
JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hello, hello. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, folks. Welcome to call number 14 of the CCT Review Plenary. Is there anyone that is on the phone that is not listed in the Adobe Connect, for rollcall purposes? And then we have Berry in the observer room. Okay, great, because that was my other question.

Are there any updates to anyone's Statement of Interest? All right, excellent.

I guess we'll go ahead and start with Jordyn talking about where things stand with the Competition and Choice Team.

Jordyn, take it away.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Jonathan. Today's update is probably going to sound somewhat similar to recent ones, but most of it good news in that we're still waiting for several bits of data or analysis to land. But we're making pretty good progress across all fronts. On our last call last week, we discussed several data projects that are underway.

In particular, we had chartered Analysis Group with a number of individual projects. And they reported that they started working on the first of those. They expected to have some initial results to us by the end of last week or early this week. I haven't seen that yet, so they may be a little bit further behind schedule than they anticipated. But I do expect to start seeing completion of individual projects from them relatively soon. We also know that the Nielsen registrant survey is in the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

field, and we expect to see results, at least the draft results of that, prior to the face-to-face meeting at the end of next month.

And the other two, sort of, big gaps in our data we've made some progress on, as well. The first is we've been looking at how we can get parking data outside of the new gTLDs. We had a good conversation with nTLDStats, who we've been looking at for parking data on the new gTLDs. And they've agreed that they may be able to track similar data, probably using a sample format as opposed to full TLD format, for some of the legacy TLDs. They sent around a proposal for us that seems reasonably priced and that we think should be able to be in budget, although I guess we'll talk about that in topic number 3 on the agenda.

On the ccTLDs fronts, I notice that Dan sent out yesterday, he's done a comparison of a few different data sources that we have right now, which are both the [Zufnic] data and the Nominet data set, and done some cross-referencing between the two. Unfortunately, there's some inconsistent results, and we'll have to figure out how to work through that. But I think we're closing in on having ccTLD data we can use, along with gTLD data, which should be helpful.

We are still looking, if anyone has contact information, for someone at Nominet to tell us how they built out all the data that they use for the map that I think they had also previously sent around to the list, which we found very helpful. We're trying to see if we can baseline that data for 2016 versus end of 2013.

We also talked a little bit about using the template that Jonathan put together for the results of our analysis, which is, I think, topic number 4

that we'll talk about later today. And I expect that we – I'm hoping by the end of this week to do an initial path of just looking at gTLD market share data, because that's data that we already have for both legacy and existing gTLDs. Stan's actually already run some of these numbers at a high level. But just sort of writing that in template format that Jonathan put together so that we can see how – to put some miles on the template and see how it works.

And so no new revelations at this point, but steady progress across the major fronts of the analysis that we're doing, with the intent that when we get to the face-to-face meeting at the end of August, that we should be able to be looking closely at completed data sets and starting to talk about conclusions and what we expect to write up in the report. So I think that's it, in terms of an update, and I'm happy to answer questions if folks have any.

Oh, I will say, the other brief update is next week – Eleeza is on vacation this week. But next week, when she's back from vacation, she and Stan and I are going to meet together and just go through our project list and make sure that we have everything that we need lined up in order to complete each of those projects. I think that's sufficient on the update.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Jordyn, do you anticipate being able to make some type of presentations? Because you don't anticipate getting a lot of writing done, probably, by the face-to-face. But sort of being in a place to make some presentations to the group, or what does the face-to-face look like, do you think, for your presentation update to the larger group, in

addition to the work that you'll be doing with your own team, if that question makes sense.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

That does make sense. I don't quite know the answer. To some degree, it depends. So as I understand it, for example, in the Nielsen registrant survey, we're going to get that data very close to the face-to-face meeting. And so I think it would be difficult to, in advance, come up with conclusions from that, that were then ready to present to the broader group. On the other hand, I expect that the subteam itself will be able to have substantive sessions around how to make sense of the registrant survey while we're together, face-to-face.

There are other topics where we essentially have now all the data that we need and/or we're expecting the analysis to be done by Analysis Group in advance of the meeting. And for some of those, we may be able to do some presentations at the face-to-face. So I think it's going to depend somewhat on the timeline of when we receive the data. I would certainly view it as desirable, once again, as we did in DC, spend a substantial amount of time in the sub, so we can use that time to work through the data points and see if we're all interpreting it in the same way, in which case I would imagine either a future plenary call or whatever our next meeting after that is, I would be able to make a substantive presentation about what to do with the results of the project.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks, Jordyn. But do you think that there's any – I guess we're doing the one sample. Is there anything else on the project list that you think it'll be possible to begin to put into the templates and things like that, so that they've gotten some exercise in time for the meeting? Are some of the projects [wishes] updated to the straightforward enough that it'll be possible to get some stuff written down?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We don't have a ton of those at the moment, but I do anticipate that will change over the next six weeks. So, yes, I think we will be able to make some progress.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Any other question for the Competition and Choice Team? Oh, right, thanks, Jordyn.

