EN

AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DREW BAGLEY: Alright, welcome to this subteam call, everyone. It looks like we may have Laureen back on the call as well. So, it looks like for this call, Gao and I can at least present our consolidated recommendations, and success measures, but perhaps we won't have [UNKNOWN] to actually do any sort of adoption of the revised recommendations on this call. We might need to do that via email afterwards, and follow the procedure we're using for the greater plenary group, where we give everyone a bit of time to provide feedback via email, [UNKNOWN] the recommendation gets adopted.

So, without further ado - Gao, would you like to go ahead and proceed with your part of the call, and present the consolidated recommendations and success measures?

GAO MOSWEU: Hi, Drew - can you all hear me?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, yep. Loud and clear.

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.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay, great. Unfortunately, or fortunately, my recommendations have not been consolidated. Anyway, I can go through each of the recommendations, then we can [UNKNOWN].

DREW BAGLEY: Real quick - do you think they should be consolidated, or have they not been consolidated because you haven't had the time to do it, or do you think they should not be, and they should stay separate?

GAO MOSWEU: I don't actually see why or how they could be consolidated. Recommendation 13-

DREW BAGLEY: Real quick, Gao - you're coming in a bit faint. Is there, I don't know, can you switch to a headset or something to make the microphone louder?

GAO MOSWEU: Is this not loud? I actually have it on the loudest.

DREW BAGLEY: That's the loudest? Okay. Then, let's see… Alright, I can hear you, I don't know if David can. Go ahead, I'm sorry for interrupting. Go ahead.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay. So, as I was saying, Recommendation 13 talks about collecting data on [UNKNOWN] gTLDs, and reasons that [UNKNOWN] for reasons- [INTERFERENCE]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Gao, we can't hear you…

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, it looks like you completely faded out. Gao, are you still there?

GAO MOSWEU: […] and how the consumer behaviour… Hello? Drew, I can hear you saying I'm faint-

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Gao, we can only hear you from time to time, unfortunately.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, is there another way you could connect?

GAO MOSWEU: Can anyone hear me?

DREW BAGLEY: I see you're connected on the phone - could you maybe go to the computer? Try the computer audio, see if that's better?

GAO MOSWEU: Okay.

DREW BAGLEY: Gao, why don't you try to reconnect in some way. Unfortunately, when we do hear you it's very faint, and difficult to hear. Other than the beginning, a little better, but now it keeps cutting out to where we don't hear anything.

So, speaking in general about the recommendations that Gao was looking at - we looked at this as another one of those where we probably should try to consolidate recommendations that are related, and calling for enhanced research. That way, based on the feedback we've gotten from the community and the comments, it seems like that would be a much easier recommendation to digest and implement as a whole, if we, you know, basically - had a recommendation like 13, and to the degree that 15 and 33 touch on this, to actually increase the ethicacy of future Neilson style studies, because I know that's been a recurring thing with different data areas.

Similarly, right now we can move onto my consolidated recommendations while we're waiting for Gao to reconnect. I know that some of the recommendations that I'll get to later - not in today's call, but in general [UNKNOWN] will want to consolidate those too, and really have some solid recommendations that give the next review team, as well as just the ICANN community as a whole, better data to work with.

Jean-Baptiste, would you mind loading my recommendations, because I don't see Gao back on yet. Maybe we'll just move onto that for now, then it looks like Laureen is listening, and then we have David, so. With these power brokers, we can hopefully get a little feedback on that, and hopefully we'll get Gao back.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Just one second… Give me one second, it was not uploaded.

DREW BAGLEY: No problem. In the meantime, we can go back to listening to David at work. [LAUGHTER] I like the difference between Laureen's workday and David's workday - one of them sounds a little more intense.

Yeah, I keep trying to load mine - in the meantime, do you want to test your audio, Gao? See if we can hear you a bit better now?

GAO MOSWEU: Hello?

DREW BAGLEY: Hello. We can hear you now.

GAO MOSWEU: Is that better?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, much better. So much better.

GAO MOSWEU: Hi, Drew. I can hear you.

