
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thanks everyone for being on the call, apologize for my [inaudible] going to take a look at the agenda. We're back to some old questions, is there anybody that is on the phone bridge but not in Adobe Connect?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, Carlos is phone only. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: OK, can actually see you in Adobe Connect. Alright, and has anyone had an update to their statement of interest? Alright. I see none, then I guess Jean-Baptiste, if you can bring up the substitution analysis paper. I can walk people through the update which is basically at the end of the paper.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You have the screen right Jonathan, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, the update to that, this paper is basically just this second to last paragraph that begins, final point is that substitution is suggested by the constant rate of growth in the second level domain market. The fact

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.

that the growth has remained constant at 5% before an [inaudible] introduction of new gTLDs, almost by definition implies sales of new gTLDs are cannibalized in the existing market for legacy TLDs, rather than creating a new complementary market. The sales of new gTLDs are sales that otherwise, would have been realized by legacy TLDs, therefore these new strings... the R shouldn't be there, these new strings represent competition not complements to those legacy strings. So, take a look at that and see if that makes sense to you, and if it doesn't, let me know. Yeah Drew its complement, not complementary, because it's parallel to competition. We could say a compliment. Are there any questions about the paragraph other than what [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]. I don't think I would say I have a question, I understand the sentiment exactly, I probably wouldn't say it is cannibalizing, it seems like a strong word. Just say that the fact the [inaudible] the same and the new gTLDs are taking a share of it, implies that they are substituting for previous consumer behavior.

JONATHAN ZUCK: OK. Yeah I guess so.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It sounds really strong and super negative.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It sounds stronger than it needs to be and negative... I don't think it is negative, like you say, I think it is actually replacing demand. The same demand exists and people are spreading it out over a broader market is basically what's happening.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So, this implies that the new [inaudibles] are... alright, I will look for a different words. Jamie Hedlund is typing, do you want to just speak Jamie? OK. He agrees, alright, I will replace that word. Any other questions? Is everybody comfortable with this then? Is anybody uncomfortable with it other than this word? Because, I will probably replace the word and circulate it around, but we probably won't bring it up on another plenary call, to discuss a single word. Speak now or forever hold your peace. Alright, I will figure out a new word for cannibalize, otherwise we'll consider this complete. OK. Thanks. Jean-Baptiste, let's move on. Over to you Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: OK, so hopefully everyone [inaudible] of two revised documents over the past, I guess on Monday, Monday US time. Do we have the... OK good, we do have the red line on here... unfortunately this is not quite as easy as what the agenda implies, of just looking at this in terms of the consolidated recommendations and recommendation 14, because those are going to get weaved into the relevant sections. The first one of these is in the consumer choice section, and I made a couple of changes... I guess I should have accepted a few of these changes... did I

change anything here... I don't think I did. The changes you can see now in section 1.2, those have all been previously reviewed. Those are just adding the analysis, of the specific detail around the sort of specific TLDs, like dot movie or dot cafe, and the behavior there different and how that might differ from dot xyz and in particular, let's go back to our big shots dot photography, how it makes perfect sense that Jonathan might have reasonably chosen between big shots dot photography, and big shots photography dot com, but if he would have registered big shots dot xyz, he probably wouldn't have been thinking about alternatively registering big shots xyz dot com, in that case xyz is sort of substituting in, and so we didn't really have a holistic way of looking at the differences between those types of TLDs, but we did look at some anecdotal [inaudible] top and bottom of those lists and the examples of how the behavior actually exists. None of that's new, hopefully people have seen that before. I will pause there in case anyone has any questions or comments about that set of changes to 1.2? OK, so moving on then to the end of section 1.3. We used to have a note here saying, we didn't find any information about blocking services, we weren't able to quantify anything about blocking services, but we expect to have some of that information in our final report, we don't have any new information so change that to say, we didn't get any information about blocking services. I raised the question and comment though of whether anyone thought we actually did have any of this information and in particular the infosurvey covered this, those questions for that might be David, and he's not here so maybe we can follow up online, unless anyone else remembers seeing anything about blocking costs in the infosurvey. I don't remember being [inaudible]. Alright. [inaudible], hey Eduardo.

