ICANN Costa Rica Meeting

Consumer Trust- TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 14th March 2012 at 11:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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**.**

Steve DelBianco: Hey good morning everyone. Welcome to the session on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition. And we have a brief presentation with a lot of detailed slides to lay out for you the kind of recommendations that are in the draft advice that's up for public comment right now.

But before we dive into that we'll do a quick round of introductions. My name is Steve DelBianco, I'm - I just a heard timeout.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Liz. And again my name is Steve DelBianco. I'm with NetChoice but I'm the Policy Chair for the Business Constituency and one of the members of this working group.

I'd like the members of the working group to quickly introduce themselves because we sort of put ourselves in the position to hear feedback from everyone today so we tried to get as many of them as possible to sit up front.

To my right...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good morning, everybody. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I'm one of the representatives of the At Large Advisory Committee on this working group.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, my name is Jonathan Robinson. I'm a member of the drafting team. And I'm within the Registry Stakeholder Group and through the Registry Stakeholder Group I'm a GNSO councilor.

John Berard: And my name is John Berard with the Business Constituency and the liaison to the GNSO Council for this working group.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, ALAC Chair and part of the working group.

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry, Jonathan Zuck with the IPC and part of the working group.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Make sure Berry Cobb, introduce himself too.

Berry Cobb: Berry Cobb with ICANN staff.

Steve DelBianco: Berry's done a huge (unintelligible) on this as has Monica and Margie.

So thanks again. Let's go to the first set up on this. And what we are going to try to accomplish quickly is background of where the heck did this come from, this advice, talk about an update since Dakar and review the draft advice.

Now as I said before the document has been posted. The screen will be too small to look at too much of the details here but you'll be able to look at it online as you can all check the schedule for this meeting, go to the workshop for this and all of the draft advice is right there as well as a copy of the slides. Right, Berry? You got a PDF up there. Fantastic.

All right next slide, Number 3 please. The Affirmation of Commitment was as close to anything for ICANN as the constitution. I mean, it was a declaration of independence from the initial US oversight. But that independence brought with it a constitution that ICANN can follow; commitments that ICANN has made as well as any other nation that agreed to commit to ICANN.

So as a constitution that Affirmation of Commitments includes one key provision and it's in red up on the slide and it was that ICANN is committed to promote consumer trust, consumer choice and competition in the DNS market place.

So coming off of that the Affirmation on the next slide, 4, the Affirmation goes on to require a series of reviews - these affirmation reviews that you've all been hearing about for the last two and a half years.

One of the affirmations - and we can call it Number 4 - is contained in Paragraph 9.3 of the Affirmation. And it says that ICANN will organize the review to examine the extent to which introducing new gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice; there's those three same phrases again.

There's other things the review will also look at but those are the keys for examining the new program after it's been launched. And that review wouldn't even begin until a year after new gTLDs have been introduced into the root. So if you think that the first gTLDs go in at the end of 2012 and early 2013 it wouldn't be until early 2014 that ICANN would organize a review team.

So, Berry, would you go to Number 5?

So fast forward back to December of 2010 in Cartagena. In Cartagena the group is - ICANN is clearly gearing up for the new gTLD program. And there was a number of discussions in Cartagena about how do we measure, define, set goals for things like consumer trust, consumer choice and competition?

There were some workshops on whether we needed to create a constituency for consumers. There was also a discussion on whether we should try to bake it into ICANN's DNA by more definitions that could be brought up by the organization.

(Unintelligible) Bruce Tonkin was there at the session. And I think he must have come away with certain impressions because on Friday of that week Bruce introduced the resolution at the Board meeting and that resolution is quoted right here, passed unanimously.

And the key part of it is it says that the ICANN Board is requesting some advice from four groups, the ALAC, the GAC, the GNSO and the ccNSO. And they wanted advice on defining measures on three-year

targets for the measures of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice.

And now you can see where that thread comes from, from the Affirmation to Bruce's resolution. And he'll be here to shed some light on that as well. The Board's resolution - in fact Peter Dengate Thrush at the time named this the Jonathan Zuck resolution because for several years Jonathan had been hammering on the idea; let's establish the metric, let's measure what it is we're trying to accomplish.

Great, so the tasks before the working group were pretty simple. Come up with the definitions, measures and targets in the context of the DNS.

Okay the working group - next slide - really had three broad purposes. We knew we needed to give advice for consideration because, remember, working groups don't directly advise the Board. When the Board requested advice it requested the advice of the AC and SOs.

So a working group is composed of anyone from any of those ACs and SOs; it turns out we have a pretty robust participation from the GNSO and from the ALAC, from the At Large; only occasion participation by ccNSO and the GAC is aware but didn't get involved in the work so far.

So the advice we prepare has to be handed over to those four ACs and SOs. And in their own way they'll review the advice, they might even modify it, amend it, they may not do anything with it at all in terms of passing it up to the Board.

In gray in the middle this is sort of aspirational for us but for the working group we wanted to aspire to try to give guidance to ICANN early in the process of the new TLDs so that ICANN could begin to measure some of the defined metrics we came up with and then maybe even, in the best of our world, manage towards the accomplishment of those targets.

I know that's a pretty common concept in the private sector, probably in a lot of nonprofits as well, but it's a new concept at ICANN to start to work towards hitting certain goals and metrics.

Finally, let me just be clear, we are not intending to limit what the Affirmation Review Team will do in early 2014. When that team is convened there are rules in the Affirmation for how to convene a team. When that team comes together we hope they'll consider everything we've put together but we realize that they may decide to deviate, add to or subtract from a lot of this.

Thanks, Berry, next one.

This is a quick recap of the efforts. We got great consensus on the targets and definitions and nearly uniform consensus on the metrics, several iterations of advice. And the comments have been posted. Comments - the first round were due by 17th of April. One comment has come in so far. Ironically it came from Paul Toomey, former ICANN President giving us some compliments for the work and some advice on competition metrics.

And then after the 17th of April when the initial comments close there's another period for reply comments to what came in. And again it's community-wide.

Let's go to the next one. The first definition was consumer trust. And in coming up with that the first thing we had to do was define consumer. This was a relatively threshold matter for us. And you'll see from the definition that consumer is defined as both actual and potential Internet users and registrants (unintelligible) contract parties necessarily. These are users and registrants.

