Consumer Metrics Project Discussion
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 06 March 2012 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 06 March 2012 at 2000 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Http://audio.icann.org/gnso-cci-20120306.mp3
On page :
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG / WG Chair
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Steve delBianco - CBUC
Tobias Mahler - Individual
Olivier Crepin Leblond - ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - NCA
Holly Raiche -
Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:
John Berard - CBUC

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the CCI call on the 6 of March 2012. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Carlos Aguirre, Jonathan Robinson, Tobias Mahler, Steve DelBianco, and Rosemary Sinclair.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have an apology from John Berard. I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Nathalie. If we just have a look at the proposed agenda, we've got the role called, review of open action items, review of our draft for Costa Rica and other business. Is there anything anyone wants to add or change on that agenda? No? Good. In that case we might go to the action items. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Rosemary. This is Berry. Basically the action here was to scrub the applicant guidebook and look for any requirements of registries post the conditions of the registration on their site or any other materials.

I've scrubbed it several times and the only thing that I can find where this comes into play is basically what Steve has mentioned in the past and that's with respect to community-based applications, especially in which where the RDDS is invoked.

Outside of that I hadn't seen any specific language within the guidebook itself, the application, nor the registry agreement that states that the conditions of registration be posted on, you know, X.

So if there aren't any other questions I'm hoping we can close this out and to be honest I'm kind of surprised it doesn't list anything in there. But hence why we have the metric identified.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, thanks for that Berry. Steve's wanting to say something, okay.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Rosemary. Berry, thanks for that research so far. Rosemary, I wanted to ask the whole group that we want Berry to get the answer to that but whatever the answer is we would still have advice that that metric be

included. Because it's really what we need to do to achieve the choice regardless of whether it's in the agreements, right.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes. That's the way I see it that the metric should be included as a measurement even if it is actually saying in the agreement.

Steve DelBianco: Great.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible) and changes of meeting the metric. Okay.

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry. If I may continue for a brief moment, there is an action that I didn't have listed here and this is the submission of the draft advice letter for translation, that has been submitted.

I'm hopeful this week that we'll at least get our Spanish translation in preparation for Costa Rica. I don't have a time schedule as to yet for the other translations and the only thing to take note here is upon the last language that is translated that will dictate the closing of our public comment period.

So once I have that schedule out I will send out to the list and just take note that it may impact our proposed schedule that we have listed down here, especially with respect to reviewing the public comments. It's not to say that we can't go ahead and get started with comments that have already been submitted. But we will be bound to the official close of the comment period.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, thanks for that, Berry. So we'll just see our schedule updated when we've got that last translation done. Good. Okay, so I guess we're into reviewing the second draft. And I was thinking because of the email that Steve sent around describing the Washington experience I was wondering,

Steve, do you want to take us through this - the way you did in Washington? And if you're okay with that do we want people to just jump in at each slide?

Or does it work better if we go through the presentation and then discuss it? Would you mind letting us know what you think?

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, it's Steve. Be glad to do it and I do think that folks ought to be able to weigh in with questions as we go.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. In that case, it's Rosemary here. Could I start with the first slide? I think it makes - sorry, the introductory slide, Berry, the cover slide. I actually think it makes more sense to see Steve's name there as the presenter.

I'm happy to have my name there as Chair of this working group but when I saw it I thought, well, really it's Steve who's going to be presenting on the day. So that's my suggestion. What does the group think about that? I've got to (unintelligible). So Berry if you wouldn't mind making that change for me - for us.

Steve DelBianco: And depending on the volume of changes, I did the last round of changes and I'm happy to hold the pen depending on the workload here. But Berry, let's you and I - Berry, break down and we'll compare notes after the call about those edits.

Berry Cobb: Okay, very good. I'm driving the 2.3 right now so I'll hopefully be able to capture most of them.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks a lot.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Great, well, I'll gong you on, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: I didn't put this in the email folks but the team that I did the dry run for - you may get a kick out of this, it was six people from the US patent and trade market office. I mean these are folks who, you know, have a very unique sort of tunnel vision view of the things that ICANN does. But they are a decade of experience with ICANN.

So it was fascinating. And they really embraced the broader concept of consumer protection, trust, choice, and so on. They were not in any way exclusively focused on, you know, trademark protections I'm glad to say. These are folks that you've seen many times at ICANN meetings.

Okay, so we delve right in and if it's okay if we're going to go through the new version. I guess, Berry, you're going to control the slides and I'll let you know about how we did.

But it took 20 minutes as I said earlier to get through the first eight slides because there were so many question on - tell me again where this comes from and that's why this provides updates since Dakar. A lot of it is for background and is it sensible that we put the first bullet on the slide that's in front of you, this background on this working group.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes, that's very great. I think that's a good idea.

Steve DelBianco: So the first bullet on Slide 2 would be background on this work, something like that, okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, great. Any other suggestions? We'll move on. Okay, great. As you guys all know the next two slides are the affirmation and it's amazing how important it is to remind people about a document that we're simply building on.

We're standing on the shoulders of a document and everybody in the room looks at me and nods when I talk about the affirmation at least in Washington. They love it as a way to transition ICANN independence but still give it a constitution that it has to live by. Is that vocabulary you guys are good with?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, now it's a very important document, Rosemary here, and I think standing on its shoulders is a really good idea and reminding everybody about it all the time is a very good idea.

Steve DelBianco: Beautiful. Okay, so in red we emphasized, of course, which is where it all came from. And all this does is keep finding roots for our project, roots for our working group that have come before.

So anybody who wanted to stand up in the audience and say, I can't believe you picked consumer trust - I just want them to get it early on that they should take those complaints elsewhere because we are working off of a constitution that's already locked in.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: All right, Slide 4, thanks Berry. Here - I don't know, later on I emphasize it but this says when gTLDs have been in operation for a year. There's two parts of this that aren't in red that some people might pick up on.

The affirmation is explicit about the beginning of a clock and as you know the resolution we're working off was not explicit as when the clock begins for that three-year target. That creates some flexibly for us I want to address later on.

They also asked me what about the text after the red, that the review presumably January 2014 would also look at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process and safeguards. And I say, yes. They asked me about that and I said, absolutely part of the review. There will be a big review.

The Board resolution, which will be on the next slide, the Board resolution directing us to work on definitions and metrics just focused on the text in red. And that seemed to satisfy them.