I guess the last thing is the nTLDStats data you need to add to the request for funding? Because we had the 18th as our deadline on that, if we were going to try to go and get more budgeted. As it stands now, we're not trying to. And I just want to make sure we don't have any surprises.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I think that's correct. I think the one bit of data that we're still not locked down on is the ccTLD data. But since our last hope to get a more comprehensive data set on that is from Nominet, I guess, I would be surprised that, if Nominet had that data, they would charge us for it. I think either they'll be willing to share it or not. They'll have it or they

won't. But given that they're a non-profit that runs a surplus every year, it'd seem odd for them to charge us for it. So I am not anticipating additional requests for budget.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, great. Anyone else? Thanks, Jordyn.

Drew, first of all, what's going on in Safeguards and Trust?

DREW BAGLEY:

Good morning and good afternoon and good evening, everyone. So Safeguards and Trust, I guess the biggest news is that the DNS Abuse Study outline has been completed, as far as what our RFP will look like. And that was circulated to the broader team last week. I didn't receive any feedback recommending any changes to it, so I'm not sure if everyone had a chance to look at it yet or not. But we would like that finalized today, so that way we can go ahead and put that out there. And then we're hoping we'll be able to hopefully obtain [inaudible] fairly soon and will be able to get data in the late fall starting to trickle in to inform our research, because it'll inform a lot of our chapters. That's the big news. And so I encourage everyone on the call to take a look at that and provide any feedback that you can in the next couple hours.

And then beyond that, still looking at the best way forward for completing our assignments thus far, because there are still some outstanding stuff. We still need some people to fill in some of the charts we've been working on so that we can all have a snapshot of what

things look like, such as rights protection mechanisms and whatnot. But nonetheless, we're going forward with our discussion papers.

I circulated a list of suggested discussion paper topics. And so if anyone has any feedback on that during this meeting, that'd be great to chime in. Otherwise, I'll be sending out that e-mail as soon as this meeting ends, with assignments. And so I've assigned group leads and other group members to help with the discussion papers. And so our focus on our subteam would therefore have definitely substantial written material by mid-August. And therefore, we'd have the starts of actual chapters to discuss by the time we show up for our meeting in Vienna.

And then lastly, propose some questions about voluntary PICs that we'll add to any relevant survey that we're sending out to registries or to applicants. And so if anyone has any feedback about that, feel free to chime in. But that should be relatively straightforward so that we can complete our research on PICs. And I guess that's pretty much where we stand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Brian, do you have a question?

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. Just a question for you, Drew, and maybe the team, as well. So as Drew mentioned, we're finalizing the RFP proposal today. And I'll be looking at the timeline for it and making any updates to that. And I'm wondering, we want to give whichever vendor we contract to as much time as possible. And it's probably going to push

the envelope of the CCT deadlines. And I'm wondering, what's the absolute latest date we could have a final report from this vendor? Yeah, so that's my question. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Good question, Brian. I think what we're looking at now is trying to have something which people can comment here by the end of the year. As of right now, we're not putting out things for people to review. And that was some feedback from the GAC. And so we're going to put some structure of a document together that has holes in it, or preliminary findings, at the end of the year, to get public comment. And then I think a number of things will come in, in more final version, then early in the new year. And so a final, final report is probably April sometime.

BRIAN AITCHISON:

Oh, okay. Yeah, I had on the timeline basically a preliminary draft by end of year, and so that's actually great. Will there be a public comment before the April deadline, public comments on anything else that we should account for?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's the thing. I think we're going to share our preliminary report at the end of the year and invite public comment, with the caveat that the report's not final, but just to give people a chance to see where we are and make adjustments and things like that, before we finalize the report in the April timeframe.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Great. Okay, that's very helpful. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We'll have to discuss whether there's been another, because there's no data or whatever, if there's another public comment at that point. But we're going to try hard to do a public comment at the end of the year.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Sure. Okay. Thanks a lot.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyone else with a question for Drew? Drew, can you drill in a little bit into the PICs [spec] discussions that you had with Ron Andruff, who was fronting ALAC on this issue, and stuff like that? Because this is something that we've gotten some real feedback on and some recommendations that we're trying to carry forward. And maybe you could share that with the rest of the review team.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, great suggestion. I forgot that that only happened last week. So, yeah, Jonathan and I, along with several members of ICANN staff, held a call with Ron. And he expressed concerns about whether or not our review team was going to look at the voluntary PICs and actually see to what extent they were implemented. What did they actually say? How could you categorize them? Did they accomplish their purported goals? And also, how did members of the respective communities feel about them? So the example that he gave was if, for example, .bank used a

PIC, did banks think that that Public Interest Commitment actually achieved the goals that they had as an industry? And so how were those PICs actually related to the different communities?

