JONATHAN ZUCK:	Folks, welcome to call 61 of the CCT. Is there anyone who is on the phone but not visible in the Adobe Connect? And does anyone have an update to their Statement of Interest?
	Okay, then let's just roll right to David Taylor to give us last notes on the INTA paper and see if we can get to a consensus approval of it.
DAVID TAYLOR:	Thanks much, Jonathan. Can you hear me okay?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	It's echoing.
DAVID TAYLOR:	Can you hear me okay now?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah, perfect.
DAVID TAYLOR:	Okay, good. I think I put myself on stereo there without realizing it.
	Okay, yeah, sure. RPM paper. I just sent that around. I got comments back from Laureen – and thanks, Laureen, very helpful. Then Antonietta helped me out with the footnotes and the endnotes and double

---

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.

checked the data, so those calculations she got from the conclusions, etc., are all good. Those are the big main points. I'm pleased with that.

I've added in a few paragraphs I can talk to now and also went through the Trademark Clearinghouse review paper so I could amend that last paragraph on the Trademark Clearinghouse bit of the report, which I've been able to do last week.

You have it in front of you. I have scrolling rights. Hopefully I can see this because I'm split a little bit between my iPad and my other one.

The first change you've got there, if I talk you through these, is that introductory paragraph is in response to Laureen who thought it wasn't very clear and the sentence was too long. So I set the a little bit more and split it up. So that green there is a response to Laureen.

Then the red is [in effect an] introductory paragraph I put in there as [inaudible] just trying to make it a little bit clearer. So there's no actual change in anything which is being said there. It's really just trying to make the thing read better.

We have a little "Background to the RPMs" included in there as a title.

If we go to the next page, then we're just going through the various RPM mechanisms, which is the standard text as we have in the draft paper.

As we go through, we get to page 5. Nothing changing there. Page 6, the "INTA Impact Study." There's nothing changing there. That's all the same except we have the footnotes in, so that makes more sense having them there than as endnotes.

Then where I'm at, still need to do this. I don't know whether staff can help. I was kind of hoping somebody would. This Table 13, I don't know who put it in originally when we did this, but we pulled that off some of the ICANN site. So I can have a look at that if we're not sure where that came from. But it was just that Table 13, I think we need to update it with whatever we've got. It might have been actually created. I'm not sure. It wasn't me that created that one, so I don't know if it was Eleeza who did it. But maybe we can talk offline and just update that one. That needs to be just changed.

Again going through, if we keep running through, Table 14 needs to be updated as well. I put in that "New Table 15," which hasn't changed. I have a rogue footnote at the bottom there of page 11, which I'm not sure where that has come from – the 23 and where that should be pointing to. That was something I just spotted as I was sending it, but I'll pick those up when I do a final proofread.

Then we get to the Clearinghouse. That's the text which has gone out crossed out and the red is the new text. It's almost the same as what we had before. It goes into a little bit more detail and basically comes to the conclusion there that it can go either way and it's lack of data and we should do a cost-benefit analysis, which the thing if they would have had that, I think they probably would have been able to conclude better. So again, I don't think there's anything at all problematic in what's there.

I go take us then to the "Recommendations." "Conclusion" is the same as last week. The "Recommendations" slightly evolve. Recommendation 40 is about the Nielsen surveying the INTA impact study. The only real

change there – apart from slightly different wording – was Laureen rightly said we do want to suggest it's more user friendly. I was taking that as a given, but it's worth pointing that out and including that so I've done that.

Recommendation 41, there were still some references in there we were looking forward to the final report because I hadn't touched these as you recall. I was hoping to get some feedback or discussion on these recommendations, so I hadn't really touched them. But I've taken out the references there awaiting the final report, etc.

What I don't know and I've left it blank there in the 41 and the 42 is I've just said that the PDP review of all RPMs, we're expecting that report in 2018. I keep changing the date because if I do listen to a call, the timetable is slipping. If someone has what we've got on that, be more specific or maybe we should just leave it as 2018. But happy to take comments and thoughts on that.

If we then go to Recommendation 42, which I've changed slightly just trying to pick up more from the Trademark Clearinghouse section, now we've got the final report and that pointing out saying that we should have a "cost-benefit analysis and review of the Trademark Clearinghouse and its scope so we can get this quantifiable information on the costs and benefits associated with these Trademark Clearinghouse services and thus allow an effective policy review." Because I think that's what we don't have is the cost-benefit analysis. Then the "Rationale" just changed there slightly, and that's it.

So comments, thoughts, anything like that, open.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, David. That's a good summary of changes. Does anybody have any questions or comments? We have a tight-knit community on this call. Jordyn, please go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I don't see anything problematic here. I'm slightly concerned on principle that we're – I have two conflicting principles. I don't know. It would be great to get feedback from others on the call. On the one hand, we're really overdue and it would be great to get this finalized. On the other hand, we just saw this text in the last hour basically. It makes me a little nervous to ratify text for what essentially will be immediately delivered to the public with such little opportunity to review.

But it looks like these changes are pretty minor, so I guess I'm leaning toward the we're overdue and we should get this published so we have another opportunity for public comments and review to finalize it. I'm just airing my concern that this is a very short review cycle, obviously.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. I agree. I think normally it would be a cause for concern, but they do seem to be relatively minor changes to the paper that we've seen before. But I welcome other people's thoughts on this. Waudo, are you not on the phone? All right, Waudo's comment doesn't seem to be specific.

Is there anyone else who is concerned about letting this go out for a public comment? Obviously that's an interim step, and we have the

opportunity to make modifications after any public comment. So the question becomes whether or not there's anything that seems particularly controversial or embarrassing that might generate adverse public comments that we're not thinking of.

Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: David, it sounds like you still have a couple of things that remain to be done, and I'm wondering about the timing on that just as a threshold matter. I share the sentiment that ideally we would have had more time to digest this, but I'm in accord with Jordyn and Jonathan that I think because the nature of the changes are not that substantive and the fact that we'll have another take at this for the final report I'm more inclined to have this go forward. But I would like to get a sense of whether it can go forward because it sounds like there are still some things that need to happen and I don't know how long those are going to take to happen.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks, Laureen. Yeah, I fully agree with that. I think if we do want to give any time for anybody to just read through the Trademark Clearinghouse paragraphs, we can read through that now. It's only four paragraphs, so it's less than a five-minute read. That's the only new text which is in there, and as I say essentially it maps and goes into a little bit more embellishment than what we had before and refers to the new final report as opposed to the earlier one. So I can't see anything in there which would be contradictory or scare anybody, but we could certainly read through that.

The thing which really I'd like maybe feedback in is if we could go through the recommendations so that everyone is focused on those and make sure. Because I've had very little feedback on them per se. We've kept it quite neutral because I haven't gone onto this thing of recommending anything like Rights Protection Mechanisms should be stronger than this and going off on a tangent.

Potentially when you look at it and you see that there are more disputes, there's more that, etc., we could go through the recommendations saying that something else is needed to protect, but I'm not really seeing that from the data and feeling that there's a need on what we're doing. So the recommendations themselves of the INTA Impact Study and the [URS] and the Trademark Clearinghouse is very much in respect of we've got the PDP review going on on these and not wishing to jump the gun on what they're doing so I feel our hands are somewhat tied.

So that's the position I've come up with these three recommendations. Apart from your feedback, I haven't had any feedback on those three. So that would just be something. And maybe everyone is absolutely happy with them, so that's absolutely fine. But if anybody wasn't, then I'd certainly welcome any comments further.

But otherwise on timing, I think once you've read that Trademark Clearinghouse, which we either do it now or jump off the call and people read it and just anybody says anything in the next hour, the only thing we have to do is Eleeza has just said she can get the relevant tables there updated from the ICANN metrics site and I'd literally just give it a one last read through taking out all the redlines so I can see if

spot any typos and pick up that one footnote. I would expect this to be in a finalized state now or tomorrow morning, depending on what time zones we're looking at.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, well, that sounds doable. I would just say in terms of the study being more user-friendly, as I recall the discussions on this were that it was too long, it was too complicated. So maybe you can make that recommendation a little more specific based on your knowledge of the challenges that people experienced.

What I would suggest is perhaps something more akin to "the study needs to be constructed in a way so that people will actually complete it." I just think the sentence now is a little too vague, but you're more familiar with the challenges that people experienced with completing the survey. So I would just say if you can make that sentence provide a little more guidance, that would strengthen the recommendation. My understanding was too long, too complicated, no one is going to finish this because it was too hard to do.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, I'll see if I can make it more specific. I think the general feeling from everybody who has been involved with the INTA Impact Study, and you encapsulated it perfectly, is that it needs to be more user-friendly. And there are different aspects. Certainly, some people found it too long, but once you start delving in, I'm not sure whether you want that in a recommendation of [inaudible] nobody wants. We'd end up with quite a list of things and it just didn't seem to be right for the

recommendations, so I just liked your straight thinking of making it more user-friendly.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's fine. Fair enough.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other [folks for] thoughts on this draft? It looks like Waudo a few minutes to read the Trademark Clearinghouse part, so take a few seconds to read. Oh, Waudo, this is the last page.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think actually it starts at Page 12, the Trademark Clearinghouse. The Recommendations are at the end, but the Trademark Clearinghouse section which is in red I think starts on Page 12 and runs through 13, if I'm not mistaken.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

DAVID TAYLOR: While Waudo is reviewing that or finalizing the reading, I just have a question for staff. When I read this through, and I was going to do that tonight to go through it [inaudible] a final clean version certainly once we have the tables in, checking the footnotes and matching them up, is that something you're doing anyway and you will do or is it something I should do? I just didn't want to do it if you were going to already do it or

EN

be on it, if you see what I mean. But I'm happy to do it if you're not. I just don't know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen, you can go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks. I'm going to actually agree with Carlton that I think the gist of this is well reasoned. But candidly, I'm having a difficult time reading it and that I think, David, is because many of these sentences are four lines or more. There's so much information packed into each sentence that I lose my way. I would just encourage you to go through – and there are some typos and missing commas and things. But I would say is that this would really benefit from you going through this and almost mechanically if it's longer than two lines, figuring out a way to break it apart. Because I'm having difficulty finding my way through these sentences because I keep getting caught up in intermediate clauses and then I'm at the end and I forgot where I began. Maybe that's just my aging brain, but I'm thinking it would be more reader-friendly if the sentences were a lot shorter. But in terms of the content as I understand it, I don't have any objection to it.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay, no problem, Laureen. I'll try and do that. I'm sure if you're having a little bit of difficulty with it as a natural English speaker, then others will be having the same difficulty. So I'll try and do that with those bits and shorten them, etc. I'll make it more user-friendly.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: So from a process standpoint, David, when do you think might be able to do that? Because then maybe we can give everybody 24 hours to read it and object to it if it somehow has changed substantially so that we're not trying to schedule another call to go through your changes.

DAVID TAYLOR: Ideally, I'll do it first thing tomorrow morning. Because we're going to be off this call at 5:00 and I have two more calls. So I'll struggle a little bit to do it tonight after 9:00. But if [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Understood.

DAVID TAYLOR: But otherwise, I'll do it first thing tomorrow morning so everyone will have it in the U.S. when you wake up, and then you'd have a final version.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that's terrific, David. So let's say that by first thing Friday morning Eastern Time people will need to have posted any objections they have to the new language.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry, Jonathan. What time did you say Eastern Time on Friday?