Okay, any other comments on Slides 3 and 4, team? Rosemary, you just watch for the hands. I'm afraid I...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, I'm watching for the hands. I've got a nice big screen today, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, all right. So then we jump to the Board resolution and of course the Board resolution right there, establishing the definition, measures, and targets. And I took the liberty of parsing that paragraph up into three chunks. Advice from whom is the first chunk, advice about what is the second and third.

Rosemary Sinclair: Now we've got two hands now, Jonathan and Cheryl. I'm not sure if they're just practicing because I'm watching - okay, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I just wanted to check if you were awake (unintelligible) merely keeping an eye on the right. But I - thanks for bringing me. Steve, this is great. I mean this presentation's clear and good.

I wondered if anyone had any comments as to given the questions you've had whether the Board - how deliberate the Board's limited focus for this group was relative to the affirmation of commitment? So was there an oversight and - are you aware of other review work going on? Or other - is there another resolution done in other parts of the review? Or is it just...

Steve DelBianco: No, this was unique, Jonathan, and Cheryl, Rosemary, and I on the Wednesday before - this was in Cartagena, Cheryl, Rosemary, and I and many others were in a little workshop on the consumer stakeholder group, the idea of a consumer stakeholder group at ICANN.

And (Bruce Tonkin) attended. We had a lively debate about whether the affirmation's focus on consumer trust and so on should create a new stakeholder group or should it be some other way of baking it into ICANN's DNA.

And I think that (Bruce) took away from that discussion - and I got to be honest with you, I didn't speak to (Bruce) again at that meeting, it was a surprise to me on Friday at the Board meeting when (Bruce) introduced as a resolution with these language in it.

He called it the (Zuck) resolution, I don't think (Jonathan)'s on the call today because (Jonathan) had been for years trying to ask ICANN to set some metrics and measures for things so that management would know what it was it was supposed to managing to and we could hold them accountable to things like a real company.

And (Bruce) took that to heart. So I was - I think this is unique. In my mind it's the first and only time the Board has invited the community to help suggest targets and metrics and measures. And...

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) addresses a portion of what the affirmation requires so that's a - anyway, that would be it I guess, that's what the resolution did and you've laid it out very clearly as to why we're relatively narrow relative to the affirmation of commitments in our focus.

But I wouldn't be - I would expect that question may come up. But, you know, I mean I guess that's not our job as it were. The job is to focus in on this - on responding to the Board resolution and that's what it is so thanks, that's helpful background and a good answer.

Rosemary Sinclair: Holly?

Holly Raiche: Thanks, Rosemary. This is Holly Raiche for the transcript. I'm looking at the list of advisees. Have we heard from the GAC at all? Because I was thinking somewhere in the - that the (unintelligible) is mentioned welcoming the GAC advisors but I can't find it. So have we (unintelligible) with them at all and are they part of this group?

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, why don't you start and I'll finish the answer with my latest interactions with (Heather).

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, good. I have briefed the GAC, Holly, about three ICANN meetings ago informally on this work. And then we asked them informally - and I don't think the letter even went from GNSO Council.

But this group has always been opened to anyone to participate in our discussions. But we did not hear back from GAC. But more recently Steve's had a discussion with (Heather) so I'll pass it back on to Steve at this point.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Rosemary. In Dakar, Holly, I broke - I made a public intervention about this at a meeting with the GAC and I asked, I said, are you guys keeping track of the work we're doing, and we're always hoping to have you become engaged.

And (Suzanne Riddell) and (Heather) looked at me like they didn't know what I was talking about. I repeated that Rosemary had kept - had invited them to join some of our earlier calls.

And then I asked the question, I said, did the Board send a specific request to the GAC asking for advice, you know, pursuant to the Cartagena resolution on the prior slide. And (Suzanne) and (Heather) looked at me and said, well, not to their knowledge. So as far as they know the Board never sent anything.

I later checked with (Bruce Tonkin) and he confirmed that. So the Board passes a resolution on the Friday of the meeting when everyone's already gone and they just, I guess, expected everyone would read the resolution. Because they never actually sent a request for advice, a formal request for advice to anyone.

Holly Raiche: Why?

Steve DelBianco: That's unbelievable. So - I know, isn't that - so the good news is the GAC is very interested, both (Suzanne) and (Heather) followed up with us. And last week when we published our draft advice we - after this group discussed it I specifically sent copies to (Suzanne) and (Heather).

They're really excited about it. (Heather) wrote back and I think I shared with all of you on the list (Heather)'s email asking for a staff briefing. And I don't know whether, Berry, that would be you as the staff briefing the GAC or whether those of us from the workgroup would be allowed in to do the briefing. What do you think, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Steve, this is Berry. To be quite honest I don't have an answer for that question. Maybe even a combination of both but I'll have to find out.

Steve DelBianco: If the GAC wants a briefing anytime we'll do it because, you know, as members of this working group we will have boots on the ground starting Friday night.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Holly Raiche: Thank you for that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Rosemary. Cheryl for the transcript record. A couple of points, I put my hand down and then I thought I better pop it back up again. Jonathan, just to follow on from the answers to your questions, we also need to recognize the absolute discretion and ability for the review team (unintelligible) forms which is an independent review team remember to do a whole lot of stuff.

And what (Bruce) I believe, having talked to him at the time, was concerned about and in fact was already concerned about which is one of the reasons he came to our meeting, Rosemary and Steve, is the lack of cold, hard data for such an analysis to go forth.

It was right at the time we had the need for baseline metrics had been discussed in the accountability and transparency review team. And I think being the good little engineer that he is he was trying to do some prior preparation to prevent a piss-poor performance.

Now Holly, the other thing is with GAC, it is always easier for GAC to respond to a piece of paper that they can send around to all their member countries and have discussed. And so in many ways the very best opportunity for them to get their teeth chewed into all this sort of stuff is with something like our draft letter that's gone out for public comment now.

But the travesty that is the assumption that if you do something in resolution the world will, of course, rush to the minutes, read it, and respond is something I think we need to watch very closely with the ICANN Board.

And I would note - like in ccNSO, have not been formally invited either. This is a GNSO working group, of course Holly, and the ALAC presentation in it is simply a matter of us not wanting to replicate work.