And those are the consumers of the DNS services that ICANN is deploying in the gTLD expansion. That is to say those who register new names and those who use the Websites.

Consumer trust then is defined for us as the three-part definition. The first is the confidence the registrants and users will have in the consistency of resolving names, things ought to work consistently, reliably and they ought to have confidence, again, that the gTLD registry operators are fulfilling their proposed purpose - they're fulfilling their proposed purpose.

The notion there is if dotBank is a new gTLD whose purpose is to serve only chartered financial institutions according to the national laws of the countries they're in well then people will have confidence in that when they register their bank there. And then end users might have more confidence when they receive an email that ends in a dotBank email name, domain name or more confidence in doing a search and seeing results that show up that end in dotBank.

So you see how that confidence - the key there is to make sure that dotBank in this case is honoring the promises it made to restrict who can register and the promises it made about the terms in service.

The third element of the definition of trust is that it's defined as the confidence they have in complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws. So every new TLD needs to comply not only with ICANN policies but also applicable national laws. And the degree of confidence the consumer has in that will drive up the amount of trust we'll have in the new gTLD program.

Berry, go to the next one.

Now we're going to give you a quick summary of the metrics. It's important to try to get through some bullet-level explanation of the metrics because as you've seen if you've opened the table there are 40 specific metrics with three-year targets in our draft advice.

And we fully intend to give as much time as possible today to take Q&A and get your comments on what they are. Here let me just give you a couple of highlights because it is pretty dense.

Naturally if we're talking about consumer trust is confidence in the consistency of resolution. We've got to be talking about up time, up time availability for registries and registrars.

We also talked about doing a survey of consumer trust; a full year or two into the new gTLD program where folks would be asked a series of questions not unlike the Whois survey that we've done for their review team.

We'll keep track of and tally up the number of complaints as well as adverse decisions for violations of registry agreements, UDRP and URS complaints; not only the complaints that come in but the adverse decisions that come out.

We also are inviting law enforcement and the GAC to try to weigh in with quantity of complaints they may have about registries and registrars and the service of the new gTLD space for any situations where they're failing to apply with applicable law.

We have a lot of metrics in here on keeping track of the number of domain takedowns, the amount of phishing and fraud. And for each of these metrics we end up trying to identify a potential source. You see it in our table.

So for instance under phishing and fraud we look to the APWG, which is the Anti Phishing Working Group, to provide that data. For every item we actually try to find out the source. And we got a lot of assistance from staff on that.

And finally complaints for inaccurate Whois which would probably come from Compliance here at ICANN.

Let's go to the second element which was consumer choice. So again we've repeated the definition of consumer. They're still the same folks, they're actual and potential registrant - Internet users and registrants.

And consumer choice is two elements, first it's the range of options available to registrants and users for domain scripts and languages.

Well here's a real recognition of the global public interest imperative for ICANN and the notion that the gTLD expansion has with it an imperative to serve global users with TLDs that are in their own scripts - not just Latin - and in their own languages not just English.

The second element of consumer choice is that registrants and users ought to have choice among TLDs that offer alternatives as to the proposed purpose and integrity of the domain name registrant.

So that if I'm going to open a bicycle shop I might have the choice to register in dotBike or I might have the choice to register in dotCom or dotWeb or any of the other new gTLDs but having choice as a registrant means deciding whether you want to pick a TLD that's particularly targeted for your domain - for your subject matter versus a generic one.

And you might even have choice about doing it in multiple languages and scripts if we accomplish the first half of that.

Let me give you a couple of examples for consumer choice. We talked about the need for registrants and users. They ought to be able to access and understand the registry restrictions. If I as the bank or the bike shop - if a bike shop is trying to decide where it wants to register if I got to the dotBike TLD Webpage it ought to explain what the restrictions are going to be.

Are they going to allow only bicycle retailers or bicycle repair shops or bicycle enthusiasts, hobbyists, maybe even travel sites that help you to pick their bike trails. So if that's the case I need to be able to see that

and understand it to make my decision about where to register and decide whether I want to go there or go back to some other TLD.

There has to be a choice of TLDs with multiple IDN scripts, languages other than English, a choice of registrars and registries that are subject to differing national laws. This is an important one that the Non Commercial Users Constituency was very active in the working group on this that if a registrant is particularly concerned about say privacy they would be able to pick a TLD and a registrar that are subject to national laws that are say more protective of privacy than others.

So that's an element of choice that the NCUC contributed to the (unintelligible) and I think it's very helpful to say that registrants will be able to pick the national law regimes that would govern the registrars and registries they're working in.

Chosen registrations; we are trying to suggest here that when you make a choice to register at the second level in a new top level domain it's really no so much of a choice if you're doing it for strictly defensive purposes.

It's very difficult to define and I'm sure we'll spend a lot of time on that today. But it's not an exercise of choice if it's a defensive registration. It is an exercise of choice in other circumstances. You might do a defensive registration and get some traffic but it's not something you chose to do actively; you would much have preferred not having to register there. So we're going to do our best to measure that.

And geographic diversity of registrants; it'd be great to see in the new gTLD program be open to registrants from all over the world and increase the amount of diversity of where registrations come from.

Berry, next one.

The final - or the third definition has to do with competition. We said here where the competition is not looking at Internet users and registrants instead we're looking at the supply side.

Because users and registrants care about choice and trust but on the supply side competition will be there if we have an increased quantity, increased diversity and the potential for market rivalry among the TLDs themselves, both gTLDs and ccTLDs, amongst the registry operators and the registrars. That would be an example of more competition in the supply side of the new DNS.

Berry, next one.

We'll give you a couple of ideas on the metrics for competition. It's easy to see that the new gTLD program ought to result in growth - in the total number of TLDs, in the growth of gTLDs. And you'll see from our table we actually put targets on that, you know, a doubling in the number of TLDs, a 10x increase in the number of gTLDs three years into the program.

There ought to be a growth in the number of suppliers. And the suppliers can not only be the registry operator but the registry backend service provider. And we also took a look at new entrants. If this is part of creating new opportunities on the supply side well then there ought

to be a significant share of registrations held in TLDs that are run by new entrants.

What's a new entrant? I guess it's a supplier who isn't in the current TLD space, which we called the legacy TLD space.

We did talk about gathering data on prices but we weren't at all convinced that we should set targets on whether prices should be higher and lower. As you well imagine a dotBank gTLD could end up charging thousands of dollars for a registration for a highly restricted population.