Maureen was already working on this issue and already had tasked ICANN staff with coming up with some PIC data, which has now been circulated to all of us so that we could take a look and start categorizing it. But we also decided it would be a good idea to add PIC questions into any conversations we have with registries or with applicants so we could understand exactly what they sought to achieve when they used a PIC. And maybe it would shed a light, even, on whether or not they saw some sort of competitive advantage if two applicants were going for the same TLD and one of them had asserted that they were going to do several more things in their PIC. Maybe that would be more attractive, or not. We don't know. But that's something that we'd like to look into.

And so for our subteam, I circulated some questions, which I can circulate with the broader group, that are pretty simple questions that just ask: What was the goal of the PIC? Why did you incorporate it? And what this goal accomplished? How do you ensure compliance with the PIC? And so that –

JONATHAN ZUCK:

[crosstalk] the list of them in the chat.

DREW BAGLEY:

Oh, great. Thanks, Alan. So that was the call. And Ron just wanted to make sure we were looking into the issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And so part of that analysis will be trying to find some sort of industry reps to look at the PIC [specs] to see if they're appropriate for that industry, right?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. And, yeah, [inaudible] actually I think the biggest challenge for some of them is going to be figuring out who would actually be representative enough of the industry to give us some insight.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Other questions for Drew? Drew, I see the staff have helpfully put up the worksheet, with lots of red text in it. Is there anything here that you need to highlight or draw anybody's attention to?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. I guess it would be more targeted at my subteam. But there has been a lack of participation the last several weeks, where I'm not getting feedback on things, nor is work being completed by the deadlines that we're setting. Nor are there alternative proposals if the deadlines aren't working. So I'm just not getting participation at all or communication from many people. So I don't know if it's because of summer vacations or what, but I just want to make sure everybody is aware of the fact that we have a lot of work to do before we meet in August, to make sure that's a fruitful meeting. Otherwise, I think we'll be left unprepared as we go into Hyderabad. And that's where we're

really going to face scrutiny from the community, to make sure we've been doing a good job and then looking at the right things.

So please, please, please, everyone, pay attention to these deadlines. Make suggestions if you don't think that they're good or feasible deadlines. Make productive suggestions for something else that will work. Or contact me if you're having any trouble completing an assignment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Drew. It kind of goes for everyone. Make sure you look back and see what's been assigned to you, if you didn't volunteer for something. And let's try to really get on top of looking at things that are circulated, because time is really moving past us. And we really can't get all of our work done on calls. There's a significant portion of this that has to happen as homework, and everybody's got to be a part of that effort. It's not enough just to show up for calls. We have to find a way to get some of the homework done so that we can get to a place where we're actually writing some work. And there'll be a bunch of writing to do. So that's just a general note out to everyone that we really need to stay on top of to-do lists and also be responsive when requests for comment on the mailing list are posted.

Is everyone seeing them and then they're dropping off their radar? Is there anything that we ought to be doing to make the requests for comment more obvious or centrally located? Is there something that staff could do? There's a page of things where people have requested feedback.

Sorry, my phone started.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I was wondering if I was cut off. Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I missed what you said, unfortunately. Could you say it again?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was just checking my line, Jonathan. I'm sorry. I thought I was cut off.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Does anybody have any ideas about whether it would be helpful for there to be a central repository of things on which people are looking to hear back?

Alice, go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Jonathan. I just wanted to say that we have three dedicated pages on the wiki where we connect all the action items. And so you can see

who owns which action item and by which date it's sent on. And Pamela and I are posting a link here in a chat, but I can share that in an e-mail as well. What we suggest is whenever you complete an action item, to send it out to the CCRT staff mailing list, and we'll make sure to check that box off for you. But, yeah, compiling everything on the wiki.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alice. I guess what I'm talking about are tasks that are not individually assigned. When it's everybody, there is something that researchers refer to as the bystander effect, which is everyone thinking that someone else will speak up, and then no one speaks up. And so that's what we need to try and change, in addition to people doing their individual assignments. And so what I was wondering, if there was a way to call out things that were assigned to everyone, and with deadlines, so that if people had a few minutes, they could go and very quickly, instead of going back through their e-mails to find them, could find, "These are the things that were assigned to everyone," to look at. And I can click on them quickly to post a response.

I'm just trying to think if there's a way, because I think what happens is they come out in e-mail. People think they'll get back to them. They think other people will answer. And then a week goes by, and no one has answered, and they're lost in their e-mail at that point. I'm just wondering if there's a way to collect those kinds of things together. Like David Taylor circulated a IP holders' questionnaire, and Brian circulated the request for proposal on the DNS Abuse Study. And there wasn't a specific assignment, but a general one.

Folks, tell me if I'm just talking crazy here. But I think this is one of those areas where e-mail isn't working for us and that it might make sense to have some way that, if everybody saw the list of things on which people were awaiting comment from the group as a whole. Does that make sense?

Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN AITCHISON:

Yeah. Just sort of spitballing here, but perhaps some kind of tracking spreadsheet so people can tick off that they've had a chance to take a look at something and say, "No comment," if they don't have a comment on something. And if they do, maybe there could be a column to add their comments so it's all in one central place. Just a thought, so we can see who's doing things and who's not. So that can put some question on people. Just an idea. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Brian. I guess I wasn't as focused on naming and shaming yet as much as trying to figure out if there was a way to accommodate the fact that e-mail requests just slip off people's radar. I guess that's my concern, that the well-meaning have just long forgotten that there was a request to look at X and such, because it didn't turn into an action item, and it certainly didn't turn into an individual action item.

But maybe we can start a quick Google Doc that has things that the group as a whole are supposed to provide feedback on, and a date, and a link to it. And then we can just be reminding people to go back and

look at that, at that Google Doc, to find the things of which there's outstanding requests for advice from the team.

Too many things just go completely silent, and we need that not to be the case anymore. So maybe, as Brian said, there's something with a signoff sheet or something that you check because you've read it and don't have comments, or you check and say that you have given comments, or something like that. So I don't know. I'll try to work with staff to figure out a way to centralize these requests for comments to the whole group. Because they can't continue to just go unanswered. So if you're wondering whether or not you're expected to comment, the answer is yes. Okay?

Then also, I guess the next thing that's sort of quasi-related to competition and quasi-related to trust is the IP holders' survey, since it's come up. David, can you give us an update, to the whole team, on where that stands, and what the timing is likely to be, and also remind people that you have a list of questions out there that you wanted people to take a look at?

I'll pass the mic to you, David.

Are you back on? I saw an e-mail you were having trouble connecting. Are you able to speak? It looks like you've got a microphone.

Okay, David's line as dropped. Okay. Maybe put a little note into the chat or something like that, David, or just let us know when you are able to communicate again, and let's try and get an update on that topic.

That has some budget implications. I'll give my understanding of it. There is a list of questions that were drafted by INTA that David circulated to the team for feedback. And so let's try to give him feedback by the end of the week, if you can. If you can go back and find that e-mail, or I will try to get it back up to the top of your inbox. So provide feedback to him, as well.

And my understanding is that INTA is full steam ahead and are interested enough in this that they're willing to pay for it. They don't want to comingle funds with ICANN. So this is potentially a budget item for us.

And then finally, I think they're trying to get this in the field by the fall. In the September timeframe is when they're trying to get this survey of IP holders, into the fall.

Yes, as David reminds us, the original deadline was the 5th of July for feedback. So let's try to give him feedback. He will recirculate this. And try to give feedback to him by the end of the week.

And then, David, I guess you can confirm or deny, but I think September is when you said you thought we'd get this survey into the field at INTA. And I guess you're constructing it in such a way that others beyond INTA could – at least at one point, others beyond INTA could also take the survey if they wanted to if they're IP holders. So we're going to try to promote it beyond INTA. But INTA is funding it and will make sure that they put it in front of their members. Because, obviously – all right, great. Thanks, David. So a goal to have it back by the end of September. So that's great.

Obviously, as we were tasked by Larry to look at this as a cost-benefit analysis, between this and the DNS Abuse Study is where we're going to find a lot of the potential cost side of the program in order to do that kind of a [balance]. So please take a look at the survey questions. Thanks.

I'll stop harping. All right. And then are there any other pending things people have asked or feedback on? Let's just use this time right now. Raise your hand if there's something that you're waiting to hear from the group on so that we can remind folks right now to go back and look, and maybe circulate again, if need be.

I circulated, on Monday, some questions that Eleeza had posed with respect to GAC advice, to make sure that she was on the right page on that. So I'm very interested in the people that are aware of the GAC-related questions. And, David, you may be one of those people. I think the others are Lauren and Megan, so we don't have either of those folks on the call. But do take a look at Eleeza's e-mail to see if there's anything that jumps out at you there.

Anyone else have anything to raise that they've circulated which they're looking for feedback? So we've got the request for RFP, the request proposal from Brian and Drew, survey questions from David, Eleeza's questions. Anything else?

Okay. All right. Thanks, folks. Any other questions for Drew? All right, thanks. And so the next thing on this agenda is looking at the data requests. And at this point, we have enough budget for the requests of which I'm aware. So if you are aware of work that's going to require

additional funding, please speak up. The deadline for this was two days ago. We didn't get anything. But I forgot who it was that was working on something to get to me. I don't know if that was... It might have been Carlos.

Are there any other pending data requests that we need to incorporate into the budget? Okay.

All right. So at this point, we're not requesting additional funds for research, because the additional funds that [Marky] allocated for this year appear to be sufficient for the things that we have, supplemental research that we're trying to accomplish. Okay.