So this is simply a GNSO response to that Board request. But we've got a strong ALAC interaction with it, which is fine because we want to make sure it's covering our workload as well. The ccNSO may be in a very, very similar position to the GAC and I mean in an ability to react to our letter.

The other thing I just wanted to say was with the staff briefing, Berry, you might want to check - are you sure she wasn't asking for the GAC staff to brief the GAC? In which case you'd have to be talking to their secretariat?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I haven't seen that request at all so I don't - I'm not sure how to respond just yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we might just need to double check because their people wouldn't have a foggy idea what this is all about. And then it would be really good to get in early and offer all of our purposes as Steve was indicating.

Rosemary Sinclair: This is Rosemary. I think it would be a good idea, Berry, to be a bit on the front foot about this because as we've found over the last few months the concepts that we're grappling with are really very tricky as are the measures and the targets.

                So it would be preferable if people could at least start by looking at work we've all done, they can then decide to reject that and propose something else.

                But it would be an awful situation if we wound up, I feel like, with dueling metrics because people just went down the path under their own (unintelligible).

                So if you could attempt to close that, pardon me, loop for us by checking out who should be briefing whom and when, knowing that our working group participants in Costa Rica are very willing to be a part of that endeavor, that would be very helpful.

                And you might just need to let us know by email because people will be on the move quite shortly, won't they.

Steve DelBianco: And to make life easy, Rosemary, I just posted the text of (Heather)'s reply to me last week.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, great.

Steve DelBianco: And you can see in there, she said, I believe we requested a staff update on this topic for the GAC's Saturday afternoon session but I'm not entirely sure.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And Rosemary, this is Berry. I'll happily take the action item. The only thing I'll mention is - and it's been a week or so since I've seen the schedule but I don't recall seeing that as an agenda item on the proposed GNSO GAC session. But I'll definitely follow up and send out the information to the list.

Steve DelBianco: Great, but let's keep in mind, looking in (Heather)'s note. There's two parts of it. The first sentence is - she asks me, will I be presenting as part of a GNSO session with the GAC? And the only reason that would happen is if Stephan puts it on the GNSO GAC agenda.

And John Bernard, who is our liaison to GNSO, made that request of Stephan. We don't really know whether he'll put it on. It probably won't be worked out until the weekend, that's number one.

Number two sentence is she says, I believe we requested a staff update for the GAC's meeting on Saturday which doesn't involve GNSO.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which goes to my point, Steve, that if it's their staff then we need to make sure they've got the right materials to work with and know that we're available if they want.

Steve DelBianco: Which staff are we talking about? The GAC doesn't have any staff.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They have a secretariat, don't they?

Steve DelBianco: Not any more, right? Not anymore, Berry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's totally gone, is it? I thought it was replaced. Berry?

Steve DelBianco: I think he's gone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I know that he's gone but I didn't realize he wasn't replaced.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, there's an ongoing GAC problem about who's going to pay for the staffer and my impression is they don't have one. That staff is probably Berry.

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, this is Julie. I just wanted to let you know that we do actually have a staff person that's helping out there right now. And it's (Jeannie Ellers).

Steve DelBianco: Great.

Julie Hedlund: We can liaise with her, you know, that's like a temporary solution so that, you know, we can be ready for Costa Rica and then we'll see what goes from there.

Steve DelBianco: Julie, who's your staff that is helping the GAC out?

Julie Hedlund: (Jeannie Ellers).

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and that's just a stopgap to, you know, get stuff done when we need to get done.

Steve DelBianco: And if that staffer, (Jeannie), needs any help all of us are there to help her. We can give her the slides or we can give the slides, we can do whatever they need.

Rosemary Sinclair: We'll jump through hoops if she asks.

Julie Hedlund: Sounds good. I'm sure she'll be glad to hear that.

Steve DelBianco: This slide - by the way, on this slide itself the previous version contained - I think it did, I think it contained the next sentence of the resolution which said provided by March 2011 San Francisco meeting. In the interest of focusing I left that off of here. I'm happy to suggest to them that the Board expected a better rapid response to this and we're still in the process of formulating.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that's a sensible selected edit.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, Berry, next slide. And this is simply a recap for people, we don't spend any time on this slide. Let's dive right into it. We set up our purpose. Here, some of this is highly nuanced because we are not advising the Board directly, that's the first paragraph. We're not advising the Board directly. We're preparing draft advice of community input of which we will hand to each of those four ACSOs.

Our charter came from GNSO but we're not trying to exclude anyone and we won't try to restrict where the advice goes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And Cheryl, you're going to be there on Wednesday when we give this. Any of you are there, please chime in and it would be great to hear of ALAC representatives sitting right up there with us during the presentation, chiming in, helping to buttress this trust community spirit we have.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, Berry, one more on the previous slide, I'm sorry. I wanted to clarify that last point. Now Rosemary's been a real stickler to be sure on that last point that we don't intend to limit in anyway what their team is going to do.

And again, I put early 2014 there because that affirmation review text that we reviewed earlier in the presentation said one year after the first delegation. Are we all comfortable sort of assuming the first delegations would occur January 2013?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Steve. And even if it was February or March that's still early.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, that's right.

Steve DelBianco: The middle paragraph - Berry, stay on there a moment longer, the middle paragraph is our aspiration in that if the Board ends up embracing these definitions, metrics, and targets well then naturally you don't want to wait until three years out to look at them.

The hope is that ICANN would manage towards achieving the targets that are defined as part of managing to objectives which is the way companies do try to run. When they can they try to run towards the achievement of stated and agreed upon goals.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like that Steve but can I make a suggestion for two reasons? One, it will fit on the slide better and two it will make the other things pop or all things pop. Can we move that paragraph to a size that is one size or maybe one-and-a-half sizes in font smaller?

Steve DelBianco: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it goes back to the old - yes, use of different things for emphasis.

Steve DelBianco: You're saying all three paragraphs smaller?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, only the middle paragraph. The to provide guidance for ICANN to manage, if we make that a size smaller or a one-and-a-half size smaller font then it will make all three paragraphs pop and you'll actually fit on your slide better.