EDUARDO: I just thought you asking a question [inaudible], could you repeat it please, I just come back on.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, the question is, you'll see in the comment that's displayed on the screen pink box, that says, right now... I think [inaudible] I updated this last sentence of section 1.2 to say that we weren't able to get any information on blocking services, instead of saying we're going to get some. I just wanted to make sure, does anyone think that we actually did get any information? I don't think we did, but I wanted to make sure that was correct before we finalized that statement.

EDUARDO: Information on blocking services, or on?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah on how [inaudible] trademark holders, correct. [inaudible]. Yes, exactly. Alright, I will ask David offline, I think he is the only person who might have a [inaudible] or a recollection of it, but, otherwise assuming we don't contradict the statements with any information was actually received, that's been updated as well. Then finally, recommendation number 9 here, now represents the... basically we've been working for a while to create a consolidated recommendation on repeating the registrant and consumer end user surveys. Based on our last discussion of it, we agreed to make two different recommendations, one for registrants and one for end users. This is now the consolidated survey of

registrants recommendation, and you'll see here that in the rationale, we try to explain that [inaudible] some surveys but we didn't really understand everything and things were still changing, so if we do a periodic survey we'll be able to get that data. Then in the details, I call out the fact that we need to support both consumer choice and consumer trust analysis in the survey, and you know why people choose to register in some TLDs, and not others where consumer choice, for consumer trust and whether registration restrictions have any effect on that. For consumer choice we want to understand sort of what the factors that weigh in to the consumer, to a registrant choosing a TLD R, like, the fact that [inaudible], they like the fact that they're survey specific IDN. They sort of like what factors go in, what are the regional implications, etc. Lastly, there's some original language from the old recommendation here that says the survey should be designed to repeat portions of the previous surveys and then constantly improving and the reference to [inaudible]. That's the consolidated registrant survey recommendation... I see Lauren just joined, so but I'll open it up if people have questions or comments about that attempt at consolidation for the registrant information.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. I wanted to understand what you mean by consolidated. [inaudible] recommendation 9, what are you consolidating?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, there used to be a bunch of recommendations, including, I think recommendation 13, possibly recommendation 11, we can go back and look, there are other recommendations that also said that we can... sorry just to pause for one second. Jean-Baptiste [inaudible] I am done scrolling, so if we can give individual scrolling rights, that would be fantastic. Great so, Waudo, there were several recommendations that suggested either, to repeating the registrant survey, or repeating the end user survey. I am attempting to consolidate those into two recommendations, one for the registrant survey and one for the end user survey. This is the attempt to consolidate all of the recommendations and say, we should keep doing registrant survey into one recommendation that says we should keep doing registrant survey and then just sort of calls out the various reasons and the types of purposes that it needs to fill out. One thing you can see back up in section... at the end of section 1.2. It basically, and I think we need to perhaps do this in a few other places, I tried to do it at least once in the consumer trust section as well, is basically to say, oh by the way, there's a recommendation number 9 and it suggests that we continue to do the registrant surveys and explains why, in order to anchor it back to the original text. In this case they're really close together, because we didn't actually recommend anything about the end user survey in the consumer choice section. I'm sorry in the... yeah, in the consumer choice section. But in some cases the reference will be further away, the recommendation won't be in the same section. So, we just need to call

that out explicitly I think. That's the idea, this is just like there's certain places where we recommended doing a registrant survey and we're now just... this is the idea that this is the only place we recommend doing a registrant survey and explain all the things that we need to do. Alright, any other questions or comments? Waudo, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Just to get it correct, recommendation 9, is it [inaudible] registrant survey and consumer survey, or it's only combining registrant survey?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It is only registrant survey [inaudible].

WAUDO SIGANGA: OK, just take it from there. If it's only registrant survey then [inaudible] they're talking about the [inaudible] consumer motivation, is there some conflict there? [inaudible] registrant survey or the consumer survey.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We consider both registrants and consumer end users to be consumers. So both, but we can clarify here by saying registrant motivation, instead of consumer motivation for clarity.

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We can say registrants instead of consumer, we have clarified earlier in our survey that we consider registrants to be consumers as well. They are one of two classes of consumers.

WAUDO SIGANGA: OK.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, this is only consolidating... basically every time in the original recommendation we said we should do the registrant survey again, this is going to be the only place where we say we should do the registrant survey again. There is a separate recommendation now, recommendation 13, that is the consolidation of all the places we said, we should do the consumer end user survey again. Alright, Lauren?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Since I joined the call late, apologies. Did you already present your consolidation of the consumer trust issues in a single survey?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Nope.

