

**ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Data
Thursday, 07 June 2018 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-data-07jun18-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p9irulckvra/>

Attendance of the call is also posted on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/GisFBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Sub Team for Data call held on Thursday, the 7th of June 2018 at 1600 UTC.

On the call today, we have Greg Rafert, Kathy Kleiman, Kristine Dorrain, Michael Graham, Philip Corwin, Rebecca Tushnet, Susan Payne. On the audio only, we have Stacey Chan. We do not have any apologies for today. From staff, we have Ariel Liang, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Mary Wong, and myself, Andrea Glandon.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phone and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to you Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much, Andrea. And thanks, everyone, for joining today. And thanks also to Greg and Stacey from Analysis Group who have joined us as well.

And so, the agenda is to follow from where we left off yesterday in the registry - in the registry survey. So, as you'll note here on the - where the agenda and the meeting details are, if you scroll down, you'll see that we have the links to each of the Google Docs and thank you, Ariel, for putting the Google Doc, the registry operator survey also into the chat.

We recommend that you follow along by going into the Google Doc and we certainly even encourage you as we go along. If you have - if you think of any edits or anything that you want to add as we're going along, please do so a swell. And I hope that people will find us to be a useful way to go through the documents.

So, I just wanted to mention - staffs wanted to mention a couple of things in - in our discussions with Analysis Group. And I - these are some issues that came up yesterday as well. But just so I give you some things to think about us, we - can you continue to go through the surveys.

You know, some of the discussion yesterday centered on questions that were eliminated and, you know, Analysis Group is well aware of, you know, how important it is to get questions answered. And yet, you know, balance that with the length of the survey and the realization that some questions just may not be answered and some survey takers just may not wish to answer certain questions.

And, you know, as staff, we know, that, you know, the goal of this policy development, processes that the policy recommendations are based - are databased. And so, we are trying to gather as much data as possible. And yet, there's also the concern about survey fatigue and that if a survey is long

or if some of the questions are off-putting, we may get very few responses. And we've seen that that has happened in the past as well.

So, I just wanted to give Greg and Stacey a chance, if they wanted to just raise a couple of points along those lines just that we have them that we're thinking about them, and also, to ask you to think about if there is a question that we think might not get any responses, can you think of other ways that we might try to get those data.

So, Greg, Stacey, if you have anything you'd like to add, please go ahead.

Greg Rafert: Thank you, Julie. This is Greg, for the record. No, I mean, I think it was really well-stated, Julie.

And I think, an example of that kind of issue was something that I think Stacey raised on the call that we had with you all yesterday regarding asking what their specific sunrise pricing was. I mean, I - that would - you know, I think, clearly be a nice data to get from registry operators. I would be very surprised if many of them, maybe any of them actually provide that kind of information given the lengths that we've gone to in the past to attempt to get that kind of data.

And I think it's also a good example of a question that because we're asking for a very sensitive information, it's likely to result - and at least some people decided or registry operators or survey respondents deciding to just stop taking the survey. So, I think we need to be pretty careful and cognizant of those types of issues as we're reviewing the questions that we ultimately decide to post to respondents.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Greg. And really, this is just all for you - all to think about. We're not, you know, you saying that you can't, you know - we'll not suggest that, you know, we can't include questions, and if we want to reinstate questions that were not included, you know, certainly, that is entirely up to the sub team

to decide. Just to ask you to keep in mind the balance between, you know, including questions that Dan may, let me say, hinder the goal of getting a broad response or a more complete response or numbers of responses.

So, I'll stop there and let's go ahead. I'll ask if anybody has anything they want say before we get started and go back in the document. I think we were on Question 16. And there were, you know, there was a discussion about questions that had been eliminated and how we could address them.

And, Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, I just wanted to say right at the outset, I'm sorry I had to drop off before the very end of the call yesterday, but I - I'd also said that I wasn't actually available for yesterday's call. So, I couldn't make it right through to the end. But I could see from the notes that got circulated that there was a discussion about the amounts of work we needed do, and consequently, a decision made to arrange multiple two-hour calls on no notice, whatsoever.