So the fact that prices are higher will not be a reflection that should reflect negatively on the new gTLD program. So we gather information on prices but not set targets for it.

There's two more slides then we're ready to break for some questions. The next steps here multiple languages are posted. As I said before it's up until April the 17th. This working group with staff's assistance will happily consider all the comments we get back in. We'll come up with a new version - final version of draft advice.

And what we would do? We'd submit it to the GNSO, the ccNSO, the ALAC and the GAC for their consideration in the hopes that they move it onto the Board.

The timeline shows how all this might come together. Next timeline. Ideally sometime in the middle to the end of this year to get our final draft advice into their hands and the GNSO, ALAC and ccNSO will then approve, modify and forward it to the Board.

If it gets to the Board's hand before the end of the year ideally the Board would adopt the recommendations in here for coming up with definitions, measures and three-year targets, hand it over to management to get busy on tracking and managing to hit the targets.

Then sometime in 2013 - 2013 we'll delegate new gTLDs. Must be the Mayan calendar, exactly, as soon as I got to 2013.

So one year - so the staff would begin collecting these measures as soon as the new gTLDs are delegated. Now one year after the delegation - so roughly January 2014 - this new Affirmation Review Team has to kick in. They'll take a year to two probably, given what the review teams have spent, a year to two years to assess the new gTLD program pursuant to the Affirmation of Commitment. It's their work that we're trying to build a foundation for.

So somewhere in the middle to the end of their work they'll be able to compare the targets that we've set against the actual performance in the new gTLD program.

I thought we would stop now and start to begin to gather your questions and comments. And if you have specific questions Berry will quickly go to one of the slides that has that metric on it so we can explain it. So thank you all very much.

Bruce Tonkin first.

Bruce Tonkin: Let me just bring up Slide 9 in which the definition of consumer trust. So the first part of that definition I think looks good so basically

consumers want to know that, you know, when they type in a name that it works.

The second...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...microphone a little bit closer.

Bruce Tonkin: Sorry. The first bit looks good. The second bit I wonder that don't sound like a consumer statement. You know, I don't think a consumer says, you know, is the TLD operator fulfilling its proposed purpose?

I think a consumer statement - and this is where I think it gets difficult is that when you're looking at using names of a consumer you're really looking for what I would say consistency in how those names are being used.

So in other words - and a lot of that's driven by an ICANN registry by the second level names. (Unintelligible) look at something like dotCom there probably is a fairly consistent theme that most of the word (parts) are commercial and therefore you think of dotCom as being commercial. And not all but it's a degree of consistency.

If you look at something like dotTV that's an interesting one because obviously the original purpose was a ccTLD but if you were to look at a, you know, a random sample of the name you probably don't see Tivoli mentioned very much and probably most of them around media and TV.

So I wonder whether you might think about the wording there because I think it would be a degree of confidence for most registrants and users that a TLD at the second level was operating consistently - something like that.

Now that might be controlled by the registry but as a consumer that's not what you experience; you experience how those names are used on the Internet or what the content, the emails, you know, what's the use of those names.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Bruce. We did intend for this part of the definition to reflect the fact when a registrar makes the choice to move to one of the new TLDs they're going to spend some money; they're going to change all their business cards, they're going to change the back of the uniforms, the names on the side of the truck.

And they're going to bet on that new TLD as their identity. They might even do some marketing and advertising about that. So when they do that they're doing it on the confidence that the value add of that new special purpose TLD, if it is special purpose, that that is going to be maintained.

Because of time if the TLD in a desperate move to get more registrations decides to open it up to everyone well then dotBank wasn't worth any of the investment they made in it. So that's an idea about keeping registries to keep their promises.

If you can help us to come up with a new way to word that that's great but we did think this was an essential content.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Bruce, I'm very attracted to what we've been saying now and I would see that there's an opportunity for the next time you see this material - we'll take it as a comment like you've put it into the public comments I think.

Because I think this is a subset we now need to also say. So it's not so much modification of what is there but bringing in that second line of what's happening in the TLD.

((Crosstalk))

Bruce Tonkin: It's probably also distinct between registrars and users so I'm probably thinking more in terms of the user then.

Steve DelBianco: Okay we have a queue. Berry, are you keeping track?

(Shandra Locke):   Okay, yeah, I think that I didn't hear everything that Bruce said...

((Crosstalk))

(Shandra Locke):   I didn't hear everything that Bruce said but I think that my initial reaction to the definition is at least similar to what he was saying which was that it seems a bit narrow. And I think, Steve, what you were describing is sort of if I'm a user or a registrant then this is something that's important to me.

But I wonder if it can focus a little bit more on actual Internet users. So if I'm just an Internet user that's going online when I think of consumer trust I think of the use of the name and whether there is a fraud that's

being proliferated there, did I get malware on second level names that are registered in this TLD.

And I just think that sort of when we think about consumer trust the concept has to be broader in terms of how we measure it.

Steve DelBianco: (Shandra), thanks for that. And when you see the definition that's only part of it; that's the tip of the iceberg. Below the water line and the iceberg are the actual full page of metrics for consumer trust.

(Shandra Locke):   Exactly and I...

((Crosstalk))

(Shandra Locke):   ...saw those. And I think my main point there was it seems like the intention was to encapsulate all of those other things in the metrics. But the definition doesn't necessarily - it's not broad enough...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: (Shandra), look at the last line of the definition. It says that they're complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws. So we don't want to expand ICANN's purview here; keep the mission narrow and it means that if we have policies against the entertainment of sites that do phishing or cyber squatting if we have national laws against fraud, and we do, then the definition is capturing that.

And - are you suggesting we actually start to delineate the specific elements of breaking national law in the definition?

(Shandra Locke):   No I just don't know that the phrase, complying with ICANN policies
and applicable national laws, really sort of highlight what consumer
trust necessarily means. I mean, that phrase could apply to any
aspect; it could apply to any issue not necessarily consumer trust.

I mean, if you're just talking about applicable national laws I mean,
that's an overly broad scope. So nothing about that last statement to
me says oh this is an issue for consumer trust.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, Jonathan Zuck for the record. I guess my reaction to Bruce's
comment is that I think that maybe there's a wording change to be
made there but that this is of utmost importance to actual Internet
users as well because the point of the program we hear over and over
again is innovation, right, that I'm going to put something out into the
marketplace that is - that's going to be a distinction so that if I get an
email for an offer for a home loan or something like that it should mean
something different than it comes from a dotBank than it just comes
from a dotCom or a dotRU or something like that.

