

**ICANN
Transcription
Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting
Tuesday 20 November 2012 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project discussion group teleconference held on Tuesday 20 November 2012 at 1900 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/gnso-cci-20121120-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

Participants on the Call:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Olivier Crepin-Leblond – ALAC
Steve DelBianco – CBUC
John Berard - CBUC
Tobias Mahler - Individual
Michael Graham – IPC
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Jonathan Robinson – Registries SG
Jeff Neuman – Registries SG

Apology:

Wendy Seltzer - NCUC

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Géry
Julia Charvolen

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

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the Consumer Metrics Project discussion call on Tuesday 20 November.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon, Steve Del Bianco, John Berard, Tobias Mather, Michael Graham, Jonathan Zuck, Jonathan Robinson, Carlos Aguirre, Jeff Neuman.

We also have Olivier Crepin-LeBlanc who will be joining in approximately an hour at 20 UTC. We have no apologies so far and from ICANN staff we have Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund, Glen Desaintgery and myself, Julia Charvolen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, thank you very much and over to you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you Julia, so this is Jonathan Zuck for the transcript and we're convening this particular meeting to specifically go over some of the concerns that have been raised by once and future registries about these metrics.

And want to thank Jeff Neumann for coming on and being a part of the meeting. Just so everybody remembers this process was initiated by the board through a resolution asking that we form advice on ways to measure whether or not the new gTLD program increased consumer choice, competition and a third thing.

Sorry, trust. Exactly. Competition, choice and trust, and so that was the language from the affirmation of commitments and so the idea was just to come up with some numbers and to begin to measure some things. So that as much data as possible was in the hands of the review team when it convened and they would make specific decisions about which if any of those data points were relevant to their review at that time.

So ultimately this is the result of advice from ALAC, GNSO, CNSO and the GAC but this working group has been designed to put together some possible

metrics for each of those issues and in some cases where it seems possible we put together some aspirational targets.

But again the final determination about all of this would be in the hands of your team. Maybe the best place to begin is to let Jeff summarize some of his concerns and then we can open the discussion from there.

Does that make sense Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Sure (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, I'm hearing it.

Jeff Neuman: I'm trying on the handset, no that's not working either. Julia anything you can do to track it down?

Woman: Julia is there something that the operator can do about the echo? Lori, operator could you - we seem to have an echo at least on one of the lines.

Julia Charvolen: I'm asking the operator right now.

Woman: Thank you so much Julia.

Jonathan Zuck: I know we've had issues with VoIP in the past, I don't know if anyone's on that.

Man: I'm on Skype so if we think that's the issue I can call back.

Man: How about me? Can you guys hear me?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yeah I can hear you, I don't hear an echo.

Jeff Neuman: All right, I might as well just start. I just left Jon a comment. Yeah I think so you guys addressed a number of my comments with respect to language. And then Steve and I were discussing some of the things, especially with respect to the brand top level domains.

So Steve do you think we should just jump in to the main crux of my argument or do you think we should just go in order?

Steve Del Bianco: Hey Jeff this is Steve, if you had overall questions about where this processed came from, I know Jonathan gave a bit of an explanation.

But when you and I were talking last Friday you brought up the distinction about us measuring things that may or may not be in the guide book.

And I think that might reveal sort of a fundamental disconnect on where we were taking our charter from.

Because our charter had nothing to do with the guidebook, it had to do with the affirmation of commitments and that board resolution which were done long before the guidebook was born.

And so philosophically are you comfortable that we have a broader sort of a charter than just measuring whether registries adhere to the guidebook?

Because we're not interested in measuring the performance of individual registries at all, that isn't what this is about. This is a global look from the top down at the new gTLD expansion program and that incorporates not only stuff that was in the guidebook, but maybe stuff that wasn't in the guidebook.

So that the next round we do could have a potentially a different guidebook as a result of what this affirmation team discovers.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Steve, so that you reminded me (unintelligible) so there's a bunch of criteria in here that you guys are - have recommended looking in to, but one of my concerns is because it's not in the guidebook you're looking for things that people may or may not do or feel like they have to do.

So for example you know you have some criteria in there that says that TLD should on their main page or on their website disclose the benefits and restrictions and they use another word in there, of their space.

My concern is when you look at this stuff after the fact because it was never required to begin with, you may have a skewed result, where if you have added criteria which may be fine but I think needs to be talked about, that you believe registries should do and registrars should do, even though that criteria is not in the guide book itself.

So there's nothing wrong with a registry not doing it, from the guidebook from the contract perspective, but in judging the program you guys will have made a subjective determination that they should have been doing that.

And you know there's criteria in there I think just don't necessarily make sense that you're using for trust when it was never required of them in the first place.

Should we go through an example?

Man: I think that makes sense.

Steve Del Bianco: Jeff it's Steve, it makes sense that you express that but would you agree that the affirmation is judging not just how people follow the guidebook but whether the guidebook had the right stuff in it?

Jeff Neuman: Right, but that could be a different (unintelligible) or different assessment or review that the guidebook should have had these things in there, that these things should be done even though they're not required.

For example the guidebook at this point doesn't require that applicants - if they're standard application if they are contractually down to what they put in the application.

You could say in that that was not this idea or was a good idea and then preserve flexibility.

I mean you can make those assessments after the fact, but to have criteria of consumer trust based on things that you're making it sound like is a requirement, like registries must disclose - or I don't know if you say must - but registries must disclose on their website their benefits and restrictions.

It makes it sound like a requirement and you're going to go back and say well 50% of them didn't do this, and therefore didn't contribute to consumer trust. Well one of the reasons 50% may have not done it is because it wasn't required.

Steve Del Bianco: yeah great point, so this is Steve, if I could answer that, sometimes we have written these metrics with words like should or must and maybe they should be written as questions, like did the registries disclose somewhere on their website what their registration policies were?

So that it's not necessarily judgmental or normative, it's simply a descriptive question about what did happen.

That may be a slightly different way of phrasing some of our metrics, that would avoid the implications that we're imposing a requirement. We don't have the power or the intention of imposing any requirements whatsoever.

So if we can avoid that by the better choice of language let's try to do that today.

Cheryl Langdon: Cheryl here.

Jonathan Zuck: Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon: Thanks Jon. Yeah look, I was - I popped my hand up because I wanted to make sure it was really clear that what we're doing is establishing a set of measurables that are taking a snapshot and then a repeat on measurements based on those snapshots.

Happy enough to soften the language from the prescriptive but it doesn't change the fact that these are expectations from a other set of rules like the telco industry which we've looked at to say measurements on trust and - trust in particular but also choice, etcetera in other contexts do look to these types of information as ways that consumers have indicated they measure trust.

So while there's no prescriptiveness at all it would be sage like wisdom to recognize that these things were just dragged out of the air. We had Rosemary's guidance and very long and I think very deep and meaningful debates on establishing what from the panacea of measures that we could have looked at.

We're able to be at least applicable into the new gTLD space but I'm happy to soften the language to remove any assumption that there is any proper prescription but we do need to remember these are just metrics.

The absence of which as a data source will hold up the ability of the review team to do its mandated work. And it really - any assumption on what it means for future guidebooks or future rounds to be drawn from these metrics is absolutely segregated from this work of establishing what they might mean and what types of things we would look at.

That said I'm happy to soften the language but I'm less happy to see them devalued. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Jeff this is Jonathan again, I guess I don't want to run completely away from the notion that some of these are normative. We've been asked to try and assess whether or not the program as a whole increased customer trust and one of the things that we reach consensus might be something that affects consumer trust is whether or not you know registries did adhere to the promises that they made.

And they're not required to do so, everyone can go off and do something completely different but I think it's probably going to be worth the review team looking at the back end when evaluating the program, whether or not that was the case.

And as you say they may reach the conclusion that it was the right thing to do to allow them that ultimate flexibility and in fact it is part of the objection of the NCSG that they should be allowed to do whatever they want.

But there was definitely a majority view here that if a dot bank says they're only going to allow banks to be a part of their registry and then they allow lots of phishing scams instead that that might have an impact on consumer trust, separate from you know whether or not it was required of them in the guidebook initially.

This isn't going to be about penalizing any particular registry for doing something.

Jeff Neuman: Should I respond or - I put myself in the queue too.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh I guess the queue's gotten kind of long. I guess put yourself in the queue and let me get to John because he's had his hand up for a while.

John Berard: Thanks Jonathan, this is John Berard, as Cheryl says for the record. I just wanted to make the point to Jeff that I entered this discussion two years ago with the notion that we were looking - that our perceptions were prompted by what was in the guidebook but we're not limited to it.

Because when one considers the value of competition and trust it's really about the outcomes.

And so I think it was prudent for us to look at what the outcome was going to be of the new gTLD being launched into the existing domain name space.

And so I don't - I agree that if we have made - if we have suggested metrics that need to be black and white essentially good or bad, that we should recast those.

Because what we are looking at are once new gTLDs are launched there will be - that things will happen and we're just looking at how to pick and choose from among the things that happen to measure whether the program has met what is the hope for goal in terms of competition and trust.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so I'm not talking about softening necessarily the point but if you're looking for example 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, that's just an example, all of those seem to say whether the benefits and restrictions were generally to consumers, 1, 2 and 3.

If you created your criteria as or question do consumers generally know the benefits, restrictions of each gTLD, okay? If that was the question that would be fine, because you haven't prescribed exactly how you guys, your team believes is the only way that could be done.

If you guys just have one question, 2.1 do consumers understand the benefits and restrictions or even two parts, are the benefits and restrictions of each gTLD disclosed and are they generally understood by consumers.

Then you get rid of 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and you can have different things that may point to whether they're disclosed, like are they on websites or elsewhere, but not as specific as you made each criteria.

Does that make any sense? So I'm not softening, your point is do consumers understand the benefits and restrictions, that's your point, that's what you're trying to measure.

But...

Man: Two things, understand is the second level, the first was are the restrictions and benefits available to them. Because understandability was really 2.4 but I really take your point about 2.1, 2 and 3 could be asked in a survey couldn't they?

Jeff Neuman: They could be asked absolutely without imposing a requirement on a registry that's not in the guidebook, that's after the fact, you're going to look at something that doesn't necessarily tell you whether you've gotten you criteria or not.

