JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright folks, welcome to the CCT review plenary call. I guess I don't have control over these slides, do you want to bring up the agenda, whoever is controlling the slides. I don't know who that is.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Do you see Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just see someone has shared their plenary call slides PDF. There it is now, it has just came up now. OK. So, I guess this question is still relevant. Is there anyone that is on the phone that isn't here in Zoom? Has anyone had an update to their statement of interest? Alright, excellent. Jordyn are you ready to talk about recommendation 5?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's the only thing people have had more than a few minutes to look at, so...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Your voice is very very dim Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let me try something. Is that any better?

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.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Much better.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Huh, weird. OK. So for recommendation 5, I think the extent of the changes that I sent out earlier in the week are the restructuring of one sentence, Laureen had flagged the sentence that talked about markers of competition and it wasn't really clear what that meant, so I revised that sentence to talk about how some parking may result in some TLDs being less vibrant competitors. I don't know if that's more helpful, but that was really the only change. Other than that, I just adopted all the changes from the previous time we'd discussed recommendation 5 because there hadn't been any other suggestions related to those previous edits.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does anybody have any questions for Jordyn, or are we ready to?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jordyn, I don't have any question but just wanted to raise that you have remote control right now, so if you want to show a bit more in detail the modifications you made, you must be able to do so.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I have no idea how to do anything. Let's see.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Along the bottom of your screen, if you bring your mouse down a toolbar appears at the bottom of your screen and one of the options is to share your screen.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Apparently I'm controlling Jean-Baptiste screen.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I literally can't see anything that would allow me to do anything on your screen Jean-Baptiste, so... [inaudible]. I just see like a big white and gray something.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what we all see.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I don't know how to... now I see something different. That's better, let's see if I can scroll down. Alright.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You can, OK, perfect.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The white and gray thing was not that useful but this seems better.

JEAN BAPTISTE-DEROULEZ: Sorry about that, it's new. Before I could just share document and it would appear on screen, but I see that now I need to click on things so that you all can see. Sorry about that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let me find this sentence, that I have changed. That's not it... let's look for the word. Hold on, let me figure it out where it is. All experience the joys of new tools.

JEAN BAPTISTE-DEROULEZ: What is the text you are looking for Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't remember. I'm just trying to find it on my side. It says something about vibrant [inaudible]. It is right before the geographic part. I guess it is not showing the red line here, that's too bad. Can I highlight? In any case, it is this last sentence of this middle paragraph showing on the screen. It starts, again we are not certain of the impact of parked domains on market rivalry. Yeah that one, that looks weird. Anyways, that's the only sentence that changed, it used to say something different. It used to say, again we are not certain of the impact of parked domains on market rivalry, but if as hypothesized above, parked domains are somehow less significant as markers of competition. This is

a substantial difference... So I just changed it to be, TLDs with a large number of parked domains are somehow less vibrant competitors.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does anyone have any questions? Yeah, that highlighting is not working. Maybe there is a different tool. So, is this ready then otherwise?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think so, I think we're at the point where text has changed very little, I haven't had any other feedback. Look now you can see the red line. That's better. As you can see, this is like a 5 word change, so...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see no hands up, so I will ask if there is anybody who rejects on the call to this going final? Absence any objection... is somebody trying to speak? No, alright, in absence of any objection we will call this parking paper done. What's next? Has everybody read Waudo's recommendation 9, 75 times?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's true.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In case you have missed it. Waudo has circulated recommendation number 9. Take it away Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I've just connected. Now Zoom has taken over all my screen, I cannot even open up the document. Just a second. There we are. OK, thank you. You can hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: OK, so basically recommendation 9 was expanded, I think we may recall that there was a call about a couple of weeks ago that Laureen requested that we include the background text that supports recommendation 9, so the current version that I circulated today, which once again I apologise for circulating late. It incorporates the background text that comes just before the recommendation 9. In that background text we have had a little bit of a discussion in our sub group meeting and I've just made a couple of edits, not much. I think the first one was a comment that came from the [inaudible] public comment of our last report, that mentioned something to the lines of the assertion that the number of registrations that were defensive was less than had been actually been feared earlier, before the new gTLD program came into operation. The [inaudible] say that they felt that that assertian did not have empirical backing, so I managed to get some citations from Jordyn and I have now incorporated those ones in the recommendation, in the support text of the recommendation as it's footnote number 19, I think on page 3 if I am not wrong. It's 3, footnote number 19... I can't quite get it. I think it's page 3 if I'm not wrong. [inaudible]