And so part of consumer trust - pure consumer user trust - is in fact
going to be a function of the degree to which these registries hold true
to the - what they're putting out there in the world as the distinction of
their brand I think.

Ray Fassett: Ray Fassett, I'm with dotJobs. I think what we're trying to do here is
define consumer trust within a particular context which is, you know,
the DNS and the new gTLD plan and I think we should try to stay true
to what the purpose of the context of this definition is.

But I might add, first of all, that that definition that's on the screen is not exactly the same as the definition that is in the document. So for example in the document it talks about the - for example the registry operator will fulfill its proposed purpose and promises.

So what we want - we don't want these definitions to become swords later for others to look at in new subjective abilities to make up whatever it is they want to make up instead stay within the context of what this is about.

And if you look at the Guidebook Question 18 exists for the purpose of being able to later measure these things that these definitions are for. So my thinking - advice - would be go to Question 18, use the language that is being used in Question 18. Stay away from subjective terms such as promises that are made which nowhere in Question 18 does it ask the registry operator what are your promises. It asks specifically what is your mission purpose.

And my suggestion would be to stay home with that and stay true to that. And wherever it's talking about proposed purpose and promises just have it reflect what is being asked in the Guidebook which is your mission and purpose. That way everybody's got...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Ray, that's helpful. But keep in mind that Question 20 is - where they make promises about what an applicant's going to do on abuse and fraud. There are places in those questions - Q18 is not the only one - there are plenty of questions in the Guidebook where an

applicant claims how they're going to handle terms and service for second level.

And it's not just the Guidebook. After it's launched - sorry, applicants will potentially change the promises they make; they may advertise. Because a year into the program, as you well know from dotJobs, an applicant may change their purpose; they may change their charter in ways that are subject to the approval of ICANN.

Ray Fassett: Right...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: If they do sell...

Ray Fassett: ...dotJobs has not changed its purpose and has not changed its charter...

Steve DelBianco: I figured that was coming, Ray, I figured that was coming. That remains to be seen because for the record I believe there is a breach notice pending review right now.

But when an applicant makes a change it won't be in the Guidebook. It could be after they've launched in which case their Website will reflect the fact that dotBank is now accepting any service related to financial not just charter institutions. And they could do that.

And if they did we wouldn't go back to the Guidebook to look at their purpose you'd look at their Website, you'd look at their current promises that are being made. And that's why promises was carefully

chosen; it's more than just what was in Question 18. It's the rest of the Guidebook plus whatever they're promising at the time a user or registrant makes a decision to use it.

So let's go to...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: ...for the definition for the purpose of what you're creating the definition for, you're expanding it.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: We're definitely wanting to be restricted only to Question 18 and the vocabulary of the world purpose. That would completely miss whole other elements that registrants and users use to determine consumer trust.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. My name is Evan Leibovitch. I've been an occasional member of the working group. I've had one particular hobby horse. It's not on the slide but I appreciate that the working group has actually put the wording into the document indicating that there is an acknowledged limitation of scope here.

That when we're talking about specifically end user choice and trust the context that needs to be looked at is not just consumer choice and trust within the DNS but in the DNS itself. And there's a wonderful example, in fact, floating around this week. Anybody who's had their picture done and given to them on this tag has something a the bottom

and that thing at the bottom is not a URL it's a QR code which leads to a URL which could be a random URL.

The point I'm making is that this kind of thing needs to be considered. When you're talking about consumer trust and consumer choice at the end user level the consumer choice is how are they getting to their content? Do they have trust in one way of getting to content and to services as opposed to others?

And to eliminate that choice within TLDs and within registrars I think is really, really missing the point if you're really trying to figure out where consumer - what consumer trust is and this whole issue of using the Internet to get from here to there. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Evan. You made that point very persuasively when the working group was meeting. And that's why we put a note in there acknowledging that because we - while we acknowledge that people may use apps and things like QR codes if they're outside of the scope of what it is that ICANN manages then we didn't want to import it as measurable metrics, definable performance criteria for ICANN.

So it's great to acknowledge it, I'm glad that we did. And if in fact the QR codes are deceiving people we're probably going to know about that and ICANN will do, within its scope, what it can do to make sure that the URLs behind the QR code are respecting the rules and policies of ICANN. Thank you. Any other questions?

Berry Cobb: I've got two online real quick please. The first one is from the GPM Group. The consumer definition doesn't distinguish between professional registrants and what I would call consumer registrants.

These professional registrants are making registrations in the course of a business and in many jurisdictions wouldn't be considered consumers per se. Was this the intention?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. And I have a second question. And this is from Rudy Vansnick. Trust is a very flexible word. Several definitions can be attributed but at the end what does a consumer get in return if he/she trusts the other party? Look at how registrants are handled by registrars. Do they need different types of trust?

Steve DelBianco: We'll take that on board and try parse that a little bit later.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. Under consumer trust again, on Page 7, you have a metric that is lower than the incidents in legacy gTLDs with regard to...

Steve DelBianco: Bring up that slide please just to make it easier. And I don't know whether the folks in the back...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Everything is in the document. Chuck, you said it's Page...

Chuck Gomes: Page 7.

Steve DelBianco: Okay folks so Page 7 which are consumer trust metrics. And which one?

Chuck Gomes: You know, in my notes I didn't write - oh the relative incidents of notices issued to registry operators for contract or policy compliance matters if that helps in terms of that. The metric itself is lower than incident in legacy gTLDs.

And my comment is - I'm not sure that's a good metric because, forgive me for saying this as a registry...

Steve DelBianco: Did you mean a good target or...

Chuck Gomes: The target, that's right, thank you, thank you, Bruce. Yeah, it's not a very good target because I don't think the incidence has been very high in legacy gTLDs. So if you're trying to exceed that - and again we're talking about registry operators, okay - that might not be a very lofty goal.

Steve DelBianco: So, Chuck, I think it's a great point. And can we make a more ambitious goal? Because you'll see - as those of you who are turning to the target pages that Chuck has turned us to sometimes we'll set a specific number like a service level agreement of 98%; sometimes we'll set lower than previous years so over time something is getting better.