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: First thing in the morning. Let's say by 9:00 a.m. Friday Eastern Standard Time people will have to have raised their objections. Otherwise, we'll consider the paper approved.

DAVID TAYLOR: Which, of course, is on the basis I've sent it around to everybody by 9:00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time on Thursday.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Yes, I think that's right, Alice. I think it's 13:00 UTC.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And just for clarity, it doesn't seem like there are objections to the recommendations themselves. If that's the case, perhaps we should note that. So the focus is really going to be on the new language rather than the recommendations themselves. I don't want to preclude anyone, but I just want to note that it does seem like we have consensus on the recommendations themselves unless I'm misunderstanding.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks, Laureen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right, Laureen.

DAVID TAYLOR: Do we have a date for the report to the PDP Working Group on RPMs or a current date scheduled for that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: David, let me have a look at that and get back to you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay, thanks. I'll refer to that in it when you've got it. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So are…?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What's the question, Laureen? Sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I was just going to ask if we're moving on then.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thank you, David. Thanks for your efforts on this. Drew, let's get the same kind of overview on changes to the DNS Abuse paper.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, unfortunately, I just learned this morning that Drew isn't going to be able to join us. That is too bad because Drew is best positioned to take us through and also provide the background and reasoning about this. Drew is on a flight. Can we get his revised paper up though, Jean-Baptiste?

At the same time, I am aware of comments first of Jordyn for his minority views and then also comments from Carlos and Waudo also expressing some support for Jordyn's views. Also Jamie has – and here I'm just summarizing things that are already on the list – Jamie had questioned whether in light of the fact that we're getting more questions about Recommendation 4 whether we really do have the level of consensus necessary to put it in the report. That is why I am disappointed that Drew isn't able to join us because he would be best positioned to respond to this.

Let's just see though if this highlights changes. Okay, I think these are old changes. I think where we still are here is Recommendation 4 which now includes the "Minority statement" and then Recommendation 5 which we still didn't come to a final view on. I just want to see this: Recommendation 1, Recommendation 2. All right, that didn't change. It does look like we have new language in Recommendation 1, although the recommendation hasn't changed. So let's start with that and move from there.

This I believe was based on, David, your example of the .EU registry and the example of proactive abuse mining. Now I know this was circulated I believe rather late last night. So I think what might be beneficial just as in the last paper would be for us to take a few minutes to read this new material on the .EU example which is on Page 11.

Jean-Baptiste, if you can give everyone independent scrolling rights, I think that would help them navigate through this. "Done." Thank you. So if folks can look at the new language in red related to Recommendation 1 and just take a few minutes to look at that, then we can have comments. David, it sounds like you would like to speak to this, which is fitting since you helped generate this idea. Go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, thanks, Laureen. I was just going to say that I can certainly comment on the language. That's the language I sent to Drew on this for inclusion, just to say it has the .EU example but also the .XYZ which Jordyn kindly pointed out. So we have two examples in there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's terrific. Thank you. Just to orient people, this is Recommendation 1 which is asking the Board to "consider directing ICANN…to negotiate amendments to…Registry Agreements…to provide incentives…to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures." So these are examples of entities that are engaging in just such efforts.

JONATHAN ZUCK: David, you have your hand up.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry, I haven't put it down. I will now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, Jordyn, did you want to speak up on the footnote issue?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. I just put my comment in the chat, but I think just given the fact that the .EU thing is basically just – they haven't even done the test yet. It's a proposal to do a test. It just seems in my mind it's sort of overweighting it to give it this much text in the proper body of the recommendation, whereas I thought last week we had agreed to just put this as a footnote as a reference to the types of things that might be good to look, which seems more appropriate to me. But other than that, the text itself is fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. David, did you want to respond to that?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, certainly. It's probably my wording there when I said "will soon test a delayed delegation system." I believe they're starting next week with a six-month test, so it is all set up. The only difference is that they're running it, so they'll be running it live and doing this with all domain name registrations for the .EU but they won't actually do the delay. They're going to put them into the [pen]. So it will be a six-month test,

and then they take the results. And provided those show that it has been worthwhile, then they're going to implement it. So it's not far off in that sense. It's a full planned integration and set up, but maybe that should actually put in a date if need be. Because I think I could get the date confirmed if we want that, but it's certainly happening.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, my point is not that it may or may not happen. It's just that it still hasn't even – right now they're at the phase where they're about to do a test. They don't know whether it's going to work or not. They don't really know whether it's useful. So this seems more like an observation of "in the future, pay attention to this" as opposed to something that we're really endorsing, which seems right to me. It's interesting work that's happening, but there's not really any data to draw from it yet.

I don't have any problem with the text. I just feel like I thought what we had discussed last week was putting this in a footnote because that seems the right treatment given the state of the work. And similarly for XYZ, we don't really have any results from their work although maybe they would give us data if we asked. We don't have time for that at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other folks have thoughts on that? Is there a way to make reference to continuing to observe innovative practices by registries and promoting them as they're successful or something like that, that then leads to these footnotes? Is there a way to draw attention to them? Because otherwise what are you footnoting? I guess that's the issue that we

need to figure out. Make some recommendation to track the experiments that are happening or something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't think you need to do that. I think you could just take the existing recommendation that says we want to incentivize anti-abuse mechanisms. Then put a footnote saying, "For examples of anti-abuse mechanisms, look at this and this."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that makes sense to me. Do other people have comments on that and the placement of the text in terms of the prioritization or promotion I guess?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, go ahead. I didn't see you up there in the Presenter's section, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I know it's a hidden [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Your elevated standing.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, yeah. I tend to agree with Jordyn that I like the text although I think the gist of this is that these are examples. So I think they are appropriate for a footnote as we discussed. Perhaps the footnote can even be in the "Rationale/related findings" after the sentence in the middle that says, "Registries that do not impose registration eligibility restrictions can reduce technical DNS abuse through proactive means…" and it ends with "filed." The footnote could be there, although I see David's hand is up so I definitely want to hear his response. But it could be a footnote there.

