

**Consumer Metrics Project Discussion
TRANSCRIPTION**

Tuesday 02 February 2012 at 1800 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 02 February 2012 at 1800 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.

The audio is also available at:

[Http://audio.icann.org/gnso-cci-20120202-en.mp3](http://audio.icann.org/gnso-cci-20120202-en.mp3)

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

(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

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund

Berry Cobb

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Olivier Crepin Leblond - ALAC

Carlos Aguirre - NCA

Paul Redmond

Coordinator: Excuse me, everyone. It's the operator. Just need to inform all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Laurie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the (CTI) call on the 2nd of February, 2012. On the call today

we have Rosemary Sinclair and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Front desk, we have Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund, and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

And we have apologies from Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, (Paul Redmond) and Steve Metalitz.

I like to remind you-all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Tobias) is in the (IC) room, I know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm tracing (unintelligible) phone number for him.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, great. So if we go to the agenda, review the open action items, which just got one carryover which is me. I'm back, and the academics are coming back. So if we can just carry that over to the next meeting, I think I should have the information by then.

Our next three action items are all complete. So that's great.

Berry Cobb: And Rosemary, this is Berry. Just to provide some clarification about the action item Number 2...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: In collaborating with Steve and the latest version of the advice letter...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...pretty much all of the necessary information that was in the spreadsheet is now in the letter.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: And so I think we pretty much agreed that from this point forward any changes to metrics or any of the metadata to that metric will occur in the letter from this point forward.

(Crosstalk)

Berry Cobb: And I'll just make sure to include all of the draft versions of the spreadsheet into the Wiki room, and we'll just carry it forward on the letter from this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, okay. Thanks, Berry. I wasn't sure who (unintelligible). I wasn't clear on that. I thought we would still be maintaining this separate spreadsheet, but if we're going to close that off, as long as we note that that's been - it's closed and transferred. I just - Wiki is there on different Wiki pages. It can get really confusion - confusing for people doing future searches.

Berry Cobb: Correct. Yes, I'll make sure they're all attached into one document and...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...so they show the version history.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific.

Rosemary Sinclair: Right, good. Were there any other comments, Berry, on other action items?

Berry Cobb: I think that'll do it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, great. So then that takes us to reviewing the draft of the letter, which we've got (unintelligible). So (Arvany) had the quickest scan on this. But it seems to me to capture those changes that we talked through at the last meeting. Are there any comments from other than the call about changes that they were suggesting?

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry. I did take a look through the letter, and certainly the changes that we had made to the definition - I'm going to scroll down to Page...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, did you want really boring (ped) entry or (unintelligible) content at this point, because if you want some (ped) entry, can you just go back up to Page 2?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think there's a space missing between 2 and zip somewhere (unintelligible). Yes, to that full resolution, in the response to, that (unintelligible).

It can pass..

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Okay. I have the - give me just a second to capture the next version, and I'll capture these.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But I mean if you don't want (ped) entry, let me know. It's just I thought we were so close to, you know, tying it up with string, we didn't need to go back and do (ped) entry.

Berry Cobb: Oh, no, I'm just - I'm talking in reference to the letter. Okay, yes, in the soft copy that I had, is editing now there is that space. Maybe that was probably an Adobe error when I converted it to the PDF.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. No problem. Okay. I would have thought you'd have had a little wiggly line under it, which, you know, we don't have. Berry, I'll shut up again.

Rosemary Sinclair: Great. You're doing a great line in (ped) entry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary, you've worked with me long enough to know, not unusual.

Rosemary Sinclair: I can rely on you Cheryl. That's what I know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I downplay the pedant, you know I can, you know.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I only play the pedant in Australia. I don't know I'm a pedant.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I'm on Page 3 now, and I think one of the big changes that we talked about from last call is just to maintain reference back to the original definition of consumer. Steve made sure that consumer was redefined in the bottom section of that page and also grouped with consumer trust, consumer choice and competition.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes. I think that's worked out really well in terms of making it easy to read and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is belts and braces, but yes, it's worth it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, because you can...

Berry Cobb: And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: After you've been working on something for months that other people will come, you know, without all that background embedded in their heads. Sorry, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Oh, no problem. This is Berry. And then I think the other major change here was with reference to registrants and users that is consistently used and consumer trust and consumer choice.

Rosemary Sinclair: Registrant and users. Yes, registrants and users.

Berry Cobb: And then the third change was with respect to competition and keeping in brackets for the time being "and potential rivalry among" as well so that we capture, you know, the market share aspect or the competition with - amongst those parties.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And those of us - this is Cheryl here for the record - those of us who are not screamingly violent free market economists, myself in that number would be recognized, I don't have an objection to and potentially - potential rivalry among. I think what's in the square bracket is about as much as I can take though.

So if you wanted my view on to remove the bracket or not, I'm happy to have it bracketed and left there. But I wouldn't want to go any further.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Tobias), have you - any further thoughts about that?

(Tobias): The reason for bracketing it last time was - this is (Tobias), sorry - for the record - was a bit related perhaps to my uncertainty about whether the wording sounds fine in English. And that we might find better wording. But I think the content is fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) native Cheryl - native English reader and speaker, I have no problem with the language, but Rosemary and Berry could also advise on that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, I think what the language does is it pulls the issue out for those people who are very experienced in competition law and economics. And those folks may have some other way of expressing the point.

So I think the way we've got it in the square brackets does two things. It indicates that we're interested in the issue of - in the process of rivalry and highlights that issue for others who may or have (unintelligible) in the field. But I think it's really good the way we've got that now.

Berry Cobb: Good. Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, Rosemary. Cheryl here. I don't - I just want to be clear, you're not suggesting we leave it bracketed?

Rosemary Sinclair: Well, I am actually.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I guess I could be (unintelligible). Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we might find out (unintelligible) counterpoint here, my dear.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, in what sense?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would simply remove the square bracket. When I see a square bracket, I see something that is still for discussion in place of language which is only potentially to stay in the document.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm suggesting that the language competition in bold is defined as the quantity of diversity and potential rivalry among gTLD, TLD registry operators and registrars is a sentence which serves the purpose well.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Well...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What our read - my read is at least, just see a square bracket and think that that might be deleted by the team.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well, if that's what you think the square bracket would mean then it might be deleted, then I'm okay to remove the square brackets.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like to go back to (Tobias) on that.