recommendation number, footnote number 19, I can't quite get the page on which it is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's on the screen Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Oh, it's on the screen, OK. I was not looking at the screen. I was looking at the original document. Let me go back to the screen. Citation number 19, footnote number 19, somewhere? I just added it there, I added it in the format that Jordyn gave me, so I am not 100% sure that's the correct report format that is recommended, in case it is not then I would request staff just to tweak it a little bit and put it in the correct format. But, those are the two kind of citations that support the assertion that what went on before the program came into effect, the fears that there would be a lot of defensive registrations was to some extent [inaudible]. The second change that I made was just a straightforward one, I think there was a reference to a possibility of that being further study on blocking, which now I understand is not going to be there. I deleted that, and I think it is a bit lower down. I can't quite see. Am I able to scroll this one on the screen?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Y   es.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Scrolling, how do I scroll. OK. Somewhere down there I've actually just crossed out like a sentence, that's referring to the possibilities of a survey or some other further study on blocking, so I have removed that. Basically that is the only change there is. The text for the recommendation itself is basically just the same, since the last plenary call we had, so I've not changed that. Is Laureen on the call? I think most of the changes now was because of her request that we have the supporting background text as part of the recommendation, so I hope when she sees this it will satisfy her.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I am on the call, but I have to say and this is for everyone, it's very hard for me when I get things at the last minute, so I accept apologies. Then I also have to respond by saying, I can't weigh in on this in the moment, I am just too overstretched now with so many other things, so I will be happy to take a look at this and send a written response, but I don't have sufficient time to give this the attention I feel it really needs. I will respond, but I am not going to respond on the call right now. Because I haven't had a chance to read it, but I appreciate the changes and I will read it and weigh in. In advance, that is going to be my response for Jordyn's changes on the other recommendations. I appreciate the work and I will read it, but I will not come to rest on it during this call and I have to say, as a matter of process, I don't think we should be making decisions on substantial changes in the moment, on the fly. I think we need sufficient time to consider it. That's my perspective on this and anything else we receive on the last minute.

WAUDO SIGANGA: OK. Thank you Laureen, once again I apologise for the late submission, that I have laid on this one, and we look forward to your email comments when they come in and then we can also incorporate them in the document. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen, presuming I shouldn't translate what you just said into an objection of the finalization over the parking paper?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, that is not an objection to the parking paper. That was a minor change and no problem with that sort of coming to rest. It's only for significant changes that we get at the last minute, not minor changes. Yes, you are correct. I would have spoken up if I had objected. Did you know I am not shy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could have been a tough morning, I don't know. Alright, so thank you Waudo, thank you for all the copies of this. I am sure we'll get a chance to read one of them and we will... people will respond back so let's put a pointer into finalize this on the next plenary call. Thank you. Then, what's next. Can we get back to the agenda? Alright, so this was the recommendation consolidation exercise that again, we won't come to final rest on the call but Jordyn if you want to walk us through what you did, just to see if people feel like it is going in the right direction as you said in your email. Take it away.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's actually I am trying to get out of this call is... I spent quite a bit of time editing this in place and trying to preserve the red line. I decided at some point that it was hopeless, but actually the structure that we tend to use with rationale and details would, as opposed to put it on the text and the recommendation itself, breaking it up into those components allow me I think to better express the intent of sort of making it clear that we're supporting multiple different causes with the same registrant survey and then using the detail to sort of clarify exactly all the information that we wanted to collect. Laureen asked for a red line this morning, and I was like, red line is not going to be helpful because the entire structure of the text has changed as a result of splitting it across the recommendation rationale and details format. But, I'm hoping that even though it is real time, people could just take a look and see if this makes it a little easier to understand that it is a single survey that has been proposed but in service of multiple different missions to understand both consumer choice and consumer trust related dynamics. If we agree that this general structure works then I think, this is definitely rough, I went to bed last night sort of frustrated that I hadn't managed to figure this out, I woke up this morning and I realised that just splitting... rewriting the text entirely was probably more useful, so it would just be great to get a sense check of whether that's helpful. Jean-Baptiste, I don't know if you can present the revised consolidation.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, just give me a second. Is this it Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes great thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You should have a scrolling right as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great. So as folks can see, now the recommendation just says we should do some registrant surveys, and then in the rationale we say, we need to keep getting information because we're in early days and we need to get both consumer choice and consumer trust. Then in the details we say we're trying to do both things, so we need to ask questions on both topics, for both of them we need to know which TLDs people visit, which they're familiar with. For consumer trust, we need information about why they choose some TLDs and why their registration policy is better, and whether their behavior changes depending on what TLD they are visiting. Then for consumer choice, we want to know a bunch of things about like, are they choosing based on geographic names or IDNs, blah blah blah. Then at the very last section, we just have a set of these are the specific types of questions we want to ask. I guess the question for members of the review team would be, is this format, at least, better support the notion of consolidating the consumer choice and consumer trust recommendations into a single one to just make it clear that we're one survey but it's supporting both causes. Then I fully expect there is more editing that needs to be done, since this was written 20 minutes before the call. Jonathan likes it, great. Anyone other feedback? In particular Laureen, I know you just had a chance to