Then I think the language is fine as is. I don't know that we would "thoroughly recommend that it is considered as a people innovative model." My inclination would be that we recommend that we continue to look at this example and encourage further inquiries as to what impact it has had on DNS abuse. But this could certainly be an example to help encourage a more secure online environment.

And then the same thing with XYZ where you've actually done that, where you give the example but then you say we should look at the "efficacy of this approach." I think that would be my recommendation for both of them, that these are examples and we should look at whether they're effective or not, but certainly these could be the sorts of proactive policies that should be encouraged to mitigate DNS abuse. That's my sense of it. David, I see your hand is up.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, thanks, Laureen. I was just trying to figure out where to put it. I'm fine to move that to a footnote. Perhaps just have it in as I think had suggested there but it might have changed, I'm not sure, at the end of Recommendation 1 where we're saying "to include provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives, to registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive and anti-abuse measures." And then some wording such as "such anti-abuse measures may be innovative and should be encouraged. For example…" reference 1, [inaudible], reference 2, XYZ, and then have them in the footnotes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's fine too in terms of placement. I'm very comfortable with that as well.

DAVID TAYLOR: I also agree to remove the word "thoroughly" from the text in the footnote because I don't think there's any need for "thoroughly" in there. I was getting a bit excited by it as I was reading it and I was thinking, "Oh, this is really good. I like this."

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think it's great too. I just think it's a little premature to endorse it wholeheartedly when we don't know what kind of impact it's going to have.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I'm inclined to agree. Go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I guess we should finish off the discussion on this, but what I was going to offer is I know David has a lot on his plate. I'd be happy to revise this part to put it in a footnote and phrase it in terms of examples that future Review Teams should be looking at the effectiveness.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Laureen. Thank you. I appreciated Jordyn's minority view on the Recommendation 4 from the DNS report and the emphasis on data. I think we need to make sure that we bear that in mind, that we do our best because we're trying to set a good example for the future and not just get to where we're winging it at the end here and to be data driven both in our problem statements and our potential solutions. So I think I certainly agree with Jordyn in terms of moving this to other examples of things that are under consideration or testing right now and that we should aggressively study these results for possible widespread adoption, something like that as part of the footnote.

Other questions? Laureen, do you want to start a little conversation about that issue? About Recommendation 4 and Jamie's comment and Jordyn's minority report? So we make a final decision about whether we're putting this out for public comment or not with Recommendation 4.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Just give me one second because if I don't make a note to myself about what I just kindly offered to do, I won't do it consistent with what

we discussed. So just let me take a pause and then, yes, I think we should move to Recommendation 4. So I'm just going to pause for one second.

Okay. I have written guidance to myself.

Okay, so then we should move on to Recommendation 4, which has been the topic of further discussion. And I know you had also had comments in the chat, Carlton, that went to this and I'm not sure everyone saw it because now the chat has scrolled past it.

So I think that our task at hand is to figure out whether there's sufficient support for Recommendation 4, and in that regard, I am glad that David is still with us because I know that he played a fundamental role in coming up with this recommendation.

So I want to open it up for discussion. Again, I'll try and channel the comments that were received, although Waudo is here on the line himself, and of course, Jordyn is here on the line so I'm not going to purport to characterize what they said because they can do that better than I. But I will say that Jamie expressed a reservation about whether we truly have sufficient levels of support here to include it in the report as a consensus view and that others have spoken to support Jordyn's minority view here.

So I would like to open it up for folks to discuss their views and then we should get a sense of how this should be presented.

So I'll open it up to questions and comments. And I think everyone has independent scrolling, so you can look at the statement from Jordyn

again. And Jordyn, go ahead, because it probably would be good for both you and David to lead off on this.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Well, I guess I don't have anything particularly new to say about my position on the recommendations [inaudible] the last couple of weeks. The proposed minority statements hopefully make that clear [inaudible] as well.

But given that there's been some support for my position expressed online and Jamie questioning whether we really have a consensus view on this, I wonder, I was going to propose perhaps a different path forward on this, which was given that I think many of the people on previous calls who had supported this roughly, said, "Well, it's just a recommendation for future discussion in the community anyways. We're not necessarily endorsing the adoption of the idea per se."

I was going to say that maybe what we do as opposed to making this a recommendation is just in the body, somewhere in the report itself, we say something like, "A member of the CCT Review Team proposed this fee resolution procedure," and then, "Although the Review Team was unable to achieve consensus on this view, it may be an interesting topic for the community to discuss in the future," or something like that, which I think is the intent of the recommendations in any case.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thanks, Jordyn. David, do you have comments? And also, I'd be interested in your response to Jordyn's suggestion here about a possible path.
DAVID TAYLOR:	Thanks, Laureen. I was going to say that I liked it the way it is and the way we've done it, but probably that's normal for me to think now, the way we got the recommendation in there and we're saying it should be considered by the community. We're not doing any further than that and we're actually recommending that it should be put in place.

So I think the recommendation as it stands matches certainly what I thought we have discussed and what people on the previous calls when we've discussed it and said, "Do we agree?" we're putting it in and putting it in this form that would work as a recommendation saying this needs to be put into place or needs to be drafted or anything like that. So it's an important factor in needs, and we're making a much stronger recommendation [then] I'd fully agree that would go out.

So I was trying to get it with the wording as something that it's really throwing it out to the community and saying, "Hey, look at this. What do you think?" That is something which will be debated within the community and should be debated in the community. And I think there will be people going on either side, and that's the debate and what I'm wishing to encourage. And we can look at what's happened previously with the PDDRP, etc. So I think it's a valid debate to have and we could be providing something here that might well turn into something which is very useful.