All right. Then agenda item number 4 is, unfortunately, a little bit of an orphan. We were going to try to look at registration numbers across TLDs as an initial shot at using the templates. But as Jordyn mentioned, we'll try to get that out by the end of the week and circulate it to the group to take a look at. But what I'm going to propose, after conversations with Jordyn and Drew, is to just adopt the templates that we circulated on the last plenary call as the working templates. And then as we start to fill them out, we will see if there's changes that need to be made as we try to use them, which we will be doing between now and – fairly substantially between August, we'll be using them. So if there's a change that's required as a result of using the templates, then we'll make that change and allow them to be organic documents.

Obviously, the idea here is to just come up with a standardized way of looking at information to make sure you have all the questions from the template answered. And then that can provide the underlying structure

for a document draft. And then we will circulate. Stan has already done some drafting on a couple of issues. So we'll circulate that as an example of some drafted text around a particular topic, as well. And again, we'll keep them organic and dynamic, and expand these documents, as necessary.

So if there are no objections, we're just going to adopt the templates that we presented next time, one of which is here, this hypothesis worksheet. And then there's another one that was more research-product driven worksheet. And we're going to adopt those, going forward.

Are there any questions about that? Any comments about that?

DREW BAGLEY: Hey, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

DREW BAGLEY: Quick question. Do you think that we should use Google Docs for all of these, so that for each discussion paper we should create a Google Doc of that template? So that way, people can check on each other's progress and be working simultaneously. Or do you think it's easier, based on your past experience with review teams, just to be passing around marked-up Word documents? Since it is just a small – since it would just be a subset of a couple of people working on a paper.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's a good question, Drew. I'm sort of inclined toward moving toward living documents because it will be easier to find them later and have a repository of documents in process. So it may be less about editing and more about having them listed in a way that everybody can get to them, as opposed to them floating around in e-mail.

So I don't know. I'm interested in other people's ideas on that, but I think I like your idea of making them into Google Docs, because they're there in a central place. It becomes a kind of document repository, distinct, I think, from our wikis, where we're putting different versions and things and they're not actively edited from the wiki. The wiki could potentially just, at least near term, have links to the discussion documents.

Does that work for folks? Is there anyone for whom that's a problem? Any ideas, suggestions, modifications?

Okay, so I think that's what we're doing. We're going to create Google Docs. Jordyn, from Google, agrees, so that's good. It sounds like we have general agreement.

All right. So per Drew's suggestion, we're going to – as we start filling up these discussion documents, we're going to do them as Google Docs. Then we'll keep a list of Google Docs that are open on the wiki pages. Okay?

DREW BAGLEY:

And then, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, sir?

DREW BAGLEY: How do you recommend choosing between the two types of worksheets? So I think for the questions we have for our group, they might fit best into the research analysis worksheet, rather than the hypothesis one. But are you thinking that after going through the research one, then may develop hypotheses and then start utilizing that sheet? Or where do you [crosstalk]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, good question. I think that the first one, the hypothesis worksheet, is sort of the primary one that will drive drafting. And so I think the goal is always to get to that template. And it was Jordyn's observation that we might be doing a lot of work that isn't hypothesis driven, but simply data or research product driven. And so this is meant to be a conduit to multiple hypotheses worksheets. So particularly in your team, where there's this big reading list, and you're looking at a particular document, part of how you can evaluate it is which, of several, hypotheses did it address and what it said about them. And then later, we break up those hypotheses to look at them individually.

So that's kind of how I see the documents being used, is you would use the other one that we were just looking at before first, if you were just looking at a research product that's either already out there or just data that you're looking at without a planned hypothesis. And once that's

filled out, you can see that there are several hypotheses along the bottom of it that this then becomes one of many research products that then feed into the hypothesis worksheet. So it's sort of a many-to-many relationship. Does that make sense to folks?

Carlton, you asked if we can set them up to get automated update notifications. Do you mean from the Google Docs? That could get brutal on e-mail if you were getting e-mail updates every time somebody makes a modification to one of those Google Docs. But it sounds like people are...

Jordyn may be about to say that you can digest them and maybe get them once a week or something like that. Oh, Jordyn says you can subscribe to getting the updates. So should we leave that up to individuals to do then? I know there was a digest feature on Groups, but I didn't know if Docs...

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah, I think so we're not bombarded with even more e-mail, we should leave that up to individuals.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. So choose the ones that you want to subscribe to, to get updates on.

Any other questions about that? I think we have a way forward. All right. Cool. So these are the templates we'll use. And we will modify them whenever they fail, to accommodate the incoming data or description of the hypothesis. Okay.

All right. So next on the agenda is talking a little bit about the application and evaluation part of our work. And one of the things that is front and center to that, that's very time sensitive, so I thought we would actually go through it a little bit on the call, is the Applicant Cohort Survey. So if you recall, Eleeza and I had a discussion with Andrew Mack about next steps and kind of reached a conclusion that just handing this list that AMGlobal generated over to a Nielsen-type company wouldn't get us the best possible results out of that, because there's probably going to be a lot of negotiating to find the right person, and things like that. And they would have very low turnout.