Steve DelBianco: Okay by me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Next slide, Berry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I did a course on all that boring stuff once so occasionally some of it drips out of my mouth.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Okay, I did spend time on this one only because I know that - I was in a meeting with Wendy Seltzer last week in New York. And Wendy reminded me that we - it might be bold to claim consensus with respect to the proposed metric because Wendy didn't want the consumer trust metric to include a - holding registries to their intended restrictions and promises.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, well, one voice doesn't make a whole (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Right, and so I said, fine. We'll note that it wasn't consensus but I wrote the word close consensus. I could put the word strong or - it's close meaning it's not completely total.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And then - I think the end of it is new to people. When I presented this at US PTO they actually weren't aware that there's now a two-phase, two-step

(unintelligible) process at ICANN, initial then replies. And so that's why I put both dates in there.

Rosemary Sinclair: Berry's just asked the question in the chat about should we add close for the three-year target, Rosemary here. My own view is no because the discussion around the targets with people that were there, we did gain consensus on those.

Steve DelBianco: I would agree and I have no notes from anyone including Wendy that would indicate otherwise.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Good. So now Steve, you were just making the point about the two-stage process.

Steve DelBianco: That's right, and now I want to give an editorial comment to the folks on this call. (Suzanne Riddell), that's the US GAC representative, had me describe a little bit about this at a meeting over at the Commerce Department last Monday.

At the end of it she said, well, when are they going to close these comments? And I said, well, it would close April 2. She said, oh my goodness, the GAC - we're just never going to get our stuff in on time, we may have to ask for an extension. And I didn't react one way or the other, just giving you guys a heads up.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: There may be some request for an extension.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, the thing is though assuming that we get any comments in by 2 of April then we by definition go into the reply comment which would automatically give the GAC to 23rd. If we can surreptitiously find out from

(Suzanne) and the rest of GAC or whoever the subcommittee that's going to hold the pen on this might be is if the 23rd isn't enough, well, then fine.

But if not - there's two things. They can put in a placeholder on the 2nd saying we will need an extension and indicate the date and that will automatically trigger the second phase anyway.

Or being an advisory committee ALAC is discussing this at the moment as well, advisory committee of course are not bound in anyway shape or form to the public comment period. We can do what we like, when we like, to whom we like providing it's relevant to our purpose.

And so whilst none of us want to step out of the new design of public comment and while we feel that early intervention and proper policy process would be enhanced by early interaction with the advisory committees, and that's all the advisory committees including SSAC, we still have that ability to take their advice in at any time.

Holly Raiche: And Rosemary, Berry's making the very good point that, of course, the windows are open longer because of the (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Berry, will we know the dates by the time we meet with the GAC in Costa Rica because then we can maybe do a - point out that these dates are now edited to the new figures? (Unintelligible) that (Wally) presented.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I hope so. We'll get with the translation department to try to get a firm date on when they intend to finish the last translation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, could I encourage you to suggest that certain people, use my name freely - it can't be a need to, it's a must have from them. We need the drop-dead date because of the presentation.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary. Let's leave that with Berry to speak what's possible and then this slide can be updated closer to the presentation date.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. This is Steve. I wanted to also just say, I don't think we want to publicly say on Wednesday that while everybody has really until the 23rd for comments because of the reply window, I mean technically at least this reply window is not supposed to raise new points but only responses to comments that were found in the initial phase.

That's the reason we designed it. May not always work that way but that's the intention. So we shouldn't try to encourage people to wait until the 23rd.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And there's always the risk that nothing comes in and then reply doesn't even start.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, but there's already comments in on this one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Everybody ready? Why don't we go to the next one?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, thanks, Berry. This is a new one. I designed this one because of all the questions about dates and processes. So let's take a few moments, I'll let you absorb this. I'm happy to make edits to it if you think it's a good idea to keep something like this.

Notice the timeline doesn't even begin until we're pretty much done in May.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Rosemary here, I think that's good and very, very helpful. It's a really great edition to the packet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Holly Raiche: Absolutely.

Steve DelBianco: Berry and members of staff that on the call, there's a line in there that says staff begins measuring and that's meant to say you're just - the mechanisms we all thought and the sources we all thought would be turned on so the data's captured. That seem okay to you?

Holly Raiche: It's Holly. For the record, just a question, maybe that some of the - begin measuring, I'm just wondering if there isn't a lot of preparatory work that will happen such that maybe there's a timeline that says staff begins to set up ability to or whatever, putting mechanisms in place. Or is that...

Steve DelBianco: Holly, this is Steve. I hope that's the case and let's assume that it is but do you think that it's necessary to show it to the community that way? Do we need to give them that extra breakdown?

Holly Raiche: Maybe not, it's just me thinking and looking and thinking, well, I hope they've done a lot of work beforehand.

Steve DelBianco: The good news is we try to design metrics and measures that were measurable and Berry kept our feet to the fire at every step and that's why there's a column called source and a column called difficulty obtaining and reporting. We wanted to be sure that the stuff we designed could be found.

Holly Raiche: No, I read all that. I understand that.

Steve DelBianco: And then I have the next line there is the affirmation review of the new gTLD program. And it doesn't even become organized until one year after the first

delegation. So I've mapped that to one year after the first delegation which we think would be probably January of 2013.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. (Olivier)?

(Olivier):   Thank you, Rosemary. It's (Olivier) for the transcript. I just have a question here. Looking at the diagram of the timeline on Page 9, we look at the three-year targets from January 2012 to January 2015. Obviously we only start measuring from January 2013 so I don't see how we can retro measure and have three-year targets.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some of them are pre data points.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, that's a great - and this is definitely a finesse point. As you know the Board just said the word three-year targets, the Board didn't tie its resolution to the first delegation. In fact, the Board wrote the resolution at a time a year ago.

I also wanted to remind you that the affirmation review is more than just the delegation activity. The affirmation review includes an evaluation of the whole program of application evaluation. And that application evaluation starts - well, it starts in May.

So there's enough - it's enough - it's fuzzy enough about when that three year target starts that it behooves us to encourage the community just to start it at a point so that the three year targets will come in before the affirmation review is done, which is at the end of 2014.

So it'd be a shame if the affirmation review team finished its work several months before the three targets were compared to the three-year actuals. So maybe no one else has thought it through before but (Olivier), you spotted it right away.

And I did it on purpose taking advantage of the ambiguity and the language in order to align things so that they work. And to make them align we want those measurements to occur be - versus the targets so that the review team can incorporate those differences in its report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the other thing is, of course, that some of our measures are pre and post delegation of this round of new gTLDs. So that's why they need to be from 12.