Sometimes we'll compare it to the concurrent performance of the legacy gTLDs - the 21 gTLDs that we hope will still be around in 2013, '14 and '15 and comparing this as a peer group against the new gTLD batch.

So, Chuck, you're suggesting that the just - it's not really enough to say they ought to be lower than the legacies but can you give us an example as a registry operator what's a better target?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, you know, I didn't go that far in my thinking so I'll have to just wait on that one.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Okay the - I wanted to let you know the Compliance staff talked to us about this. There are three steps - there's three phases or stages that staff - Compliance goes through when they suspect that there may be a breach of a registry agreement. Let me open up a registrar accreditation.

And the first couple of those notices are private because it's ICANN Compliance letting the registry know they may be in violation. So we're not suggesting those have to be disclosed by name. We're recommending that the quantity of first notices be tallied up, right, without (unintelligible).

The quantity of second notices be tallied up. And the quantity of breaches that are actually in Phase 3 go public and that's another level beyond that. So all three - we want all three for all different kinds of reasons.

And Maguy was telling me before this meeting that her team is gearing up to be able to categorize the breach notices depending upon the nature and what drove it.

Chuck Gomes: Steve, I spoke incorrectly. I actually didn't look far enough ahead in my notes, which I created quite a while ago and that is is that actually I wrote down as an example plus or minus 5% of legacy gTLDs - plus or minus 5% of legacy gTLDs. I don't know if the 5% is the right number or not but you get the idea.

Steve DelBianco: So that would say that in 2015 we'd measure the number of breach notices of all three phases in the legacy gTLD space and if there were 100 then your goal would say 5% or 5. For the new gTLDs at large, all 1500 of them would have 5 breach notices compared to the 20 in the legacies that year. Is that what 5% is about?

Chuck Gomes: No I think you got a problem there.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Plus or minus 5% so between 95 and 105% of what the legacies are getting.

Chuck Gomes: As a former math teacher I call that a (risk defect).

Steve DelBianco: That would - it's likely. So that would actually suggest that the metric is - you're lowering the bar to suggest that it doesn't have to be lower than the legacy gTLDs; it could be 5% and you'd still say that was a good target?

Chuck Gomes: Yes because I think that you're being unfair. It's a very high target for the new gTLDs. And I think you're going to - because of the large number and everything else you're going to have more variation and so forth.

And the legacy gTLDs especially if they've been around for a while - and most of them have now just with a couple exceptions - probably have had the advantage of firming up their work, etcetera. So it's kind of unfair for the new players to have too high a standard there.

Andrew Mack: Okay Andrew Mack, AMGlobal. Steve, a lot of the metrics that you're looking at - I'm looking at both consumer choice and competition - really haven't reached in to new markets, the global south you're talking about IDNs, you're talking about options in terms of new registrars, you're talking about new languages and the potential for a lot of new users.

I'm wondering whether your group took any look at the kind of outreach that would be necessary. One of the things that - and Cheryl, you can premise with me if you'd like - one of the things that we members of the JAS group and others who were doing outreach around these kind of things noticed is that though there have been efforts by ICANN they've not been hugely successful and they've really not reached the Africas, Latin Americas of the world, the global south.

Do you have any thoughts on weighing in on that? Do you have any thoughts on trying to urge ICANN to do perhaps just a bit more? And is there a possibility for having a metric around that? That's going to certainly be a key component to whether or not some of these others are successful. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: That's a great point. There is some - and I want Cheryl to weigh in on this. But if you look at the top of Page 9 we are suggesting that sites ought to be clear in disclosing what they do but we don't have an

explicit measurement of the communications program; that's what outreach is about, communicating what we have.

There's a notion that would say that communication is a means to the end of getting a lot of registrations and IDNs in languages other than English. So if the Board were to embrace a standard like this then presumably management at ICANN would undertake the communication steps to hit the metric.

So it's probably not within our task to tell them how to do it at all but rather to say what would be a measure of success for the program. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I see you've got run of replies coming. But what struck me when you were saying that - by the way Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record - is that this is giving us an opportunity to see what gets measured tends to get attention as well. And I think that's the power. I think putting it in as a metric I would argue is out of scope. But I do think power in this is the what gets measured gets the attention.

Andrew Mack: I would only - I understand what you're both saying and I think you may be right in terms of it being out of the narrowest version of the scope. I would only suggest that if we wait two or three years down the line to come back we will have missed a great opportunity. And you have an interesting platform.

If ICANN is paying attention to this, if there is a way to include this in some way either as a part of your advice or as an interim metric I think it would be worthwhile. It would do a lot of good for the global community.

Steve DelBianco: Andrew, I'm going to ask you to propose a metric that would fit right here in choice and it would propose a metric that suggests that three years out ICANN has a target to have spent X dollars on advertising and outreach or have communicated X million messages to people of the planet in multiple scripts and languages.

So it's up to you to - frankly to just come back on that and give us some specific metrics that we can put in here with a three-year target. And I think it makes great sense.

Ray Fassett: Just a follow on question. It seems to me the group took a lot of time discussing the possibility of when a registry operator doesn't fulfill its purpose or promises. Did the group spend any time considering the affect on consumer trust if ICANN should interfere such as, for example, with a dotBank that is trying to fulfill its purpose and promises?

Steve DelBianco: Great question, Ray. And I believe that if consumer confidence that promises were being kept is undermined by either the registry operator or by ICANN it's going to result in the same problem that it will reflect badly on the new gTLD program and reflect badly on ICANN.

So I don't think we attributed why they failed to live up to their purpose. They may have failed to live up to the purpose because they went out of business, because the national governments where they work wouldn't let them do it anymore or ICANN could have changed what they allow.

So all - any of those potential causes would have generated the same undermining of consumer trust. And we're going to capture it.

Jonathan Zuck: So Jonathan Zuck for the record. I would love - even though he's hiding over there - to direct Andy's question a little bit over to Bruce because I think there's a - I think this raises an interesting issue is once we've fulfilled the mission you've set out for us what do you envision the execution side of this looks like from the Board?

And what is the degree to which you need the help of the working group or the SOs to suggest how ICANN might manage to these metrics? Or do you believe the existence of metrics themselves will lead to a level of creativity in the management of the new gTLD program?

Steve DelBianco: Bruce, you want to take that? Berry, would you put up the timeline? That'll give us a couple seconds for Bruce to come up with a brilliant answer.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, it's Jonathan Robinson. I'd just like to make a comment in reply to Ray's previous point while we get to the next - or in follow up while we get to the next point.