And so we've been going back and forth with Andrew. And I've gotten some feedback. Thank you very much, Carlton and Waudu and, I think, Carlos, who looked at these questions as they went back and forth. And this is kind of where we ended up, in terms of a conversational version of the interviews that AMGlobal are going to begin to do with these applicant cohorts. And if you saw there was a plan that was circulated earlier that involves – while they're continuing to compile new names from Asia and the Middle East, they are going to begin to survey the cohorts that they have already identified in Africa and Latin America, and with an objective of getting 30 responses, basically, in the next couple of months here.

The biggest concern, I think, that they have, in talking to them, is that everyone is just going to say, "We don't know what you're talking about," and then the survey will die. So a lot of this is about trying to find the right person and trying to ask the questions in such a way that aren't too leading.

So I thought I would take you through this document, because what I want to do is give AMGlobal the go-ahead to start asking these questions, rather than later. So that's why I thought I'd go ahead and make it a discussion topic for today. So if you recall, obviously, the Applicant Cohort Survey was based on Jordyn's recommendation that we try to identify the categories of entities that applied for these strings and then go out and find those categories of people in the developing world, in an attempt to understand why we didn't get more applications from the developing world.

And there's been some feedback, based on the lists that AMGlobal provided. They presented a preliminary set of results that had a lot of brands in it. And so several people provided feedback about tourism in particular, and clubs and things that might – like sports leagues that may have done verticals, etc. So some other areas where investment might have occurred. One of the biggest difficulties is trying to find an analog to somebody like Donuts in the cohort side, because it's a group that sort of came together just for this. So they've got a list of names, and they're going to expand it a little bit. And this is the beginning of a survey.

So as you can see the top, the two key questions basically are: What kept you from applying? And are these factors anything that ICANN can do anything about? And so that was the overarching question for the survey that... Why didn't the people that they're talking to apply, and trying to determine what can be done about it. Because it could be, as Drew suggested, that there were other market priorities. It could be, as Steve Crocker suggested, that there was insufficient technical expertise to run a registry. And so all of those things could have been reasons that

didn't have anything to do with ICANN's efforts. Or it could have been they didn't hear about it, or the process was too complex, etc. So we'll talk about that.

Carlos, you've got your hand up.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. Talking about these issues, we had a short presentation by ICANN staff last Monday in the LACRALO meeting on these regional results for Latin America. Now that you mention the [inaudible] it was very interesting to see that half of the Latin American-based gTLDs were based in Panama. So I haven't been able to get the data. I asked for the data from Daniel Fink, who gave the presentation. But I would assume that companies based in Panama is not because they have a big business in Panama. So there might be link, with the case of Donuts, that you just mentioned. And I'm waiting for further information on the Latin American data, and I will be glad to share it. Just that note on the Donuts analogy. I would assume that there's some investors based in Panama that will look like Donuts. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. That could be interesting. So thanks, Carlos. So that's probably going to be a fairly unique case. I think just identifying an investment group that may have decided to do this is going to be difficult, generally. But it'd be great if you could find some.

And it looks like there's all kinds of things happening in the chat. "Would it be helpful to AMGlobal if those of us who can help with ID'ing people

to talk with share the info?” Carlton, certainly. If you know of folks that were considering applying or something like that, but didn’t, I think that would be very interesting. I don’t know what kind of context you’re thinking of. “I have several names that I know.”

Carlton, are you on audio? Okay. All right. So when you say you sent them through, I guess send them to me so that I have them, and I’ll make sure that they’re in front of AMGlobal. Because I’m not positive what it was that you’re talking about. So let me know the ones that you have, and I’ll make sure that I get them into AMGlobal’s hands. Okay?

Okay. So then this survey is then looking at a couple of different areas. One is awareness. Did they know anything about the New gTLD Program? And if so, what did they know? And then barriers, what barriers did they face, which sort of fell into three categories: the cost, either the initial cost or the ongoing cost; the complexity of the idea, the application process, or even just of running a registry; or it’s a business model problem, they didn’t have a clear idea of how this could benefit them or didn’t know how they would make money from it. So those are some of the kinds of things that they’d be trying to have in the discussion.

Possible uses, the attractiveness of the idea; if they considered the idea, what might have been some of the possible approaches. And then advice, what advice might they have for us, if we have more TLDs. What were the best ways to reach people? This gets to Carton’s issue about radio and things like that, if there was an outreach problem. What kind of questions are we looking to answer? Try to get people’s feedback about how to get them engaged.

So there's a set of questions that they did hear about the program but decided not to apply. And then there's a set of questions here, if the answer was no, trying to get some hypotheticals answered about whether or not this sounds interesting to them generally and throwing out some examples of why it might, just to get some kind of feedback, if they're not even aware of what some of the ideas have been for the uses of TLDs. And then again, some recommendation on getting the word out.

Are there questions about this? Take a second. I think everybody has scrolling ability. Take a second and look through this, rather than having me just read it to you. Those are the categories of questions they are going to ask. And they're going to be fairly informal conversations, as opposed to a rigorous quantitative survey, because we're just not going to get the kind of numbers that we need.