So it's that kind of - again it's not softening it, it's basically saying I don't care how the registry did it or whether it was through registrars or not, right, because I can guarantee you registrars are not necessarily going to disclose benefits and restrictions of each TLD.

But that may or may not be important when you look back on it. But here since you're putting it as an absolute criteria, let's say website should clearly disclose the benefits or restrictions.

You're now setting that criteria up to fail, whether or not that criteria matters.
So the ultimately point of was this self disclosed and was it understandable?

Jonathan Zuck: Steve do you want to go ahead?

Steve Del Bianco: Jeff it's Steve Del Bianco and I did a quick count of all of our 60 metrics and it turns out only four of them start out with a statement of what somebody should do.

The rest are simply statements of things to measure. And they don't again we cannot impose requirements so it was never any intent to do so. But 2.1 through 2.4 are the places in this entire document where you start out by saying should, should disclose and should be understandable.

So we're not talking about softening, you're right, we're talking about making it consistent that column one of every single metric is - should describe what the metric is.

Column two talks about where we would get the data from, so if in fact we changed 2.1 to suggest that benefits and restrictions - what is the clarity about benefits and restriction in TLDs, the source could be an audit of registry websites, it could be a survey of registrants and end users and elsewhere in this document Jeff you may learn that we have suggested that ICANN commission by any old surveys of users and registrants with a whole bevy of online questions that they would answer.

And it's easy then to add a battery of five or six questions with respect to that just to stick in there. But I wouldn't want to do a survey alone, I think it would be beneficial to do a fast audit to see whether the 1400 websites to what degree do they disclose the restrictions, either on their home page or some about page.

And again they should be completely flexible as to whether and how they do such a disclosure, we cannot and don't wish to impose a requirement. So having said all that I don't know for sure if we combined 2.1, 2 and 3.

The 2.1 and 2 distinction Jeff was done specifically in response to your objections in October because we saw that there ought to be a clear distinction between a closed brand and a closed key word, TLD, you know dot search very different than a dot Neustar with respect to the - I guess the expectation of clarity with respect to the disclosure.

We may not need to keep them separate like that, it could be that they could be combined. But when it comes to being normative, the board asked us to stick a column four in our advice.

The board said not only give us definitions and metrics for consumer trust consume choice and competition but also give us three year targets.

There were no three year targets discussed in the affirmation paragraph 9.3, but it was the board's effort to do what a lot of companies do, that if you measure things it's great to start off with some expectation of how those measurements should go since that way management works to achieve the target.

So we were all applauding that sort of management focus to ICANN's role and that's why you see a three year target. So my question for you Jeff would be that if we could find a way to take the should out of the first four items on this page, what would we do in the three year target column?

There are some items we have no target, but on this one we want targets like all, or 100% hit rate. What would be an appropriate target for these measurements?

Jeff Neuman: That's a good question, I'm just thinking about it as you brought it up. I mean again I don't think - even if a registry website did disclose the benefits and restrictions, that would necessarily prove your criteria which is that there was choice.

So...

Steve Del Bianco: May I respond to that?

Jonathan Zuck: Sure.

Steve Del Bianco: You're right, choice is the overarching definition. Under the definition we measure, we designed metrics that contribute to deciding whether we had choice.

So the notion of disclosure and understandability we believed and I think it's pretty inarguable the disclosure, knowing what the restrictions are and understanding what they are contributes to my ability as a user to choose whether to trust the content at childrens.book.

As a registrant in an open TLD the restrictions allow me to determine whether I - maybe I want to register there in dot book if I'm allowed to.

So registrants and users have different information they would rely upon to make the choices that they'll make. And that's why these things that contribute to choice but they don't directly measure choice per se.

Jeff Neuman: But then again when you look at users it's not like when you go to iTunes and you go on there there's a clear statement when you open up your application there's a clear statement that here's the benefits of using iTunes over (stodify) over Pandora over other thing.

You just know it because you go to the site, you see what it does. Whether it discloses the benefits and restrictions on it in anything other than the terms and conditions which nobody reads anyway.

Whether it does or doesn't, doesn't measure you as a consumer, the fact that you chose to use that particular application.

You chose to use iTunes for a reason which was not whether - what was disclosed.

So I mean 1, 2, 3 and 4 again may or may not be relevant to your criteria. But I'm not arguing that they shouldn't necessarily be used and looked at after the fact.

But I don't think that any one of those on their own or even collectively is necessarily the measurement of what you're trying to get at.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah this is Steve we combined the words benefits and restrictions because we're looking at two kinds of consumers, both registrants and users. The word benefits is applicable only to the registrants.

So if I'm deciding to put my bookstore in dot book and move it out of dot bus where I have it today, I needed to know what are the benefits of going there.

So it's really a marketing benefit of the registrant. So we have fallen prey to trying to be brief and sticking both registrants and users into the same metric and I can see why that would have made you believe we were suggesting that the benefits to the user should be disclosed.

And we never meant to imply that and it's a good discussion because it's leading me to think about ways of rephrasing 2.1 through 2.4 to separate registrants from users and to take out the normative statement of should.

But while leaving a target in there that's ambitious by the way, we might leave an ambitious target.

But take out should so that it doesn't look like we're creating a requirement where none exists today. Would it be helpful that if we started - if we cut this up between users and registrants that if combining the single metrics?

Jeff Neuman: I think that should be done in general across the board, because I see registrants being such a small subset of consumers and almost and could be irrelevant for a number of TLDs.

Obviously you have the closed brand TLDs there where registrants are pretty much irrelevant. I also think closed key word TLDs would fit in that category as well whether people like them or not.

If they're still allowed to exist, if there's a closed key word TLD that doesn't have registrants then obviously\ that criteria should not apply to them.

You and I still have that discussion and of course I have that in my initial letter or revisions back to you guys.

Steve Del Bianco: And our reaction to that had been to create 2.1 and 2.2 and so I just hope you'll acknowledge we took your initial suggestions very seriously and that's why we did the work you saw there.

But I really don't think we solved the problem with what we did on October 31. We've left the word should in four places and it's nowhere else.

We've smushed users and registrants into one row and we actually do that very rarely and the third level of question is whether we still want to have metrics that look in a different way at closed key word closed brand and open.

Your letter to us actually prompted us to change other things in this document where we only looked at open and we deliberately would have excluded the closed.

Don't want to jump into all those right now but there's benefits to what you prompted us to do because we found several things later in the document that shouldn't apply to the closed.

So staying on just the consumer choice metrics, it looks to me like we could solve a lot of this by taking out should and rephrasing them to be non-judgmental descriptions of saying let's design a metric on the disclosure of benefits to potential registrants.

Another one, a metric to discover the disclosure of restrictions for purposes of internet users that want to visit a website and rely upon its - sorry visit websites within a TLD.

And understand what the eligibility criteria may have been to get in. and we could continue to maintain that the source of the data could both be an audit and a survey.

The survey, what about 2.4 where we went into the understandability and it's been over a year Jeff but I believe 2.4 came from a conversation when Wendy Seltzer was on the call and said that for choice to be worthy people have to be able to understand what's disclosed.

It can't just be legal gobbledegook, and that's where we came up with this notion of plain language.

Cheryl I think you came up with the plain language idea.

Cheryl Langdon: Yeah, both Rosemary and I, Cheryl for the transcript record, sorry. Been so long since I've had to say it. We're very solid on that and I think that was one

of those we kept going back around and not coming up with a better model as well.

Jeff Neuman: So 2.4 seems like the right question to ask, I don't know what the target is there.

Man: Can we move the document so we can see the thing Jeff is talking about?
Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Exactly which section did you want to go to? This is Julie Hedlund.

Man: It's called a Measure of Consumer Choice, it's the beginning of the table on Page 14.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Getting there.

Jeff Neuman: I'm seeing the chat too and I understand that you're looking at things in the aggregate. But in the end people will take this survey, if they don't like new TLDs and will use this whether it's any aggregate or on an individual basis to say the program failed.

And I just want to make sure that if the program is indeed a failure then it's failed because of the overall criteria and not because one, two three or even four of these things fail.

Which never measured what you wanted to measure in the first place, people will use this as they see fit and I'm worried about the future of the program.

So if the - if your criteria is transparency and clarity of registry benefits and restrictions so that users and registrants can make meaningful distinctions on new TLDs, that's great.

That's exactly what we should look at, I'm just not sure any of these individually or even in the collective get to that criteria.

Jonathan Zuck: DO you have a recommendation Jeff?

Man: If you look at the chat I have a recommendation for 2.1 in the chat, you might want to look at that.

Jeff Neuman: So if there are potential - if there are registrants who are clear disclosure of a TLD benefits and restrictions, such as registrants could make informed choices, I think that's fine, yes.

But again by definition that would only apply - that wouldn't apply to any of the closed TLDs or the single registrant TLDs whether key word or brand.

Steve Del Bianco: Jeff if I could reply to that, it may be that in the target column, the target for open TLDs would be all. It might be a way to finesse this issue with target rather than create a separate metric for open, closed brand and closed keyword.

Man: Even the closed ones are going to have to disclose that they're closed, right?

Jeff Neuman: No, why? Why are they going to have to do that? I'm just challenging you, I don't think they do but...

Man: We never say anything about what anybody has to do, right? There's nothing in the guidebook that requires it.

Man: I guess that was misspeaking on my part, I just think that people would benefit from knowing that a closed TLD was in fact closed.

Jeff Neuman: Who would benefit?

Man: Look at 2.2, because we've just confused registrants to users. If by separating registrants and users in 2.1 and 2.2, then Jonathan Zuck's point becomes relevant about 2.2, but not about 2.1.

Jeff Neuman: Again if it's a closed TLD, I want you to think about - think like a business like dot Neustar okay? Dot Neustar I will not have - I'm in charge of the site, I will not have anywhere in my site the benefits of the TLD or the restrictions on eligibility, I just won't.

Won't happen, it's irrelevant to my business. Nobody looks at my website whether it's neustar.com or soon to be home.neustar or whatever it is.

Nowhere on that site will there be anything about the eligibility to register a name. There just won't.