LAUREEN KAPIN: OK that remains, OK that's fine. Just my general point is that we need to figure out how this is going to be knit together in the actual report so

that when things are referenced it's still clear that this recommendation relates to certain text that is interspersed throughout the report. That's really just my placeholder and I know you're already aware of that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's a good point Laureen and like I've done that but only so far in the [inaudible] where it is actually the least useful, where it's already next to the recommendation, so, we just need to go back and do it in the remaining sections.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's probably part of the things we'll be doing when we have our drafting session.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. I sort of was going to make a stab at that for the... I forgot... the consumer benefit section that [inaudible] has put together, because we're taking out recommendation 11, I think, as a result of this and so we could, that's the shortest section. A lot of the recommendations, the consolidation affects, like recommendation 33, 35, that's part of a really big section so I didn't want to do [inaudible] three lines of that so, we can make a path through [inaudible] to make sure that the general tone works for everyone. Alright, any other questions or comments that this registrant survey consolidation? I see Jean-Baptiste, I don't know if he has a question or comment about the consolidation. Any further actions needed? Only the one that Laureen mentioned, that we need to find any other places where we would have referenced or discussed the idea

of doing a follow on registrant survey and make sure there's a reference from the text back to this particular recommendation. Alright, why don't we move onto the consumer trust update that I sent out. I'll just note that this is not actually an attempt to update anything about consumer trust findings or anything like that, this was just my... this seems like the right place to consolidate the consumer end user survey, and so that's what I attempted to do on recommendation 13 here. So you'll see as I just mentioned to Laureen, here in the consumer trust and domain system over [inaudible] there is this, I think Carlos we're picking up your dog, or something like that, so maybe if you can mute, that would be helpful. [inaudible]. Alright so you'll see here there is a reference to the recommendation 13 and trying to ground, here's what we found and by the way, we think we need to do a survey in order to get better data, because it was done early. Then you'll see down here, in recommendation 13, let's not talk about 13, 14 yet, but in recommendation 13, this is my attempt to consolidate the consumer end user survey and it follows roughly the same format as recommendation 9 now, it says we need to do the end user survey periodically, it sort of explains why we need to keep doing it. It indicates that we need to do both, there's reasons for both consumer trust and consumer choice, and what we're trying to get out of it. In the details, it sort of outlines some specific things that we need to make sure that it does [inaudible]. This roughly follows the... I think actually, this is pretty similar to consolidation I previously presented, Carlos we're picking up quite a bit of background noise from you. Please mute. OK great, so recommendation 13 is very similar to the previous consolidation that I have done, I have taken out the references to the registrant survey and tried to tighten up the language, the justification to be focused on the

consumer end user survey, but otherwise it is pretty similar. So, I don't know if people have questions or comments here but this is the consolidation related to the consumer end user survey. OK, Lauren do you have any feedback on this or just a general statement that we need to tie it back?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I have a general statement with the promise to take a second closer look and give you specific comments as necessary in writing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure, alright, OK. Any other questions or comments? Alright, so then we can move onto recommendation 14, and for recommendation 14 we discussed this quite a while ago, I look back at the documents, it looks like we discussed this in January, but we had... I think there had been a discussion around the feedback from the NCUC, saying why are you sort of taking a particular type of model and trying to make that happen. I think that... and also there was some concerns raised, I think that we were trying to regulate content, which is definitely not what we're trying to do here, and so, I made two edits to this recommendation 14. The first edit was to replace the word content with types of registration, so people can put up whatever content they want within the restricted TLD presumably, but the idea is like, if it's in... whatever, if it's in dot phd, I'll choose that one, or a Google TLD that we haven't launched yet, that everyone might have to be a PHD in order to register in the TLD, but you could obviously, if you're a... you could just put up your blog, or if you wanted to... if you're a global warming PHD, you could post stuff