And so, I just want to take the opportunity to express my extreme objection to the way this is being handled. And I think there is a degree, a vast degree of work that needs to be done before these surveys can be issued and rushing it through, in this way, without allowing people the opportunity to review the document is unsatisfactory and is setting this up to fail.

But with that said, I'm here on the call.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. And apologies for the haste and also for the extremely short notice and in setting up additional calls. It was something that the subteam discussed yesterday, not necessarily - not something that the staff said we'd, you know, suggested. But it was a way that was suggested that we could try to move forward expeditiously to meet our timelines but we do note your extreme, you know, concerns and thank you for that. And we'll try to - staff try to support this process as best we can and

make sure that, you know, it is done and as a complete and thorough and quality way possible. I'm sorry, that's not said very well.

Thank you so much for joining and for joining yesterday, Susan, and thanks, everyone. And I see we have a few more people who joined. So, that's great. We'll note that in the attendance as well.

And then, I will then move to the Google Documents. And I think that we were still on question - Question 16 and that I think there was some discussion around, you know, trying to do some, you know, trying to do some edits here.

Kathy, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. Can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we can hear you.

Kathy Kleiman: Good. Perfect. So, I have a kind of an overarching question based on kind of where we left the conversation last time, this is Kathy, to Greg and Stacey. Is Stacey on, too?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, she is.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Okay. So, where we kind of got stuck yesterday was will an anecdotal question became a more concrete question and there's one of the reasons we weren't anecdotal in some cases was to not plant answers. Not plant ideas or directions that there may be kind of broad - just - there may be broad issue that we're getting. But from our perspective, we could see that there were different ways people might answer the question and we kind of want to invite all of them.

So, let me ask you whether anecdotal questions especially if the working group has already kind of said we're willing to take anecdotal answers. And that may be too broad to answer, but let me - when can we go back, from your perspective, can we go back to anecdotal questions that we don't wind up having to go through every variation of a question especially when we can see potential policy implications and wide answers and we've only hit kind of a fraction of them, so we could go on forever with these choices but it would take us forever to design it.

Can we just revert back to the anecdotal and at a kind of own other risk and work with the answers when they come in to avoid planting preassigned answers? Thanks.

Greg Rafert: Yes. Thank you, Kathy. This is Greg. I'll speak in - Stacey, you should, of course, you're free to jump in.

I mean, I think you certainly could go back to anecdotal questions where you provide open-ended responses. I think if you did that, I would be - I would lean towards being very selective and how many of those questions you actually include in the survey just because it does take time for people to respond to those answers and it does help or it does lead to respondent drop out. And so, I wouldn't want to include too many of those types of questions in the survey.

With respect to kind of potentially leading people to answer a question in a certain direction based on the options I provided, and that's certainly a concern that I think we have as well, you know, because we're generally speaking, you know. It's a potential design issue with surveys.

I think, you know, in an ideal world, what we would do is we would provide options that would encompass, let's say, something like 75% of how respondents would typically, you know, what they would typically select for a given question. And then, of course, provide kind of the other option where

they could enter responses that we hadn't envisioned. So, I think that's the idea. But I do realize that obviously takes a little bit more time.

So, I think those are really some of the tradeoffs to consider since we haven't seen anything else.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Greg.

Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine Dorrain. I would like to ask a question to Kathy to follow-up. I am wondering what is your - okay. Let me rephrase. Are you - are you more interested in retaining the open-ended anecdotal type question because you - you feel that's more valuable? I know Greg is at the - is very concerned about drop off.

But I also heard you talk about, sort of, in the interest of time and getting things moving. I mean, it will take a long time to kind of rewrite these as non-narrative answer questions. And so, is that sort of you being more driven by the desire for open-ended answers or are you more being driven by the desire to try to meet the timeline because I'm going to suggest that while we should be respectful of the timeline and we should always be keeping that in mind, that should not drive any of our decisions today.

If we decide as a - as a group and we may or may not, if we decide as a group that this Q16 and Q17 needs to be a table and we need to sit down and figure out what these - to go into that table, then I think we need to do that even if it means yet another call. And I don't think it means another call tomorrow or another call Monday or another call Tuesday.