(Tobias): Yes, in my understanding, yes. Square brackets means possibly to be deleted or amended, while regular brackets would mean an addition.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Tobias): But it - it's really not a big issue. My question would be rather whether the team would also want to mention the word "market" in the definition of competition, which would somehow further accommodate the aspect of competition law which is about rivalry in a market. This - I'm not really sure about how to formulate it, but by mentioning the word market, we would at least open up for that (dispective).

And in any case, this is not where things are decided. It's in the measures where we decide how we (unintelligible) competition.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Tobias): So this is more something about an understanding of the general issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Tobias): So perhaps if it would be possible to add the word market somehow. For example, a potential is "rivalry in the market for gTLDs, TLD registry operators and registrars." Then I think many people would easily recognize that as an element or a specialization of a very general definition of competition.

So it would just be instead of "rivalry among", it would be "rivalry in a market for."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A potential for market.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hang on. Here you got, can you see what I've just put in the Chat?

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible). I can have a look, because I'm in my iPad.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, I can read it for the record as well. Now what I've asked (Tobias) in the Chat is to change the words square bracketed currently as previously discussed, and "potential rivalry among" could be parenthetical, therefore an example, and the potential for market rivalry in, closed parenthetical. In gTLDs.

(Tobias): Yes, I think that would make sense except for the "in" doesn't really fit well with the continuation of gTLD, TLD registry operators and so on, because it wouldn't be "in gTLDs."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah, okay. So we need to move the "in."

Rosemary Sinclair: So you - sorry - so you said...

((Crosstalk))

(Tobias): Something like...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: "In the market for gTLDs."

(Tobias): That was closer to my - this is (Tobias), sorry. This was closer to my original wording, but I think we should at least at this stage avoid any discussions about what is the exact market or is it one market or several markets. That's too complicated for this definition. But perhaps the way it is phrased now, and then - but then we would need an "of" or something after the parenthesis.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes. Yes, "of" makes sense.

Rosemary Sinclair: So, sorry, how would that read now, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a sec. Sorry there's a space in my gTLDs, but that's my lousy typing at the end of the day in the absence of (Cathleen).

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Well, let's go with that then. I'm okay with that.

(Tobias): Good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm happy with that. Can you make sense of that Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I'm just going to paste the final version, and I think if I'm capturing this correctly and if I could type appropriately, it would be good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now I know what my excuse is, Berry, what's yours?

Berry Cobb: My fingers are big. So competition - this is Berry - competition is defined as the quantity, diversity and the potential for market rivalry of gTLDs TLD registry operators and registrars.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine excepting - Cheryl for the transcript record - you have it in square brackets still and it needs to be ordinary parenthetical.

Ordinary parenthesis.

Rosemary Sinclair: Why do we still want it in the brackets?

Berry Cobb: We don't. I just left them in there for purposes of notice - noting that that's the area we're working on. So let me remove that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, I think we can take the brackets out now.

(Tobias): This is (Tobias). I would agree, because it's not really an example. It's connected with "and."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. That works.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And I'm updating the next version of the document if everybody is happy with that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I (unintelligible) happy with that.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Unfortunately you won't see it on the main screen, just have a PDF up here, but I'm maintaining the fourth version in Word.

(Tobias): This is (Tobias). Can I just mention a related aspect here? Some of you might have seen a letter recently sent by the European Commission to ICANN on the issue of competition. That is more related to vertical integration, but nevertheless, the competition people at the European Commission have asked ICANN to provide some measures for competition in this market.

And at a later point in time, we might take a look at the proposed measures by the European Commission and see whether they overlap what we are planning to measure. Perhaps that would be an interesting way forward, because I would assume that at some point these comments would get back to us through the (grack) if we don't take them if we can now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. It's Cheryl...

(Tobias): If you want I can send out an email tomorrow and quote these aspects and see whether they can somehow be compared with our measures.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here (Tobias). That'll be perfect. I was actually going to interrupt - when I was trying to interrupt, it was grasp for exactly that. I think when we get - because - where there's not enough of us on the call today to do the measures effectively or reasonably.

But yes, I think that would be an ideal opportunity to raise that known potential request into the documentation. Save us having to deal with it later where I'm sure we would have to.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, I agree. Rosemary here. That would be helpful, (Tobias). That would be great.

(Tobias): No problem.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. Just coming from the previous battle of vertical integration within ICANN, certainly...

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: ...the - one of the key issues in that discussion was how do you define market and I, you know, from my read of our current use of the definition of competition, it is easy to define the scope of market with respect to TLD registry operators and registrars.

Where it gets fuzzy is the gTLDs, and I think that the point of contention was do we view the market of all top-level domains or do we view the market as competition within a particular top-level domain.

And the only reason I'm bringing it up is it'll be interesting to see how the EMU views that based on their previous - or the most recent letter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

(Tobias): This is (Tobias). I don't recall the details in the letter, and it's - at least I don't remember any specific market definitions. I think what the Commission (unintelligible) was more the market share of different market actors without them specifying the market.

And the second comment, yes, defining the market is always the critical issue in all such analyses. And it's quite challenging. And well, I guess we'll continued discussing that for some time.

Steve DelBianco: Hi, all. It's Steve DelBianco just joining. Sorry I'm late.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, Steve. Cheryl here, Berry. Oh, sorry, Rosemary and Berry. Just to follow on for a minute. I think what it allows us to do if we were to integrate

aspects of the proposed lines from the letter, it's only going to just put this back in play.

It's not going to solve the issues, the particularly thorny issue that you reviewed then from the (VI), debacle. I think I can call it a debacle at this point in time - that - but it also doesn't become our problem. It becomes a problem for the review team.

Steve DelBianco: Absolutely.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Steve, we're glad that you joined. We were just reviewing through the changes from the previous version of the - and these definitions. We're on Page 3 right now.