DREW BAGLEY: And we can hear you now. So, when all hope was lost, we moved to the other recommendations, so I'll do this briefly, then we'll go back to yours - but keep whatever good connection you have.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay, alright. Go ahead, Drew. Let's see if I can keep it!

DREW BAGLEY: [LAUGHTER] See if you can keep it - and I think someone needs to mute their microphone? So, the recommendations I was tasked with looking at for consolidation, of them, there were three recommendations that should be consolidated, and there are 2 other recommendations that we should not look at for consolidation until after the current public comment period is over, because they deal directly with DNS abuse, and with some of the outstanding issues that we anticipate we will get community feedback on. So, with these recommendations, though - which are 37, 38, and I believe 39 - these are dealing with voluntary picks, something that we should shape more broadly into voluntary commitment, as we don't know what form, in the future, what for voluntary commitments would take, whether they would still be fixed, or whether they would exist in the future, but they're dealing with the

assumption that if such voluntary commitments exist, we would want them to be shaped a bit differently, and be a bit more transparent to the community, so.

You can see the original recommendations here. The first one was about accessibility, because we had a lot of difficulty as a team tasked with scrutinising and reviewing the implementation of these commitments, we had a difficult time obtaining all this information, particularly in a way that we could do any sort of comparative analysis, and understand which TLDs had made which commitments. If it were not for ICANN staff spending so many hours extracting this data from the agreements themselves and putting it in a spreadsheet, then we really would not have had much to work with in terms of understanding this from an accountability and overall ethicacy perspective. So, this is something that, you know, several months ago as a team we decided would be a good recommendation going forward, to actually make the commitment available in a publicly accessible database on the website.

The next recommendation was about future gTLD applicants needing to actually state the purpose and goal of the voluntary pick, because there were many voluntary picks that we scrutinised, and we were not able to actually understand what the intended goal was, even if we could understand what the commitment itself was. So, that's something that would be very helpful for the community, as the community determines whether or not something is really or not in the public interest.

Then, going along the same lines, the other recommendation we made along this topic was dealing with the fact that voluntary picks should be submitted with enough time for community feedback, so that way, you

don't have a voluntary public interest commitment that gets submitted during the application process, then gets adopted, then later on it turns out that the other community members really oppose the measure - it was not in the public interest, or it was redundant, or there's just something flawed about it - that's something where we all know, because of the history of the new gTLD program, the last time around was a bit haphazard, with the way in which voluntary picks came about, and so this is our way of making a recommendation to formalise the input process a bit.

So, all of those can really be consolidated into one recommendation, I believe, in terms of - I'm eager to hear your feedback on that, so, this is the new proposed consolidated recommendation, and it reads: To the extend voluntary commitments are permitted in future gTLD applications processes, all such commitments made by a gTLD applicant must state their intended goal, and be submitted during the application process, such that there is sufficient opportunity for community review, and time to meet the deadlines for community and limited public interest objection. Furthermore, such requirements should apply to the extent that voluntary commitments may be made after delegation. Such voluntary commitments, including existing voluntary picks, should be made accessible and searchable in an online database, to enhance data-driven policy development, community transparency, ICANN compliance, and the awareness of variables relevant to DNS abuse trends.

So, I can get to the other aspects of this, such as the success measures, in a second, but does anybody have any feedback on this combined recommendation, and whether you think this is a good idea in general,

to combine these three recommendations too? I'm looking at you three fellow team members who are on the call. David, Gao, and Laureen.

Alright, David is typing, so we'll await that. No comment, really. So this, instead of it merely being a consolidation for efficiency, it was also a response to the feedback we received during the last public comment period about this, where people thought our original recommendations in this realm were too prescriptive, assuming that there would be something that would be called a voluntary pick in the future, and whatnot - and David agrees, great.

So, that's that. We can go ahead and put this consolidated recommendation forward via email for the rest of the team to adopt. First, I guess, the subteam - I'll perhaps defer to Jean-Baptiste on the way in which we would go about that, if we still would go with the subteam adopting it, or go with the full plenary, but. I guess without working quickly, I'll just go over success measures, then Gao can present hers.