I mean, I am fully in favor of, you know, pushing that line if we need to do it because we are going to get the best possible answers. So, I'm trying to be mindful of Greg's concern that if we ask for a lot of people to type out

answers, they're just going to drop. I agree. If I see a survey with a lot of fill in the blanks, I just quit. If I can't just tick a couple boxes, I'm done.

So, I feel like - I just like to explore that a little bit more and see where - what's driving you there, Kathy. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Great - it's a great question. Thank you for asking.

And, part of what's driving me is I think you've raised some questions really, really well. And I'm not sure people are going to flee from certain open-ended questions like their experiences with the sunrise period.

I think people want to talk to us about some of these - these, you know, musings, if you could, (unintelligible). I think some of these people want to talk about it.

And so, I think that opportunity, we created them on purpose, that opportunity for people to talk broadly. And again, I think you phrased it really well from the originals.

My father was an economist engineer. So, he always wanted quantifiable data. I'm a lawyer. We deal with more broader types of answers.

And so, I think - I think we can handle the more anecdotal providers. We don't ask a lot of it but once we descend into the quantifiable, I think we're going to good for a long time.

So, with my co-chair hat on, I am aware of the timing. I'm just not sure if we could spend an intimate amount of time. I'm not sure we're going to get all the possibilities just because I'm not sure we know everyone's experiences. So, I think select open-ended questions will serve us well on many grounds. Thanks. And thank you for your question.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy. Kristine? I see - you said, "Thanks, Kathy."

And I see Susan saying, "I would say that registries who won't talk to us have had and continued to have plenty of opportunity to do so."

So, shall we, at least, explore - and I'm looking to Kristine, really, thinking about how we might rewrite or reformulate questions 16 and 17 if we - if we do want to use a tabular structure and noting that, you know, the desire is to, you know, to try to come up with the best possible way, you know, to get - to get answers irrespective of the length of time it may take. Thank you.

Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes. Thanks. Since I was called on. I'm actually struggling to go - again, I don't have the red line open, so I'm struggling to remember which questions were removed from which of the anecdotal questions these were meant to take place. So, I don't know for a fact I can tell already that the table does not - does not pull in. I mean, the table goes above and beyond. The table comes up with suggestions, ideas of - I think Ray pointed it out.

Like, we're guessing at what 75% of people would say and we are - we were providing those opportunities, assuming that 75% of people will make those - will answer those questions. And then, you're providing in other for the 25% that are unlikely that to think that those selections are provided. I think I heard Greg say that.

So, I'm looking ahead to find out on the table which - which questions is deleted and I'm trying to manage multiple documents here, so I apologize.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. This is Julie. So, staff would put the table into an Adobe Connect Room as well. But Greg, Stacey, could you also give us some guidance of where - how we arrive...

Kristine Dorrain: And, Kathy, just while you're doing that, Kathy, the original question - this is Kristine, again - was, you know, what do we think about those questions 16 and 17? The ones where they - the analysis group converted the narrative questions into the, sort of, tick box of table-type questions. I know when we ended the call, one option on the table -- I think, I may have proposed it or maybe it was Michael or maybe it was a combination -- just sort of combine them and to say, you know, for this - for 30 days, for six days, for 90 days, you know, how would, you know, sunrise - how would brand owners, you know, be best able to protect their marks?

How big of an operational significance would it be on a registry operator?
How - I'm now trying to toggle back to that other doc. What was the other bit? But I believe that there were multiple, sort of, questions that allowed - it allowed, you know, we were sort of guessing, you know, some of the issues that might come up with sunrise, if that answers Kathy's question.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. Before I go to Kathy, staff have pulled up that spot in the - the original table. And there's actually a comment associated with it that says, you know, general comes on these questions. Some of these questions, when you threshold - questions to be answered first, you'd give direction to the survey provider and hear some of the questions talks about, you know, preventing cybersquatting and then there were some other things as well.

So, I think I've got the right spot there.

Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: That was - I mean, we didn't - thank you, Kristine and Julie. I knew 16 and 17, but kind of really going back to on the original document that we created with the sub team. And thank you for (putting that), Julie.

Susan Payne: Kathy, apologies for interrupting you but your extremely muffled. I have no idea what you said. I'm so sorry.