Everybody confirmed the use - the reuse of consumer as combined with our other three definitions, and we just closed out on competition, and I'm maintaining the next version, or Version 4 of the advice letter.

And competition was changed to read the following, "Competition is defined as the quantity, diversity and the potential for market rivalry of gTLDs, TLD registry operators and registrars." So basically the change was to remove the square bracket and to include the use of the word "market" in connection with rivalry.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks very much. Appreciate it.

Berry Cobb: Great.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right. So what was the next issue Berry?

Berry Cobb: Moving on to Page 4, I don't believe we had any large changes amongst the Notes 1, 2 and 3. And then the next big change - we'll kind of start on Page 5

where we get into the advice on the measures and the three-year targets for defined terms.

Let me move over to the soft copy because I see another space error, so it's definitely a flaw with just Adobe Acrobat in the conversion of PDF.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Don't want me to jump in, do you Berry?

Berry Cobb: Okay. Steve, you know, you're welcome to jump in at any time. I think we - around the example of the three-year targets basically you list in a small table the type of target and the example of targets for the UDRP complaints, and that was just to provide context as to what some of the targets for our measures may look like. I don't believe any of that changed.

The next change that I believe was included in this latest version is the use of terms, and we have listed "obtainable, reportable and relative incidence" there. If you like I can read through those, and we can see if those are acceptable definitions that will provide more clarity to the readers.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, let's do that.

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. So notes about terms used in the tables of measures. First one being obtainable is a column heading indicating the working group's assessment of the level of effort and available access to raw data is needed for each measure in the table?

Steve DelBianco: Berry, this is Steve. I know that obtainable and reportable were innovations that you came up with something like two months ago. So I was taking a stab at defining them. But believe me, what was in your mind when you came up with obtainable? Is it anything close to what I came up with?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. It's actually better than what I envisioned. So it makes sense to me.

Steve DelBianco: Any comments?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, Rosemary here. I think having (unintelligible) is the number of times these (unintelligible) between obtainable and reportable. And I think these definitions capture that difference very well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Berry Cobb: Cheryl.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, let's go to reportable.

Berry Cobb: Reportable is a column heading indicating the working group's assessment of any challenges in compiling and publicly disclosing each measure in the table.

Steve DelBianco: So that could be a confidentiality issue or it could be a problem at turning raw data into a measure that we can report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) difference between one jurisdiction and another, yes, which is I guess under confidentiality but not quite, because one part of the world might see it as a confidentiality issue and the others might not see it as an issue at all.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So having come up with it - and Berry is that definition close to what you had in mind for reportable?

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. All of these exceed what I had originally come up with.

Steve DelBianco: Great. So one challenge for the team would be that if it were easy to combine obtainable and reportable into a single column, a single assessment of difficulty, it would simplify our table, because they are very closely related, obtainable and reportable.

If you had just one thing called reportable, it would encompass the difficulty to obtain. Is there anyone on the call that thinks we ought to combine them into a single column or leave it as is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I think we should definitely not combine them. Having served on a review team, I can see our giving them the pre-dissected version to chew on as being a good way to make sure that the matter is addressed early in their discussions and most importantly does not take up the huge amount of definition or time that it would because it would occur very early in the dynamic of a review team.

And trust me on this, the dynamic of a review team can be a very interesting beast indeed.

Steve DelBianco: I did want to - this is Steve. Let me clarify one thing. When you look at the obtainable-reportable for all of our measures, in no case is reportable more difficult than obtainable. In no case did data was relatively easy to obtain but more difficult to report.

Now that may change if we add new measures, but so far obtainable, the difficulty of obtainable would be sufficient to convey the difficulty, because the confidentiality considerations of reporting it once we've obtained it in no case would have swayed any other rows.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I - Cheryl for the record. I still don't see a need not to have the separation in columns.

Rosemary Sinclair: And Rosemary. I feel the same way that it's - I mean when you say obtainable, then sometimes it means you get a truckload of data. So you've got it. But then there's just an impossible task in turning that data into a report that's timely, efficient, effective, you know, whatever.

So I really feel that keeping these two definitions separated out is very practical. And (unintelligible) will highlight a number of issues for the review team henceforth. However, comment is only a draft who might have (unintelligible) things they think ought to be measured.

But once they think, "Okay, is the data really obtainable, and then can it be efficiently and effectively messaged into our report," they might come to a different conclusion.

I feel in this that we always had a principle of being very practical in terms of the measures. And so I really support leaving these two columns at quite clearly separated even during this public comment phase.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. If I may just gild the lily a little more on what Rosemary has said here. And it's important from setting a precedence point of view. Remember this is sort of the very, very most basic foundation stone of a whole lot of other stuff in the future to be built upon.

And I think having this perhaps excessive amount of columning, I do see the point there, Steve, we'll ensure that when things do diverge in the future, and I'm pretty confident they probably will, that we still have this degree of - pardon the pun - accountability on from whence these definitions came from in the first place and what the yardstick - I'm trying not to use words like measure - (leave) what the yardstick would be for how realistic or otherwise a measure has to be to get into the stable of what is collected and then created into reporting.

Rosemary Sinclair: Steve, is there an issue that you think we should be thinking about?

Steve DelBianco: Was that question for me?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, (unintelligible), yes.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, so I brought it up because I'm being an engineer I am always driven to simplify. If we had two distinctions where one would have sufficed, this would have been the time to eliminate the complexity as we ask the community to review it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: While I fully appreciate the distinction between obtainable and reportable, and I tried to capture that in the definitions, I did observe that at least the rows that have been scored thus far are all the material difficulties in the obtainable column in no case is reportable turn out to be the problem.

So that would say that empirically it doesn't change anything right now, the reportable column, because it's never a limiting factor on something that we could otherwise obtain.

That being said, I don't have a strong feeling one way or the other. If you guys all want to keep the columns, then we ought to do that, and there's no extra work at all.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I accept that as well as to what Steve just said. I would think that when we go to review pricing, and we'll come across this when we review the individual metrics, but I like how you explicitly call out publicly disclosing each measure and whether the team chooses to use pricing or include pricing within the advice letter or not, that might be an instance where reportable is more difficult than necessarily obtainable.

