translation services the new section. This was last week. At the time I sent it, they mentioned it would take a maximum of three weeks. I resent an email to them on Monday to ask for an update on the completion date, and they had not received a confirmation from all translators, so, I'm still waiting for an update on the final date, but it should be less than three weeks. As soon as we have all versions, in each language, then we can publish the sections for public comment, but in any case - the English version is currently on the wiki.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, sounds good. If no-one has anything else - I'll give a pause in case anyone wants to jump in - If no-one has anything else, then I will wish everyone a great rest of the day, and remind people to let me know if they have scheduling issues with appearances at the next couple of Wednesday sub-team calls, and to look out for my email with proposed scheduling.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, everyone. Take care.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks, Laureen, bye.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]