Kathy Kleiman: I'm going to switch, though, to a landline. I'm on my cell. But - and I'll try to talk really loud just for a second. I just said thank you. What I was looking for was actually the original questions obtained from our sub team document before they were put into a table and that's supposed to be in front of us. So, thanks and I'm going to switch phones. So, I'll go on mute for a second.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy.

So, here we have them. These are the original questions. And now, we also then have 16 and 17. Greg, please go ahead.

Stacey Chan: Hi, this is Stacey. I just wanted to respond with the original questions and it does look like, Julie, you have those pulled up on the screen.

So, are you're saying, I think, the Question 16 and 17 in the current draft survey instrument were intended to convert the questions, do you think the 30 day minimum sunrise period is effective in preventing cybersquatting? There's a follow-up to that, why or why not which is not covered by these questions.

And then if you run any sunrise period for longer than 30 days, what were the benefits to the registry or to brand owners? What were the drawbacks? Were there any complaints or was anyone confused? Include complaints from potential non-brand owner registrants.

Greg Rafert: And I think the, kind of, the one set of potential responses that our current Question 16 and 17 don't cover are the potential kind of benefits or costs to brand owners. And I guess for the (tribe) as well. So, I think these questions are really designed to just look at it from the registry's perspective.

Kristine, please go ahead.

And thank you, Greg and Stacey.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, thank you, Greg. That was very helpful. I was going to ask that question.

I haven't had a chance to go through the other tables yet, I just - back-to-back meetings all day yesterday. So, I'm assuming that this table because I know we ask similar questions later, so I'm assuming that you have a very similar table but customized to the specific target.

So, registrars. So, for instance, registrars have to implement sunrise. I'm assuming there's completely different questions for registrars. I'm assuming that you do the same thing for how this impacts registrant or potential registrants. And this specific set of questions only goes to the relationship between the sunrise period that a registry operator offers and how complicated and, I guess, maybe burdensome that is versus the benefit that a trademark owner may or may not obtain.

And really, this is from the registry operator standpoint. So, we can't even ask landowners here what they're getting. We're only asking registry operators if they think brand owners are getting a benefit. That's correct?

Greg Rafert: Yes. That's correct.

Julie Hedlund: And, Laurie, please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: I'm sorry. I was on mute. I'm on my phone. I hope you can hear.

Yes, I want to go back to Kristine's point about - and I know that many hours of discussions we've had, but now we're down to brass tacks and what's

going to work when we're asking questions versus sort of what we were aspirationally trying to get as a discussion group.

So, to this point about whether or not the registrars think brand owners are getting a benefit, is that relevant to what we find out if it's not the brand owners themselves? Look, I'm not sure why registrars would necessarily speak to brand owner benefits or cost.

Greg Rafert: So, this is Greg just jumping in quickly. I think it's a really good point. So, I mean, that's why we didn't include questions in the registry survey about kind of what they thought brand owners thought about the sunrise period or what insurance thought about the sunrise period. So, I think it would be a really difficult question to ask. And I don't - I mean, registry operators might have somewhat of an idea but I think it could be a little special.

Lori Schulman: Yes. I - this is Lori. I'm going to just jump in with a follow-up, Kathy, if you don't mind. And I would say I agree with that.

I mean, speaking for an association that represents brand owners, I'm not so sure that registrars can answer those questions with any degree of certainty.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

And Kathy, please?

Kathy Kleiman: I'm on a different phone now. Is this clear?

Julie Hedlund: Much better.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Terrific. First, I just want to check, we're on registries, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we are.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. So, and I guess we'd have to go back to the table. We were looking at 16 and 17. But looking at the original comments, the original questions we're asking, so a question to Greg and Stacey, apart here is -- you can see it, it's the kind of third and fourth bullet points down, sub-bullet points -- what were the benefits to the registry or, I guess, as a registry would see to the brand owners but also what were the drawbacks? Were there any complaints? Was anyone confused? Include complaints from potential non-brand owner registrants?

Where is that in the table and I could be wrong. I don't think it's there. How do we include kind of the flipside to both which is what we worked very hard on our questions to make sure that both sides were represented?