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. That's a good example, Berry, and it - include leaving the definitions obtainable and reportable means that we can then be very comprehensive in terms of the measures but very realistic about, you know, where there might be difficulties. So, I like it the way it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Can I just say that building on that, I think we need to make sure that when we do our show and tell in Costa Rica we draw this out as an example. And the rationale for why it is as it is, and I believe it should be as it is. (Unintelligible).

(Tobias): Yes, good.

((Crosstalk))

(Tobias): Okay. I was the one who asked for these definitions in the last call, and the reason was simply that I wasn't really sure what we were meaning, and now I at least understand them fully. And I think we should perhaps postpone the question of whether we need the two categories or not as a matter of presentation.

I think it's useful to have the two categories at least outlined initially, but perhaps if there are only two or three problems in terms of reportable then we might consider whether a footnote or some other way of communicating the problematic reportability would suffice. So that the overall table would be easier to read.

So for example we could just remain the reportable as a explanatory aspect in the beginning, at least as distinction, but then present the reporting problems differently just as a note somewhere if we only have two or three reporting issues. Perhaps that would be a compromise between the two positions. And it would make the reading of the measures a bit more easy.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I actually think it's important that we leave reportable separately at the moment and not put it in that kind of note form, because I think that it will allow us to collect the varying views that may exist out there as to whether things are easily reportable or not.

It's - and I'm saying this from just experience where we start at the beginning of a process, you think that something is going to be easily obtainable and then easily reportable. And often that's not the case.

So I think it'd be fairly (fade) where we're thinking about issues for the review team to consider, to actually get feedback from the community about whether things are reportable would be a useful contribution to our final piece of work. At that point we might say that or we might decide that we could go for the kind of footnote approach rather than the separate column approach.

But I think right now this is something where it would be useful for us to get community comment on whether things are reportable.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. If I could add final to that? (Tobias') point reminds me that it wouldn't necessarily have to be a footnote. But picking up on his point, imagine if the column just said, "Obtainability and reportability," and we only indicated on any given measure where it wasn't easy. It would say things like doubtful to obtain on a row that was doubtful.

We would never have to tell people if something was easy or moderate, and we might even say source would be combined. So a row like UDRP complaints, we'd say, "Easily obtainable from RPM providers."

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So rather than a footnote, it could actually be that we consolidate all three columns into one and it could be a different way to present it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Or maybe (Tobias) is right, and we wait until we're finished with the table, and I could run through and do a set of examples with the exceptions basis, and then a set as is. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, I - Rosemary. I'm comfortable with that approach, because it still brings out, in fact, cuts more to the issue by issue, whether there's a problem with obtaining something or a problem with reporting something. So that still provides the clarity of focus that I think is really needed and the opportunity for feedback.

So if you're happy to do that, Steve, after we've looked through the table, then I think that could be a way forward.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, because the way we have it now, almost begs the question, like there might be one where we said it's difficult for obtainable, even though we indicate the source.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: What happens is that the community will ask us all - starting at Costa Rica, they'll say, "Why did you say that was difficult?" And we'll end up explaining verbally what we could have actually put in the row. For instance we would have said, "Difficult to obtain from law enforcement and government because they are not likely to respond to requests for information."

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And that's a mouthful, but it's what everybody really needs to know, because the word difficult doesn't convey nearly as rich information that that explanation would. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Okay. So Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I actually put my hand up before Steve finished his clarification points there. And that is I'm certainly less fast about the exact thinness of - I guess is the best word I can come up with at this hour of the day - of the columns and how easy the columns are to read or not read at this stage.

But I'm very fast about us making sure this has been drawn out and properly discussed in the Costa Rica meeting, because I see this particular part of the report at this stage being the thing that the community will want to chew over most. But I don't want them to spend all their time just nitpicking on things that we've actually, you know, gone through reasonable amounts of time thinking over.

I think we should press them with why things are in our view the way they are, and then get them to counterpoint, suggest or help us see otherwise if indeed we are to be seen otherwise. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So, where are we Berry?

Steve DelBianco: All right, let's get into that table.

Rosemary Sinclair: Woo-hoo.

Berry Cobb: Well, there are just one more quick one. Relative incidence, a particular measure would divide the raw data by the total number of registrations and each gTLD zone evaluated. This is intended to put a small or new gTLDs on a comparable basis with experience and larger or more established gTLDs.

Steve DelBianco: And that's not new. That's been in there since (V1).

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay. All right, very good. So concluding on - moving on to Page 6, measures of trust. Again, the definitions for consumer and consumer trusts are included above the table.

And we have our easier-to-read chart here that includes the columns obtainable, reportable, source and the three-year target. I think if everybody's accepting the first four, we did definitely reviewed from our last call, the change here is on Row 2 where the - I guess the category was applied, which is measures related to confidence and registrations and resolutions. And then we list the availability of those.

Then starting on about Row 6, which is the next category is measures related to confidence that TLD operators are fulfilling promises and ICANN policies.

The question I had here, Steve, is why the registrar availability numbers wasn't included in the first category, measures related to confidence and registrations and resolutions versus the second category?

Steve DelBianco: So the first row underneath the one that says percentage up time, yes, I think you're right. I think that could go in the first chunk. You know, let's move that up.

Rosemary Sinclair: I agree.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Okay. Well, we thought -- and you'll all notice that in this version I put the three-year targets in the same table, so it's all in one place. I also removed the color coding to make it easier to print and can put the colors back. But for the time being, it was easier to manage without. Okay.

Now, I'm on a cell and I don't want to burden everyone with the crackly noise, so Berry, if you'll lead us through at a healthy pace, we can hopefully get through a couple of these tables right now. Go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Okay, I just moved that up to the first category and you're coming in fine and clear on our end. So second category measures related to confidence that TLD operators are fulfilling promises (in ITN) policies, the first metric -- we'll go through these pretty quickly because I think we did review them on the last call; I just want to make sure we're reviewing.

Relative incidents, I've noticed that issue to registry operators for a contract or policy compliance matters and three-year target was lower incidents and incidences in the legacy GTLD. And if anybody has any -- I'll just read through these quickly. If anybody has an issue, raise your hand or speak up please.

