
LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so I'll repeat my welcome for the recording. Welcome, everyone. I'm hoping we can start with Carlton's revised recommendations and I believe that Carlton had sent that around previously. Jean-Baptiste, do you have Carlton's revised recommendations for the screen?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Yeah. I will place on screen now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect. And I'm hoping we have Carlton connected. I know he's connected to the Adobe Connect but I'm not sure if we have his voice. And it looks like we all can make screen bigger or small as we need. So are we still having trouble getting Carlton connected?

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Brenda, can I ask you to try calling Carlton?

BRENDA BREWER: Jean-Baptiste. What did you say about Carlton? I'm sorry. I see that he's attempting to dial in.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Okay.

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.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, and I see Carlton is typing. Okay, so maybe Brenda, you can connect with Carlton to get him connected so we can hear him. And also, if someone can ping Calvin, who is I believe is also up for today.

BRENDA BREWER: Calvin sent a note that he'll be 15 to 20 minutes late.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, and I may have seen that and just forgotten. Okay, right. I guess he has some conflict. Okay.

Okay. So, just in the interest of efficiency, maybe, Drew, we should have you kick things off. Do we have you on the phone on a working line?

DREW BAGLEY: You do. I am on a phone. I focus most of my attention, though, to the DNS abuse report, trying to produce a draft. So, for the proposal to consolidate those PIC recommendations, something I have not done yet, which I know I need to do is thoroughly read the .feedback case.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That is an important one.

DREW BAGLEY: To better understand PICs in practice before going ahead and proposing new language that may or may not need to address something we learned from that, which that is a big deal. Other than that, the good

news is with our existing PIC recommendations, there's either support or there's feedback that would lend it still basically be okay with our recommendations so long as we're more specific and don't inadvertently exclude people from the process. For example, where we're suggesting that any future PICs are released with adequate time for GAC to weigh in. Of course, call out every part of the community that should be able to weigh in and things like that, but that's something where I definitely feel much more comfortable doing the .feedback analysis first before all the spending our time debating whether or not the new language is sufficient.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so we'll [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: Sorry about that. That doesn't help with the flow of the phone call.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's okay. And I know we're all excited about the finalization of the DNS abuse study, so that will be interesting to see how that [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you for your highlights from that, too.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, my pleasure. It's quite dense, so doing [inaudible] is helpful for me to get my brain around it. Okay. There's an action item then for Drew to circulate his revised PIC recommendations next week sometime.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, this is great.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Does that sound good? Okay.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. So, do we have Carlton on the line now? So, I see Carlton, you said that you are now on in the chat. Are we able to hear you? Okay. I see you're saying on the audio bridge. Is there any technical help for Carlton so that we can [inaudible]?

Welcome, Calvin. Okay. It looks like we're still having some technical difficulties with Carlton, which I'm hoping we're going to get resolved. Calvin, maybe we should... Are we able to hear you, Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE: Hopefully, you can. How's this going?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. That sounds great. And Calvin, perhaps, you can present where you are with your recommendations. If you have anything for us to look at, that's always helpful, too.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sure. So, what I did do is I did e-mail a consolidation of 17 and 18, I think it was.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Yes, Calvin. It's currently on screen.

CALVIN BROWNE: It's currently on – there it goes. Really, I don't think I've changed anything in meaning there at all by just combining the two, so I think that that's a fairly straightforward consolidation. [It only] changes either or loses any of 17 or 18.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Calvin, were there any public common concerns with these recommendations?