Steve DelBianco: And we can rationalize - thank you, Cheryl, for that because we will be able to rationalize quite a bit. But the good news is that all the TLDs will be up for at least one year and some as much as two years.

At the point when these measurements will be taken and compared they'll all have one to two years of operating experience. So I think we'll avoid the criticism that these three-year targets will be imposed before the new TLD operators get all the kinks out. You guys all right with that.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Rosemary's battery's low. I just want to let you know that you've got Holly's hand up and Berry's hand up.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Cheryl. So we'll go Berry and Nathalie would you mind doing a dial up to my mobile? Can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I didn't realize you were still on the call, Rosemary.

Rosemary Sinclair: No, no.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, Berry, you start talking and I'll hang up this phone before it dies and wait for the other call. Okay, thanks.

Berry Cobb: Okay, thank you, Rosemary. Steve, just a quick question, shouldn't the compare versus three targets actually be January 2013 to 2016?

Steve DelBianco: Berry, were you online? The last five minutes of conversation were about that very point and what we concluded is that the affirmation review is more than just post delegation. It's supposed to also evaluate ICANN's evaluation process for application.

So the Board resolution was not clear about when the three-year target begins. And we have an incentive to align things so the targets can be considered by the evaluation review team, which would finish its work, if they're like the rest of the review teams, roughly a year after they're organized.

So we wanted to align things, Berry, on purpose like this because we don't enough - we don't have strict guidance from the Board resolution to know when their three-year target clock is supposed to start if they passed the resolution in 2010 for that matter.

But Berry - I mean it's going to be a question we're going to definitely have to deal with and we want to say that normatively the targets should be evaluated by the review team because that's really the whole point of this. I would hate to have the targets not even kick in until the review team finished its work.

Holly Raiche: I believe I've also got my hand up.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Holly Raiche: I understand what you're saying but I do understand the confusion of the terminology and (unintelligible) word change.

Steve DelBianco: Take out the word three here and just make it a target, how about that?

Holly Raiche: Yes, I'm just thinking because otherwise people are going to look at that and say, well, that's interesting, 12 to 15 but you're not measuring. So to avoid the kind of questions that arise just from this maybe a slightly rewording to indicate what you're measuring.

Because right now it sort of doesn't make sense that you're measuring something when you haven't had the targets and the measurements in place for a year. So it's just a wording thing but otherwise it's (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: The one word to change I guess is the very last item on the timeline could just say compare versus targets.

Holly Raiche: Yes, something like that that actually doesn't raise the obvious question.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, but the Board will - sooner or later the Board will have to sort this out. When the Board does the second thing in the timeline where they consider the advice and they adopt the metrics that's where they will have to get a little more explicit than just phrases like three year. They're going to have to put dates on things.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Could I make the suggestion just for the minutes that we hold our decision on this timeline because I'm just wondering whether we might have this in the wrong spot.

And that if we kept this timeline until after we've gone through the discussion about the definition and the metrics that that discussion would enable people to understand what we are meaning by this comparison versus three year targets.

The Board may still provide further clarification done the track but I'm just wondering if we hold the timeline but put it in the deck after we've had the definitions whether our intentions would be clearer.

Steve DelBianco: For the sake of argument, Berry, would you advance to Slide 16? So right after 16, Rosemary?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, Steve, that's what I'm thinking, see how it works at that point in the deck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, and I guess - Cheryl here for the record. Steve, that would simply mean that any question early on you simply say we'll deal with that at the end of the deck.

Steve DelBianco: Fine by me. What does everyone else think?

Holly Raiche: Also - I agree with Rosemary because if you look at the next steps you actually go back May 2012 and so forth. So you're starting to pick up what you're talking about which is this is more than targets. So it actually then starts to answer the questions that (Olivier) asked.

Rosemary Sinclair: And Rose - sorry, Holly.

Holly Raiche: No, go ahead. It's okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary again. The other thing that I think it would stop us from doing is getting into a process discussion about timing and leave us to concentrate on the actual substance of our work. And I think that would be a better flow because we wouldn't want the workshop presentation to have, you know, half of its time spent on this timetable and not...

Steve DelBianco: No, you're exactly right. I would agree completely essentially because the word three-year target that's relatively imprecise when it was put into the

Board resolution - and we're dealing with a lot of imprecise moving parts that we're trying to align. It would be crazy to burn ten minutes of discussion time on that, you're absolutely right.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, good. Well, let's see how it works anyway.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, back to Slide 10. Thanks. So it turned out that the way we'll move then is right after the efforts on Slide 8 we'll go directly to this slide which is the first of the definitions.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And the only thing that's different here is that the previous draft had a comma in there after Internet users. It was a stray comma so I took that out. And I parsed the consumer trust definition - and it was three component parts.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Any comments on that before we move on?

Rosemary Sinclair: Holly?

Holly Raiche: Just a question, sorry to come in at this really late stage, but when you talk about ICANN policies does that include compliance with the RAA?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Holly Raiche: Okay, I'm just wondering whether you put it in and the reason is that Cheryl, (Olivier), and I sat in on a teleconference yesterday where compliance is kind of front and center. And it seems to becoming a bit of an issue.

Steve DelBianco: Should be.

Holly Raiche: We won't go there. I'm just wondering if it's clear to everyone that policies includes the RAA and if so then I'm happy to leave it.

Steve DelBianco: We - I hope that on this slide we'll all say that policies means all consensus based policies to which the contract parties are bound. They're articulated often in contracts, they're articulated in RAA, etc.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: We're not going to change the definition, Holly, but I don't think you're suggesting that.

Holly Raiche: I'm clarifying what you mean.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, very good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Clarifying (unintelligible), Holly. My only suggestion is just a visual one. If you bold or color the ends to make the point that there's a - kind of three limbs in our definition on the consumer trust.

Steve DelBianco: All right, Berry. Maybe bold is a big much, maybe make it gray or something.

Holly Raiche: Yes, that would work, just a contrast gray, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Contrast gray rather than bold. Okay, next slide, 11, bounce right away to the metrics that will fit in for consumer trust. I went back to the - Berry had created these three bullet metric slides and I went back and tried to true them up a little closer to the document, the advice document.