Stacey Chan: Hi, this is Stacey. I hope it's Okay that I just jump in here. So, certainly, we do want to stress that we attempted to include some options here in the great end. We are looking for the expertise of the working group to help us know what other options would be good to include here, to get the kind of feedback that you want.

So, please don't think that we're trying to limit the options that you - you offer here because that was not our intent. But also, I think, going back to Lori's comment, it is important for us to think about, you know, which - what kind of responses we do think that registries are our best place to give versus, say if we're asking what complaints they received, perhaps asking on brand owners what complaints they have about this process because that would be more of a first-person experience for them rather than the registry.

Kathy Kleiman: I don't think...

Greg Rafert: Yes, I think our suggestion slash may be request, maybe that's a little too strong, could be for the working group, the data sub team matter to - if you have suggestions for other options to include, to make sure that we're kind of covering the kind of as full of a range as possible to potential options that

were the kind of selections of registries, I think, would be the to add those to this Google document and then we can incorporate them in the final survey.

Kathy Kleiman: Could you say it again more slowly, Greg?

Greg Rafert: Yes, of course. I am known to talk quickly. So, I can definitely say that more slowly.

I think our - I think in our ideal world is, you know, a couple members or even just one member of the data sub team were willing to add additional options to Questions 16 and 17 in the Google Document. I think that would be very helpful.

I think as Stacey noted, this was our first attempt at some potential options but it's by no means meant to be kind of the definitive and final list.

Kathy Kleiman: Great.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Greg. And Stacey? I have Kristine and then Susan, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine and I don't want to put - put words in Kathy's mouth because she's fully capable of articulating her own thoughts. But I want to pick up on her point.

I think that if it were as simple as just coming up with more options, that would be an easy answer. I think what we're maybe trying to communicate is that the reason these were anecdotal is because we hadn't come up with a checklist. We actually went through the first time and tried to put, like, sort of - like, you know, we had, sort of, more definite definitive lists before but we realize that what we really wanted to know is what are we missing?

We, I am a registry operator. I can tell you what the costs are and the technical burdens are. I mean, we have - we don't (enforce) participated. We've had detailed registries participate.

What we're trying to figure out here is if people who chose to extend their sunrise past the minimum 30 days, why did you do it? Did you have a perceived benefit to yourself? Were you trying to help trademark owners?

You're the grid - there's no good way to get to that answer on a grid. And then when we talk about the drawbacks, we are specifically asking for not only complaints from brand owners about sunrises, but other people. There - what if somebody else came in and was super confused about sunrises, generally? Maybe the place to go they'd go is the registry to complain about that.

And we're specifically trying to solicit, like, stories or information about how the sunrise impact in ways that we haven't even imagined yet.

So, that - when we design the next applicant guidebook, we can make sure that we address some of those issues and we don't so much care about the one-off outliers. But if there's a pattern of a lot of people were confused about X, then we need to go back and try to fix that.

So, I can tell you that things - the 75%, but it's more that 25% that we're worried about and I think that's my concern. I know you have the other open text field, but I'm not sure that's going to get to the questions that we want to get it and I don't think it's as easy as simply adding another line. I think that's my concern and maybe the concern of others. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. Susan, please?

Stacey Chan: Yes. Thank you. Yes. I completely agree with what Kristine has said. So, I'm cutting my comments a bit shorter.

But what I just wanted to flag as well was that I know - I understand the points about the complaints and the concern about asking about that. But to some extent, the kind of lack of (things) being reported to us is also useful - useful information because, you know, there are various, you know, different people within our working group who make claims about, you know, problems that may or may not exist.

And what we're trying to get to is, well, you know, if there were those problems, you know - you know, then someone must have complained about them. You know, who did the complaints go to and what were they?

And if we - if the results of this whole exercise is we get no, you know, no registries and no registrants come back telling us that they got complaints, well, that's useful information, too.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan.

And, Greg and Stacey, now that you've heard a little bit more explanation of what - what we're looking for here, any thoughts about whether or not we should, you know, try to get back to these original questions? And we format them in some way that might get to some of the answers that we're looking for? It sounds like the grid doesn't really lend itself to this and just listening to the discussion here, it doesn't really lend itself that well to what we're trying to get at here.