And I think, Jordyn, having read through the [minority] review, it's a strong [minority] review and it's very clear there that you're strongly disagreeing with it, so I think that mirrors or matches it in a way where, obviously, I can see what you feel about that.

And I think that makes sense because in a way, it takes the view of many will strongly disagree with it. So to me, it seemed to get quite a good balance going there of getting it on the paper and we're pushing in that, the whole thing there if you see it with the details specifically where we're talking about the examples of the .science at 51% and .stream at 47% and .study at 33%.

To me, it reads well and I actually quite like that minority statement in there because we're highlighting where there's a difference of opinion and where it's rightly been coming from [inaudible] different angles.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, David. Certainly, between the recommendation for further discussion, which I do think there is emphasizing, this is not a "We should do this." This is a mechanism that should be discussed in light of the data from the DNS abuse study, which does show certain registries have high levels of abuse compared to others. This is a "we should discuss/the community should discuss" recommendation. And then we have Jordyn's very articulate statement of concerns.

So that said, then folks have expressed views on the list. If those people want to speak up now, this now would be the time. And Jordyn, it sounds like you have a response to that. But before you give that response, can I let Carlos jump the queue because we've heard from

you and David preliminarily and I do want to also give Carlos the chance to express his viewpoints, particularly because he also expressed it on the list.

Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you very much, Laureen.

Yes, I have read the discussion last night and the problem I have is as interesting as the abuse report is, we have to go back to our mandate and to the purpose of our review, and really, abuse is a derivative of what we are analyzing. But the recommendations really are out of place in this document and the recommendations are out of place in terms of targeting the registries.

We are talking about the second or the third derivative here, which is very relevant, which we should [slack]. I found great enjoyment in the discussion of abuse and so on, that we have to speak to the review. The review is about consumer trust. We have taken some assumptions where consumer trust can be measured and it's good to flag it.

But from there, to jump to recommendations directly targeted at the registries goes well beyond the mandate and we have heard also from Jamie many very qualified comments that are very valuable, which is fair. That's a good comment. That's a good recommendation, but it's not up to ICANN or ICANN with the registries to solve this issue. I think this recommendation falls into this gray area that it's interesting, it's worthwhile, but it is not the right place. Thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Carlos. Other comments or questions about this? Go ahead, Jordyn. And Carlos, your hand is still up. I'm going to assume that's an old hand.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: I have three hands, two new ones and one old. I'll take it down.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I wish I had three hands. Jordyn, did you want to comment? Your hand was up before and I let Carlos jump the queue.

I think you're still on mute, Jordyn. Okay, while we're waiting for Jordyn, Calvin, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, I think I'm a little bit curious [inaudible]. So what does the minority statement actually mean? Does it mean that some people don't agree with it, that one person doesn't agree with it or what is actually the meaning of [inaudible] a minority statement here?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So as I understand it, and I invite staff and anyone else knowledgeable about this – perhaps, Jonathan – as I understand it, a minority statement can be from a view of one person if there's someone, if there is a lack of consensus and even one person disagrees, that they can, if

they choose, present a minority statement. So I think that's what that signifies, which is that there is someone who disagrees with this.

Now your question may go to clarity, that this doesn't indicate whether it's one person or more than one person. I don't know how that is handled in this situation, if that's your question.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. Look, I'm not sure I agree 100% with Jordyn's statement. In a large part of it, I do. But in terms of [inaudible] but I'm also not really confident in supporting or making a recommendation for it at all either. So yeah. Okay, [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: First of all, if anyone else has comments, please jump in or raise a hand and I will absolutely recognize you. But in-between the comments on the list and then the comments here, I'm seeing an erosion of support here.

Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. I was just going to simply speak to the notion of a minority report. I think it can be, as you said, one to N number of people but I think that instead, at this point, we need to, as you were heading, look at the definition of consensus to see if we have it. That's got to be our next exercise, to see whether or not we still have the consensus that we believe that we had before to include this.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	And Jonathan, I want to look to you for some guidance here. We have now had several phone calls where there have been some shifts in position on this recommendation.
	And now we have, again, a situation where we have some, but not all, Review Team members on the phone and I'm wondering if we should be taking a formal poll on this via e-mail of the full Review Team to have people actually formally vote so we know where they stand or we should be basing it on the latest information we have, which is people's responses to the draft that was circulated last night where we have some concerns raised or we're thinking about who we have on the call. I'm just a little hesitant to take an incomplete poll in order to assess whether we have consensus.
	But maybe we should start also by getting a better definition of consensus. And I think that was Jamie's point in the first place. Consensus does not need to be sole agreement and I think we have wrangled back and forth about how to try and achieve consensus here. And we're left with this recommendation and this minority view.
	But go ahead, Jonathan.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes, so I think that ordinarily, I would suggest that we go to a formal vote of our members, but if I'm understanding correctly, we've now heard from 4 of 11, or really even 11 members.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which feels like a fairly substantial erosion. So even if every other person still felt strongly about including it, I think we would have difficulty talking about that as an overwhelming consensus.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's my observation as well, Jonathan, which makes me wonder if the path forward here, instead of having this recommendation and minority statement, is to follow-up on Jordyn's suggestion, which would be to include this idea in the text as something that would warrant further discussion.

That certainly could be a path forward, and then we could avoid the position where we have this recommendation and this very strong descent. So I realize that [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go ahead. I was [inaudible] to everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, that's right and I appreciate, Eleeza, thank you very much for looking up our Terms of Reference because the question then is just

EN

how to deal with this situation so we're not bound to have consensus for recommendations as is typically defined. So in many ways, Eleeza's text helps address Jamie's concern.