Michael Graham: Jeff this is Michael for the record, I just wonder and one of the difficulties in phrasing this is some of the sites and we discussed this, some sites will self evident the benefits and restrictions.

Coming to a site that is dot Neustar and being told welcome to the home of Neustar this is what we do in effect states one, it's closed, this is Neustar only and two, the benefits are you have found Neustar.

Difficulty is in measuring such things.

Jeff Neuman: That's right, in fact what you'll see at home.neustar is the exact same thing that you see today at neustar.bis, it won't be any different.

Man: Well then in part what Steve has suggested for 2.1 I don't know if it's disclosure or if it's evident, I don't know again how you put that in other than in a survey which we provided for in 2.4 for users.

Perhaps there should be a separate one for registrants or potential registrants that whether or not it's disclosed whether they are aware of it's sort of like an either or type of proposition which my understanding and I did come to the project late in the game.

But my understanding was the direction was to put together measurable, empirically measurable metrics that could be passed along, along with a few hole fillers shall we say, such as the suggestions with surveys.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I mean I do think that it will be evident in a lot of cases and I see Cheryl's comment on the chat. But Cheryl one third of the TLDs are going to be brand close.

And they'll look exactly like we start up bus, I mean they won't look like that but they'll be just like that in the sense of they're not - they're catering to their customers and their potential customers which have nothing to do with registrants.

And maybe even nothing to do with consumers in the general sense but they have everything to do with that company's business or that - you know that say NABP has applied for dot pharmacy, they're not going to talk about the TLD in and of itself, we're going to talk about what their organization does.

Cheryl Langdon: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Right so they're not going to have - the website's not going to disclose the benefits and restrictions of the TLD. It won't happen. And I don't think there's anything wrong with that, because I think like Michael said, it's pretty obvious or can be pretty obvious to the normal consumer who's behind it and that's it.

Who's behind it and the types of things that appear in that TLD.

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve I put into the chat 2.1 and 2 that included the applicability of the metric as I'm hearing Jeff say it. I'm not necessarily proposing it.

But Jeff is what you're getting at what I just put in the chat for 2.1 and 2?

Jeff Neuman: So 2.1 seems right, I'm looking at 2.2.

Michael Graham: Steve it's Michael, should those begin whether or is there clear disclosure, something along those lines?

Steve Del Bianco: That isn't the way we've done it any of the other 60 metrics Michael. In the sense that we didn't start them as questions right?

We often stated the metric, just take a quick scan of some of the others and I think you'll see where I'm going.

Jeff Neuman: well then the opening would be whether there is, simply to be clear, what it is that's being measured.

Steve Del Bianco: Like many of them we start with the word measure so we would say measure whether there is clear disclosure so it's possible to start that way, to start with the words measure whether.

Michael Graham: Yeah something along those lines.

Steve Del Bianco: But let's not start with things like should and what is to be consistent with the rest of ours. So in repeating it back from what I'm hearing Jeff saying, his 2.2 would not apply to close brand TLDs.

Personally I agree with that but on our last two hour 43 minute call one of our members within ALAC, Evan felt so strongly about having disclosure even on brands somewhere about this.

And we didn't come to consensus on that, it was more of a compromise you know to get through the call.

But potentially if you agreed with what I have put in the chat it's 2.1 and 2.2, let's be fair to Evan who felt strongly that 2.2 should not be restricted in the way I proposed here.

Evan sometimes would inform normativeness to these metrics and we know that we don't have the power to do that, they're simply measures and I think that I would encourage Evan to get on to the AOC review team and if in fact the brands don't disclose that they're restricted he could be one of the voices saying that that's a - you know a negative mark against the gTLD expansion.

Let's make sure in the next guidebook that everybody has to do such a disclosure and that was completely appropriate discussion to have there.

But I'd hate to see us lose momentum and lose consensus on an otherwise pretty damned good document over just whether closed brand TLDs should be measured as to whether there's a disclosure of the restriction.

Man: I agree with that.

Cheryl Langdon: Oh dear, perfect timing.

Steve Del Bianco: The way to really solve it if you're Evan the way to solve it is to don't put a restriction, this is on 2.2, simply measure it for all users and then in the target column we could say no target, just measure it.

We've done that Jeff several places where we don't set a target, we just say measure this for purposes of understanding this.

We do it that way then Evan is empowered to use the data we've collected to suggest that the new gTLD program is not really contributing to choice as

much as it should because people have no idea when they're choosing to go to dot search or dot book they have no idea what they're choosing.

And if they go to dot Neustar do they really care? I don't know but that would be his opportunity to do that, and we will have preserved Evan's opportunity to make that point by designing a metric that measures it.

So arguing for Evan I would say that 2.2 wouldn't have any parenthetical at the end and it wouldn't have any targets.

Cheryl Langdon: Cheryl here Jon, Steve I agree with you on that, I think that's a good way around it for 2.2 and I keep saying again and again these are measures and the ability to look at any change, should any change occur in these measures over time.

It's just fodder to the IOC review team to do what they will with it.

Jonathan Zuck: Michael are you in the queue?

Michael Graham: I still had my hand up, sorry. I was going to take it back down, I was just going to basically go back over but I think it was just covered, the use of the language and body which again was the sort of either or.

Jeff Neuman: So this is Jeff so what does it say now? Sorry I missed that.

Michael Graham: Three page to get in the chat because it always scrolls up. Give you a second to read that.

Jeff Neuman: Well for the target on the - so there's two for parenthetical in 2.1.

Michael Graham: Yeah the second parenthetical Jeff is what shows up in Column 4 and it's the exact thing we already have in Column 4, 4 being the target column Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: All registry - but again we're back to all registries should be perused whether it's - when you say open TLD...

Michael Graham: Sorry, it says open TLDs only so we would - I mean we shouldn't - it's all registries that are measured, just 100% of the opens. It's opens only for 2.1.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and then 2.2 clear disclosure of TLD, they're targeting for four and you're not limiting 2.2 at all.

Michael Graham: Exactly so we give Evan what he asked for which is a recommendation that the metric measure all TLDs but we're not implying any sort of normative scope that says that every single of them, closed brand and closed keyword and open should all have it on their home page.

Because as you say that doesn't make much sense but I want to make sure Evan gets the opportunity to assess that if he's on the affirmation review team or he can comment.

And we may determine that the affirmation review that next time around we should have such a requirement and he'd have his way.

Jeff Neuman: There's a clear understanding in TLD eligibility restrictions, we need to disclose there because again I will not disclose - there are no users making choices about my dot Neustar domain name itself, right?

Michael Graham: Yeah and I use the word disclosure because a year ago we split the baby this way, we said it's one thing to disclose, it's another thing to say that it was readable and understandable, hence the 2.4 of plain language.

And if that is too splitting hairs here, I could see getting rid of 2.4 and changing the word clear disclosure to understandable or you know understanding of.

Is that where you were going with that?

Jeff Neuman: I mean yes because look we all know, we have an understanding now that the applications in, we all know that one third of the applications are closed brand TLDs that will not do this disclosure on TLD eligibility restrictions because it makes no sense because there are no eligibility restrictions that need to be made known.

It's like a regular website that a company has. So I mean I think it's incumbent upon us to do that recognition and not just put in here something that we know that a third of TLDs will not comply with because there's no reason for them to.

Jonathan Zuck: So the question Jeff is still whether or not people are aware that that's the case, that that's the TLD that they can't somehow be a part of. Because for example if Facebook - this is purely hypothetical but at Facebook had gotten dot Facebook it wouldn't have been clear, right?

In fact it might have been possible that they would have lead their users to get dot Facebook URLs right? So it's not a given that because I've got a brand that I'm not going to allow anyone to register or use those second level domains right?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I mean I see that but if the application that Facebook users or whoever gets a new TLD uses has nothing to do with domain names in and of themselves.

But has everything to do with the innovative service that they're doing. But who cares? Who cares whether people know that they couldn't get a name.

In the end they're using a service. I mean we're still pigeonholed.

Jonathan Zuck: The key is just whether or not the people understood this expansion happened and it's a question of whether people understood what their choices were right?

And there are in fact going to be brand TLDs that let people register, whether it's partners, franchises, there's going to be lots of opportunities in which this disclosure's going to be important.

Man: And Jonathan Jeff's point was disclosure is a step towards understanding and if we really just want to measure understanding or understood as you just said I just proposed a new way to phrase it picking up Michael Graham's suggestion of starting with the word measure and picking up Jeff's suggestion of going straight to understanding instead of a two part test of disclosure and clarity.

And I do want to have Cheryl think about whether we dispense with plain language or move plain language into the target.

Jonathan Zuck: And then is the measure of understanding just a survey then? Is that the only way to get to that?

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve, I would prefer that it be a two part, that we rely on these biennial surveys we've already designed but since it is trivial for our staff to do an audit of the sites, it's trivial to run through the sites and check the boxes to whether there was any disclosure, they'll have great data to say that some of these open TLDs didn't even disclose it on their info.tld page.

They may say that very few of the brands disclose it and we may all say who cares, because it's understood that I can't get a TLD in dot Neustar. So I would propose both survey and audits since the audits are easy.

Jeff Neuman: I mean an audit is fine as long as it doesn't come out where not having the disclosure in brand TLDs is a bad thing, right? So that's - as long as people

understand or as long as people doing this after the fact are measuring understanding, that's fine.

Like I have (unintelligible) dot com. I can't have that not because Amazon they were on their website, I just know I can't have neuman.amazon.com, I just know it.

Steve Del Bianco: So Cheryl has weighed in, Jeff what is your feeling on the latest paste of 2.1 and 2 with the understanding that 2.4 goes away?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah from my perspective that's fine, it's a lot better.

Steve Del Bianco: Michael's typing, while Michael's typing Cheryl and all the rest of you on the call knowing how passionate Evan is, the intent here is the 2.2 retains what Evan had in mind in measuring every TLD with the opportunity to use that as a way to assess whether the TLD program was really did contribute to choice.

Does that sound like we can discuss this with Evan after the call if we agree to go this way?

Cheryl Langdon: I think probably that would be all right, that the lack of target is not an issue. I believe that is the data set is what's important and being able to have that data set seems to be covered in the new language for 2.2.