And again, Kristine, Kathy, Susan, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but that's kind of kind of what I thought I was hearing.

I'm just - I noticed Kathy's point should we move on, but I also think that, you know, we're going to run to other issues like this, and it probably behooves us to spend the time we need to see if we can get a little bit further along.

Greg Rafert: Yes, I think so. This is Greg. I mean, we can certainly get rid of the grid questions. I think maybe another option, although I hesitate to suggest this since it adds even more questions to this already survey, is to then have kind of another question where we kind of allow for this more, kind of anecdotal kind of descriptions and, you know, of the cost and the benefits that registry operators perceived. That's - we could - so the grid questions could be maintained and that would allow us to kind of undertake potentially some type of analysis with respect to the data we give back. But then you'd have a separate question that would allow for these anecdotal responses.

Stacey Chan: And this is Stacey, just jumping in quickly. This conversation is very helpful to know what the - what kinds of questions or what kinds of answers the group is really hoping for here. And I do understand that grid is trying to get at a different type of answer.

And so, I'm hearing, in some respects, there are some yes or no or don't know questions that the group is looking for rather than - and so, of course, the yes/no, it's a different format than this kind of grid so we can certainly make those kinds of formatting changes.

And it may be helpful so that we can continue moving through the survey for us to have this kind of conversation about what kinds of answers the group is looking for. So, some of - some of what you're looking for that we have converted to different type - different formats of questions, maybe yes or no and we may - may not have formatted it in that way.

You may have been looking for anecdotal responses and instances where you don't know what kinds of answers you're looking for or where you may have some informed opinions about those, whether it's informed opinions. It would be great if we could talk about those and format those questions as a multiple choice rather than open text where you're looking for the universe of potential responses and open text fields may be the most appropriate.

So, perhaps - and this is just a suggestion, we might think about going through the survey and talking about, you know, what kind of data is most appropriate and that will help us, you know, like what format is most useful here because I think that's - that is the big point that is coming across here as we're talking about these grids.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Stacey. Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine and I agree that maybe we need to move on 16 and 17 and try to just kind of get a better sense for the rest of the survey and then perhaps the next call we do have should be just sub team just diving deep on stuff, I don't know, and starting to kind wordsmith.

I want ask a follow-up question to Stacey. Okay, I'm looking at Question 16 and 17. I've gone through and we - I think, you know, a couple of us have gone through now and kind of explained this chunk of the anecdotal section that's on the screen right now. Do you think that the explanation that we've provided at this point satisfies what you just said you were looking for for Questions 16 and 17 or do you believe that you still have missing information or don't fully understand what we're looking at?

Just to get a sense of have we provided you with enough? Do we need to dive a little deeper? I will give you an example.

Increased technical burden for registry operators. IME registry operator. I am not entirely sure what you mean by that. Do you want me to sort of words - do you want me to tell you that? Like, operating costs and technical burden could mean totally different things to different registry operators based on whether or not they do their own backend registry functions based on how many registrars they're trying to set up, based on their type of sunrise. Is that information helpful to you or have we provided enough? And I'm just getting into the weeds. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: Thank you. This is Greg. I think we do have enough information, I think, at this point. With the caveat that if there are options that are currently being provided that are a little bit confusing to you as a registry operator, to the extent you would be willing to do a little bit of words and I think - I think that would be very helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. And I was wondering if Greg and Stacey had heard anything about some of the marketing issues involved with the rollout of the sunrise. And so much of the technical is actually done by the registrars, so this question seemed very appropriate to registrars.

But some of the issues, the marketing, some of the delays, I mean, once we dive in to this again, we're going to be on lots of variations but I was wondering if you had heard of some of the marketing issues on this?

Greg Rafert: And this is Greg again. And so, that sounds like something that would be a good option or maybe set of options to add to these grid questions. So, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Kathy, too. And if you do have suggestions to add, you know, keeping in mind that, you know, we've got the Google Docs, so we've certainly welcome to add, you know, texts in there. But I don't know - I'm not sure if we're entirely sure of what you mean.