about global warming. If you're a transportation finances PHD, you could post stuff about that. You just happen to be a PHD and wanted to views about politics, you could do that. There would always be some restrictions like only PHD's could register. Trying to differentiate between registrations and the content. Then, in the rationale related findings, I think what we're trying to clarify is that, for good reasons, which is basically like it is never economically makes sense to restrict your TLD, because you increase your costs for the registry and registrars, while decreasing the number of potential registrants. This model hasn't really emerged, despite the fact it's what [inaudible] expect to happen. So, we sort of explain that in the rationale, and then in the details say, you know, we're not trying to say exactly how this should happen, but... [inaudible]... but some sort of incentive might help to overcome the sort of natural tendency to just do open TLDs. That's what I added here in order to try and capture that, so Jonathan go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Jordyn. I guess I recall this conversation evolving into the notion of instead of specifically incentivizing a particular behavior, trying to remove the disincentives and it was things like, you know, lowering or removing the minimum sales number and things like that, that created a barrier to entry for what might otherwise be considered niche TLDs, because they wouldn't get the same scale as the completely generic ones, and I guess I have in my head that's how we had the conversation evolved. That's how we ended up with this recommendation, this is specifically incentivizing, creating a particular type of TLD.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think we did certainly elaborate on... I think it would make sense to also get rid of disincentive, but I guess if we believe the statement in the rationale section here, that like [inaudible] naturally everyone is going to create open TLDs, because like, that's how the game is rigged. Like unless you do something, I don't think it's only the case that niche TLDs have like a financial disincentive, like an active financial disincentive, it's just that like there's never going to be a good reason to create a restricted TLD. Like unless that's addressed somehow, like obviously... unless you deal with the incentive and the rationale [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] even though it's a small number of registrars.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, I think there are a couple of examples, the examples are that we see are essentially industry groups. There's a couple of industry groups that have decided as a not profit making exercise to create association for themselves, essentially [inaudible] with themselves. Certainly from a... as far as I can tell, none of them are doing it as a profit making exercise, like no one is expecting to make money off a registry per se. Or similarly [inaudible] it's a function performed by a national association of realtors, it's not a... they're using that to enhance their existing trademark essentially. [inaudible] good enough, but I would expect that that would be continued to be very rare.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I mean, I guess so. I mean it's a... that gives your profit motive is that linear I guess, I mean if I've got a lower barrier of entry into it, it doesn't make it cost prohibitive to do a... a restricted TLD, then I guess I'm thinking of... kiwi for example, is something that comes up, right. That you have the same disincentive to create something that just doesn't have huge demand even in an open environment and so addressing this barrier to entry might go a long way to open the possibilities of more restricted ones... I guess... you should at least mention that as they will continue to push back on it as the way that it's...

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I do think we should also address, like you say, the certain structural disincentives as well, but like I think, kiwi is a pretty good example, even if you got rid of the minimum, that made it sort of an economically viable thing, they probably wouldn't throw on additional restriction that you have to be from New Zealand in order to register it. It would increase the types of namespaces that could emerge, but it would not increase the propensity towards having them actually reflect the restrictions that users expect. I don't know... [inaudible] I don't think we have to obey the NCUC, right, if you expect something and the market is not delivering it, I think it is totally reasonable for us to say, ICANN should do something in order to make it more likely that the gTLD programs delivers the things that users expect. [inaudible]. Yeah, I think if we were saying that this is the only model that should exist, there would be a stronger argument, but like to just say... you know, ICANN should at least even the playing field, so like, sometimes it happens. Or happens ideally... if you start with roughly the same number of restricted TLDs, that brands and open TLDs then you can aha, everything