I'm happy with the language - this is Cheryl for the record by the way - the understanding language measure the understanding language. I'm less comforted by words like plain language disappearing however.

And I guess that tends to come from experiences even working just in a multi lingual world within single language contracts in the telco industry, remembering that we are also now working in a multi script world.

And what is plain language in Farsi might be very different to what is plain language in Australia. And plain language we did establish has some meaning across a number of foreign restrictions.

But I'd like to think a little bit more on that one but your question directly to Evan's concerns and 2.2, I think that will probably be okay. But I can also say that once Olivier gets on the call in a little while, he's running an executive committee meeting within the next 24 hours.

So we should be able to raise it with Evan fairly properly as well.

Steve Del Bianco: I just pasted a proposal to address your concern in the chat Cheryl for 2.2.

Michael Graham: And this is Michael for the record, Steve while you were doing that I just in reading both of these over again and again I'm just wondering if we need to indicate for those who's understanding is being tested.

Steve Del Bianco: The word potential registrants for 2.1 and internet users for 2.2 and that phrase is used in half of the sentence. Michael are you suggesting I repeat that phrase?

Michael Graham: Yeah up front, measuring...

Steve Del Bianco: Potential registrant understanding of TLD benefits and restrictions such that potential registrants can make informed choices.

Michael Graham: Yes.

Steve Del Bianco: That makes you feel better we can do that.

Michael Graham: I think that would be clearer, otherwise the sample up above is going to be everyone to see if the registrants or potential registrants, I think we put that

right up front then we also limit the universe that's being tested with that particular metric.

Steve Del Bianco: Cheryl did the audit, plain language disclosure work for you?

Cheryl Langdon: Yes, plain language, I know it sounds silly to try and dine and ditch over just a couple of words but you know they really will help I think later on because we don't want to have sufficiently obfuscated language.

It's a bit like putting up the 172 page TNC in point three font, yes it's there, but.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff if I can - what is the TLD main website?

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah great question, we certainly don't want to imply that every website in the TLD and I don't even know what dot book will have an info dot book.

Jeff Neuman: Well go to Neustar dot (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: Help us think that through, with a closed brand or even an open TLD, I'm an end user and I go to childrens.book.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Everyone go to neustar.bis.

Steve Del Bianco: No, you're going to a brand, let's not do a brand, do a generic, a closed key word. I'm only worried about the closed keywords on this one.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, go to www.neustar.us, that's my main US page. Okay so that's an example of sort of an open TLD with a bunch of restrictions on it.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah interesting that you picked neustar.us as the - is that what you would call your main page Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: That is our main dot US page or dot US website, yes.

Steve Del Bianco: Interesting, I mean is there an info.us?

Jeff Neuman: There's a nick dot US that would just point you straight to here but there's no requirement. It's the same.

Steve Del Bianco: In the case of dot US, your main page happens to be neustar.us. And by using the word main page I guess you're answering your own question, it's that page.

The one that describes how the TLD is run.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah but that's a website in and of itself, where you find the policies, you click on a policy page. I mean that's where your restrictions are I guess if you were to call them restrictions.

Steve Del Bianco: And Jeff you've identified a potential pitfall in what we came up with a long time ago, we knew we had this pitfall in here of not knowing where in fact this disclosure would ever occur.

It's not at all clear, if Amazon wins dot book they've put up an info dot book page? I don't know what that would be and so we came up with this nomenclature of a main website or a website.

Jeff Neuman: Right, so it's a main one, like where we do our marketing programs would be www.about.us. I don't know which one of those are main, we send different consumers to different places.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah they're similar, they're very similar. It's funny, the word benefits, about us benefits?

Jeff Neuman: About dot us.

Steve Del Bianco: But at the top it has benefits right there. Benefits is something we discussed earlier on the call.

Jeff Neuman: That's right, is that my main page?

Steve Del Bianco: I guess I would ask you, you tell me which is your main page, the neustar.us or about.us? Which one would be the one the auditor would check the box to say yep.

Michael Graham: Or Steve this is Michael, if I could impose another question which is what would you call that page Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Which one sorry?

Michael Graham: The page on which you're making these sort of announcements or explanations.

Jeff Neuman: So if there were restrictions and policies it would be neustar.us. If it was the benefits and marketing and why you should get it and some pretty cool stuff I would say about.us.

Michael Graham: I guess what I'm asking is, is there a general term for this type of page regardless of its address that appears on a website?

For example you know in intellectual property notice page, I think everybody knows you look for either copyright or trademark down at the bottom and you click on that.

So I can call it that, it's not a main page. I'm just wondering if there's a term that we might use rather than main page that would be clearer and would be more inclusive of the different possibilities that are out there that you're pointing out.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi this is Jonathan Robinson speaking, can you hear me okay?

Man: Yep.

Jonathan Robinson: So the traditional page for that would - and this is the - I'm seeing sort of a circular irony in this because the traditional page for a registry to do that kind of thing would be the nic dot TLD page.

There one might expect that there would be the sort of key non marketing focus description of the registry and its positioning. But actually I mean whether or not there is any standard home or base paid.

I mean Jeff's just put a really good illustration there of what some creative marketing can do to try and position a TLD as an attractive piece of real estate to consumers.

And so ironically in that being that one of the overarching objectives of the new TLD program is to permit that sort of freedom, we're looking to say well we're trying to find a restrictive space in which consumers could trust that they could find out about that TLD.

But it is difficult to pin that down. So my short answer is the traditional page would have been nic dot something, but whether or not that's even used at all universally these days is questionable.

Steve Del Bianco: We're debating whether the word main, we definitely wouldn't put things in here like nic or about, that's way too explicit and ideally we allow the registry itself to indicate which page is their general information website.

So instead of the word main with the word general information website, solve this problem for everyone?

Jeff Neuman: I think it gets closer and I think - but as you can see they may not be disclosed on the same page, benefits and restrictions may be in different places.

So in other words you'd see the benefits on a dot us, and it wouldn't be until you're actually in the registration process that you'd see the restrictions.

Steve Del Bianco: Okay so to make it plural general information pages, for plain language disclosure.

Jeff Neuman: Again I think that's good for open TLDs, I think for brand TLDs you'll get more like what's on neustar.bus.

Steve Del Bianco: In which case that would be duly noted as some of the data that comes back on one of the 60 metrics and it be up to the affirmation team to say whether that statistic for the closed ends up mattering.

What you'll see we've done on many other metrics is we've asked staff to gather the metrics and categorize them by whether it's a closed or open or closed keyword or closed brand.

And the purpose of that is so that when the data is gathered you don't just simply get a score that says 700 out of 1400 were understandable.

Instead you get 700 out of 700 open or understandable, 300 out of 400 generic keywords were understandable and maybe none of the brands were understandable. You with me on that Jeff, trying to make sure that we capture the data in a way that it can be analyzed by segment.

You'll see it on Page 19 under 3.9.

Jeff Neuman: I mean I understand that, it can - what an unrelated group of people will do with that information once collected, is that your line on this? What's that?

Jonathan Zuck: Might be all the same people. But yeah I guess the key is just to come up with some measures that we have that we're not later on wishing we had them.

I mean I think a lot of these debates are going to happen in the context of the review team about which of these statistics in retrospect are relevant.

And in fact the data they contain, if as you say none of the brand TLDs disclose any of this information and that hasn't lead to any questions into the compliance office and it hasn't created any kind of you know confusion anecdotally then it might be simply ruled irrelevant at the time.

Or it may be something that becomes a restriction in the future, but I don't think it's anything that is going to have an individual impact on the individual registries.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think we've come as far as we can come on this one. I still have a question on registrar's disclosing.

Steve Del Bianco: Can I answer that (Jeff)? I really believe that if we measure the understanding of potential registrants that that metric, which is 2.1, would be an understanding that they obtained by both looking at the registrar Web site if Go Daddy carries a .book and it's open. They'd get part of their understanding there and they'd get part of their understanding from the general information pages of .book.

So I would propose that 2.1 eliminates the need for 2.3 provided that the source of data includes a quick audit of not only the registry but the registrar Web site.

We acknowledge that there's no way registrars like Go Daddy would paste and repeat all of the restrictions and benefits from every TLD. They'd simply have a link to that.

So this way we can capture the fact that a potential registrant makes an informed choice based on information the obtained from a couple of sources. Things...

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: ...they obtain from registrars as well as general information pages of the registry itself.

Jeff Neuman: So I agree with taking 2.3 out and measuring understanding. I'm not sure I agree with the notion that registrars may even have a link to the TLD. I don't think they necessarily...

Steve Del Bianco: I'm not even - I'm not even caring if they do, right.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: Do you think that the audit should try to discover whether they did? We're not being normative about it. We're just wondering. Should we assess that?

Jeff Neuman: All right. Did they do it, yes or no? And then it's up to people to say do we really care. Okay. (You still there)?

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah Jeff. I'll read Page 2.1 and let's look at it in the chat and see what we want to do here. I was looking at Michael Graham's question. I have no idea what to do with that one. But look at 2.1 in the chat.

Man: Steve, Michael. I rely on you on knowing what to do with all of these comments from time to time.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: All right. So Jeff Neuman, we were just discussing whether we are wanting staff to take a look at a quick audit of the registrar Web sites to see to the extent at which they contribute to the understanding of a potential registrant.

As a practical matter do the registrars do anything to link me over to the registry or do I have to go find that on my own before I buy a domain name?

Jeff Neuman: Usually they don't like to lose control (unintelligible) so they generally do not link - they generally have in their terms and conditions the restrictions for particular TLDs once you go through the registration process. But they will not necessarily link back to the main (page) of the TLD.

Man: Jeff, from what you're saying though is that they may not link back but they would provide that information themselves?

Jeff Neuman: The restrictions part. Not necessarily the benefits but the restrictions. So if you tried to register a .us domain name like Go Daddy, in the terms and conditions - in the 50 pages, excuse me, there's a section on .us and (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: Jeff, I just went to Go Daddy, a big registrar and I looked for NetChoice and .biz because Go Daddy carries .biz. And NetChoice.biz is already taken. Hey that's new to me. I got to figure out who has that.