And I guess the other caveat here is that we're only at the place right now where we're putting it out for public comment and my guess is we'll get some on that recommendation and that, in some ways, we could punt this decision until we've heard that feedback from the community. But I think it's a tough percentage to call a consensus, so the question then becomes how best to incorporate this into the document in such a way that it could still engender discussion in the upcoming public comment period because discussion is most often useful.

So I guess that's my only caveat and I guess I'd be interested to hear from Jordyn if he feels like there's a tremendous risk associated with its inclusion in this interim submission in its current form simply because it might be easier to get discussion if it's pulled out in this way. But that's the other consideration, is that it could very well be that what's absent consensus, we may as a team decide to do exactly what Jordyn has described, which is make some mention of it in the text, as we did, actually, in the pricing section. There's one of those soft recommendations built into the text, but not carried forth into the recommendation section because there's not enough data to support it. So there's some precedent for doing what Jordyn has described.

And so the question just becomes, what is the downside of letting the community muse on this during the public comment period? And I

guess Jordyn is one of the people I was interested in hearing from on that question. Jordyn, did you just dial back in?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I did.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So did you hear any of that or not?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I heard some of it, but it was very choppy for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, no problem. I guess I was asking the question about whether or not we need to have as definitive or [dispositive] discussion about this prior to this interim public comment and that is there a downside to letting the public speak up a little bit on this before we make a final decision about the inclusion of this recommendation and do you see a risk associated with letting that discussion out in the interim?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think the discussion is fine. Like I said, I was trying to propose a way forward that allowed it to be clear that this idea existed and that the community might want to talk about it. But I think there's a difference between that and having the Review Team recommend it.

I was going to say earlier, I actually think it's a little bit of a copout to sort of say, "It's a recommendation, but it's just a recommendation for discussion." I feel like, A) people are going to view any idea that's included in the report as endorsed by the Review Team regardless of whether or not we say it's just for discussion, and B) as Carlton points out, there's a real problem with community overload and sort of mandating that the community talks about something, I think is problematic as well.

But I think it would be totally fine, in my view, to include some commentary in these chapters saying, "This was an idea. We talked about it, we didn't get the consensus. It might be interesting for the community to talk about," and put that in the call to public comments, even make reference to that section and see if the public has feedback on it at this point. That seems fine to me, but once again, I hesitate to call it a recommendation by the Review Team for the reasons demonstrated on this call, at least.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. That's a good point that I think kind of addresses the point that I was trying to make, which was making it a part o f the public discussion in the near term. If we incorporated some of this text into the discussion section of the DNS abuse report but called attention to it in the reviewer's guide on which I'm working a little bit. That might still bring about the discussion we might want to have in the near term about whether this should harden as a recommendation or not.

David, I don't know what you think about that idea, drawing attention to it, but not quite elevating it to the level of recommendation of the group given that we have a little bit of an eroding consensus.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah. It's a hard one. I think there's a lot of work gone into it as a recommendation and the idea and to and fro-ing like that for quite a while on it. But I can certainly see there is certainly an erosion.

Again, I don't know how you do something like that. Do you put in a recommendation where you say that we don't have consensus? Because I think that's certainly a fair point based on this call. We don't have consensus on it even though we've got it marked in there as consensus. I think we'd have to say no.

But as we're allowed to put recommendations in that we don't have consensus on, to me, that makes it a less strong recommendation and it actually underlines the consensus that you do have on all of the other recommendations, which to my mind, strengthens the other recommendations.

So I personally think it's a good thing that we come out with one recommendation where we actually don't have consensus on and that is enabled to be discussed, and as I say, highlights the other recommendations where we do have consensus on.

So my feeling would certainly be to keep it in as a recommendation but with a strong minority, and then instead of being written by Jordyn and saying "I" in the singular, we point to a number of or the general

EN

minority, however we reword that and have it like that because I quite like the way it's set out like that, that it's strong.

The minority opinion is stronger worded than the recommendation and I think that encapsulates the reality of the situation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, David. Other thoughts?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I have a question because that's a very interesting idea that David points out, which is can we just present this recommendation, but indicate that we don't have consensus and basically include these two viewpoints?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We definitely can. I think that's clear from the way we're structuring recommendations with that consensus in the Bylaws requirement is to reveal whether or not there was consensus has implied in the notion that there can be recommendations without consensus. And I think it Eleeza's text from our Terms of Reference to just [set] as well.

And we can kind of draw attention to that fact, and if there's a storm of criticism about it or something like that, then we can revisit whether to even include it in that form. But I guess I'm inclined personally, not as a Chair, taking that hat off for a second, I'm inclined personally toward David's perspective of including it as a non-consensus recommendation because of timing and things like that. It becomes a soft

recommendation that is still easy to discuss and that I think the effort associated with trying to integrate it back into the paper in the near term would not give us a comparatively stronger document to put out for public comment even if that ends up being our ultimate solution. So that's me speaking personally.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And then it looks like David would also like to chime in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is that new, David? Sorry.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, it is. Sorry, it is new but I'm not going to agree that I agree with you agreeing with me or anything like that and you've actually just covered it but I was going to respond to Laureen's query about whether we can have it or not and it was just referring to Eleeza's words there which I thought was very appropriate because that, to me, it does sort of underline what we have. To the extent the CCTRT has been able to achieve consensus, which is exactly where we are with respect to any such recommendations, its report and recommendations will reflect the variety and nature of the CCTRT views. So I think we've got that and we go the variety, we got the nature, and just going back to my other point and taking away, as I said, I believe it actually strengthens our other recommendations where we then show and we have drilled down on these things and to have one where we don't have consensus, to me,

underlines the consensus we have on the others and makes it a stronger report.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Then what I would suggest based on the discussions, it seems like we lack consensus, so that would certainly need to be noted. It seems like we have the latitude to present this as a non-consensus recommendation including a minority statement. It also sounds like some people would join this minority statement, which I think indicates we should change the language to replace the "I"s with "we" and maybe Jordyn, perhaps, since I'm not sure everyone strongly disagrees, we could say that certain members disagree with the proposal and present it in terms of that "we" language. I think that might be a path forward here.