Next metric, relative incidence of breach notices issued to registrars for contractor policy compliance matters, the same three-year target. Third measure, quantity and relative incidents of (URD) complaints...

Man: Berry, it occurs to me that the first one I should have had the word breach in front of the word notice to make these consistent. Once they're registrees, the others registrars, then I think I probably should have had breach on each of them. Is that right?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible). Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Good catch. Okay, the third measure and actually the one, two, three, four, five -- the next five measures are basically a distribution of (UDRP) complaints versus decisions for -- and violations but in addition to the (URS) notices.

I think everybody should be happy with those. We reviewed through those on the last call.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, this is Steve, if I might. The word decision it's meant to be the same thing as a violation. It's a decision adverse to the owner of the name. The name had to be given up, so that's the decision. I don't know whether they're going to call it an adverse decision or not. But I do want to make it a violation.

So I don't think we really have three -- we don't have three flavors. We have complaints and we have adverse decisions. I don't think we have complaints, decisions and violations.

Berry Cobb: Oh, yes, and you did put in parentheses duplicates here.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Yes, in fact, I think the reason -- I think the draft I circulated to everyone more than likely I took out the duplicate and just went with...

Rosemary Sinclair: Adverse decisions.

Steve DelBianco: Complaints and decisions.

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. I'll make sure I remove row.

Steve DelBianco: So it depends on what everyone's looking at. If you're looking -- Berry, the one you have up, is it V3 that you have up in Adobe? I can't see it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, it is V3.

Steve DelBianco: All right, so here's the thing is that right after the last call I set up V3 to Berry. He gave me a couple of ideas and comments and then I sent a V3 to everyone else, which was slightly different than the original one I sent to Berry.

Rosemary Sinclair: V3.2 or is it 3.1.

Steve DelBianco: Oh, gosh. Okay. So we -- I think we can work (unintelligible) when it comes to (unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: The first thing we measure is the quantity of complaints. And the second thing we measure is decisions that went against the (unintelligible) or against the (unintelligible) I shouldn't say the (unintelligible). So if the (UDRP) went against the main name owner, then that is the zone in which the main name owner owns the (unintelligible) that generated an adverse decision and they had to give it up. So that's an indication of a lack of trust. Okay.

Berry, the next row in there is new, though. Decisions against registry operators arising from registry restrictions, dispute resolutions procedure or the RRDRP, I added that.

Isn't that designed expressly to say that a registry operator had some restrictions in their contract and now there's been a dispute because somebody claims they're not following their own restrictions anymore, like they said they would only admit chartered (unintelligible) to dot bank but now they're allowing non-chartered banks in?

So one would file an RRDRP and I wrote in there that any adverse finding by the arbitrator, not just a percentage, but any adverse filing is a strong indicator of a lack of trust in that particular zone. Comments?

Berry Cobb: Steve, just so I understand, are -- the measure that you're referring to, the quantity and relative incidents of registry operator (URS) violations?

Steve DelBianco: No, it's the row called decisions against registry operator arising from RRDRPs.

Rosemary Sinclair: But there's a -- yes, it's not on our version.

Berry Cobb: Yes, correct.

Steve DelBianco: Not the one he has in Adobe but if you check the last email from me, I'm pretty sure it's the V3 that I sent to the group. I said before that I think Berry could be (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Yes, that's correct, Steve. I, you know, I didn't realize you made changes from that one, so I just used the one that you had sent me that's positioned up here.

Rosemary Sinclair: How long would it take you to pop up the new one, Berry, because my idea is switching screens between the two fields (unintelligible) challenging?

Steve DelBianco: Why don't we wait and let Berry bring that up? Thanks.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, because, you know, if he could -- I mean, I know (Rosemarie) has trouble even seeing the whole -- the IC room. So I fear what would happen if we were switching between screens as well.

Berry Cobb: Well, in all honesty, it's going to take me a little bit because I don't have that copy in front of me and I can't PDF it in time given the system restrictions.

Rosemary Sinclair: Big surprise.

Steve DelBianco: The changes are minimal. I could handle it verbally.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: So I'll just quickly review that. This is one that we had discussed a few weeks ago and somehow managed not to have it in the table. I'm glad we caught it. But we have designed -- I want to pass over here something called the RRDRP, registry restrictions dispute resolution procedure.

It's specifically designed to allow you to challenge a registry operator that they're not following their own restrictions. We've got to have that in there. (Unintelligible) made but we can do it.

Rosemary Sinclair: I agree.

Steve DelBianco: Great. (Unintelligible).

(Tobias): This is (Tobias). I have your copy here. So I posted it in the chat. My question was I think this is an interesting metric. I'm not sure I'm understanding fully what you mean by the three-year target of any adverse findings.

I understand that any adverse findings would be an indication to the contrary but I'm not sure the current wording gives us a good target.

Rosemary Sinclair: Shouldn't it be zero or less than zero?

(Tobias): Yes, as few as possible adverse findings, something like that or as few as possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: See I -- Cheryl here -- I would think a target would be -- few as possible is still wiggle room as far as I'm concerned, (Tobias). I think the target should be zero or less -- equal to or less than zero is the target. Yes, they'll probably fail to meet that target but it's an appropriate target. We lost Steve?

Rosemary Sinclair: Sounds like it, doesn't it?

Berry Cobb: Yes, he is disconnected.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Susan), (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nathalie, sometimes calling out to a cell phone gives you greater stability than calling in from one.

Nathalie Peregrine: Well, I can try dialing out to him then.

(Tobias): While we're waiting for Steve to come back, maybe I can just briefly mention one issue I had with several of these criteria. If we set zero here, we don't want any adverse decisions, isn't that partly difficult because in a sense if I can once manage this, then a good way of managing this, of achieving the target of zero, would be not to send anything to arbitration through the RRDRP procedure.

Steve DelBianco: I disagree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think zero's relevant here not relevant elsewhere.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. I lost you. I got back in. You're exactly right. And adverse finding is not the same thing as something going to arbitration. It means it went all the way through arbitration...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it was...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: That's right. A non-zero number of adverse findings is a significant indicator that a registry operator is failing to uphold consumer trust.