see this this morning, is this more helpful than the other one in understanding that why we're consolidating.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think it is more helpful, I think what I want to do is go back to where this lives in the text to see how it's going to follow, you know I'm thinking about our section on visitation and consumer trust. That for me is the challenge, to see how this will fit within the part of the report, at least where it is going to be living in terms of consumer trust. But, yeah I think keeping it at this broad level does address some of the concerns that I had raised, just in terms of being able to understand it. I guess the only nitty-gritty question I would have is, whether we lose anything in terms of its ethicacy by having the recommendation so general, and plopping everything into the details. Because, if the recommendation is just to conduct more survey, that to me is the... the recommendations are the things that everyone focuses on and I'm not sure if we lose something by putting all the nitty-gritty about what the survey should contain in the details. Whether that somehow gives them less weight. That is just a preliminary perspective.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, sure. I mean, it's definitely the case now that the recommendation text is very terse. So, there's probably some middle ground between where it was before and where it is now as well. I think this is something that we should probably just think about a little bit more broadly, in that I do think that we have a pretty high variance in our recommendations as to whether the recommendation is sort of just

a very high level summary, versus whether it has any of the details. I think in general, we've been sort of veering... not veering.. we've been triangulating on a formulation where the recommendations tend to be more terse with more of the stuff in the details. This is consistent with some of the other changes we've made as well, but if we think there's important elements of the details that we want to incorporate into the recommendation itself, I don't have any objection to that. I was mostly just trying to break it out, to make it clear that there were more... that we have the multiple purposes and so on. That just seemed easier to do in the rationale and detail system than trying to have a bunch of text in the recommendation itself. Secondly Laureen, I was just going to say. I actually planned to try to do that same analysis you were talking about and look at how this relates to the supporting findings. But, I just hadn't gotten to that yet as it took me so long to get the actual consolidation done. I was also planning on taking a look as you suggested, how this relates to the findings text for both sections as well. Maybe we can both do that over the next week.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sounds good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I have my hand raised Jordyn, but I think my guess is that we aren't used to seeing the screen yet and stuff, so I will just speak up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think generally this is a good way to proceed to do this kind of consolidation. I think some areas that some bolding and things like that in here, might help to sectionalize the detail section a little bit more, and if I'm understanding what you and Laureen are saying about where this lives in the text. Then it might make sense to make even page references back to findings within the explanatory text and the details, so that it relates back to particular findings. I mean, obviously the findings themselves aren't going to have all this recommendation text. That was the other thing I was thinking, some sort of references back to the findings might be good, as opposed to just general explanation. But, I guess finally on Laureen's point about the details. I think it's a good question, but at some level we might be past being as concerned about that, we're not as public comment driven at this point, etc. This is going to be handed over to an implementation team that hopefully we can rely on to read the details and not just the top line of the recommendations. I mean, it's stuff that's that proximate, it feels like details is a very important part of this, and sort of like, making the top part longer, isn't going to make it any more likely to be read. I think as people see the top line, it will help them decide which recommendation they are interested in and then they will read the details. I don't think turning... replacing the top line with the details will solve the problem of people who have a reading quota for the day. I think that it makes sense to keep it crisp like this and make the details the details. That's my reaction to your concern Laureen, at least in the near term here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great, if folks have specific suggestions related to the text, let me know. I will continue to refine this and take a look back to the findings section and as Jonathan pointed out, maybe make some references in both directions, but it sounds like we're generally happier with this as a directionally structure wise. Then, we can anchor on this and start editing this as opposed to anchoring on the previous text. Then, that's mostly what I wanted to get today, whether this was directionally correct or not as obviously it is still rough.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it's definitely directionally correct, again just to clarify that part of my opinion.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great, thanks. Alright, so yeah. Jean-Baptiste you have your hand raised now.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you Jordyn. Just a quick question and not only regarding this but also regarding the recommendation 9 that was presented before. How much time you would like to give to the review team to review these documents and send their input.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This one is a little bit more complex than 9. I would certainly think, I'll defer to Jonathan generally, but I think that we could hope to finalize 9 over the next sort of week or so. This one we might need to give people