CALVIN BROWNE: Hang on a second. I will go to those. Just let me get my notes up, my screen's a bit full at the moment with everything on here. 17 and 18.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, and I'm also seeing in the chat that we're having some audio connection problem, probably our technical gurus have also seen that, but I want to make sure everyone's aware of that. I'll just observe that we seem to be having a lot of technical problems with the Adobe Connect in general.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sure. [It's one of those days again]. Right. Sorry. I was [inaudible] my other thing here. That's it. It's in the [inaudible] 17 and 18. So, Recommendation 17 and 18 is that they really go hand-in-hand and in terms of accuracy, well, here's basic complaints analysis rather. Let me get that right. So, it's complaint about WHOIS data and analyzing them and taking it further to get a little bit more details for us or for a future review team to use in future as well as with the procedure be accuracy reporting system project on the ICANN side.

In terms of support, there were support. I think the biggest one against it was the [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry. You dropped off, Calvin. The last thing I heard was the biggest against it.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sorry. The biggest two are really going to, or the two major things were the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group and the ICANN Organization. I think the main problem from ICANN Organization side of things was the

challenges we recommend that they look at third-party sources of information.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, do you think that the recommendation needs to be changed in response to any of the public comments, Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE: I haven't looked at that much. I spent more time on identifying, putting the two together. So, I'm not going to go on to [inaudible]. I would really just spend a little bit more time on that and see if there's anything there that we should change there. I think it's a rather unusual thing and it really just talks to doing a little bit more analysis of data per se, and I do believe it fits within in the ICANN [call] and framework.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so what I'll ask you to do then, Calvin, is take another look at the public comment and consider whether there should be any revisions made to the recommendations. And I say this and I'm not just for Calvin, I know it's summer and everyone has probably a lot of things competing for their attention. But I think there's been, perhaps, some confusion about this phase of our exercise is. So I want to repeat it and make sure everyone understands. Our task now is to be considering the public comment and deciding one, whether the recommendations can be consolidated, and whether it makes sense to. Just because we can consolidate them doesn't mean we necessarily should consolidate

them, if it makes sense to in terms of efficiency and clarity. So, those are two things.

And then to look at the recommendations tool, which has been e-mailed several times, which really talks about being more explicit in our recommendations and rationale about the findings are that support the rationale, why it's important, and what a measure of success would be, and in terms of the why it's important, that really goes into the cost benefit analysis.

So, there are really several steps that folks need to follow when they are considering how to deal with this next set of recommendations. One is the public comment, two is the being explicit about the benefit, three is consolidation, four is measures of success, and then you should all look at the recommendations tool, which has been e-mailed several times, which identifies other factors, which may or may not apply to your particular recommendations but is a useful tool to consider because it gives a framework about how we can make these recommendations most useful.

Finally, things need to be phrased in a way that they're actionable. No one is going to revise these recommendations once they're done in the report; they have to be ready to go, so to speak. Otherwise, they're not going to be nearly as useful.

Okay. With that said, the review said, Carlton, do we have you on the line in a way where we can hear you?

BRENDA BREWER: Carlton is trying one more time to dial in via Skype. He's [inaudible].
Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sorry, Lauren, but I think here I've gone over 17 and 18 and consolidation thereof. I also did some work on the consolidation of 12 and 24 and they're also to look at it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Want to [inaudible] that also?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes. My recommendation is not to consolidate those two and let me just go through my thinking on that. Basically, the Recommendation 12 addresses the situation where [inaudible] data and concerns where registries don't have adequate policies regarding the registrant data. Whereas recommendation 24 concerning data that is held by registrants of domain names.

So, basically 24 talks about certain regulated strings or strings that pertain to regulated areas and some protection was granted by the PICs, and it really talks about two different sets of data. So, one's registrant data in the case of Recommendation 12, and 24 talks about data that is collected by actual registrants of the domain names. So,

combining those two, I would recommend that we leave those two separate, that they are two different things.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. That makes sense to me. Were there any public comments that you felt needed to be responded to in looking at those?

CALVIN BROWNE:

Let me go to my notes on that one sec. Right. In terms of the public comments, I put the two of them through the recommendation tool, so the – oh, no. That's on 20. I haven't put 12 through the recommendation tools, so I need to do that still.