                   These probably deserve a little scrutiny from the folks on this call to be sure these are the key items that we want to begin a discussion over.

I'm going to confess to you in my meeting to the US PTO I brought this slide up and I literally skipped it and said, you know, with this small crowd around the table we'll get into the actual document and look at the advice in the table when it comes to what the metrics are.

An hour later I realized that was a terrible mistake. I should have gotten through the bullet and as you guys designed them as they're much easier to talk about than get into the nitty gritty of the way we've got the table. So I am a believer in spending a good deal of time on Slide 11 and giving people a chance to talk about it.

Now what happens if in the middle of Slide 11 somebody really probes from the audience and says, I don't know, we're not going to take a lot of questions that are live, it may not come up but somebody says, well, what do you mean by (unintelligible) availability?

What is an adverse decision? What do you mean about applicable law? That forces us to jump forward into the table, which is the Appendix in this slide deck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or it falls - Cheryl for the record. Or it falls as you just say when we get to the table we'll discuss that completely.

Steve DelBianco: Could but that one, Cheryl - is that that implies that we fully intend to walk through - as a row of the table and we probably don't. I learned that lesson too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, how about we'll have the opportunity to look at that in greater detail when we get to the table and that way you can just do some (unintelligible)?

Steve DelBianco: Certainly could work. Do the folks on this call believe that we should open it up for audience questions throughout the presentation or only when we get to questions in about three more slides?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I think with this - the density of this material that we need to actually force feed people, you know, the whole information before we then get into questions. I think we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl here. One way around that is to just - as we've done in some discussion forums before is take questions on little bits of paper, with sticky notes.

You know, say, come bring it up and give it to staff during it and that allows people to, you know - or by that said, they're going to do that they can drop them down and come up to the microphone at the end, yes. I just talked myself out of my own idea.

Steve DelBianco: So I think you - didn't you just agree with Rosemary?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I did. I was - I was disagreeing with Rosemary. I was finding a way around it but then I've now disagreed with myself and I'm back with Rosemary. That was a complete 360, Steve. I do that sometimes.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible) small words because I think you should - I think, Steve, if you can just explain to people that this material is dense and we need people to kind of see the whole pack.

But I really like Cheryl's idea of saying to people, if they've got a question if they can just note it down - and it may be by the time you get through the next slide their question has been answered and maybe not. But writing their questions down because of the density of this material I think is a good suggestion, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, you know what we could do, Steve? Cheryl for the record again. Is pick up on what Rosemary just said and that is in the intro, before Slide 1, you know, moves to Slide 2, just give them a heads up. You know, they

should stop doing their banking and their email and their stock trading because this material is dense and important.

And we're going to go through the slide deck and they may be well advised to make a note of questions as they go through the slides. Some questions may be answered on following slides and that might assist them in the Q&A section later.

Steve DelBianco: All right, so that's what we have on Slide 2 which says, provide an update, review the draft advice, and then have a community wide discussion.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So we're going to explain then that we'll press - this is dense material so we will press through a quick summary, not the details, the quick summary of the draft advice, and then hopefully get into the questions. And after all this isn't secret, they've all had our actual draft advice with the details for two weeks at this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, we're talking humans here.

Jonathan Robinson: Steve, I apologize and Rosemary, if you've covered this already but I guess then - under those circumstances it's important to describe the way in which this is set out. In other words to let the audience know that there is this table that we'll come to at the end.

Now while you may not want to go through all of the metrics in the table but that's - because otherwise the natural question is how are you going to measure up to available, what is this, tell me a little bit more about this.

Whereas if you can say, look, A, it's dense, B, so we'd like to cover, you know - get through the presentation insofar as it's possible and then take questions

at the end. And by the way, there is a table of metrics that's available as part of the draft advice and for comment as well.

So that that gets known that even while we may not go through it in the presentation in fine detail it is how it will be measured and how it's presented.

Steve DelBianco: So Jonathan, just to understand, right here on this slide before we begin to summarize the bullets we might do a quick jump, you know, to Slide 20 and say, you know, we're prepared to discuss with you each and every row of the detail and explain how it's constructed.

Jonathan Robinson: Even just to simply highlight that there is a table with a series of measures in because that may not - I mean if one isn't familiar with it you may not even know that, you know. So it's really just saying that each of these measures has - there's specificity and detail on each of these measures that these are the primary metrics and they're all covered in a table at that detail.

Steve DelBianco: I think that's a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's right after Slide 2. I think it's a good idea to do a little cameo appearance of Slide 20, Cheryl for the record by the way. And the other thing is - I mean as (unintelligible) is pointing out, this could go to a five hour presentation if we go too far too deeply too quickly.

That's when you pull a, yes, well, you see us all here, you know, find us in the corridors and we can bore you silly with the questions and answers of any time during the next five days. Sorry, got to mute, my dogs are being stupid.

Steve DelBianco: All right team, so I think we've made a consensus that we're going to respectfully ask people to bear with us through some very dense material. And we're going to summarize metrics we've come up with. And then in the

Q&A, happy to discuss the details of the particular targets we've set up and the details behind each of the measures.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: All right, we if we do it that way then let's just at least look at the eight bullets on this particular page, 11, and see whether you folks think we've captured the right ones and the right words.

So you would cross reference this with your true advice document beginning on Page 7. Berry, I think I have a typo. The second bullet should be survey of consumer trust in the DNS. I didn't mean to say upon.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Steve, I think that's good. I mean there's an awful lot, you know, covered on that slide so this gives people a real feel for metrics associated with consumer trust as we've defined them. I think it's really good.

Steve DelBianco: (Olivier), did I capture your last three bullets for yours? I mean take down phishing and fraud and who is. You're good with that?

(Olivier): Yes, absolutely, Steve, thanks.

Steve DelBianco: All right, no other questions on 11. Let's bounce to the second of our three, which is choice. The first thing we did is repeat the definition of consumer and then I have parsed the consumer choice definition in two pieces.

(Olivier): It's (Olivier) here. And in gray as well.

Steve DelBianco: That's right.

Rosemary Sinclair: And Rosemary here. Steve, was there any discussion about repeating the definition of consumer? Did your trial group find that helpful or confusing?

Steve DelBianco: You know what, they didn't bring that up. I think might have just said we repeated this here for convenience.