a little longer, especially as we still need to go and figure how to integrate this into the other recommendation text. Sorry the findings text.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the question comes, how do you want... at what point do you want to sit people off on reading it, do you want people to try and comment back on what you have done this far? Or do you want to set a time by which you'll do a more fleshed out version of this and so people are making more specific comments then?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I think getting edits and suggesting for the current text would actually be helpful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Set a deadline for those, and you can be working simultaneously on finding references and things like that. Maybe, let's say a week or something like that for getting comments back on this text and this approach and if people have something that they want to... something to raise.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that seems [inaudible].

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you Jean-Baptiste. Alright, what's next?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It will be the [inaudible] on the DNS abuse recommendations A and B.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, Drew take it away.

DREW BAGLEY: I think this will fall into the category of minor revision, so that for everyone who looked at the chapter I circulated about three weeks ago, when I circulated Monday is the same exact version of the chapter except I added the success measures that I had left out of the previous one inadvertently. So, if we could just scroll.. do I scroll... no... do I control your screen. I can't OK. Here we go. I think there's some latency with my scrolling, if you could scroll up... oh, actually, perfect. Well I guess slightly more so we can see the top of recommendation A, and then success measure at the bottom. As you will see, I just added what success would look like for each of these and, alright... maybe we will just do that. Alright, so for recommendation A... I forgot about... it's taking over the screen. For recommendation A, this was related to the recommendation that we had to incentivize contracted parties to adopt proactive anti-abuse measure, and potentially through financial incentives. For the success measure for what success would look like, if you don't mind now scrolling down a tiny bit... I have more registries even those with open registration policies, will adopt proactive acti-

abuse measures, such that theres a decrease in overall rates of technical DNS abuse in their zones. Our goal at the end of the day was to reduce technical DNS abuse and in particular we thought incentives might be a way... incentives for proactive anti-abuse measures might be a way to reduce abuse without instead suggesting that all registries adopt restrictive registration policies, which invariably would reduce abuse, but then we would have a less open DNS as a result. That is how we came up with this recommendation to begin with, and so the success measure attempts to encapsulate what our reported goal was and what we think success would look like. Does anybody have any feedback on that? Does anybody like it? Does anybody hate it? Or have recommendations on how to change it? OK. Mr Buchanan has voted and it seems good. So, then we can move onto the next one.

If anyone has any feedback after this, just shoot me an email and we can revise the text accordingly. Next is for recommendation B, a recommendation was considered directing ICANN Org in its discussions with registrars and registries to negotiate amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement and registry agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse. If you don't mind scrolling down to the success measure. So the success measure for this, I actually did modify this slightly but did not send the latest draft of the success measure. Basically, I cut off part of it per Laureen's suggestion. So the success measure will now read, contractual language is adopted which empowers ICANN to investigate and engage in enforcement actions against registries and registrars associated with systemic technical abuse period. So that is where it would end, before I got to my more, lofty definitions of what success

would look like from a policy standpoint, which would be related to this measure but not necessarily would be a success of what we're actually proposing here in the recommendation. For purposes of this, pretend that the part that begins with such that, does not exist. Then let me know what you think of that as a success measure. OK, if anyone has any feedback on that one too, just shoot me an email and then for recommendation C, I added a success measure. Recommendation C, dealt with of course, providing ongoing data collection to the community to drive data driven policy with regard to DNS abuse. The success measure, therefore is comprehensive up to date technical DNS abuse data is readily available to the community, so problems can be identified and data driven policy initiatives can be measured for efficacy. Any feedback on that one?