But I do think that Jonathan's greater point, which is that if we put this in the text, it is somewhat varied for the purpose of public comments. It's an excellent one and if we really do want to get public comments on this, I think it does need to be in the form of a recommendation. Jonathan has persuaded me on that point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other thoughts from other folks? I'm trying to read things in the discussions, and Carlton rightly points out that I'm trying to play Solomon here as best I can.

But it feels like we have a path forward in the near term, so part of this just may be, related back to Jordyn's first comment is that we're feeling

some pressure to get some things published for comment and the question the becomes the best way to do that in a timely way. And so I don't want to trigger anything irrational, but it feels as though we've got the coverage of our Terms of Reference and the implications from the Bylaws updates on the Review Teams that, to include a non-consensus recommendation and a minority report and then just draw attention to it for discussion and then maybe based on how that discussion goes, will feel more or less emboldened on how we might carry forward to a final report.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So the question I would pose then is, Jordyn, would you be comfortable with changes to this minority statement to put it in terms of the "we" and create those language changes so that it's not just "you" since it seems like certain folks join your views. Perhaps not everyone joins them wholly, but people join certain aspects of them and I just think we would need to change the language to reflect that.

And it looks like you're going to take care of that. And Carlton remains entirely in support of Jordyn's statements on the record.

Okay, then in terms of action items on this paper, I am going to reformat the text in Recommendation 1 so that it is a footnote and it talks in terms of using these as examples that should be followed, particularly to see whether these examples to have proactive measures to mitigate DNS abuse are effective. So I am going to take that on as an action item and circulate it back to Jean-Baptiste.

Jordyn, as an action item, is going to tweak some of the language in his minority statement to indicate that it is not just an "I" there, he is joined by others and he is taking that on as an action item.

And we are going to note that this recommendation does not have consensus support and I think that will tee it up for public comments, which is the goal, and then we will figure out in our final version, where we stand on that.

And I'm just going to repeat that because I want to make sure that Jean-Baptiste has this in our action items. I am going to reformat the text in Recommendation 1, the new text, so that that is now a footnote and I'll tweak the language so that it's consistent with our discussion about referring to these two examples, the .eu registry and the XYZ registry as examples of registries taking affirmative, proactive measures to combat abuse and those should be studied by future Review Teams to assess their effectiveness.

And then second, Jordyn is on Recommendation 4, is going to tweak the language in his minority statement to indicate that other members are supporting this minority statement, so that would be changing the "I" to "we" and perhaps tempering some of the language so it's not a single strong disagreement but it reflects some concerns by a number of members. Okay. And that said –

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Laureen?

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yes, go ahead, Jean-Baptiste.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Sorry, Laureen. Do you have a deadline for both action items?
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yes. ASAP. I'm going to do that when we get off the phone and I'm hoping – Jordyn, can you turn that around very quickly as well?
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yeah, I should be able to do that the next [inaudible].
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Okay.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	I mentioned in chat, but I'm also going to try to… I think Carlos raised a point today that's not in the current text which relates to the charter of the Review Team that I'm going to incorporate as well, make sure I'm capturing all the various points of disagreement.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Okay, so fair enough. Although I guess for the record I'll disagree with that somewhat because I think the issue of DNS abuses is very closely related to the issue of consumer trust and safeguards of course for part of our charter form the start. So reasonable minds may differ but I do think this is in scope.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Laureen, speaking of the tie between abuse and trust, before we end the discussion of DNS abuse, I'd like to make sure we address the non-recommendation [language] brought up last week and then brought up again on the way this morning.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Are you talking about the general issue of how we phrase recommendations?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, it's not the recommendations at all. In the DNS abuse chapter last week, Drew had added just expository language that talks about… like we really need to get rid of all this DNS abuse in order to improve consumer trust, which I don't actually agree that we have any basis to believe that that's true. And I disagree with the inclusion of that language in the chapter as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, [inaudible] you raised the point, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There wasn't any discussion of that. Carlos agreed with me, and then it was still included.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I see. And you did raise that point in an e-mail. Can you just for clarity purposes – because even your e-mail talks about this, you talked about that language – can you point out precisely in the text what you're referring to. And then Carlos, I will get back to you because I do see your hand is up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Let me try. I'm on – it's really hard on mobile.

LAUREEN KAPIN: For the purposes of discussion, I would like to see if we can deal with –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I should be able to find it. Give me just a second.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Should we let Carlos speak then while you're finding it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, go ahead Carlos.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. I really think abuse is very important. I mean, I think it's very relevant. And it's very important to deal with what I see that is very far-fetched is to go back and assume that dispute mechanism at the registry level is going to be effective. I said I think it has been very interesting. It has gone very deep and so on. But when I see the arguments and the recommendation, it's about the conclusion where we are supposed to fix it.

And I don't believe that we are looking at an effective point of intervention. It's not effective. It's beyond the task of the review because this is an ICANN internal review. And this is about ICANN. We're not here to fix the market. I mean, we're not here to fix the world. The Affirmation of Commitment has a very specific task and we are within the Affirmation of Commitment. It's very nice that we have the time and the knowledge of such good people to go that far. But that doesn't support the case for using a [inaudible] instrument that has been designed for other type of conflicts to think that that will solve the effects of the expansion in terms of abuse, which we agree are minimal.

So it's not about agreeing or not agreeing. What I'm saying here is it's not the right place. It's just not the right place. It's not the right point of intervention. I added to that, I can agree both ways. We should keep it in the text in case that the recommendation doesn't fly. After the discussion with the community, I would agree to make a big footnote about that because that's a very interesting issue even if it doesn't fit into the recommendation. So I never try to take importance to the issue. It's just a framing. Thank you.