So, as Susan is noting. So, if you did have some texts you wanted to add, that sounds good. So, let - let me - so again, it sounds like, Greg, Stacey, you have, at least, for now what you need, it sounds like we could - correct me if I'm wrong, sub team members, have a combination of the grid and the anecdotal type questions. If that's the case, Greg and Stacey, do you have enough to at least get a start on this and keeping in mind that we could have some wordsmithing.

And one possibility is that if we had some sub team members who, you know, wanted to look at, you know, a previewed survey, you know, a previewed survey and, you know, and then, you know, suggested edits there, it might be easier to get a sense of how these could work and, you know, how these might be able to be answered. It might be harder to see that in this current format. So, something for the sub team members to consider.

So, shall we move along? Not seeing any objections.

Question 18, I guess - Question 18 also then - pardon my ignorance, really kind of a follow-on for what we have above.

Greg, maybe I'll just turn things over to you.

Yes. That sounds great. And Stacey and I will kind of tag team the various questions. So, yes. We're on Question 18. Which begins at please rank the following possible sunrise and sunrise period requirements for most to least preferable.

Julie Hedlund: Anybody have any comments for Greg and Stacey?

Greg Rafert: And I should note that there is a follow-up which is then kind of please explain the ranking and that was designed to get some of this more anecdotal information that could help to - could help to kind of inform where policies go - going forward.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kristine. Please go ahead. And then I have Michael.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. Thank you, this is Kristine. I'm losing my place here. I have too many documents open, I apologize.

The - Okay. I don't have an issue with the question and the ordering that you've provided because I think that's pretty clearly taken the request table and I like the way you've done that. My question - my concern here is that we've not asked, I think the critical question here which is would you change your answer if the tradename was perpetual?

So, some people - there's been a lot of discussion about whether or not the claim service should be live in perpetuity and that's a very hot button issue and we haven't addressed that as far as I can see yet. And so, I think that piece of it is critically important and should be included in the final version of survey. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Michael?

Michael Graham: Mine is just a, I suppose, it's a survey technical question and that is in the wording whether or not it would and I'm putting this out like questions that I would face and so I'm going to ask Greg and Stacey, would it be better to phrase it something along the lines of please explain why you ranked the requirements as you did in response for the above question rather than explain the ranking that you provided which - yes, it's sort of clear but I'm just trying to think of an easier way of presenting this and maybe someone within the registry world, understands within the trademark world a little bit more direct syntax might be better. I'm just putting that out there.

Greg Rafert: No, this is Greg. Actually, I really liked that wording. So, we can refine Question 18 to incorporate that - that's really helpful. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Michael. Susan, please?

Susan Payne: Hi. Thank you. I'm not sure I am particularly in favor of this question. I mean, I can see that it's - you know, it's relatively easy to answer it. But I'm not sure - I don't know if it's really getting to what we were asking. I mean, we were - you know, for example, we were asking things like if the sun - if the

size wasn't mandatory, would you still opt for a sunrise? And they don't see that being captured here, although perhaps it is somewhere further on.

And that was quite an important one because, you know, in - before the new gTLDs, there wasn't a requirement to necessarily to run a sunrise and many registries RAM won't anyway. So, I think that's something we still need to capture.

And I'm not sure, you know, we still just seem to have moved past the duration of the sunrise. And again, I may be missing it somewhere else in the document. But we're not, you know, we're not getting to any kind of consideration of the duration of the sunrise and maybe that's what we were talking about on these tables. I'm not sure. I just...

Greg Rafert: Yes, this is Greg. I think the only thing that we're missing from the kind of original set of Appendix A question is this the duration or, you know, if it were perpetual. And so, we can certainly add that back in.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Greg, and thank you, Susan. And I see in the chat, Michael is agreeing with Susan. Please include - would you still offer sunrise after 18?

And Kristine said, Susan, I think the grids were supposed to be getting in the impact of the duration but they're not. But thank you for noting that, Greg.

Any other comments on 18 or 19? Not seeing hands. I'll move to 20.