Rosemary Sinclair: No, it's good. I think it works well. I just was wondering, okay.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, good question. Okay, next one. Again, here I'm summarizing some of the choice items which for us begin on Page 9 of our documents. And these are complex, Page 9 and 10. It was tough to figure out which ones to bring forward into the summary slide.

Rosemary Sinclair: Good. Rosemary here. Steve, again, I think you've got the main ones covered. I - just speaking from a user's point of view I think you bared all the big issues, being able to access and understand what the registry's really offering me, having a choice in scripted languages other than English, a choice of jurisdictions.

You've brought forward the issue of definitive registrations and the issue of geographic diversity. So I think those are big issues there. Anyone else? No?

Steve DelBianco: You can bet that our main topic of interest is that offensive purposes, that's going to really get the attention and there'll be a thousand hands go up. And I'll say, we were quite explicit about the definitional assumptions for offensive. And you'll see it on our document on Page 11 and we're happy to spend as much time as you want at Q&A on that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes. And Steve, that's - it's such a good reason for being explicit about where the Q&A's going to happen because you're right. The whole session could just focus on this particular issue.

Steve DelBianco: I'm afraid so.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So we go to the next slide?

Steve DelBianco: Please. This one's easy and I didn't think it was necessary to parse it up into components. Anybody?

Rosemary Sinclair: No, I think it's fine.

Steve DelBianco: Good, next one. Here we have a summary of some of the metrics which begin in our document on Page 11, a little bit easier.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. No, Rosemary here. Again, I think those - you've captured the main issues there. You might, Steve, just have to talk about why we've got the TLDs given that the focus of all of this is the gTLDs. We need that big picture to understand what's happening in the gTLD space.

Steve DelBianco: Great point, I'll explain that we view that they compete with each other, that's why Gs and Cs compete with each other and we wanted to cover them all. But we have separate metrics for the TLDs versus just the Gs.

In an earlier draft in (unintelligible) I had written 2x growth in number of TLDs and 10x growth in number of gTLDs. I had written the 2x and the 10x at the beginning of those bullets.

Rosemary Sinclair: Interesting, interesting. (Olivier)?

(Olivier): Thanks, Rosemary. It's (Olivier) for the transcript. I also fell into this - just reading the slide here thinking growth in number of TLDs, growth in number of gTLDs. It looks so similar. Could we just add in total number of TLDs in operations as to really make it explicit when looking at the whole space?

Steve DelBianco: You're only - put the word all in front of the first TLD, growth in number of all TLDs in operation.

(Olivier): Okay, perfect, yes, excellent, good.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

(Olivier):   Good one. That will serve to differentiate it.

Steve DelBianco: Excellent. What does the team think about putting a 2x and a 10x in front of the words growth on the first two lines?

Jonathan Robinson: Risky.

Steve DelBianco: Risky, huh?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I wouldn't do it, Steve. I would just leave all the measures for the tables. Holly?

Holly Raiche: Could I suggest that you reverse the first two so it's growth in number of gTLDs and then growth in number of all TLDs because then it makes it clear that gTLD is only part of and I think that that's clearer if you change the order of presentation?

Steve DelBianco: I guess so. But I do think that everybody's going to yawn because of course the number will grow. This - these two bullets, we wasted time on them discussing what we're going to do because I find myself feeling silly even talking about them without some indication of the target, the 2x and 10x.

                    And here's where - they're really boring to just say these without adding a little color in terms of the target.

Rosemary Sinclair: Steve, this is Rosemary. I'm all for putting the 2x and 10x in brackets in the lines.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why would you do that for those and not for the others?

Steve DelBianco: Funny you should bring that up. I have a draft where I did it for them all and it makes it extremely challenging but we could go there. I mean if I want to jam through it...

Holly Raiche: Then you really are going to have a finial presentation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I don't think so Holly because all it's doing is picking out the bits - sorry, Cheryl again. It's picking out the bits from the table and in some ways, Steve, doing it there just - you know, in a small form in brackets will make people remember when we get to the table that that's what it's linked to.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. What they'll do, as soon as you put the number on any one of these proposed metrics the conversation will stop and the focus will be on that number. And you won't get through the overview.

Remember, this is an overview of what we're proposing to measure and it doesn't matter which one of these you use. But as soon as you put the number down then the focus will be on the number and the discussion will stop right then and there.

So it's my strong advice to the group to just insist that this part of the presentation is a conceptual overview of the proposed metrics. And then you could give the audience a reward by saying, if you let me get through this then we'll get to the table where all the numbers are.

So is the table the next slide, Steve, or the first table?

Steve DelBianco: No, we've still got to go through the timeline, next steps, and then we get to the Q&A.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Now keep in mind that maybe verbally I say, growth in number of all TLDs and for those of you who've read ahead you know that we're suggesting a doubling of the number of all TLDs.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And also gTLDs and you'll see that we think it ought to be ten times as many as the current 21. And I could say it if you think it would be okay. I realize that that too might focus attention. Otherwise, it feels a little dull to say that we have been so bold as to say that there ought to be an increase in the numbers of TLDs.

Rosemary Sinclair: But it's no duller than anything else, you know, you've said if you go back.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, in the sense that we haven't said what we're comparing it too. All right, so you share my dilemma and we'll keep it as simple as we can in order to get through it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sure it will work out on the day.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: All right, I guess we are ready for next steps slide.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Any questions on this?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Only that you'll just need to mention the fact that our translation process will move these times.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, could I ask you to put a parenthetical under the first bullet with whatever we have - what would we say about translations?

Berry Cobb: That the English version of the advice letter is out for translation to the other UN five languages. I'll come up with something short and sweet to put as a sub bullet under there.

Steve DelBianco: Good, so after the word draft advice in the first bullet put in parenths, EN, parenth. And then make a new bullet that indicates, you know, X other languages (unintelligible).

And do I understand it that each language gets its own 42 days?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary - I thought what we did is when the last translation is available then we shift the clock from that date 42 days. I wonder if someone from staff could just clarify for all of us.

Berry Cobb: Right, as soon as we get the last translated advice letter that will open up the 40-day window per the original one that's submitted now.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Sorry, then that would mean that we really don't want to review and consider all comments until the close of that final window.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. We might want to do a little work along the way but certainly we're committed to the final window. Cheryl in the chat is making a good point that we perhaps just put a sub bullet in there about the translation.