The success measures - I wrote the implementation of… Could somebody mute their microphone? Oh, it was Laureen. So, for the success measures, I put that the implementation of this recommendation will be successful - and apparently I've typo'd - but if the purpose of any voluntary commitment proposed by registry operators is clearly stated to describe the intended goal, all parties in the multi-stakeholder community are given ample time to provide input before the commitment is adopted into a contract, and any adopted measures are available and easily accessible on the ICANN website in an organised way, to empower community awareness and accountability.

I'll fix the typos, but that's the way this recommendation would see it as being adopted successfully, as in, future new gTLD delegation we saw that we were able to actually ascertain the purpose that we knew there was ample time for input before something was actually adopted, then after the fact, we were able to find any such commitments in an easily accessible way, they would go with what we're talking about in terms of data-driven policy making and accountability.

Alright, and that's that. I will briefly call Laureen out, and see if Laureen has any commentary, and if Laureen has not, we'll pass it back to Gao. Laureen are you able to speak now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Yes, I'm able to speak.

DREW BAGLEY: How did you do with the fire-drill? Did you survive?

LAUREEN KAPIN: [LAUGHTER] I passed.

DREW BAGLEY: Would you have been a goner? Okay, good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: [LAUGHTER] I probably-

DREW BAGLEY: We only want heroes on this team.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I saved ten other people in my race down the stairs.

DREW BAGLEY: [LAUGHTER] Okay. So, I'm not sure how much you heard about the consolidated recommendation and the success measures.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, is this- what is this consolidating?

DREW BAGLEY: This is consolidating - if you recall, there are two recommendations I was looking at for consolidation that should not be addressed until after we've received public comments from the DNS abuse chapter. Then, these three, they focus on voluntary picks, and so based upon the feedback we received during the public comments period, the consolidated version of these makes it less prescriptive, so, not implying that in the future there would be something called a voluntary pick, but instead, describes it more broadly as a voluntary commitment. Then it consolidates all these into one that describes the way in which any voluntary commitments in the future would have to clearly state their purpose, be given ample time for community feedback before being adopted, and after the fact, be available in an organised way for the community, so, ICANN display the- Can you see these

recommendations? I've moved onto the consolidated one again. I just want to make sure you can see these.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, no, I can see them. Thank you.

DREW BAGLEY: Laureen, this is the consolidated one.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, got it. So, this is in response to the - I am so sorry [UNKNOWN] - this is in response to public comments expressing concerns about a recommendation being too prescriptive, and assuming that picks were going to be a part of the second [UNKNOWN] gTLD program?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. So, there were public comments related to that, and in that - I would have to look back where it came from specifically - but, in that by us being too prescriptive, we were not giving enough deference to the PDP, and the fact that volunteer picks might not exist in any subsequent round of delegations. Instead, this is written to just broadly say 'voluntary commitments'.

Similarly, some of the feedback was that they thought that our previous recommendations with regard to feedback from the community was only naming the GAC, even though we did make reference to the community as a whole - the community and limited public objections -

but with that too, I made sure that we are being clear that what we're actually referring to is the entire community - the multi-stakeholder model - there.

Then, there was also feedback - I think those were the two main areas where we got feedback, but then, you know, in general we have been getting feedback - if you recall, during our face-to-face meetings - that we have too many overlapping recommendations, which of course is why we're doing this whole exercise of consolidation, so then this goes to try and meet that as well.

The feedback I have about the new consolidated recommendation is that whoever drafted the success measures should fix the typo.

LAUREEN KAPIN: [LAUGHTER] Okay. This actually looks good to me. It seems like a sensible consolidation, and also I like that it involves the whole community, and it speaks in terms of- to the extent that we're not pre-supposing any specific framework for the next round, which I know is going to take a lot of discussion anyway.

In terms of format, do you think there are any necessary details that we need?

DREW BAGLEY: Sorry, what do you mean by that?

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is for everyone. If your recommendations don't need a recommendation section - and I was explaining this actually via email to Calvin - the rationale is really the why, the details are the how, to the extent that the recommendation doesn't make that clear in the first place, or to the extent that you need additional information. That would be my only question - do we need any further details about how this should be done?