And since I picked .biz, the first thing Go Daddy does is bring up variations that I might consider in .biz. But there isn't anything on their page that describes .biz's benefits and - nothing. Nor is there a link to .biz because they don't want me to leave this page. I think you bring up a really good point.

Jeff Neuman: If you go down to the bottom of the page -- sorry, my voice is running out -- it does say pricing. Do you see a pricing chart if you pick an actual name? Like pick - I randomly pick sdfd.biz and it's available. And you look at the bottom on the pricing. Sorry, my voice is going here.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah, yeah, yeah, sdfd.biz. Did a search. It is available at six bucks. And if go all the way down under pricing...

Jeff Neuman: You see .biz?

Steve Del Bianco: Nothing there. This is just the...

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: ...resale price that Go Daddy's offering.

Jeff Neuman: I got a pricing chart that says all the TLDs (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: I know. But there's nothing on there about restrictions. Whether I will be eligible for something in biz.

Jeff Neuman: You go to (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah. Nothing at all. They don't want me leaving the Go Daddy site.

Jeff Neuman: Right. But if you go to US for example it'll say private registrations not available for .us domains. But that's not all the restrictions. If you click

through, you'd have to take (a nexus) and all that other stuff. Yeah, they don't want you leaving the site.

Steve Del Bianco: All right. So for the team since we've had a year and a half, almost two years into this project, we have not spent much time on 2.3 before. Again, this arose very early in our work. That's why it's really high on the choice list. It's Number - right at the top.

This was based on making sure that potential registrants have a good understanding, not Internet users - end users who never look at the registrar site.

So the question for the group is is it sufficient to audit, sorry. To measure the potential registrant's understanding through combination of registry Web site audits and biennial registrant surveys. And simply leave out a specific reference to registrar Web site disclosures and go right to the thing that we seek, which is understanding.

Maybe a thumbs up on that one in the - would be...

Michael Graham: Yeah. This is Michael. I'll thumbs up on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I can't do a thumbs up on my chat so this is Cheryl indicating yeah, I'm okay on that one.

Man: That's pretty close to a quorum there.

Jeff Neuman: Michael gets two votes.

Man: And we got Cheryl's vote as well. So that's excellent. Are there other examples? We spent a lot of time on this one but there are other things that bothered you as much Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Trying to think of if they all got addressed.

Man: I just noticed the reason for your comment and yes it is Chicago.

Jeff Neuman: Did we - so what did we do on 2.5 with IDN? I'm a few drops back on mine.
Can you scroll down (unintelligible) IDNs?

Steve Del Bianco: That's the new 2.6. And so if we could scroll to the new 2.6 please. That it
right there? Quantity of TLDs using IDN scripts.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. So with this one - my question on this one is is this measuring top level
or second level or both?

Steve Del Bianco: It says quantity of TLDs. It does not say quantity of domains. So it's strictly
TLDs. So there'll be 1400. And again, this is not just Gs, but it's all TLDs
using IDN scripts. So this is an effort to say and measure the program to say
that relative to 2011 when there may have only been about 30 TLDs using
IDN scripts, we hope that that number is higher.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: And we have a goal that it be an increase in the number.

Jeff Neuman: But you didn't really answer my question.

Steve Del Bianco: TLDs only. Top level.

Jeff Neuman: So it's the number of IDN top-level domains.

Steve Del Bianco: Not just IDN. It's IDN or languages other than English. It's slightly broader
(unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So again, it's irrelevant to you all of this criteria whether .shop uses an IDN at the second level. It's really only relevant to you as to whether this IDN or non-English version on shop.

Steve Del Bianco: That's right.

Man: That's right.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think that should be made more clear because it's (unintelligible) from that. It's fine. I'm not arguing the criteria. I'm just saying it's not clear. You could take quantity of TLDs using IDN scripts or languages at the top level other than English.

Steve Del Bianco: I see your point. I see your point. Yes you're right. Let's change that to at the top level. Julie, in previous calls the pen was held by Berry. But I've been keeping track of the edits we've made so far but if you're already doing it, keep doing it. Let me know. Are you making any edits to the doc while we're talking?

Julie Hedlund: I wasn't because Berry told me you were going to Steve.

Steve Del Bianco: Okay. I will add the top level in front of the word at the end. I will add it to the end of the sentence.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. At the next (unintelligible)...

Steve Del Bianco: Clarify what I did earlier is the 2.1 and 2.2 are what I pasted into the chat. And we are eliminating 2.3 and 4.

Man: Right.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So then what about the next one? Quantity of registrar Web sites offering IDN scripts or languages.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Del Bianco: If the IDN TLDs are out there but the registrars aren't carrying them because they don't have high volume, that would be an indication that we have not necessarily increased the choice available to potential registrants. It's not meant to be normative. We simply want to measure.

And the goal was that there be an increase in the number of registrars whose Web sites themselves have IDN scripts or languages other than English because if these people truly do use their own native scripts and languages, how will they understand in English only or non-IDN Web site?

Jeff Neuman: Right. So I understand the criteria. So I think it should be quantity of registrars, not really the number of Web sites they have; but the quality of registrars offering second level domains in IDN top level or something like that just to clarify. And it's not IDN scripts in general. It's IDN in IDN top-level domains. Otherwise you'd get the idn.ascii (counting) in this. And this one's really only open for the - and it's only for the open TLDs.

Man: And again in this case we're just looking at a - trying to look for a net increase.

Steve Del Bianco: It wouldn't matter at all Jeff. A lot of these we didn't put open and close restrictions for the reason (Jonathan) just stated. You want to think about that a second?

Jeff Neuman: This one doesn't have the relative increase. It's just (quant) specific, (never increase).

Steve Del Bianco: That's right.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I'm not too concerned about that then.

Steve Del Bianco: So if it goes up a little bit, it really doesn't matter that a bunch of them didn't offer it.

Jeff Neuman: Right. But you'll pick out the Web sites, right. You'll just - it's registrars in general.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah. Let me paste - I just pasted it in. Look in the chat.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. That's right. Well wait. Offer the second level domains and IDN scripts (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah Jeff, it's not just IDN TLDs.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. That's right.

Man: That might have been something - we're not trying to restrict it to just IDN TLDs.

Jeff Neuman: Oh we're not?

Man: No. We're just looking at a net increase in the second level.

Steve Del Bianco: IDN availability.

Man: I'm sorry.

Jeff Neuman: But then that's different than what you had in the criteria above it, which you said it's specifically quantity of IDN TLDs. Like I can offer idn.web. If I offer idn.web, you say that doesn't meet Criteria 2.6 but it will meet 2.7.

Man: That's right.

Steve Del Bianco: That's right because 2.7 only measures the registrars whereas 2.6 measures TLDs.

Man: That's right.

Steve Del Bianco: Agreeably they're not entirely consistent because there are these rare instances where people will take an idn.ascii, which is a strange and bazaar combination that can't be of much value because the users have to change the script they use halfway through a TLD. It's halfway through a domain name.

Like there's a million IDNs in com today for some reason. Do you allow IDNs in biz or US Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: No, in biz but not US.

Steve Del Bianco: Do you have many of them?

Jeff Neuman: Maybe 100,000 total. No, not even that many probably.

Steve Del Bianco: And as (Jonathan) said, we just tried to word this in a way that's relatively simple because we're getting at the notion that does a potential registrant have more choice after the expansion than that potential IDN registrant had before the expansion?

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: And since the TLD space primarily English and ASCII today, the hope is we'll be able to show that the expansion has resulted in an increase in their choices. Their choices are evident both in what the wholesaler, the TLDs offer the registries, but they're also evident in what the retailers offer and that's the registrars.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Steve, I'm not arguing the criteria. Just be clear in the second one that it's in any TLD and in the first one any IDNs top level.

Steve Del Bianco: You're right. At the top - that's why I put the word at the top level under 2.6.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: Did that. You won't see it on your screen until I've processed the document edits.

Jeff Neuman: All right. Then the next one - appreciate you guys staying on the phone walking - letting me walk through this. Two point - I guess it's nine now. Just scroll down a little bit.

Man: (Julia) could you scroll the document down? Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry about that. Yes 2.9. Is that correct?

Man: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Well, to me it's 2.9 so it's...

Man: Back a little.

Julie Hedlund: New 2.9. Okay.

Jeff Neuman: There it is.

Julie Hedlund: There we are.

Jeff Neuman: Why is this - I don't understand this relevance.

Steve Del Bianco: Jeff, this actually came from an earlier conversation with Wendy Seltzer where she talked about the fact that some registries will base themselves in a privacy friendly regime, some of the new TLDs and they may only use registrars that respect the kind of privacy concerns that the NCSG raises frequently.

And there may be a diversity. There may be a diversity in choices that a potential registrant can choose registrar or registry in a legal regime that is agreeable to them when it comes to things like privacy or take downs for IP protection purposes.

Even end users might feel the same way. They might want to choose TLDs that are subject to legal regimes that require strong Whois for fraud prevention. Julie meant to capture choices that registrants and users could make based on the diversity of legal regimes governing the operation of the registry.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I don't buy it and the answer will obviously be that the greater number of jurisdictions if you look at the applications they don't - I don't know if that's the number of choices - I don't know. It's irrelevant to me because the quantity is going to be greater. We already know that.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah Jeff. And think about this. There will be things that go wrong with this gTLD expansion. You know, everyone will be a critic. So if there are a few metrics in here that are genuinely evidence of greater choice, however obvious they may be, this is the time to get them into the list.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let's...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Del Bianco: ...plenty of ways in which this will come up short. People have very high expectations for this expansion. And the critics of ICANN will not miss a

chance to say the where we have come up short. So it would be great to make sure that we acknowledge ways in which we will probably check the box even if it is obvious.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Then you can scroll down and easy (unintelligible) and open if that makes sense. I'm trying to find where it differs from what I said. Two twelve. Or the old 2.12. So it's probably the new 2.13. You have to go down one more.

This again should probably be...

Steve Del Bianco: Which one you looking at Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: The top (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: I thought this one was really only relevant to open TLDs.

Steve Del Bianco: When you do open only you're focusing only on registrants because Internet users who's the other half of the definition of consumer have access to all TLDs both open and closed.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. This is measuring the increased geographic diversity of registrants.