Then 24 through recommendation tool, and that is basically the answer to the first thing on the recommendation tool could just – give me a sec while I pull that up. Okay, [inaudible] issues of the recommendation kind of solve the problem statement that we talk about there was basically the GAC was trying to protect public when it comes to representations that may be made by registrants when registering in certain strings.

So, for example, if the registrant of a domain name was something like a doctor or a financial practitioner or something like that, and what we were saying is that Recommendation 24 was attempting to get determine what steps the registrants should take when they're involved in gathering ways to find a sensitive health and financial information as well as get the stakeholders involved in defining what might constitute sensitive health and financial information.

So, in terms of the tool, we've been asked how significant would the impact be if it's not addressed? I was unsure of this. I couldn't really determine that, and I was thinking that maybe we could discuss that and figure out between us what the recommendation would be if or what the impact would be if it was not addressed.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thoughts on Calvin's question?

CALVIN BROWNE: You know, my best feeling is that it's not that significant, per se. There's not going to be huge [inaudible], per se, because this really deals with something that really falls outside the scope of ICANN. It deals with the contents rather than a – something to do with the security and stability of the Internet, per se.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I guess I have to disagree there, Calvin. I don't think this deals with content. I think this deals with security measures to treat sensitive data that users would be providing to domains that are engaged in services or product to collect that. I actually don't see this as a content issue at all and I also would tend to disagree that it's not important because I think the studies show that actually, the public is quite concerned with the safety of their sensitive information and that is one of the factors that relates to a lack of trust in the new gTLDs in particular, so I guess I'm disagreeing with you, Calvin.

CALVIN BROWNE: That's fine.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I guess this also points to another example where the recommendation tool doesn't need to be followed. It has questions. In fact, it has 10, it has 10 – more than 10 because it's misnumbered. It has 11 questions. These are not comprehensive. You do not have to answer each and every one. What you need to do is use this a springboard to think about what are the most important questions here that relate to your recommendation.

So, for example, one of the things here is what are the findings that support the recommendation. That should be in the rationale and if it isn't, it should be added, and that's certainly in the report in terms of findings that the public is concerned about the safety of their sensitive information. What outcome is the review team seeking, for example, or measures of success. So, there is really no shortcut here. Everyone really needs to be able to spend the time thinking about this and having gone through this process myself, I can tell you that, yes, it's going to take some time. So, I'll ask people to really go back and think about these questions and think about how we can make a recommendation even stronger than they are.

Calvin, did you want to talk about any other of the recommendations?

CALVIN BROWNE: Let me see what else I have here. Just hang on a sec. I guess that's 24. Yeah, Recommendation 20 was I think [Christine] and that's also

[inaudible]. And, in terms of Recommendation 20, just hang on a sec, I'll get it quickly. Recommendation 20 – all right. So the next CCTRT should review the proposed Registry Operator Framework when completed and assess whether the framework is sufficiently clear and effective mechanism to mitigate abuse by providing for specified actions in response to security threats.

So, basically, we have a process that is ongoing doing the [inaudible] security checks by the registry operators and this is a recommendation to a future CCTRT to assess the outcome of that process and the objections that we had against it. It was only one objection and some support it. The objection that – sorry. There was one neutral one [inaudible] disagreement and two people supporting it.

So, it basically in my opinion should be left as is and it makes sense.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, Calvin, I'm sorry. What was the nature of the objection?

CALVIN BROWNE:

I'm sorry. There wasn't an objection there. There was just a neutral comment by the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group where they said the word abuse seems to be a systematic response to security threats and so we have no objection but this needs to be clarified.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. So, do you think there's any clarifications that should be done?

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay, to mitigate abuse by the corporate fund's specific actions in response to security threats, so they are looking for a clarification in the word abuse.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And perhaps it might be useful to make sure we're defining that in the same way that that's being used by Drew in the DNS studies. But I also think this referred to specification 11 in the contract, which may itself have additional definitions. So [Inaudible] that to take a look at. Its Specification 11 in the Registry Agreement.