I think it would be quite nice in this presentation on this particular subject to let the community know that we are committed to having the translations

done so that the input can be as wide as possible across the community given that we're talking about consumer matters.

Steve DelBianco: All right. All right, Berry, so come up with some clever way to - in the second bullet and just take EN in front of - after the word draft advice in the first bullet so we clearly only mean that one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, Cheryl here. Yes, I agree totally. I think what Rosemary said, it shouldn't be lost - doing this presentation in an area that is predominately Spanish speaking but in a region which English is definitely not a favored language and that they are politically and geopolitically very keen on local languages, including of course Portuguese.

So I think this would be a huge brownie point winner and something very important.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, that's a great point. If I forget to make it I hope that you will. Let's go to the next slide, would be what we've already covered which was the timeline.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And then we stop. And ideally we have 90 minutes so ideally we have used no more than 30 or 40 of the 90, maybe we used half of it. It would be outstanding if we only used half the allotted time by the time we get to Slide 17.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. So Rosemary here. At this stage we've not shown the table.

Steve DelBianco: Well, we might have done an advanced/preview to Jonathan Robinson's point and it would only have been to make sure they knew there's a lot of substance in there.

But to your point, Rosemary, once we get to Slide 17, when the first questions - the first question that comes up which references anything in the table, whoever's controlling the PowerPoint has to be quick to bring up the slide that references their particular item, what about that.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that's a great idea, Steve, a great idea. Whatever the issue is, if we then bring up the slide with the table that references that issue then that will really bring that to the floor, that's a great way of doing it.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, would you advance just one to Slide 18? Thank you. And you'll see that I got rid of the background on all of these tables to make more room for a larger font. I hope you guys are okay with that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Good.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: Steve, Rosemary, you'll have to just - the minute this first example of the table comes up explain to people how the table works like sorts, anticipated difficulties, you know.

Steve DelBianco: You're right. And it might well be that in that preview, and this was Jonathan Robinson's idea that under consumer trust if I bring up this slide momentarily there's nothing controversial in this slide, thank goodness.

So I bring this slide up and say that for all of our metrics there's a lot of detail including anticipated difficulties and explain what we mean by obtaining and reporting the source.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: As well as numerical targets. So I'll do that preview, I'd like - to Berry I might say, Berry would you jump to Slide 18 quickly? And then you'll pop it up, we'll

discuss it for 30 seconds, and then I'll come back to the bullets, something like that. You okay with that?

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that's great, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so team we don't need to go through 18 through 20 something, we don't need to do that on this call. So I guess at this point...

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Yes, (unintelligible) Berry. (Unintelligible) any bad formatting problems, keep going and we'll just all give it a quick look.

Rosemary Sinclair: They just look beautiful Steve and Berry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, they do look good. I must admit I actually find this a very nice looking presentation. If you don't know I'm not all about looks.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, there you go. And I did fatten up the three-year target column. I made it wider on some items where the three-year targets were complex.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right.

Rosemary Sinclair: And all these metrics and targets look so friendly now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Rosemary for (unintelligible) and friendly.

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, back to you however you want to go next.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well, I think we're done. One thing I do want to do is I want to ask our guest reviewer, Holly Raiche, who's joined us on this call to give me a kind of news here of (unintelligible) to just give us her feedback. And then - yes, and

then we'll just go back to our agenda. So I think we're going to get an early (unintelligible) today, folks. Holly?

Holly Raiche: It's kind of like giving the last presentation before lunch, everybody wants to go off to break (unintelligible). I actually - I found this - I found it very useful. I think having read the paper first and thought about it first it's a lot easier for me. I think there's going to be a lot of questions for the people who haven't sort of read the paper, read the slides before, and so forth.

So I think you've got a challenge but I think that there's enough material in here so people are going to go away and think very sort of heavily about this.

And I would pick up the comment I made that Cheryl and (Olivier) would be quite aware of and that is that the implications for compliance in this document are pretty strong. And I think it's going to be a really - a real issue in Costa Rica. There may be some very interesting questions and comments on the day.

Now you can all go have breakfast or dinner or whatever.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thank you for that, Holly, that's great. Now is there anything else that anyone would like to bring forward or discuss on this call today? So I think that brings us up there to Item 6 in our agenda which is review action items. Is that just reminding us about our schedule?

And Berry's just said in the chat that he will use the schedule to really strongly recommend to people that doing the homework before the pres would be a really good idea.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: And I guess a little bit of corridor on that during the conference will help as well. So Berry, now what is Item 6, reviewing action items?

Berry Cobb: That's basically - and this is Berry. That's basically new action items that came up as a result of the call today. And I think I have three of them. The first is to find out the details about the GAC requesting a briefing from ICANN staff or the working group or a combination of both on the weekend sessions. We'll get with (Jeannie Ellers) as well.

Second action item is to get with the translation department and determine the delivery date of the last translated advice letter so that we can have our new schedule ready for Costa Rica briefing.

And then lastly I'll make sure to include text to do your homework before attending the session to make sure that's on the schedule.

Rosemary Sinclair: Great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary, Cheryl here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl, good, Berry, but we can we make sure as well that every one of us on the stage or however the room is set up have the headsets for the translations to come in clearly. We need to remember that we've gone a long way to make sure that there is out there in UN languages.

There is nothing worse than us having to grab for the headsets and then have them turned on and then put them on our heads. They need to be in the ears or hanging around your neck from the very beginning of the presentation. It just says so much to the non-English speaking communities when you do that right.

Rosemary Sinclair: Good.

Jonathan Robinson: It looks so awful around one's neck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Tough shit.

Jonathan Robinson: What about the pictures? The pictures?

Rosemary Sinclair: Presentation is so beautiful, you're going to be great.

Holly Raiche: Bring a nice scarf.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well, I think we might be done, folks. And...

Holly Raiche: Thank you Rosemary and Steve and everybody.

Rosemary Sinclair: But I'm not sure what ungodly time it is but at this stage I'm intending to just be a little (unintelligible). So good luck with it all and we'll reconvene of course after the week is over and see where we take it from there.

And a huge (unintelligible) Steve to you for all your work on this and to you, Berry. It's really just resulted in a terrific document and a terrific presentation.

Okay. Thanks (unintelligible). Okay, bye.

Holly Raiche: Thanks everybody.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

END