And my personal view at least is that actually I think it's a very useful perspective on which to look at this. And I can say personally I wasn't - there's clearly a value chain in terms of the contract. ICANN contracts with the contracted parties to fulfill their promise in delivering these new TLDs.

And to the extent that one - personally I've always been viewing it through the optics that look at the fulfillment of that. But actually ICANN is a party in the contracts and ICANN's ability to meet their part of the contractual obligation in fulfilling the overall promise of the TLD is a vital frame of reference.

So I personally value that input even if it didn't make any difference to the measures, which it may still do, it's still a very useful frame of reference to take when looking at the whole thing. So I appreciate Ray's comments and I think we can certainly look at the metrics with that frame in mind.

Bruce Tonkin: So - I'm going to lose my voice. I guess from a Board perspective there's a couple of elements to this. Probably the first element is I think the ICANN community needs to have accepted definitions of these terms because we're going to kick off a number of reviews. And if people on the review team have different definitions I think that's not a recipe for success.

So I guess what - and I'm only - I'm not really speaking as the Board but just as an individual or an individual Board member if you like. But what I think we should do is probably get to a point where ICANN would approve a policy that defines those terms. That's an ICANN policy and it defines those terms.

But the second issue is metrics. And the issue with metrics is there's a cost to collecting them. And I think the Board would need to ask the staff for advice on, you know, what is the cost of implementing this measurement program.

And that might, you know, I hope you're thinking about that in your report because when I look at some of the metrics - and I notice you've - I'm not sure who gave you the rating or whether you've self-rated but you're said some are easy to measure, some are hard to measure over time, yes. So who's - is that yourselves or is that staff giving you that?

Steve DelBianco: We had fabulous support from ICANN staff on...

Bruce Tonkin: Yeah, so there's a degree of resource implications on some of the measurements. But I think certainly a review team is going to want to be able to see information that's collected. And so we need to think about as a Board I guess what's the cost of collecting this information?

You know, you might have a desire to (unintelligible) but ten metrics we think it's viable for us to collect the information on five of them. Some other group might collect the information elsewhere, that's fine. But we'd have to think about what are we going to actually commission and resource ourselves and then target.

So I guess targets is almost part of strategic planning (unintelligible). You'd think some of this would fade to the strategic plan of ICANN to say in a particular area because consumer trust, etcetera, is part of our strategic plan. But we would incorporate the targets as proposed by the community and approve them as part of a strategic plan.

Steve DelBianco: Bruce, that's really helpful. The first part of what you said is the community needs to embrace the definitions first. And the resolution the Board passed asked the community, through the four ACs and SOs, to propose definitions.

So the quote unquote policy of defining terms is exactly what this is. If this isn't a policy of defining terms in the bottom-up AC/SO what is the policy that you've (unintelligible) definitions?

Bruce Tonkin: No, you might have misinterpreted what I said. I think the Board needs to approve an ICANN policy that contains both terms. You're going through the process of - it's not a PDP (unintelligible) PDP. But in other words if you had one definition and the GAC had another that would have to be resolved before the Board would approve it, yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Jonathan go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Steve. Just thinking about what Bruce had said - it's Jonathan Robinson. I certainly am aware of at least one other group I think it might be Whois Review Team would certainly work on the Whois that grapples substantially with the definition of consumer as well.

So it's an interesting point that if we're going to have, you know, parallel or multiple parallel work tracks with - but that's not to suggest that anything in contradiction or what Steve said just the recognition that there are multiple community efforts and in each case some grappling with, for example, the definition of consumer and perhaps some other relevant community-wide definitions.

Bruce Tonkin: What I'm saying is I think ultimately we need to have a document that - like the Whois Review Team said, you know, there's no single document that describes Whois; it's spread across 100 documents. And I think we could say the same about the word consumer. You

know, there are number of different uses of that word at ICANN (unintelligible).

I think we just need a single definition; could even eventually get into the bylaws. But a policy that the Board approves saying this is the Board's on behalf of the community's definition - of course it could be changed over time but we should have a shared definition.

Steve DelBianco: Bruce, the second bar up there where the Board considers presumably four different bits of advice from the four ACs and SOs that's one way to do it is the Board would take four bits of advice and if it's inconsistent the Board...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Right. Yeah, that proposed - now, Cheryl, did you have another potential way of - could this work or endeavor to try to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, I'm...

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I'm happy.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck. Olivier, you want to say something first?

Olivier Crepin LeBlond: Olivier Crépin-LeBlond for the transcript. Just to make sure that whilst we are dealing with definitions of course it's really important that I do hope that it will not actually delay any of the timelines that we

have on there because it's all very tight so we have to get this done ASAP. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Chuck Gomes again. Steve, in your presentation and also in the document itself if I understand correctly you equate sunrise registrations to defensive registrations. Is that correct?

Steve DelBianco: Berry, would you bring up the slide on consumer choice? And for those of you following along at home with the document we would go to Page 10 of the document.

Chuck Gomes: Right, that's the first one on Page 10.

Steve DelBianco: So there's an italicized note at the top of this page and it says measures designed to assess whether prior registrants have chosen new gTLDs for primarily defensive purposes. That's what these next four - three measures are.

And we put a note in there that registrations using privacy and/or proxy may not provide meaningful data and would therefore not be counted in certain measures.

But we are endeavoring to do something very hard which is to try to understand one of the key criticisms of the new gTLD program and it is that the business models of many of the applicants will be based mostly on the money received from defensive registrations not by choice of the registrant. They don't do it to get new traffic; they do it because they want to avoid having someone else squat on a name and have to go pay to get it back. And I'm articulating positions all of you have heard 1000 times.

So we are endeavoring to try to say how do we distinguish one, two
and three years out between the quantity of registrations in dotBike or
dotBank but are new registrations, genuinely new traffic taking
advantage of a value proposition versus those that were defensive.

Now the word defensive registration - nobody checks the box for
defensive registration. So we are very anxious to have community help
in come up with a term. And we did the brave thing, which is instead of
punting we put something in here. Very brave thing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: And we said well during sunrise - and, Jonathan, maybe you should
speak to this as it was your idea.

Man: So much for bravery.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...to pass my position in the queue at this stage.

Steve DelBianco: That's a great idea.