Steve Del Bianco: I know. But me as an end user I can visit sites of registrants even in closed TLDs. And therefore including the open and closed will simply result in a greater diversity.

Jeff Neuman: But if all the registrations are owned by the same company, there's no geographic diversity in that TLD at all. And that's fine.

Steve Del Bianco: That doesn't hurt the measure.

Jeff Neuman: If 1/3 of them are, wouldn't that hurt it?

Steve Del Bianco: All it says is that diversity should be greater than the legacy TLDs has and adding one to that measure for a Netherlands based closed brand TLD doesn't hurt you. And over time...

Jeff Neuman: If you're taking the statistical measure, it will.

Steve Del Bianco: But there's not a denominator. Right?

((Crosstalk))

Steve Del Bianco: Look at what we wrote in the Column 3. We said that we looked for an index or statistical measure of diversity. It was Annalisa Rogers who brought this up at the Dakar meeting and Cheryl and (Rosemary) followed up with her diligently to say what is this statistical measure of diversity. We thought that there was some sort of a academic index that could be used. We could never find one.

Jeff Neuman: Right. But Steve if you...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Del Bianco: ...find yet another sort of weak spot - we don't really know how the affirmation team is going to be able to do this.

Jeff Neuman: Let me tell you right now that in .com there's a registrant in every country in the world. And .biz (unintelligible) the same thing. So how are we going to increase it anymore than that unless you look at percentages or other measurements?

Steve Del Bianco: We did a percentage Jeff, what would be the denominator, the total domain names and what would the numerator be? I mean...

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: ...I'm really at a loss. We actually did...

Jeff Neuman: I think...

Steve Del Bianco: ...spend quite a bit of time. And Cheryl if you're still with us, what was the answer we got from Annalisa?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I am here.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I just had to come off mute. Sorry. Cheryl for the record. We didn't get an answer from Annalisa.

Michael Graham: This is Michael. Jeff, is your concern that the closed registries would somehow affect this measure? They're not even covered by this because they're - presumably if they're closed, there are not registrants to be counted.

Jeff Neuman: There's one registrant that could have millions of registrations. That's what I'm worried about. So in theory you could have a .google and ten million Google names. But because the registrant is listed as Google itself, it skews the whole balance.

And that's the geographic diversity could look worse than the legacy TLDs if you look at a percentage. Because right now each TLD can do a breakout of registrants by region and most of them do that. And even .com does that. They'll tell you what percentage of that - approximations about what percentage on which geographic areas.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...do that now. And I'm just worried that you could have the closed TLDs skew those results later on if you do the same thing.

Michael Graham: Right. So perhaps this should not exclude the closed but should provide that in the case of closed registries only the single registrant would be counted, something along those lines.

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah but statistically the shortcut to that is to only count the open TLDs as opposed to adding another level of complexity as to how to count them.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. It would only be open TLDs. Just like privacy and proxy don't count. You don't count the closed TLDs.

Michael Graham: And let me - could I get a clarification? When we're talking closed, we are not including within that restricted TLDs.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Del Bianco: ...we added makes it very clear that these are single registrant. If you're closed you're a single registrant and you are one of two flavors. You're a single registrant where the TLDs your trademark; we call those brands. And the other single registrant are known as closed keyword.

Man: Okay. Michael again.

Michael Graham: If there was a reason why we wanted to include the closed registries in this measure, my suggestion would be the approach that we took with the two point whatever, which was to create a separate category then for the closed as opposed to all of the others.

Steve Del Bianco: I don't - and to answer your question, I don't recall that there was an explicit effort to count the closed. But when we made our pass through here on our last call, this wasn't one of the metrics that looked as if it would be skewed badly by inclusion of closed and therefore we left it alone.

That is still the case if you're simply measuring the number of countries touched. Inclusion of closed wouldn't matter. But there's a good chance that the affirmation team has somebody smarter than we are and they figure out a measure of diversity, which is a density of diversity or a percentage of diversity.

If they cross that bridge to some sort of a percentage where there's a denominator, then Jeff's point is well taken. At that point the closed could make the new gTLD program look as if it didn't fulfill this metric when in fact it did increase diversity. So I'm of a mind that we add the word open to the second line across all new open gTLDs rather than have it be all and then find a way to back it out in the second half of the sentence Michael.

Jeff Neuman: And we've already got for single registrar TLDs I mean the criteria we just reviewed was those different legal jurisdictions. We ought to be looking at that kind of.

Steve Del Bianco: Michael, what's your thought on that then?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Graham: The only thing I can think is I wanted to go back to our definition of open - where is that? Closed registry.

Steve Del Bianco: Page 9.

Michael Graham: Nine.

Steve Del Bianco: Page 9.

Michael Graham: Okay. Give me a moment then.

Steve Del Bianco: While you're looking Michael, the rest of the folks I've pasted into 2.13 what the revised would look like if you guys were so included. The only difference is the word open.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie Hedlund. I move the Adobe Connect room to Page 9, which shows the definition for open gTLD.

Michael Graham: Okay. Thank you. I've got a hard copy here as well I was looking at Steve. Yeah. I'd go along with that suggestion with including open or - you're including closed in there. I have to go back to the other. The restriction that you were proposing to put in there I'd go with that. I just wanted to make sure that we were covering all the others.

Steve Del Bianco: And the way that works is the inclusion of the word open after the word new. So it only counts those. And this is on the - this is a belts and suspenders. A little bit of an insurance policy that in case the measure of diversity is a relative measure that it not be skewed by what will look like an apparently low diversity among well hundreds of thousands of registrations that really belong to one company.

Michael Graham: I'm fine. I just looked at your 2.13 text. I'm fine with that.

Steve Del Bianco: Oh cool.

Man: Jeff Neuman, back to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I think I only have two more. So if we go to 2.16, Web site traffic. Can you just give me an indication of what Web sites (unintelligible) that you are looking at?

Steve Del Bianco: Jeff, a little bit of background. This came from the U.S. Government and filed extensive comments on our draft advice coming from a more traditional view of competition. And the competition section has a very similar metric on - with respect to traffic.

They wanted us to measure this notion that there was a lot more - that the new TLDs if they did increase choice and if they did increase choice and competition, that would show up in having more traffic there.

Jeff Neuman: So all right.

So traffic to domains ending in that TLD extension?

Steve Del Bianco: That's right.

And the last thing we wanted to say is that the new TLDs would somehow overcome. So all we asked for was that - whether staff could design either a survey sampling -- like a DNS dropper like Alexa -- and be able to show growth rates.

If you look at the targeting (unintelligible), all we asked for them to do was to assess the growth rate in the new gTLDs. And they start from a rather low denominator. And so three years out, we think the growth rate in the legacies should exceed the growth rate in that same year in the 20 legacy gTLDs.

Jeff Neuman: So there is an assumption here that it's a zero sum game.

Steve Del Bianco: Oh, I wouldn't say that.

Jeff Neuman: The way it sounds is that the growth rate...

Steve Del Bianco: Let's put it this way.

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: If I decide - if I decide to get NetChoice.ngo or NetChoice.web in addition to my NetChoice.org, I don't have a lot to say about where the traffic goes, but it is kind of either or.

If my users - if my visitors end up going to my NetChoice.web, well, that's one time they didn't go to NetChoice.org. They may start to choose that. That's why it's in the choice (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

But most -- and this is just a case of the governments not knowing what they don't know. But most Web site traffic has nothing to do with users going in and typing in a particular address.

Steve Del Bianco: I mean -- I know, but they're selecting it from a search results page, (Jeff).

By the same token if I look at a search results page, I see the URL and I may make my decision on which to go to based on what the URL is as well.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

And your URL could get there because you've paid more money to be included.

Steve Del Bianco: No, not the paid search.

I'm talking about the organic search. If I bring up the word NuSTAR in organic search, I'm sure it's going to show me NuSTAR.us, NuSTAR.com and NuSTAR.biz and I'll pick one. I'll pick one based on my understanding of

where it's placed in the list and maybe my implicit understanding of what it conveys to be in .biz, .us or .com.

When I'm doing a search for a bank I may - I may well go for the .bank instead of the Wachovia.com out of an understanding that there's a higher reliability.

So people will make...

Jeff Neuman: So look.

Steve Del Bianco: (unintelligible)

Jeff Neuman: So let me give you one thing to change.

You don't necessarily mean Web site traffic. You mean traffic in general, whether that's DNS, Web site, whether that's mail, whether that's any kind of query that would take place. You don't mean Web site.

Steve Del Bianco: Good point, but explain that to us.

What is the difference?

Jeff Neuman: Well so if you are only tracking traffic to and from (unintelligible), that is a small subset of traffic that goes around the Internet, whereas a lot of traffic that's DNS traffic from which (unintelligible) the Web sites...

Steve Del Bianco: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: ...because in a lot of cases it's not.

But it's mail, it's other protocol traffic -- it's a whole bunch of other things. In fact, usually it's indistinguishable unless you check only the Web resolvers. (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: So you - the second sentence uses the word 'User traffic.' Does the word 'user traffic' make more sense, or the word 'End user traffic?'

Jeff Neuman: It makes more sense, but it still doesn't make sense as an indicator.

But (unintelligible)...

Jonathan Zuck: Because (Jeff) -- I mean (Jeff), there's certainly a lot of traffic that goes over the DNS that's not user traffic.

But it - but because we're only looking at consumer choice, trust and competition, I think that's why we're restricting to consumer traffic as opposed to what might otherwise be considered B2B traffic or some other things that might - that might go across the form of sub-services or something like that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

But I was (unintelligible) companies can't distinguish between the two.

Steve Del Bianco: Yes.

But so (Jeff), this is Steve. Where - we are happy to go with the right words, because we've been ambiguous. The first sentence says Web site traffic and the second sentence says user traffic.

And now I have to tell you that we added this after the public comment period using the words that came from the public commenter which, in this case, was the US government.

So help us to fix this rather than eliminate it, you know what I mean? And fix it in a way that it's somewhat meaningful in what you may say is a meaningless metric. Help us be explicit about it.