(Tobias): Well, you could also argue to the contrary and say that if there is the finding then it actually shows that ICANN is able to manage consumer trust through the existing RPMs.

Steve DelBianco: Conversely, it indicates that a registry operator did not follow their own restrictions and it was that problem that gave rise to the eventual enforcement action. So I'll agree with you that I'm somewhat happy if ICANN's enforcement showed that it can use its enforcement tools.

But it means that the GTLD expansion (written large) is an expansion that created a situation where operators did not follow their own restrictions and that's a more critical problem than the secondary affect of whether ICANN's enforcement eventually caught up with the violation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I prefer the positive there rather than the negative one, that's for sure. Yes, I think that (Rosemarie) here has given me nervousness about the development of this market and the privacy around consumer trust. I think the way Steve's constructed the targets for this measure is the right one.

I support that. And, as you say Steve, it's after the full process has been exercised for there to be an adverse finding in a new market I think should raise flags for, well, a number of stakeholders in ICANN. So I think this is an important measure and target.

(Tobias): I didn't mean to bring up a general. I didn't suggest you really change this. It's just that there are a few of these measures where one could simply manage to achieve this three-year target by not sending anything to arbitration, by not escalating things. And I just want to make sure we somehow capture this difficulty.

So if there is a way to perhaps in the text explain that we presume that ICANN will use its compliance department to manage any conflicts that happen, that is basically an assumption for this measure. Or if we have a

second measure that is already probably here in the table that can help us to highlight that fact that there are actually issues that are escalated, then we can at least face that possible future criticism.

(Unintelligible) delete it here or change it here.

Steve DelBianco: (Tobias), this is Steve. Thanks for that clarification. But in the instance of an RRDRP, the complainant is a community member, not ICANN and the community member is the one who petitions for something to go to a dispute provider. I don't really think that it's an ICANN initiative that has to be here.

(Tobias): Right okay. Thanks, that was very important. I forgot about that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: However, (Tobias), I wouldn't mind asking, perhaps not in the table but perhaps somewhere in text, it might be interesting to have an assurance of public reportability on escalation trends. Now, I would be highly surprised if the compliance people weren't creating these reports already.

But where they go to and how they will be handled in the future in the new GTLD environment might be a little murkier than what they say and where they are now and who has access to them.

Perhaps it would be appropriate just to remind what could be considered internal reporting of compliance also has a public value in this context.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve, if I could address that. There are items above us that we just discussed that have to do with breach notices. That is, in fact, staff that escalates things to breach notice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I understand that. But I think the point (Tobias) raises is if you simply don't issue any breach notices then your stats look good.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, great, and that's very...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...other layer that I think we need to suggest is also captured. Now, I should think there probably are reportability issues that are already being created in ongoing dashboards or whatever in the wonderful world of ICANN compliance that do exactly this. And, indeed, they may be to some extent publicly accessible.

But they need to be accessible to someone who is able to bring it into this trust and consumer trust context.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. I love that line of thinking and we did, on our previous call, discuss what ICANN compliance steps are. And Berry did some research for us and circulated the compliances presentation from the car where the first measurable indication that they think that an operator is in violation and we concluded that the word breach notice was the term of our -- for when the staff puts something in writing and sends it over the line to the operator, to which they have to respond.

But if there were an earlier indication such as complaints from the community that would be a great thing for us to add and one of the (minds) might be who is accuracy if there are complaints?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so you'll see that later on in this table down below there are the items we added from (Olivie) and that might be a good place to pick up (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steven, I'm putting on my (At Large) and (ILAC) hat here. I feel this is hugely important from my community's perspective. We have a number of very active (At Large) members. There're also a complete (ILF) that's dedicated to things like watchdogging who is accuracy and any other time anybody ever tripped over, you know, life.

Now, as annoying as all of this flooding of sometimes highly irrelevant information can be, what's even more annoying is that we need to get to discuss what's happened to it having gone into the funnel that becomes ICANN compliance issues until we actually sit down face to face three times a year at ICANN compliance and then they tell us how it's been dealt with.

There'd be a whole lot of more relaxed people in between sessions of those (that lead) directions if there was an ongoing dashboard type thing and that's at the current level of TLDs. I fear for what will happen in the new (unintelligible) world.

Steve DelBianco: Cheryl, for you to call compliance a funnel is a flattery they may not even deserve. It's more like a black hole. So I concur and would recommend we add a row -- we add a row indicating the quantity of complaints on who is accuracy. I do think there is a logical place for it on the next page.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Steve. I'm actually a fan of compliance. I think they're doing their best to try harder. They're under-resourced.

(Tobias): This is (Tobias). We're getting to an interesting issue here and I'm glad that you're following this up. For me, some of the basic problem is that if this was a piece of research and my finding would be there are 10 breach notices, then I could either argue that, oh, this is a very good notice -- a very good sign because it shows actually that the compliance department is very active.

Or you could say it's a very negative sign because it shows that there are 10 really big problems somewhere and I think it's still relevant to measure these. But they can be interpreted in different ways.

And perhaps if we correlate them nicely with the elements you mentioned now then we can avoid some of this discussion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here. I agree, (Tobias). I think it's a matter of making sure we look at the hole relevancy and perform the critical points, perform the critical control points in the issue's pathway from an I think something might be happening putting the community complaint and, by the way, it turns out I'm wrong right through to all of the risks and critical control points that go up to a full blown decision.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. This is Steve. If we were to measure an expansion of a town or a district and we would measure the amount of crimes that are reported in that district and it was much greater than expectations or much greater than older districts, we'd be very concerned about that.

We might also learn that the police do a good job of investigating and solving some of those crimes after the fact and that would give us some amount of comfort. But there's no way that enforcement alone after the fact could mask a greater incidence of crime in the new TLD space, a greater incidence of abuse in the TLD space.

So I'm onboard measuring both. Enforcement is to ignore the fact that those are greater than we have failed to meet the promise of the new TLD expansion. I wouldn't say a black and white failed but we have under...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It allows us to look at the risk management outcomes as well and that will be something that the review team I would have though would be then making recommendations on.