Carlos, is that a new hand?

So any other comments on these questions? Because I'm going to reach back out to AMGlobal and tell them to go forward and start making calls. Presumably, this will start to, again, be a little bit dynamic, based on how those calls go.

DREW BAGLEY: Hey, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Drew?

DREW BAGLEY: What did you think of incorporating questions about if they did not go forward because everyone in their country uses mobile devices, and domain names, they don't think, are as important on mobile devices? Or they use apps or some of those alternative things we talked about. Because I did a markup that I sent out that included questions such as that, but I only put them in the comments, just because I wasn't sure what everybody's thoughts were on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And this is something that I'm happy to discuss further. Part of the issue is how leading to be, right? So I think that the idea is to be open to that answer to the question, and that's meant to be about the business model side of things, is where that's supposed to fall, Drew. The question is the degree to which we should be giving that to them as kind of multiple-choice question thing that they then latch on to. Part of the issue here is not being too leading in the questions, but being open to those responses.

And I may have missed it. If you have additional questions that should be asked, if that's their answer, then I missed that. Is that the case?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. I sent a document, I don't know, a few days ago. I can resend that to you individually. But then along those lines, instead of business model, I'm just trying to think of a question that's more audience oriented. So on the one hand, maybe their business, this isn't how they

do business. But maybe there would be a perception that it wouldn't reach their audience with a new gTLD or something. I don't know, I'm just trying to think of something end user focused. And [crosstalk] leading –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I equate that with market, I guess.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead. Sorry.

DREW BAGLEY: Maybe I'm missing a market question. Where's that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, that's sort of business model. I don't see a market –

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, maybe we could add market?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can just add a bullet that says...

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, for market. Yeah, that'd be good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [crosstalk] market. All right. Let me make a notes. Okay.

And then, Calvin, you've got your hand up.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes. When it comes to costs, the questions on cost there, I would probably differentiate between capital and ongoing running costs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Calvin. The distinction that we ended up with was the distinction between the initial application cost, \$185,000, which then ties into a set of questions about applicant support and the ongoing costs. So were you suggesting that distinction, or just like money in the bank versus a revenue question? What distinction were you trying to draw?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, that first distinction that you mentioned, I don't see it in this document in front of me. But I might just be missing it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Up under barriers, if you go back to the top, "If they knew but decided not to go forward [crosstalk] initial cost [crosstalk] costs?"

CALVIN BROWNE: [crosstalk] go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, what'd you say?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes, I've got it. So it is there. I was just looking at the program costs, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thanks, Calvin. Any other comments? So, basically, they're going to go forward with this discussion template. And I've asked for them to provide feedback after they've had a few conversations, and then we'll make modifications as we go. But we wanted to just get some questions going sooner, rather than later.

And, Carlton, I'll look for your response. I forwarded everything from that thread on to AMGlobal, so it could be that Andy's got it. But I'll go back and find your e-mail on that.

Any other questions about this project? All right.

Okay. So this is a big part of what we're doing. We also have a set of survey questions for applicants, the folks that did apply. So this will include the people that applied and dropped out. It'll be the people that applied, went all the way to delegation and dropped out. So all those different variations are not part of this survey. They're part of the other survey, which is the Applicant Survey. There's a little subteam that's working on that survey, and the questions from that are going to have relevance to potentially all three of the subteams here. And so that was just expanded to include some questions about PICs.

I guess I don't know the answer. Alice, do you know if Eleeza, at some point, circulated the current incarnation of the Applicant Survey to the whole group? I don't even remember anymore whether I got that individually or whether it got circulated to the whole group.

ALICE JANSEN: I don't think it was circulated to the whole group. [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry, say that again. You can confirm?

ALICE JANSEN: No, I was just saying I don't think it was circulated to the whole group. [inaudible] can ask Antonietta if she has any input on that, because that's Antonietta [inaudible].

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Yes, hi, Alice. I'm actually not sure if that was circulated.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Antonietta and Alice. So there is an evolving Applicant Survey. And we will circulate it to the whole group shortly, if we haven't. And decided that it was getting robust enough that we should probably coordinate with the PDP folks, the Subsequent Procedures PDP folks, to see if there's questions they want to modify or see additions, hopefully not letting that process go on too long or letting the survey get too long. But that's where we are in that process. So we have a proposal from Nielsen, which was reasonable, to survey applicants. And we have a working survey. So let's just make an action item to circulate that within the next week, Alice and Antonietta, if we can.

Okay. Thank you. So then as far as the next steps for the application evaluation process, maybe you can pull up the application eval task list. We can look at it quickly. Oh, I don't think it's this. This is our discussion document in the face-to-face. But we generated, I think, a task list from this.

I just wanted to remind everybody this document existed and that your names are next to some items on it. I guess it might be part of the plenary tasks, since we don't have a separate application evaluation task list.