DREW BAGLEY: I don't think so with this particular one, because of that feedback about being too prescriptive previously. I think that we don't need the details - because we have the success measures, which, you know, are giving the goal of where we want to be, then I think the rationale is already pretty sufficient as to the why, but I think that keeping the details intentionally, I mean, not having a separate details section, just the details being in the recommendation itself for this particular one, I think it's fine, rather than detailing the process, and at which point a community party would be able to provide feedback on voluntary commitments, and I think that would go toward being too prescriptive again. Similarly, we don't want to tell ICANN how to create the database - I mean, I think that's the only place we may want more details if we wanted to talk about what we want, but I think there were already, probably, detailed enough in the recommendation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. Okay, thanks for catching me up, and sorry for the inefficiency of my-

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, the only other thing you might have missed is that we're going to, as we don't have [UNKNOWN] on this call now, after I fixed the typos in the success measures, I guess this will be sent out. I know Jean-Baptiste told me which one to do, and I was wondering should it get sent to the subteam first… Yes, to the subteam first, and then we'll follow process, like the one we're adopting for the new plenary process for adopting recommendations. Then go the greater plenary for adoption. So that - instead of waiting for another call, or anything - it's simpler to do this via email now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's right. Maybe we can put in bold in the email as the heading, you know, this is your opportunity to weigh in, responses, you know, necessary by 5pm, end of week, otherwise this would be deemed approved. Just so people are on notice.

DREW BAGLEY: Right, okay. I'll get that out today. Then Gao was presenting - as you were fleeing the building, bravely taking others with you - she has not yet consolidated Recommendations 13, 15, and 33, but she was going to discuss Recommendation 13 with us, but unfortunately, as I'm sure you've seen in the chat, her audio connection was not very good. I guess it's due to her being connected via the internet on very, very low bandwidth. So, I don't know if - Jean-Baptiste, we could have him put Recommendation 13 up again with the notes. Jean-Baptiste, do you also have Recommendations 15 and 33 with notes?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Drew. Yes, I do.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, so maybe we could take a look just now at those, and decide whether it makes sense to consolidate them - just do a quick look through them to remember what each of them is.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Drew, if you wish I can also put on screen the original version from the draft report, if that helps.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that, well, I'd have to ask [UNKNOWN]. I thought she had [UNKNOWN] in red. [UNKNOWN] in the chat, we can't hear you.

GAO MOSWEU: I can't even hear-

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, it sounds like we're having a lot of technical difficulties.

DREW BAGLEY: Laureen, maybe you want to, at least, look at what these three are, you know, with the modifications, just to get a general sense of them. Gao, why don't you send out your consolidated recommendations via email,

then we can just go through that process too. Then we still get through both consolidations this week.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, I'm just [UNKNOWN] notes on, Jean-Baptiste, about which of these recommendations would be good topics for consolidation, to take our my notes on this so that we at least… Now, so. Okay. So all of these [UNKNOWN]. Sorry about that. So all of these [UNKNOWN] for consolidation? Can I still be heard?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I'm thinking that maybe it would make sense, since at least we do have the benefit of what Gao has sent around, is to take a quick look, because my sense of these is that Gao didn't change the recommendations themselves that much, but she has some additions to the rationale and the success measures.

DREW BAGLEY: Jean-Baptiste, could you remind us what Recommendation 15 and 33 are? I'm just wondering if these are all related to the Neilson style studies in general.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, sure. Let me just… I'm just going to put the other slides very quickly, so you have a better overview of the different recommendations.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jean-Baptiste, I have the recommendations in front of me. So, okay, good - Jean-Baptiste already doing it. So 13 really talks about 'visitation' and 'trustworthiness', because those were the factors that you recall- actually 'familiarity' and factors that contributed to trust-worthiness. So, 13 really speaks of studying which gTLDs have been visited the most, and why, and how this relates to trust.

Then I think 15 is related to - if you can scroll down - to repeating the parts of the consumer and registrant survey that also relate to these same issues - familiarity and trust. Putting those two together makes a lot of sense. They're really covering related issues, and 33 deals with the same thing - subjective and objective trustworthiness in new gTLDs - but the focus there is on how the issue of registration restriction come in.