OK. Then recommendation E, even though we haven't finalized who it is going to be directed to. Part of that is now complicated by some of the WHOIS discussions going on. For recommendation E, I believe I did add a success measure, so at least we could talk about that success measure. Then D is work in progress where David will be working on that one, so no reason to look at D right now. Let's see if memory is serving me correct, if I have added one in this draft, if not, I have one in another draft. Yes, OK. E was a really simple recommendation, that's the one where we are recommending that the reseller be made available to the community, whether it is through WHOIS or some other forum, so that people can determine, with a domain name registration, which reseller it is associated with. Therefore, the success measure is, it is possible to readily determine the reseller associated with any gTLD registration. Any feedback on that one? Alright, then I guess if anyone

has any feedback after this, get back to me before the end of the week, otherwise we will adopt those success measure for the three finalized recommendations...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do you mean tomorrow Drew? Just to clarify.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh yeah, today is Thursday. So, by Monday, we'll say by Monday.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hey Drew, it's Jordyn. I have raised my hand, but who knows.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, I am not seeing hands.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, it doesn't matter. Anyways, I am just going to backtrack to B for a minute. Because it seems like, just like changing the contract for the sake of changing the contract, isn't really what we're after. It is actually closer to your aspirational goal, but it seems like what we want to see is an actual decrease in abuse, not just the contract gets changed. You want to see something like there are fewer... abuse is less concentrated and there's fewer contracted parties that have high concentrations of abuse, or something like that. As opposed to saying, you want to have the contract changed for the sake of having the contract changed.

DREW BAGLEY: Right, we want the contract changed with an intent to have a reduction in a specific category of abuse.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess what I am saying is what you want to measure the actual reduction in abuse, not the contractual change. It is [inaudible] if you do the contractual change, you will have done the contractual change, but you won't know whether it is doing anything useful or not.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. Since we're recommending the contractual change, then the success is this contractual change. Then how could we tighten the language, because, yeah my first idea was absolutely that. To then go after the bigger goal but then I think that Laureen brought up a good point about the recommendation being focused on the contractual change itself. What do you think is... I think you just said it a moment ago. How did you word that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think you would want to see...

DREW BAGLEY: So we say such that... we have the same success measure and then we say, such that there is a reduction... is that the way you worded it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I won't come up with the best language on the fly, so I'm happy to try to think about this offline too, something like, you want to have fewer contracted parties with a significant concentration of abuse. I think that's what you want.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, because in an ideal world, basically ICANN would have the powers to deal with the types of situations we already saw from the DNS abuse study and therefore we would not longer see those types of situations anymore, with regard to the systemic abuse, because of the ICANN being empowered by this contractual language.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You would expect one of two things happen, right. Either ICANN goes and decredits people when they're bad, or people are afraid and they don't want to get de-credited so they don't allow it to happen in the first place. In both cases, it should result in... there shouldn't be contracted parties that have a lot of abuse in their population of customers.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. If you have an idea, otherwise I am going to take another stab at that to try to tighten it from what I had, so it's tied more closely to the scope of our recommendation but the intended goal of the recommendation. OK. Thank you. Sorry I didn't see any hands, apparently I do not have the right screen up, I can only see the chat.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We're still practising with Zoom.

DREW BAGLEY: If anyone else had hands up, just please start speaking, or someone who can see the hands call them, if you can see them Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't see any other hands Drew, just for future reference, if you bring your mouse down to the bottom of the main screen, you will see an icon for participants. If you click on that.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, the problem is when you have control of someone screen, you lose that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see, interesting.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, that's where I don't... because I know under normal circumstances how to do that. I don't know when I have control. It's too much power.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, there aren't any other hands. So, folks are going to spend some time absorbing these changes I guess. I definitely agree with Jordyn that we want to make the success measures about the finding as opposed to

the finding being the contract isn't good. I look forward to seeing that text.

DREW BAGLEY: Both are true. Yeah we need to make sure it encompases both.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions for Drew? OK. Alright thank you. Jean-Baptiste, do we have anything else on the agenda? Any other business?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. AOB.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you have some AOB, Jean-Baptiste? Or does anybody else?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Just a quick question, has anyone heard from David lately?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I have not, but I can ping him.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes please, just to have an update on his recommendations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: OK. Will do. Alright, if there is nothing else, thanks for being on the call today folks, appreciate it. We are in the final stretch, last gasp, let's push through.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]