Chuck Gomes: So I can challenge Jonathan's thinking instead of yours is that the
extent? I think there is a problem with the assumption there.

Jonathan Robinson: I actually was going to illustrate a typical example where that might
have been case. And you'll be familiar with the dotMobi extension, for
example and applying that that test against for example a dotCom and

a dotMobi the two could perfectly coexist adjacently with all data being identical and yet that wouldn't necessarily qualify the dotMobi. So it's a very good point, Chuck, and it's something we need to think about.

Chuck Gomes: And let me take it a little bit further. It's Chuck again. The - I mean, you're going to have registrations by rights holders in the sunrise period because they are a rights holder and they want to use the name.

Now let me give you a real - an example that will I think be very prevalent. An IDN version of dotCom - I don't think it's going to - a rights holder likely is not going to register that because they just for defensive purposes in particular the way we're going to offer it that wouldn't be necessary.

But that's beside the point. If somebody wants to talk about that I can talk about that separately.

But they're likely going to use it even if they have an ASCII version of dotCom for their local language community. So just to throw that out so that you have to be careful there.

Now unfortunately it becomes more complicated than the measure. The nice thing about what Jonathan suggested was is that it's easy to measure. The problem is it's going to give you false results. You're probably going to have to check to see if there's use of the domain name beyond - yeah, so, okay. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) brilliant idea to try to capture the distinction that if a sunrise registration is in a new script or language it's by no means

defensive it's to capture new traffic for people using that script and language. That's a great modifier to this.

Another would be that TLDs that are not available to the general public a dotBrand, for instance or a really tightly controlled community, their sunrise period might well be one that's not defensive at all.

If dotApple were to allow all of its divisions to have second level domain names and they simply stuck them in sunrise that has nothing to do with third parties. So we might have to restrict this measure, Jonathan, you think, to only those TLDs that are open to the general public as registrants would be an idea.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah that could be. I'm just looking back at the point. And for the record I think my contribution was measure share of sunrise registrations to total registrations not necessarily the whole point. I can reverse out of that one partially.

Steve DelBianco: An item in that table on Page 10, Chuck, does say redirected registrations. We used the same goal - the redirected registrations. So we were thinking that the idea here is measure them both and the outcome - remember that if three years in the review team was to keep any of this and the answer came back that post-sunrise registrations were only 60% of total that doesn't mean that is has failed, that doesn't mean we conclude that there are too many defensive registrations.

When you measure something against a target when it comes out differently or even if you hit the target the next step is to explore why.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: By the way - sorry, Bruce, I just - to finish this thought. Redirected doesn't necessarily mean defensive either.

Bruce Tonkin: Right. I was just going to comment - and this might be the way you could trace some of these metrics. But Chuck did - sometimes when you're looking at a problem it's hard to measure you have a series of indicators. And so some of these things can be indicated but you're not looking at isolation; you would look at all of those under the topic of consumer trust, not just one.

And I think that's why what I think they're doing is using quite a few indicators. And you can form a picture from that because it's very hard to make a conclusion from one thing. You know, if you try to measure employment data you can't really, right, so you can measure the number of job ads in a newspaper; that's an indicator but it doesn't directly tell you what the unemployment situation is.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, this is Jonathan Zuck for the record. And I guess I would just add to what Steve and Bruce said which is that I think the key thing here is to start tracking some data because how that data gets interpreted, how it's evaluated later is up for a lot of discussion and doesn't need to be predetermined.

The stakes aren't that high. It's not as if suddenly it's, you know, somebody is losing their registry or something like that because they didn't hit this 85% mark. It's really just to have a topics of conversation and things - real data to have those conversations about down the road. And what weight to give any of these particular metrics I think is

something that can be decided by a review team once it's constituted and doesn't need to be decided up front.

But we need to get out of the pattern that we've been in for years and years and years which is getting to a review without any information on which to make the review.

Chuck Gomes: Can I - this is Chuck again can I respond to Jonathan? Agreed, Jonathan. But keep in mind that your recommendations will kind of set the basis for how that additional work will happen. So even making statements like he just made in your recommendations would be helpful to set the right context for that.

Steve DelBianco: Any other questions? So I hope all of you will contribute to the group. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I don't want to monopolize but I do have one more - mostly a comment I think. This one is on competition, changing it a little bit. And it's - the fourth measure under competition on Page 11 if you want to go to that?

It says, quantity of unique gTLD registry service providers before and after expansion. So first I have a question. Is a ccTLD operator that becomes a gTLD operator counted as a new operator?

And that may be significant because it's very expensive to become a back end services provider for registry services. So you may not have huge numbers of those but I think you will see some new players in the gTLD space that have been in other spaces like the ccTLD space.

So this is more information for you to deal with as you refine this. I think that's an important consideration.

Steve DelBianco: Chuck, let me ask you about that. This is the fourth row down. It says, quantity of unique gTLD registry service providers before and after expansion. And take a look at the target. We've proposed a target that ought to double so that would be twice as many as what it was in 2011 prior to the expansion program.

And then the footnote refers to the number six that we found by counting the number of registry service providers today in the gTLD space; there are just six of them. So this would say you need to get to 12. There needs to be 12 by 2013.

Chuck Gomes: So my reaction to that is if you include ccTLD operators in the space I think that might be a realistic target of twice. If you don't it might be hard to reach it. I don't know, it's a guess because we don't know how many new back - there are some; we're aware of some new backend registry service providers already. I don't know, just think about it.

Steve DelBianco: It strikes me that if a ccTLD operator became a gTLD operator in the expansion that is a new entrant for purposes of this...

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely.

Steve DelBianco: ...indicator. So it would be. We have Bruce...

Chuck Gomes: That's you're call and I'm asking you to be clear on that...

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...so that we know what we're measuring. And then I think two times is probably easily reachable.

Steve DelBianco: Bruce and then Marilyn. First Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson:So I just very briefly want to just comment and say that is my interpretation although I take your points it needs to be clearer. But that's certainly my interpretation and understanding of it so thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And I don't have any problem with that interpretation it just affects your - the reality of the goal.

Bruce Tonkin: Yeah, just to elaborate a little bit on what you're saying there, Chuck. I guess there is a macro view of ICANN as an organization. So if you go back to the very - in fact if you can go back to Slide 3 it might help just to sort of put that into context.