CALVIN BROWNE: You mean like a [inaudible] on the [inaudible]? I will do that. So we'll look at Spec 11 in this regard and see if there's some clarification [we can do].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

CALVIN BROWNE: I think that's –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: [inaudible] at the moment and that I've gone through.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Carlton, do we have you on the line in a way that we can hear you yet? Okay, I'm still not hearing Carlton, unfortunately.

Carlton can hear us but we can't hear him. Oh, very frustrating.

Okay. I think we're going to have to resolve this problem so that Carlton is able to present. I will say Carlton, first of all, I appreciate the work you did. The one question I raised for you is to consider whether in your efforts to consolidate, we may have lost sort of this step-by-step components that the recommendations originally included and that was one concern that I had.

So, maybe consider that this time between now and the next phone call. I think many times in our recommendations we had a step-by-step and very specific items we want done. And then, when we're thinking about consolidating, there's the necessary inclination to summarize. But what I don't want to get lost, it's a clarity that we had in our original recommendation.

So, anyway, that's some food for thought.

Fabro, are we able to hear you? Fabro? Are we able to hear the line of Fabro?

Okay. So you're hearing my many deep sighs on this call. This [feed] defy technical talent is... Okay.

Let's move then to some work that I have done and I think one of our more challenging recommendations was Recommendation 14. I'm actually going to e-mail a working document, which is not complete to Jean-Baptiste just so we can at least get something up on the screen.

But bear with me for a minute.

Okay, Jean-Baptiste say this e-mail [back] to you. Let me orient people to this recommendation since we haven't discussed it for a while but it was a recommendation that was the topic of a lot of discussion although the comments were not as heated as the discussions in Johannesburg.

Recommendation 14 dealt with meeting user expectations. And the expectations focused around both as to echo Jonathan the public expectations for more semantic web. In other words, that there'd be a relationship between the name of the gTLD and the website associated with it, and a consistency between the meaning of the domain name and its use.

The other set of expectations that we found from the consumer surveys dealt with the expectation of the public about restrictions on who can purchase domain names and also the public's concern with the security of their personal and sensitive information. And this relates also to the recommendations that Calvin is working on as well.

So, in this recommendation, which is not the topic of any consolidation but just of the topic of public comments, we had recommended that New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group create incentive to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations on these three

topics: relationship of the content name, restrictions as to who can register a domain name particularly for sensitive domain names working in sensitive or regulated industries, and the safety and security of users' personal and sensitive information.

Jean-Baptiste, let me know if you have that, if you're able to open that document and put it up, it would be a heads up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Laureen, I have not received it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, it's the –

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm refreshing but nothing –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I know sometimes it takes little time. We make sure – yup, Okay. Well, definitely, it got sent. Okay. In any event, let me talk about the responses to that so we're [down] with the [inaudible] is.

We got many positive responses for support particularly from the ALAC and verified top-level domains' consortium.

We did have feedback from the Subsequent Procedures PDP, which is important because they are the group that this is aimed at asking us to define future expectations more.

And, we had some general concerns about content regulation from the noncommercial stakeholders group. But in general, we actually had a lot of support for this recommendation.

So, my proposal for changing this, it's first of all, I think we have some disagreements about what constitutes content regulation. We actually thought this through very carefully and it was a subject of much discussion about how we worded it, and we specifically phrased this in terms of incentives rather than a mandate. And we also phrased it in terms of encouraging rather than a mandate.

So, I think we were very careful in how we phrased this. I do think however we can view much better in a rationale about identifying the findings that relate to it. And when I look back, I saw that we can be much more explicit about the findings that the surveys indicate regarding user expectations for the relationship between websites and their content, and more specifically, the surveys indicated the public websites have different extensions to properly identify the purpose or owner or give an indication of content or function.