Is it Internet? Or is the word 'End user traffic' better than 'Web site traffic?'

Jeff Neuman: So what you're trying to do is show that DNS (unintelligible) -- it grows from day one to three years out, right?

You're not trying to show that it grows relative to percentage in legacy -- in other words...

Steve Del Bianco: Well three years out -- the annual growth rate in the third year out -- let's say in the new gTLD space is a - is 15% a year year-over-year traffic growth.

And the traffic growth in the same year for the 20 legacy gTLDs -- we're saying compare them to show the growth relative to the growth. We didn't even say it needed to be higher. Our metric is to simply compare them. So you compare the 2014 over 14 growth rate in traffic in the new versus traffic in the legacies in that same period in time.

And this would give this particular commenter the data they needed, or that - the data they thought they needed, compare whether these choices are choices the people are making with their fingers.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay.

I'm not going to argue against the US government.

Steve Del Bianco: Well they're a stakeholder, right?

So what would be the right word -- User traffic, or Web site traffic?

Jeff Neuman: Neither of this would be right.

Steve Del Bianco: What word?

Jeff Neuman: It's not a word here.

It's...

Man: (unintelligible)

Jeff Neuman: It's an assumption that behind why the US government is saying (unintelligible) that I don't agree with, so therefore I'm not going to comment.

Steve Del Bianco: All right.

So team -- for the rest of us, let's be consistent. Let's either word - use the word 'Web site traffic' or 'User traffic,' because we have both words...

Jeff Neuman: I would just...

Steve Del Bianco: ...in here.

Jeff Neuman: I would use - I would use DNS traffic and leave it at that, because that's what the TLDs manage. They don't manage Web sites traffic, they don't manage user traffic -- they manage DNS resolution, right?

Cheryl Langdon: I'm -- Cheryl here.

Man: (unintelligible)

Cheryl Langdon: I'm (unintelligible)

Man: ...conversation.

Jonathan Zuck: I'm sorry.

Cheryl, what?

Cheryl Langdon: I'm actually okay with DNS traffic. I have no problem with using that.

Jonathan Zuck: And Olivier, do you have your hand up?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

I -- thank you. It's Olivier, for the transcript.

Jonathan Zuck: All right.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlanc: Sorry for being late. I was in another call.

Just - I understand (Jeff)'s point of view on this. The thing, though, is how is this to be sourced? You know, what data source does one have to find out the traffic, whether it's Web site traffic or DNS traffic? They're two entirely different things.

The Web site traffic, I understand, might be measurable by organizations like Alexa and et cetera that might be looking at the number of hits and having a deal with those Web sites to find out whether they were called upon by one domain name or another domain name.

The DNS traffic, I guess, can probably - it's probably more accurate, because when one looks at the Web site traffic as (Jeff) said, you could use a new gTLD extension solely for Email and not for Web traffic at all.

I mean for example, .mail. I mean, would that have Web site traffic or would just - this just be for mail? And so at that point, one has to look at the

possibility of having some kind of DNS resolver data and whether this could be made available, or how could this be made available and whether it goes further than anything that we want.

But I guess if the US government thinks this should be put in there, I'd go for DNS traffic.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

I mean, in the end it's going to take a lot more -- this is (Jeff). It's going to take a lot more than three years to create a massive change to the market. And you're going to need the larger organizations and, you know, the larger social media sites to be using the new TLDs. And that's going to take a while. More than...

Steve Del Bianco: Well I mean their growth rate is good and their rate grows.

It's easy to get a good growth rate when you start with a small percentage...

Man: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: So that's why we decided to measure rates instead of asking staff to start to measure relative share between the two -- simply compare the growth rate in the...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, but...

Jonathan Zuck: Let's leave -- (Jeff) is sourcing the data, I guess, out.

So I mean, that can be a conversation -- that implementation side of this may affect a number of the different metrics. But it - I - if we have some consensus that DNS is the best of all worst ideas, as they said in Argo, then let's just put DNS traffic down for now and see if we can turn this document around.

I mean, it -- presumably the USG will still be okay with that. Is everyone agreed on that? That is was...

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Jonathan Zuck: ...it's a DNS?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well I think DNS currently is being tracked as to how many hits.

I don't know to what extent because it is distributed. You know, it would be pretty hard to get per domain name. But...

Jonathan Zuck: Well and I don't think we need it per domain name.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (Jeff), do you know of anyone -- does anyone know of current DNS hits being tracked?

Jeff Neuman: I mean, there is large providers of DNS recursive services that could - you could use as a baseline.

And if you keep going to those sources they would presumably be able to tell a growth rate. But I don't know -- I think we just put it in there and let's see what happens.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's right for now.

I mean, you know, to some extent...

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Jonathan Zuck: ...this is going to fall on staff to see what things are measurable and we'll have - we'll get pushback if things appear not to be.

But ideally, we're meeting...

Jeff Neuman: I'm cool with that.

Jonathan Zuck: ...the USG recommendation by measuring DNS traffic.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: So was that your last point, (Jeff)?

Jeff Neuman: I know Steve's leaving.

The only other thing I had, Steve, was in 3.4, which I think should only be open TLDs.

Steve Del Bianco: Okay, 3.4.

Jonathan Zuck: (unintelligible) is gTLDs.

Steve Del Bianco: Well 3.4 is the back end. It's the registry service providers -- it's the back end, right?

Jeff Neuman: Exactly.

So it's pretty much irrelevant, or close (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: And (Jeff)...

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Jonathan Zuck: But again it's (unintelligible), (Jeff).

Steve Del Bianco: It's only measuring relative to 2011 when we had six...

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Steve Del Bianco: ...registry service providers.

Whether you count all the closed or not, we're simply saying it ought to be twice as many. So if we just count the opens can we get to 12, because I don't know why we would want to exclude the closed.

If the - if including the closed gets us to 13 or 14, we'll have shown an increase in competition on the supply side.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

And they only recommend it for reading a targeted (unintelligible). And that doesn't mean that a group might not take this criteria and then, say, triple or quadruple, or whatever it is.

And - or it might not...

Steve Del Bianco: Somebody might...

Jeff Neuman: ...(unintelligible) it.

Say it happens 10 times. So the fact that we could - we could think of two times being true now does not make me want to keep this criteria.

Steve Del Bianco: Well whether we keep it or not, I'm pretty sure we don't want to limit the metric to measure only the open, since...

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: ...measuring them all always gets you more data.

Jeff Neuman: Who is...

Steve Del Bianco: (unintelligible) more...

Jeff Neuman: Who is the guy from

Steve Del Bianco: (unintelligible) to get you more.

Jeff Neuman: Who the guy in the back end for (unintelligible) is not a relevant measurement of competition.

Steve Del Bianco: I disagree.

The number of competing registry backend providers is -- and from a standard economic standpoint, the greater quantity of competitors, presumably you get greater quality, lower prices and more competition.

Jeff Neuman: Right, but not for users or registrars.

If we're looking at users and registrants, it's not relevant.

Steve Del Bianco: It's indirectly - it's indirectly to the registrants, since the registries would presumably have lower costs if the registry service providers were more numerous and more competitive.

Jeff Neuman: I (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: There's lower cost to generate more...

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: ...successful TLDs, they're...

Jeff Neuman: I wholeheartedly - I wholeheartedly disagree with that.

The backend providers do not determine anything about the front-end policies, the choice, the -- anything like that. They have no -- and in fact there's no charge from registrants -- there's no charge from the registry to registrants to use it...

Steve Del Bianco: I didn't - I didn't mention choice.

I mentioned the simple notion that the cost structure of a new gTLD registry operator will in part determine on what they have to spend to get somebody to run the back end.

And the cost...

Jeff Neuman: But it's not...

Steve Del Bianco: ...structure of the new...

Jeff Neuman: ...of which it would...

Steve Del Bianco: ...TLD operators will effect...

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: ...their (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: But Steve, with five or six -- does not make a difference whether you have 20, right? There is no difference.

And it's - to me, you're basically making it sound -- this is one, you know, obviously (unintelligible) feel strongly about. You may disagree, but I don't feel like it's a relevant (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: Yes, but you're arguing to get rid of the entire metric.

And earlier you said maybe only count the opens. It doesn't make any sense to only count the open. I think you're arguing to get rid of the metric, is that right?

Jeff Neuman: No.

Just to get rid of the - for the closed to justify it's open...

Steve Del Bianco: Say that again.

You're breaking up. Say that one more time.

Jeff Neuman: To justify it's open, because that's where it affects price.

It affects the end user. It affects a lot of things. In this case for closed TLDs it does not affect the registrant. It doesn't affect the end user. The fact that...

Steve Del Bianco: Well...

Jeff Neuman: ...there's six versus 12.

Steve Del Bianco: And you would argue that 3.4 as you see it on the screen should say open TLDs only?

If that's...

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Steve Del Bianco: ...your argument I would be willing to agree.

I'm fine with that. I'm just surprised you'd want it since it rolls out in a lower achievement of the metric.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, and I see the -- you know what? I'm okay with it -- with just being open.

Steve Del Bianco: You really are. Okay. For...

Jeff Neuman: What...

Steve Del Bianco: And the reason -- in case somebody asks, what would the reason be?

Jeff Neuman: The reason is because many - there are many things -- I don't see that - I don't believe that increasing the quantity of backend providers to closed TLDs has - affects the user or the registrant.

I see -- if it doesn't affect any of the normal things that you look at competition for the benefits. Plus, I think - I seem to think that if you have, let's say - let's say there's -- if people do separate the open from the closed and there's only five or six backend providers that service all of the closed ones, I'm not sure that's necessarily a bad thing from the user perspective.

Oh, and you've set your target as increasing it two times.

Steve Del Bianco: So you would want parenthetically at the end counting open gTLDs only?

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: This is for Steve's purposes. I'm perfectly fine with that.

Man: I would be fine with this as well and with your same logic, Steve.

Jonathan Zuck: Well I mean -- this is Jonathan and I'd - I mean, I guess I'm fine with it.

And I understand your argument (Jeff), that if this was some sort of a percentage figure it would make - it would make more sense to worry about that, because as it is, the broader it is the more likely we are to capture additional backend service providers that come online, which would be (unintelligible) metric.