PAMELA SMITH: Jonathan, I'll get that up in just a second. That I do have. Oh, Alice has it. I have one that's a little bit more expanded. Hold on. Sorry that it cut off, but it's extensive. But that should help.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So here is the document. And then I guess if you can put the link to this up in chat.

PAMELA SMITH: It's already up there, but I'll add it again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I see it there now. Thank you.

And as you can see, there are a number of plenary things. In fact, I think that, Jordyn, not to put you on the spot, but one of the things you were going to do was issues with rounds. And now I can't even remember if you circulated that. Did you circulate it as a document for comment yet?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I haven't done that yet. But I'll add that to my backlog [crosstalk].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Sorry [crosstalk] to put you on the spot about doing it as much as – somehow I had it in my head that you had talked about it in an e-mail. So that's why I was... So that's on here. I don't have scrolling ability on this task list, so it's sort of... There we go, thank you.

So we had finalizing funding requests, etc. I'm going to need to break this out into the application eval, because it's sort of merged in, in this document. So I'm going to, I think, create a separate task list that's on application eval that's half of the items in here. But as you can see from this document, if you... Wow, things just went crazy.

You can see from this, your names are associated with a number of these different issues. And so I guess you can see the meetings that resulted in the action item, and then who was assigned to it as well. Is that in this link that you're showing us? I don't know who's showing this now. Is this you, Alice?

PAMELA SMITH: No [crosstalk] –

ALICE JANSEN: [crosstalk] is actually –

PAMELA SMITH: Yeah, I'm sharing my page. And I'm trying to figure out how to get it open so you can see the whole... This is the complete document, what is open. There is a toggle button on the wiki page. There is a toggle button down at the bottom that allows you to slide right and left.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay.

PAMELA SMITH: And you can see that there are assignments here. Unfortunately, I can't... It's a large document. So unfortunately, I've not been terribly successful getting it all on one page.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

PAMELA SMITH: But, yes, there are assignments. And –

ALICE JANSEN: Pamela, if you decrease your menu box on the left, you should be able to see the whole thing.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. Let's do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Okay. So they're color coded.

PAMELA SMITH: Yes. And the blue [crosstalk] –

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so you can see –

PAMELA SMITH: – analysis [crosstalk] application evaluation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Excellent. So, folks, please take a look at this document. And I'm going to be going through it and reaching out to people individually, as well. But take a look at these documents for anything that's got your name on it. Do a search on your name, and try and get it done. And also, the link, Carlos, is just above, in the chat. Alice did it. It's there at the top. Take a look at this, and try and give me an indication of when you think you'll get the task done that you've got on this list. I don't want to just go through this name-by-name now, but I will next time. So please go through the blue rows and find your name and get back to me. And I will be getting in touch with you, as well, for the things that are still due. Okay?

So that's right, Calvin. So take a look through this document, please. Get back to me with updated dates. And I'll be reaching out to you, as well. So let's get on top of these tasks. And I think that's it for application evaluation.

Calvin, is that an old hand? Right? All right, great.

PAMELA SMITH: One note, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

PAMELA SMITH: Please e-mail the staff when you make changes. There's a note at the top of the page. If you would please e-mail the staff list so that we know when you've made changes. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'll try to compile those maybe and send you one e-mail. All right. Any other questions about that?

So we're going to... As Drew mentioned in his presentation, he's put out a list of discussion papers for feedback. Please get back to him on those discussion papers. His next step, in the absence of volunteers, will be people being volun-told on those sections. And I'm going to begin to do that same process on the application eval, coming up with the discrete discussion papers for the application evaluation. And I will circulate that for volunteers and, in absence of volunteers, make some suggestions there. Okay? All right.

DREW BAGLEY: Jonathan, I was going to chime in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, sir?

DREW BAGLEY: For ours, our discussion paper topics mirror our existing groups. So the approach I'm going to do is assign people to papers, and then people

can let me know if they want to switch papers within... You know, by the end of the week or something. Just so that way, I'm at least hopefully matching up interests already and we don't have to wait until everybody volunteers for specific things. I'll make sure every paper has enough team members.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Great. Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Okay.

We're on to any other business. Alice, do you want to talk about the upcoming meeting?

ALICE JANSEN:

Yes. An announcement was posted to the list today to let you know that we're having the meeting in Vienna in August, on August 29th and August 30th. So the Constituency Travel Team will be in touch with you to make your booking arrangements. And please, please send a note to [inaudible] if you need [inaudible] invitation for your visa procedures. Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Anybody else have any other business? Okay. So I'm giving you a half-hour of your life back. I'm hoping you'll use it, because you've already agreed to give it to us, is to go and look at these to-do lists and go back through your e-mails, and find the things that people have requested comments on. And please try to spend the next half-hour reading things that have been circulated to the list for comment and provide feedback. So I'm hoping that my inbox will be full of people's

observations in the next 38 minutes. Okay? Thanks, everyone. And we'll see you on the subteam calls next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]