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Carlos. And I appreciate you clarifying that. And also I'll note Carlton's statement in the chat and based on what I'm hearing Carlos say, maybe Carlos you can weigh in. Carlton is saying that he's used your point is that the data that correlates abuse and trust is not strong. Plus a remedy would not be so effective as a registry level, which I think is certainly also part of Jordyn's main point.

So maybe all of that together will help you Jordyn. Make sure you include the concepts that Carlos has raised in this minority view.

Jean-Baptiste, do you have your hand up?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, thank you Laureen. I just wanted to reflect the comment from [inaudible] chat, make sure she saw it. If we use as well as for the [actual] paper, the same deadline which would be Friday for community to see for raising objections on the DNS's paper.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And you know, actually I think we're… at least this is my view although Jonathan you could weigh in. I think these are the objections to the DNS abuse section. And we're handling the objections by these action items, which is that we're going to reflect there's a lack of consensus and recommendations for we're going to move some text in the footnotes regarding Recommendation 1. Jordyn is going to tweak the language on recommendation 4 to reflect the minority statement. And then I believe we still need to hear from Jordyn about certain text.

Jonathan, I'm going to actually ask you, do you think these are too many changes to not release this one more time with the same Friday deadline? Or do you think we can after making these changes move on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that you set it up well, that we've already achieved a lack of consensus. And have decided to move forward in that context. It's not like we need to get on the call and reconfirm our lack of consensus. So I think that the only real issue is probably changes Jordyn's making to the minority statement to accommodate the broader group and people get 24 hours or something to react to that. But otherwise, I think as you say, we're dealing with the situation now. And I don't think we need to have another phone call to go over it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's fine. Then what I would say is once we get this, we're going to get this out or changes to Jean-Baptiste, and that will be re-circulated with the focus on Jordyn's minority report to make sure that those signing on to it are comfortable with how it's phrased. And that deadline will be the same as the deadline for the INTA paper which is Friday 13:00. So I think that will answer Alice's question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	And then I'll turn it back to Jordyn because you had a lingering issue with certain texts that had not been added on.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yeah, thanks Laureen. So the text is at the bottom of page – starts at the bottom of page 10, starting with the last 12 pages [inaudible] bullet point. And so there's the Recommendations 1 through 5 [inaudible]…

So the [inaudible] particular trouble with is the consequently these recommendations target the phenomenon of high levels of DNS abuse. So first of all, I don't think the notion of high levels of DNS abuse is really substantiated or what by high levels of DNS abuse. And then it says, "Which needs to be eradicated from the DNS to ensure consumer trust." I think we have no evidence whatsoever that there is a correlation between these types of DNS abuse and consumer trust. So certainly that eliminating these would ensure consumer trust.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Is [that] the sentence?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Well, my preference would just be to – I don't think this last paragraph in bullets really have a ton of value. I would probably erase it entirely. But I definitely think we should get rid of that particular sentence. I don't know if other people have opinions about that [sentence].

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN: Other views about that – I'm going to take your strongest objection and narrow the conversation to that, this sentence for consequently. Are there other views about that sentence?

Well, what I would propose then is to – and I think this sentence can be viewed as perhaps too strong. It's just to take out that sentence but leave the rest.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's fine. I would just say there's also a call out to the new DADRP recommendation. I think we should just make it clear that we have these recommendations and then should call out if there's [no] consensus on that last recommendation in this paragraph.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And would that be resolved by, for example, having a parenthetical non-consensus or no consensus? Okay.

So for the action items there, just to memorialize this, we would take out the sentence on page 10 starting with "consequently" and ending with "consumer trust."

And then in the bullet at the top of page 10, we would make sure that the reference to Recommendation 4 has a parenthetical after it that says "non-consensus" or "no consensus."

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, Laureen. I did not hear you because of the typing going on in the background.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. The second part of that is the top of page 10. The bullets starting with "consider." There's a reference at the end of the first sentence to Recommendation 4, which you notice the parenthetical immediately after recommendation 4. I would just say "lacks consensus." Did you get that, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm sorry. [Inaudible] I understand the bullet points starting with "consider" and you [went] to "lack consensus."

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. That's on page 10. I'm sorry, that's on page 9, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry. I'm looking at two different sets of page numbers. Okay. That's on page 10, correct. And then on page 11 on top of the page, the reference to Recommendation 4 in the first bullet should be followed by a parenthetical that says "lacks consensus." So the bullet point starts with "consider." The first sentence ends with Recommendation 4 and we should add a parenthetical, "lacks consensus."

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. And actually, when I do the footnote language, I will make those two changes then you can check that I've done that properly. But I will take care of that in the version that I sent to you that has the footnote change. That way, we'll make sure that these don't fall through the cracks. I'll just make sure to take care of it in that version. Does that sound good?

Just to close out the DNS abuse paper, are there any other issues or concerns? Because when we pass this around, the only things that we're going to be asking people to weigh in on are the changes, which are fairly small in number. So this is sort of the last call. And then the last look is going to be very, very limited. I'm not seeing any hands.

So that is our course of action and then that will close out the DNS abuse paper. What I'm assuming is that then the paper will be ready to go and it will reflect this non-consensus recommendation and minority view, and that's how we'll be handling it.

Then Jonathan, let me turn the baton back over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Laureen. I will accept the hot potato – I mean the microphone- and ask if anyone has Any Other Business for today's call. Just to clarify, this interim call for public comments is what we're talking about right

now and then we will evaluate the public comments when they come in and incorporate changes as called for after evaluating those public comments.

Any Other Business for this call? I'm just waiting to see what people are typing. Great. Okay. Thanks, everyone, for your participation in the call today and for helping to navigate a tricky situation. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, everyone. Glad we have a path forward.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]