They'll look at the risk landscape, the risk actuality and then look at risk mitigation, if I can put it in that terms, and make recommendations to reduce risk procedure.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, why don't we move on? It's already 2:15. The last two rows on Page 6 were -- and, by the way, Berry, were you able to put up the new doc or am I just sort of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've got the new doc up.

Steve DelBianco: Wonderful. Well done, well done. So below the RRDRP you'll see there's two rows for (URS) complaints and (URS) decisions. And the trick about (URS) is we can't compare it to legacy GTLDs because there is no such thing as (URS) in the legacy GTLDs yet and, therefore, we need to come up with a percentage target because this is relative incident.

And I put the letter X in there because I don't know what number to put there. Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've got to be realistic -- Cheryl here -- you've got to be realistic. There's not going to be none. But what's unacceptably high? I don't think we can actually say because (unintelligible) the other system, at least it's a robust system, then the incidents should be, the incidence could be high but the decisions could be quite a different number.

Steve DelBianco: Berry (unintelligible), this is Steve. (URS) is most akin to a (UDRP). In fact, it's supposed to be a faster form of the (UDRP). Berry, is there a way to give us statistics on the quantity and incidence of, relative incidence of (UDRP) complaints and decisions in the dot come zone for 2011?

It's really just two numbers. It's a raw number of (UDRP) complaints and we would divide that by the total number of registrations and then raw number of decisions in (UDRP) and maybe those two numbers could be the targets we would use. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not a bad starting point if we could get the data.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'll have to take that one offline. I'm not sure that I can collect that data already and, you know, the key element here is the source. We

would be going to third-party providers like (UDRP)search.com to even start to get some of those numbers.

Steve DelBianco: Does (WIPO) handle all (UDRP)s?

Berry Cobb: I don't believe so. I think there's several providers out there. They...

Man: I think (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Yes, I think (WIPO) handles the majority of them but, you know, shooting off the head, I'd still be (evident) to think that we were trying to compare apples with apples.

Steve DelBianco: I'm kind of afraid to write. It would be better to use a smaller zone than com.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But which one?

Berry Cobb: I mean, personally -- this is Berry -- personally I would say that, you know, in terms of the three-year target, it would almost be safer to say is that, you know, this is a brand new metric, a brand new process. There is no baseline that's truly equitable because...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: One idea is to pick a metric that says it's relative to the previous year by saying that it has to -- it's the third type of target I described on the prior page called relative to prior period.

So for instance, the number of complaints in new GTLDs in 2015 should be a fraction of the number in 2014 or should be lower than. What do you guys think about that for the target?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I think that's absolutely the only way we can really go at this point. And I was going to say, what we perhaps need to do is just explain that the baseline, the very first X will be a measure X months out. And I'm not saying X months out because I'm not sure it actually needs to be 12 months out.

I think we're going to have more volatility in terms of complaint incidence at (Blake) and perhaps even some decisions in a shorter space of time when new GTLDs start than we will in any other point of time after that, if you know what I mean.

Steve DelBianco: I do. But this does -- this is a three-year target the board asked us for, which ironically three years out is even after the team, the review team has probably done its work. They do their work one year out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But we need to give some baseline metrics. So let's suggest that the baseline metric, the bit that needs to be collected is X months out after go live.

Steve DelBianco: I understand you and yet we could also suggest that the target for year three is that it be lower than whatever was observed in year two. What do you think of that as a way to do a three-year target? It needs to be improving.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let that then make some (due) year two, so, yes, that's fine.

Steve DelBianco: Cool. So I would write in declining percentage and quantity, so declining percentage would be the phrase that would be used on these two rows for the call (them) under three year targets.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can we just make sure they realize that's not starting at year three but starting compared to year one and two?

Steve DelBianco: Good point, so that year three is lower percentage than year two. Would it be better to write it that way?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Great. I wrote year three is a lower percentage than year two. Great. And that would -- I would put the same thing in the (URS) decisions row.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And then let's move on to the next page, which is -- I probably -- I think that this probably doesn't belong here. The (URS) violations is the same thing as the (URS) decision and it's not the registry operator who gets the (URS). Isn't it the main name holder? And, Berry, could you clarify for us on this?

A (URS), a rapid suspension is the suspension of a domain name and it's really a judgment against whoever registered the name who shouldn't have. It's not a complaint about the registry per se.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'm drawing a blank here because I just recall kind of pulling this out from the original deck. But I would...

Steve DelBianco: So, Berry, my view is that this is something we covered earlier in the call in that adverse decisions is really the key, not violations because (URS) also goes through an arbitrator. So this (unintelligible) -- this row is probably not needed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a delete, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Cool. And now we have one for law enforcement and governance.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Targets, initiatives.

Steve DelBianco: Sure is. Again, we could put in declining to indicate that things are improving by the third year.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know, that's got a great deal of sense.

Rosemary Sinclair: You know, I (unintelligible) too. I think it's a great approach that, you know, what you're trying to get is improvements because that is what we're trying to get, not about the absolute numbers. It's about whether they -- numbers that indicate behavior as decreasing over the three-year period.

Steve DelBianco: Cool, all right, great. The next one is the main takedown. I don't exactly remember where this came from.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's one of (Olivie)'s.

Steve DelBianco: Is (Olivie) on the call with us today?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, he's not.

Steve DelBianco: The next six rows are all from (Olivie) and it would be great to get some more guidance on updatable, reportable source and targets. You notice that for targets I took a shot at saying that the new GTLDs should be having -- they're better.

They should be better than the legacy GTLDs because, if you recall, we have been told so many times that dot com is a large source for registry abuse, for abuse by registrant because it's so large and people use it the most.

And we are told over and over again that the new GTLD expansion won't see nearly as much cyber squatting, won't see nearly as much crime, malware or abuse because it's not as popular as com.