But I guess no one's against narrowing it.

Jeff Neuman: (unintelligible) reason why I'm (unintelligible) this, because I have a feeling after the fact it may get narrowed.

And my fear is that they say, "Well there's only five or six backend providers - the same five or six are doing the backend for all the brand. And therefore, that weakens competition." But I'm not sure that that's right.

Steve Del Bianco: We're already hearing that, (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: What's that?

Steve Del Bianco: I said I'm already - I've already heard griping like that.

Jeff Neuman: I have too and I don't like it.

So...

Steve Del Bianco: I pasted into the chat and...

Man: Did you?

Steve Del Bianco: ...so I now have a full page of edits from 2.1, 2.2, got rid of 2.3 and 4, I have (unintelligible) edits to 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 -- 13216 and 3.4.

Anything else?

Jeff Neuman: No.

I think that's pretty much it. I appreciate you guys getting all (unintelligible)...

Jonathan Zuck: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: No.

Thank you (Jeff). Thanks for putting up with us.

Jonathan Zuck: So do we have a new champion, (Jeff)?

Jeff Neuman: What's that?

Jonathan Zuck: Do we have a new champion?

Jeff Neuman: Well I told you guys, you know, if we got on the call and you guys listened, yes, that I would absolutely be in favor of it. I was serious about that in Toronto.

Jonathan Zuck: (unintelligible)

Well thanks a lot...

Steve Del Bianco: All right.

Jonathan Zuck: ...for putting in the time. I know you're on vacation.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: And thanks - and thanks everyone else for sticking with it too.

And a lot of work's gone into this thing, so I'm glad that we're coming to some closure. Does anybody else have any points and you want to raise on this call? (unintelligible)

Cheryl Langdon: (Jeff), Cheryl here.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon: Just with Olivier arriving later, two things.

I wonder if I -- and (Jeff), thanks for this. It's made a big difference to all of our work knowing that we may have a smoother passage through this (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) of it.

I just wondered, could you indulge me a moment and just go back through to the -- I think it's 2.4 - 2.3-2.4 changes we made, because Olivier will need to also explain why we did that to (Evan) in the Executive committee, particularly since I'm assuming we'll have the new text out of this in enough time for Olivier's agenda on the 27th to consider the - what we are now seeming is final draft text?

Steve Del Bianco: Got it. Cheryl, this is Steve.

I have to jump off when my call comes in, so let me go as far as I can. Olivier, I will paste into the transcript what we've done with 2.1, 3, 2 -- 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 and I will pledge to give an updated document in the next 24 hours.

So you'll all have one on the Working group -- we'll have an updated document. I can make these edits quickly. Suffice to say that we took a look

at what we had before on 2.1, 2, 3 and 4 and we used to lump together users and registrants.

I think that -- okay. We used to lump together users and registrants and we are going to change that and explicitly measure users and registrants separately. And we used to say that disclosure was distinct from understanding -- that is to disclose something -- something you could measure -- was it on a Web site -- understanding something we would measure as to whether it was in plain language.

With (Jeff)'s help we actually simplified this to just two measures instead of four. The first of the two I'm about to put into the chat -- Olivier, I think you have access to the chat.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Steve Del Bianco: The new 2.1 measures from the standpoint of registrants, do they understand the benefits and restrictions of the TLDs so that they can make choices -- informed choices, because this is under the choice metric.

And it - of course they can only make a choice where it's open. So from a registrant's standpoint you only would count the opens, and (Evan) had agreed with this distinction before.

The target is that all open TLDs would have an understanding and the source would be our famous biennial surveys of registrants. We'd ask them about their understanding and then we would audit the general information page or pages of new TLD registries, which is sort of what we had in there before.

Now the second measure, and then I'll stop and take your questions. The second measure is 2.2, where you think about end users. And end users don't know opened from closed. They just visit Web sites -- stuff they see on the side of a truck, things that show up in search results, links on a page.

So what is the Internet user's understanding of the eligibility restrictions so that a user can make an informed choice about relying on a domain name and a TLD? We don't believe there should be a target on this, but we want to measure it for all TLDS, both open and closed and even .brand.

And we want to measure it because (Evan) is very keen at determining the extent to which end users know about the ability to visit a Web site even in a closed TLD and who's the one controlling the domains that can get into .book if it's closed.

We also added that the audit here should include the plain language information pages. That captures a little bit of the understandability from the language standpoint, but ultimately we're relying on that survey -- that biennial survey -- because the biennial is really going to ask people, "Do you understand about the new TLDS?"

And then by doing it that way, we got rid of whether the registrars in 2.3 disclosed or linked. And we spent a good deal of time on the call -- as (Newman) walked us through we all went to GoDaddy and some other registrar sites and we learned that even today they don't disclose because they don't want you to go off their page.

They expect you to do your research separately before you go to a registrar, because the registrars don't want to lose the traffic. They don't want to lose the customer, as it were.

I'll stop there and see if you have any questions.

Jeff Neuman: Hey guys, (unintelligible).

I have to drop off now (unintelligible) family schedule.

Steve Del Bianco: Thanks again (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: All right.

Take care (unintelligible). Bye.

Cheryl Langdon: Thanks (Jeff).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So it's Olivier here.

I'm perfectly clear. Just one question -- are you - are you then planning to remove 2.3?

Steve Del Bianco: That's right.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: The registrar won't find that...

Steve Del Bianco: Because the understandability will have been measured in 2.1.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (unintelligible) restrictions and the terms and conditions for each respective TLD (unintelligible). That would - that would go, basically.

Steve Del Bianco: Yes, because the understandability of -- I'm a registrant and I'm thinking about where to register. I'm considering moving to one of the new TLDs.

So my understandability -- my understanding of the benefits and restrictions is now being measured explicitly in 2.1. And I will have obtained that understanding either by the registry's Web site or by the registrar's Web site, or by some marketing brochure I saw.

I don't know where I'll have obtained it from, but we're going to try to measure your understanding through the biennial survey and we're going to ask ICANN staff to audit the registry Web sites, assuming that each one has some sort of general information page that would describe the restrictions and benefits.

How does that sound?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm concerned will just get very horrendous figures for that, because it's going to be hard for a registrant to find that information, bearing in mind today it's hard for the registrant to find such information.

Steve Del Bianco: That would have been the case before or after these edits, though, because...

Cheryl Langdon: Yes. But it...

Steve Del Bianco: ...in both cases auditing -- right?

We're - in both cases -- both before and after today's call, we are auditing the registry Web site.

Jonathan Zuck: And Olivier, this is Jonathan.

I think what's also important to remember that we keep reminding everyone else is that we're not empowered to actually create requirements on registrars or registries.

All we're doing is looking to see whether or not the program was successful after the fact. And so measuring whether or not people understood is different than us prescribing how we think that would most likely occur -- that we're...

Steve Del Bianco: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: ...we don't - we're not empowered to do that.

Cheryl Langdon: Olivier, Cheryl here.

That's the sort of thing that the Review team itself would be acting probably well advised to consider.

Jonathan Zuck: No, that's exactly right.

Man: (unintelligible)

Jonathan Zuck: I mean, if these numbers are low they're going to say, "Well whatever mechanisms were in place..."

Cheryl Langdon: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: "...are insufficient. Let's think of some new ones."

Cheryl Langdon: That's right.

Jonathan Zuck: But that's not what we've been tasked to do.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So 2.3 is being scrapped, 2.4 remains, or...

Steve Del Bianco: No, 2.4 goes away because we no longer are measuring disclosure...

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Steve Del Bianco: ...separately from the word 'understandable,' but going straight to the prize, which is understanding.

Do people understand, because before we were being...

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (unintelligible) some (unintelligible)...

Steve Del Bianco: ...we were requiring two steps.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Okay.

Steve Del Bianco: Some sort of objective discussion of...

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Steve Del Bianco: ...was it disclosed, and then a separate assessment of whether it was understandable.

And I do think it's far more workable if we measure understanding in one shot, however it was disclosed.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Understood.

It doesn't fill me with joy, but it's understood. I mean, it's a -- I understand that. And of course, it's a restriction that this Working group has. It cannot impose anything on the registrars or the registries and how they will mark it their ways is really down to whatever Review group is going to look at -- those metric.

And these two obviously -- 2.3 and 2.4 don't seem to be metrics. That's what (unintelligible).

Steve Del Bianco: Well we didn't get rid of them though.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: We have - if you look in the chat, 2.1 and 2 have captured what we used to have...

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Correct.

Steve Del Bianco: ...3 and 4.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, but captured them in a way as to say measure that rather than impose that.

So I'm fine with it.

Steve Del Bianco: Oh, excellent point.

Of the 60 metrics we have, there were only four that started with the words 'So and so should disclose,' or, 'So and so should be understandable.' And the only four we had that started with the word should as if we were imposing a requirement were these four.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Steve Del Bianco: So that made it more compelling to - on us to standardize and make our metrics facially neutral.

But everybody understands that we are being a bit normative about what we think should happen. I know we can't impose requirements if they're not in the guidebook or the contract, but we are hoping that the Affirmation Review team will look at the whole program.

And if it turns out that the understanding of these closed TLDs is really low and people are relying on Childrens.book not knowing that it's Amazon only that -- we think that'll reflect badly on the program and it will change the rules next time around.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: All right?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (unintelligible)

Steve Del Bianco: All right, team.

I will circulate all of that. And I'm afraid, Olivier, to be filled with joy you'll have to wait for Christmas.

Jonathan Zuck: Good point.

Or soon...

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm already filled with joy...

Jonathan Zuck: (unintelligible)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: ...just hearing this is the end of this work, I guess.

So that's (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Good point.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It'd probably come back to us before Christmas anyway.

Jonathan Zuck: And that - and that - and that will be a kind of Christmas.

Cheryl Langdon: Oh, god love us.

Man: Love you all.

Thanks so much.

Cheryl Langdon: Thanks everyone.

Steve Del Bianco: Thanks everyone.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you.

Man: Thanks all.

Happy Thanksgiving.

Olivier Crepin-Lelond: (unintelligible) everybody.

Have (unintelligible) and safe.

Cheryl Langdon: Bye.

END