What are we at, Slide 3? So Slide 3 is talking about relating consumer trust, consumer choice, competition in the DNS market place. And then the way most of these metrics have been crafted, which I think is good, is you are actually talking about the whole market place which is gTLDs and ccTLDs.

So what answer to the question if we're looking at competition, picking on your comment, if I'm using a measure at this level I might be saying how many new TLD registries are there just in the generic.

　
And if you go to the next slide there's a much more targeted review. Because I think there's two different reviews. There's a review is these are ICANN as a whole including the market place and then there's a targeted one here which is to say when we expand the gTLDs, you know, what happens within the gTLD market place so I think, Chuck you kind of have two different answers to your question.

If we're measuring the impact on the gTLD market place, which is a subsector of the total market then I think you - what you're saying is correct. If a ccTLD operator moved into the G-space to operate as a gTLD operator that is one of the 12. If you're talking the whole DNS market place then there's no net change.

I think it's just useful to understand when we're looking at those metrics that if I was doing - and it sounds like Jonathan, when you just present the data and just cut and slice it the question is about the whole market place is one answer, if the question is about the gTLD market place it's different.

And I think they're separate reviews, you know, one review is at the whole and another would be very targeted to new gTLDs.

Steve DelBianco: But, Bruce, Number 3, Slide 3 isn't a review. Slide 3 is the front end of the Affirmation of Commitments. So it isn't a review. Slide 4 is the review. And as you quite correctly described the review is of the new gTLD program.

Bruce Tonkin: So I think, yeah, I just wanted to get that context right. So I think you met - yeah, definitions of metrics are being crafted properly. But then

when Chuck is talking about the review he'd say in the context of that review there is an additional player.

Chuck Gomes: But Bruce raises something that's really interesting. I don't know if the group wants to consider this or not but there could be some value in measuring the overall market place and not just gTLDs. I don't know. I'm not suggesting that that you should do it but I'm fascinated by what he's - the different...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Keep in mind that the choice metrics on the standpoint of registrants and users a registrant and user is making a choice amongst the entire DNS space and they may perceive it is (unintelligible) choice.

If you look at our metrics in there we're looking at the total TLD space under choice. When it comes to the supplier side in the G-space, that's where you've been focusing your comments just now and Bruce is being - responding to. But if you go back to choice you'll see we're looking at other areas.

Jonathan Zuck: And both...

Steve DelBianco: And Marilyn I know is in the queue after you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh sorry I need to - in both cases you're looking at the entire marketplace because you're looking at whether in fact the new program promoted those things.

So by definition they're going to involve deltas vis-à-vis the current market place whether consumers now have more choices than they did before is going to be an evaluation of the whole market place but the effects that the new program had on that overall market place and even in the context of competition that's going to still be a delta from the current status quo that is a function of the new gTLD program. Did it succeed in promoting trust, choice and competition?

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: That's okay, Jonathan. Yeah, it's Marilyn Cade. I think I'm taking us back just a little bit. This is really just a question and that is in your consideration of increasing the number of registry providers did you take into account that number is not perhaps the only element that should be counted or measured but that is also if we are diversifying the geographic distribution of registry providers?

And I'll just give you an example that really the distribution of the infrastructure that serves registries and registrars will be strengthened if we are at least gradually increasing providers in other parts of the world than they're coming from now.

So if most of the providers today are based in Europe and North America I would think that a metric would be how the increase in providers is also in some ways diversifying. And I'm not even saying it has to be an - not proposing a big goal but I'm thinking that it should be a goal. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Marilyn, on Page 11 of the document we hope we in fact have got that covered.

And just for the record let's make sure that you think we've got that covered.

When we refer to the quantity of registrars before and after expansion along with invitation of countries where registrar is based we were trying to drill into that geographic diversity. If we haven't done a good enough job on that let's discuss it in a moment.

But there's a second one on Page 11 as well which is the relative share of new gTLD registrations held by new entrants; so it's not just opening another office in another part of the world for the purpose this measure of new entrants are gTLDs.

So if we haven't got that expansive enough we really would value from you and everyone else in the community to know how we should improve the wording there.

Marilyn Cade: I just need to follow up to clarify what I meant to say if I didn't say this - it's Marilyn. Registries was - I was referring to registries. That's why I said I was taking this back.

Steve DelBianco: Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson:Marilyn, just a brief response, I mean, I would just say - it's for me I'd like to think that through and we should talk about it within the group. I've never been completely convinced that geographic diversity of say, registries, can necessarily - while I'm not necessarily - I'm not saying it's a bad thing but I'm not - it doesn't necessarily for me mean enhanced competition.

In fact it doesn't - for me the geographic diversity I would like to think about that some more and chew it over because I'm not convinced that it's - the registrars is where the end point of contact with the customers are and I guess one needs to think about the registry in terms of are we talking about the backend provider in this instance or the operator of the TLD because in many ways the operator of the TLD may well provide some increased diversity of choice or competition by virtue of its location and/or themes.

But so - those are the three areas where geography might need to be considered. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: And, Marilyn, on Page 9 when we take the consumer perspective because Page 11 is the supplier side but on the consumer side if I'm going to use Websites or register in a TLD Page 9 talks about different IDN scripts, languages other than English, national regimes other than say the US or other than European nations.

So we are trying to capture diversity from the perspective of a registrant and user on Page 9. And I think you were pointing us to the supplier side as well.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, you have a follow?

Marilyn Cade: Well I'm just - I'm making a - and maybe this is not the place to go into this in depth but look, if all the - we wanted to - now I'm going to use an analogy from a different service.

If all we wanted was to make sure that consumers had trust, confidence and choice in mobile devices then we could manufacture all of them in Finland and just ship them around the world. But in fact building the infrastructure and being a part of supplying it is important to user trust and confidence. But we can take this up at - in another time.

Steve DelBianco: Great, if there's no further questions let me also acknowledge Carlos Aguirre who's here - a member of the time. And, Evan, I hadn't seen you earlier so I'm sorry I hadn't pointed you out. And let's also thank Rosemary Sinclair who's not here in person but is the Chair of this working group - was unable to make the trip to this meeting.

I know we still have a lot of work in front of us as we gather all the comments that have come in and try to prepare advice to the ACs and SOs.

And I imagine the ACs and SOs will pick apart everything we send over with an effort to make it better, right? So we look forward to getting all of your comments and help move this ahead.

Thank you all for attending the session.

END