And if that's the case, the percentage of all six of these should be lower than in the legacy GTLDs as a whole.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that measure itself, Steve, will be fascinating because there is a counterview, as you well know, that what we're doing is opening up Greenfield.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, I'm afraid. I hope you're not right about that but this would be us putting a really sharp point on this and the trick is we need to put some meat on the bones of all six of (Olivie)'s rows. I don't know where, what is the source of these information items, what is the difficulty to obtain a report.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. In terms of spam, you know, there are providers like (Spam House) that do a lot of metrics.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it would be third party, well-established, accredited sources (unintelligible) I would have thought.

Rosemary Sinclair: I wonder if (Olivie) could suggest that sort.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I actually thought he did when he was talking about them as examples like (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: I'm sorry but I don't recall seeing the sources and that's why these are blank. It might be easy to fill them in but I put, for example, (Spam House) in the sources, (Honey Pot Spam). What about the next one?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Phishing would be the APWG.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And ditto with the next one.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Who is can actually come back to...

Berry Cobb: ICANN.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And that's an interesting -- the next -- last one.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: This would be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's like I drifted into techy land where I start to blur.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I would put registry operators because these kinds of things can be found within the zone files.

Steve DelBianco: And but who would do the audit to determine the number of errors? That wouldn't be the registries themselves. So the source would be somebody doing an audit. I don't know who that person is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Interestingly enough, if I can put on my (DSSI) hat for a moment, while it doesn't exist now, the suggestion that ICANN in its own risk analysis for the security and stability of what we're supposed to be looking after may indeed require that we keep our finger on the pulse of these things in the future because we're going to be proposing an ongoing risk assessment model, which means frequent review of exactly this type of information.

What we're doing right now is sourcing every time we bring up one of -- what is a possible risk to security, stability, we find someone on the call, and that's between 20 and 30 people, has the data and says, yes, this has happened and here's when it's happened.

It's simply data that exists and is not being collected in a coordinated manner. But even within ICANN's current (DSSI) group, you could very easily collect that data should you be so motivated to do so.

So I put it as moderate but it's actually more attainable than moderate. But simply because no one's actually orchestrated it yet I guess it probably would be moderate and ICANN should be able to in it's (unintelligible) component be able to do that.

Steve DelBianco: So is the source regular zone audits and we just don't know by whom, in which case I could take the question mark off and indicate moderate, moderate and regulate zone audits?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: We jumped over -- the row above is the one on inaccurate or suspect who is and that is the row about which the number of complaints needs to be worked into the measure. Do you recall earlier in the discussion when (Tobias) was discussing that to -- I think we need to change the wording: the quantity and relative incidence of complaints regarding inaccurate, invalid or suspect who is.

Shall I repeat that or is that okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, adding complaints in there (unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, good.

Berry Cobb: And these would be easy and easy.

Steve DelBianco: Oh, good, fantastic.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. For the (sam), the fishing and fishing rows, shall we just say moderate, moderate and moderate for attainable...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually, I think they're easy. I think the quantity -- I think the first three because they're already out there in public reportings, so it's easy. The reportability might be more difficult but the access, I think it's very attainable.

Berry Cobb: If they're done for all zones. They may only be done for selected zones about which APWG has a high degree of concern. I don't know if they do the comprehensive or targeted.

The (Honey Pot), for instance, may not do every single one of 1500 new GTLDs, moderate at best.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right.

Berry Cobb: For that reason.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can we explain why then that is moderate as opposed to easy?

Berry Cobb: Yes, that gets to my notion of wanting to explain it. I'll jam it into the cell. It might lead us to that plan B that I discussed earlier on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Woman: Yes, yes. Now, Rosemary, do we need to just be mindful that we're almost out of time on this call? But we've done a huge amount of work today getting through this consumer trust table.

We've got the consumer choice and competition to go. But my suggestion is that we do that on the next call. How does everyone feel about that?

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. This is Steve. I support that idea but I do recommend we do that next call as soon as we possibly can.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. The next call is scheduled for Tuesday the 7th at our regular time, scheduled for 1.5 hours. Perhaps I can send out an email to the group that kind of unofficially plan on maybe two hours just so that we can try to finish it up.

Steve DelBianco: Sounds okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we need to put it...

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: I think (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Agree.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I mean, looking at it, we only have two pages left, 1.5 pages left. But it's some of the heaviest lifting on our plate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd rather plan two hours and be pleased to have five minutes early.

Steve DelBianco: Good, good by me. So, Berry, after this call -- this is Steve, Berry -- if you don't mind, would you send me the edits you made while I was late for the call? I'll combine them with a new draft for V4 and I will circulate it to everyone.

Berry Cobb: Very good. Yes, I started a Version 3.5 and I'll send that right now.

Steve DelBianco: Fabulous.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry, just one last thing. Heads up, the public session for Costa Rica is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday from 11:00 to 12:30, so we'll be able to beat lunch and we won't conflict with the GNSO public session and so hopefully we'll get it for 1.5 hours.

Steve DelBianco: Well done, man, well done. Well done. Would you send an email to the entire group indicating that date and time, please?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you so much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Before I go, I have just opened up my diary and, you know, the ICANN diary and various others diaries feed into my diary. My diary is now blank after Sunday. You and (Giesel) have access to my diary or (Hardy) and (Giesel) and anyway I am now in near hysteria because there is literally nothing in my personal diary after Sunday. Something scary has happened.

So things as simple as two-hour meeting next week for us needs to go back in but something really bad has happened in my Google calendar.

Steve DelBianco: Maybe they've fired all of us volunteers, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This isn't just the ICANN. This is even my personal diary's gone.

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh, dear, oh, dear.

Steve DelBianco: Well, the rest of us can see it because Google shares it with everyone else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know what? I actually don't care about that. That I'm happy with. Not having it, I'm not.

Rosemary Sinclair: You want it to be shared with you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like (unintelligible). It could be printed on the front page of the morning tabloids as long as it exists. It appears not to exist past Sunday. Okay. It's that basically that, Nathalie, can you let (Jean) know that, you know, everything she's done may not be there?

Nathalie Peregrine: All right, everybody, we'll chat again on...

Steve DelBianco: All right, signing off.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, everyone.

Rosemary Sinclair: Bye.

Berry Cobb: Bye-bye.

END