And also, the majority survey showed that they expect the connection between the name of the gTLD and the website associated with that and also a consistency between the meaning of the domain name and its actual use. In terms of measures of success, I think measures of success could include improved findings of public trust and visitation of new gTLDs and also perhaps reduce concerns regarding misuse of users' personal and sensitive information, i.e. if there were more measures in place to ensure that users' information is protected that the public might not have as many concerns about that.

And the other thing that I added to the recommendation itself, not the rationale but the recommendation itself, was that these incentives could relate to applicants who choose to make public interest commitments in their applications that relate to these expectations.

And also, a suggestion that applicants for subsequent rounds are aware of these expectations perhaps by inserting this information from the ICANN surveys and the Applicant Guidebook. And then, I have as a question mark, perhaps ensuring that applicants for subsequent rounds demonstrate their awareness of how to comply with the legal obligations regarding maintaining the security of users' personal and sensitive information.

That suggestion was in response to the comment from [Nixi], which talks about that there are regulations already in place to do this and this really is in a question of an election or a choice but this is actually in compliance with the applicable laws.

So, those are my thoughts on 14. And I see now that it's up. I think you have 16 up. Do we have the independent? I see everyone has scrolling rights I believe. So, people can zoom in on 14 to see this in – I won't say it's just black and white because it also has some color.

To write the public comments, what I did was I basically pasted as a reference for myself the public comments, and they appear on the screen in light blue. The changes that I have made appear on the screen in red.

So, as people's reaction to this attempt by me to respond some of the public comments on recommendation 14.

Questions, comments?

Okay. I'm not seeing hands and I'm not hearing comments. Well, Calvin is typing, so I'm going to wait to see what Calvin says.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sorry. I'm just looking at the red where you go and respond to the – I did to the input that we've got, is that correct? So you want to make that addition there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Those are some proposed changes.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. So, I just need to digest them and go back to the comments. So it's not that quick but yeah, it looks okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, what I think this call points to is that we have additional work to do. So, what I'm going to do is send around an e-mail that more clearly outlines a process for us to follow so that we can drive towards this revised recommendation together.

What I have found to be helpful myself is the processes on the screen where for the recommendations that I am tackling, I will have taken the original recommendation from the report and put it in the document along with the rationale.

And then, I will actually have gone back to the public comment feedback and pasted that feedback, the most pertinent ones, particularly the ones that disagree in the document so that I can keep that in mind when I am considering how to bolster the rationale and improve the recommendations. And I would recommend that as a useful process proposed.

I think it is helpful to have something available to put on screen for discussion purposes, even more helpful as Carlton and Calvin have done and I have done in the past, so then at this time, it's to circulate things in advance so people have an opportunity to digest it and review it.

Last questions, we have a few more minutes and I'm sensing there may be a little bit of lack of clarity regarding our task ahead. So, if folks do have questions, now is a good time to ask them. Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. So, I just wanted to check the [inaudible] in the e-mails and I... Did we get the final reports in a Word document at all or did we used it with the final PDF?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We did.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We did originally and also I believe Brian resent that around.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. So, I'll just dig through my e-mail and I'm sure I'll find it there. If I don't find it at all, I will then [inaudible] Brian.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Maybe we can ask Jean-Baptiste, can you send that around again? The onboard version of the final report – actually the report has undergone some revisions. So, can you send around that version that we're working on?

And, can we have as an action item, I'm going to send around an e-mail reviewing what steps we need to take. But the other action item is for all of us to be working on our revised recommendations and then circulating them, and I was going to ask people to circulate them as soon as possible so that people have a chance to look at them and digest them.

I am also going to note, for scheduling purposes, I am going to be out of pocket next week with my family, so I will be back in action on the 28th. I do have access to e-mail though, so if people have a quick question, I'm happy to respond.

Any other questions or comments?

Okay. So, I will end the call and encourage people to tackle these recommendations and if they have questions to let me know. Thanks, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]