is working as expected, as people are choosing to do different things [inaudible]. As it is, we [inaudible] only two models.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, and even the ones that begin as one model become the [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: OK.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Certainly we can go back and have a language thing, also we should get rid of things that are actively discouraging it right now. Back to your earlier point, like, it would not... I can't imagine that thing or that realtor, like \$25,000 a year was a thing that made their mind up one way or another, to pursue their model. Like it makes total sense that for, like a portfolio player or for a profit TLD, that's a considerable consideration, but it's precisely because you can't, like a profit motive would always dictate that you don't do restricted TLDs, that getting rid of just the financial disincentive isn't going to fix that problem.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I mean obviously the logic of inclusion of it goes, unless your incentive provides the same amount of profit that an open wound, you're going to have the same problem. That's the logic of [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's correct. Well at least at like to have to get you to believe that you could, you know, you could reasonably, you know... there's a path to get there. So like, if for example, like I think we've talked about examples in the past, that there is some like consolidated accreditation service or something like that. Like if it was easy to actually do verification of thing, like that would get rid of one of the big barriers to doing this right now. I'm not saying... I don't know how you would do that, but that's like... magic land. If there was a think that existed that would allow you [inaudible]. I mean apparently ICANN is going to figure out how to accredit IT lawyers and law enforcement agencies and stuff like that, if they could figure out how to do that, then maybe we can accredit all sorts of other things.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Not ICANN the community.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That is the ICANN I was speaking of Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: OK, just making sure it wasn't Org that was [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Apparently people at ICANN believe that it is possible, people within the ICANN community believe it is possible to accredit these things, if they can figure out how to do that, they can hopefully figure out how to accredit all sorts of other things. Alright, any other feedback on this recommendation 14? OK. Alright, so that is it from me then.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jean-Baptiste to add, I guess an action item to add language to the bottom of that about removing [inaudible]. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry Jonathan, I didn't hear the last sentence.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, add language about removing disincentives in addition to creating incentives. Thank Jean-Baptiste, that's close enough so Jordyn will know, remember the conversation. Right, what's next? Is it Drew?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that's recommendation C from Drew.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Take it away Drew.

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you, can everybody hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

DREW BAGLEY: OK great, thanks [inaudible]. This is a recommendation that I think we already discussed, the consolidation 4, so the update here is that I have provided a little more language that helps, basically incorporate the intent of the two recommendations that will now be going away due to the consolidation and basically we had before we been had the DNS abuse chapter, we had two recommendations in our draft report that went out last year, called on for a repeat of the DNS abuse study, and [inaudible] data collection. Then we of course, got the results of this study, drafted the DNS abuse chapter, put that out for comment and so forth, and then had the, you know, came to conclusions based off of the results of the study itself, where we called for ongoing data collection in the DNS abuse chapter. So what we're doing with recommendation C is consolidating our previous recommendations, of recommendation 19 and recommendation 34 into one recommendation that encompasses what we want generally with all these areas we've looked at, in terms of data driven policy making, and data to be available for the community to... on an ongoing basis measure efficacy of different proposals, as well as of course, creating a data set that would be there for the next CCT

review team, as we've discussed in the past. Kind of all of those ideas are now rolled up into one, so recommendation C will read exactly as it has in the past, when you've looked at it before, except that there's language added now for the rationale and language added to the success measures, so for the rationale, what I've added is comprehensive DNS abuse data collection and analysis is necessary for studying the efficacy of safeguards put in place to protect against malicious abuse, issues associated with the expansion of the DNS, furthermore progress and trends to be identified by repeating studies over time. Then the... so the success measures I added, I redid the existing success measure just so it read more clearly and added a little bit of language and now the success measure reads, comprehensive up to date technical DNS abuse data is readily available to the community to promptly identify problems, draft data driven policy solutions and measure the efficacy of implemented safeguards into ongoing initiatives. Furthermore, the next CCT review team will have a rich data set on DNS abuse from which to measure safeguard efficacy. Those are the only changes to this and so, please feel free to chime in on either of those or the recommendation itself, which like I said, we've already discussed so that has not changed at all, since we all approved that as a group. Jordyn comment, thank you. Does anybody oppose this consolidation of recommendation? You are a consolidation enthusiast Jordyn, you absolutely are. Thank you for your consolidation support. OK, well then I guess barring any objections, and feel free to send an email if there are any last minute objections, then I think we can consider this consolidation approved and the new language to be approved as well. Back to you Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, I couldn't get un muted. Jean-Baptiste, what do we have... AOB, does anybody have any AOB?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, you have your hand up Jean-Baptiste, go ahead, sorry.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, just wanted to follow up on what was presented today in the [inaudible] and Jordyn whether you want to forward the updated version of the substitution analysis paper and the two... and the two papers that Jordyn presented. Once they are updated, send them to the review team for review, and maybe approval on the new language. Do you want to proceed this way? Or, do you have any other views on that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I will forward it around for objections but I can't imagine trying to grab approval for it, I am going to assume that happened on this call. I'll just try and substitute one word.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sounds good. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah same, I think we've substantively... like it seems we're sort of tweaking at this point, so once, and the revisions happened, I think we just circulate for any final objections or edits and otherwise assume it's approved on this call.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: OK, thank you very much for the clarification.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, anything else? Alright folks, thanks a lot, closing in.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]