I think certainly 13 and 15 can be consolidated very easily. I have a question mark about 33, just because it comes in a very different section of the report, that focuses on registration restrictions, so all of the data and the rationale is a little different, and it may be that these should be cross-referenced? Yes, I have a question mark about how easy it's going to be to consolidate 33 with the others in the report, although one idea might be to consolidate it into a single recommendation, and then just repeat the rest if the recommendations in 33 - the same one we do for 13 and 15 as a consolidated recommendation, but keep the rationales

separate. I think the rationales are separate. That's my quick thinking on that.

GAO MOSWEU: Hello, I'm back.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Ah, now we can hear you!

GAO MOSWEU: [LAUGHTER] [UNKNOWN], David. Okay, I must have missed out on a portion of the discussion while I was struggling with…

LAUREEN KAPIN: You just dropped off now.

GAO MOSWEU: […] connection… Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I can hear you now, but I'm not sure if the pauses are your pauses, or I'm just not hearing you. Okay, I think since we're having problems hearing Gao, here's what I would suggest.

GAO MOSWEU: [UNKNOWN] Is that better?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, but - do you want to take it though 13, then if we still can't hear you clearly, I think we're going to have to do this via email.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay, so, Recommendation 13 was talking about conducting a study and collecting information on which [UNKNOWN] visitations of new gTLDs that [UNKNOWN] the visitations and awareness of those new gTLDs, and how consumers trust in them [UNKNOWN] behaviour online.

Can I ask whether everybody can still hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah.

GAO MOSWEU: Perhaps not… Oh, okay, great. So, the rationale was that in the [UNKNOWN] surveys, we [UNKNOWN] we've seen the relationship-

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, Gao, you're still cutting in and out.

GAO MOSWEU: […] between the [UNKNOWN] gTLD and several other factors such as familiarity, reputation, and security - obviously, the security of that particular gTLD. So, the new text I've added there - the two surveys that

were taken in 2015 and 2016 [UNKNOWN] awareness of visitations to new gTLD sites… Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, what I'm going to suggest, Gao - and I'm going to put this in the email - I think what would be best is to take a stab at consolidating 13 and 15 into a single recommendation, but I think what everyone needs to understand - and maybe I can put this in an email - is how your changes relate to the public comments, so. You've made changes, but I think it's important in the email to explain how the changes relate to public comments, so that people understand. Please type, I can only hear [UNKNOWN]. Okay.

So, you should be able to see this on screen. I would say that's the next step, Gao, to put 13 and 15 into a single recommendation, and then send that around for the group to review. Yeah, by the end of the week, then folks can respond via email. I'm sorry the technology is [UNKNOWN] to hear, and yes - David needed to duck out.

I think that's how we're going to have to proceed with that, and have people also get comments back to Gao, and I'd like to take this up again at the next call. Are there any better methods we can use for Gao's participation? Maybe I can ask our staff to try and figure out if there's so more reliable method we can have for connecting Gao to these discussions, even if it's only via phone-line. Okay, so we're going to try and work on that.

I think that's all we're going to be able to take on-board today, which was, basically, to get the review team via email, the subteam to look at

Drew's consolidations, then, Gao, to ask you to consolidate 13 and 15. Can we mention in the action items to see if Gao can use track-changes, so that it's very clear what is new, and what is from the original. I'm going to ask everyone to do that, because it makes the document much easier to work with. So, if we can add that to the action item - to use Word and track-changes function, so that it's very clear what is new and what is from the original.

I think that's it, unless anyone has any other questions or comments? If there's nothing else, then I think we are done. Any other questions/comments? Oh, go ahead.

DREW BAGLEY: No, the only other thing would be, so then, what do we want to accomplish on next week's call? I'm just looking at our list - there's Carlos on there, and then we need some of the [UNKNOWN] Recommendation 14, I guess.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, there isn't going to be a call next week for the holidays, so our next call is January.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. That's right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, I'll work with Jean-Baptiste to come up with an agenda for our call in January. How does that sound?

DREW BAGLEY: Sounds good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good, then I will release everyone, and again wish everyone happy holidays, and thank everyone for their work.

DREW BAGLEY: Happy holidays!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]