I'll note in the Google Docs that we have a question from Stacey. Should sunrise registrations have priority over other registrations under specialized gTLDs where it says sunrise registration and special - specialized gTLDs? Then I see Kristine and then Kathy, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine and I'm just going to provide some historical context here because this is one of the questions, as I recall, and please,

everyone, correct me if I'm wrong but we were hoping that you could help us word it better.

So, this question is super vague and ambiguous. Do you think there should be special roles to give precedence to certain groups? Good Lord, what that means. What we're getting at here is that when you have sort of a specialized gTLD - for instance, let's pick on city names.

So, you have a dot. I'm going to go with London just because we can. When you have dot London. And you want to get - should brand owners get in the door first? So, should, you know, Amazon, be able to get dot London police and fire and, you know, bank of and whatever it is.

I mean, so - so, there was - there was supposed to be some sort of - should we take into account sort of a special purpose TLD? And lastly, not even a city name. Let's say - let's say I run a TLD dot, you know, dot washroom. And so, do I allow people who have washroom fixtures and, you know, offer public washrooms?

I mean, there are other ways to sort of pre-allocate or give precedence to people in a TLD that are not contingent upon a brand that may make more sense than letting brand owners in the door first? That's what we're trying to get at.

And so, what we're trying to find is the registry operators experience a lot of pushback for some TLDs when people were like, well, no. These TLDs related to what I do, why should brand owners get in first.

That's what we're trying to get at here. Perhaps that helps a little bit and maybe Kathy can correct me if I'm wrong. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. This is Kathy. I think Kristine's exactly right.

And so, a question for Greg and Stacey. With Question 20, you've phrased it as do you think there should be special rules to get precedence to certain groups when registering and restricted these TLDs. And I'm not sure if I were reading through that, I would really understand and - you guys are the professional survey providers.

But the original question were should there be different rules for some registries such as specialized gTLD registries, community or GOs based on their published registration eligibility policies? And we've actually given an example in our materials so that some of the things Kristine had mentioned, so police.paris or police.nyc or windows.construction where you take, you know, a famous trademark but in a certain type.

And so, even though we're thinking of the examples, we're not sure that people rapidly go into a survey. We'll have these specific types of examples or, in fact, any examples in mind as they go through. And I'm not sure a general worded question - generally worded question will kind of get them to the same place that we're trying to trigger.

And so, how do you that as a professional survey provider? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: All right. Go, Stacey.

Stacey Chan: Hi, this is Stacey. Thank you.

So, I do see the question that you're referring to, Kathy and Kristine, under the charter questions and we had - I just not realized that the column mark is relevant charter questions were also suggested survey questions.

So, this question - Question 20, is framed as of the first bullet point in that same row of the appendix which is raised should there be special rules to get

precedence to certain groups. But I do - I do think that there - there could be more clarity if we were to use this question that has examples to help the registrant - I'm sorry - the respondent understand what your - what the intention of the question is. So, I agree.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Stacey. Kathy, you still have your hand up. Is that - Okay. Thank you.

Kristine, please?

Kristine Dorrain: And again, belt and suspenders here. The other side of me, the lawyer side of me is like - but we do want - examples are good but let's make sure that they're not limiting, right? We don't want people to think it only applies to gTLDs. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine.

Stacey, Greg, do you think you have enough information now to, perhaps, make some changes to the question? They think it's fairly - that the sub team's trying to help by saying that here is where they were hoping for help from you with your expertise in survey.

So, while you did capture the question verbatim and the charter questions are meant as guidance, so we're hopeful that between the two of those, you have a sense of where the sub team is seeking some help without necessarily giving examples that as Kristine noted or, you know, specific to GO names.

Stacey Chan: Thank you. Yes, I think this is very helpful and we will revise this question.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much.

Then, Question 21. Anybody have anything on Question 21 from the sub team?

Kristine, please?

Kristine Dorrain: I want to put an opinion in this because I think the question is vague. Have you had to balance the restrictions against sunrises, I'm not entirely sure that people will know what that means. But then, if you answered yes, you would get the text, like, what have you done to accommodate the registration eligibility restrictions and sunrise requirements also unclear.

I think we want to dig in to that a little bit. Again, I - this whole section was not - I'm sorry. It was not meant to be taken verbatim because we knew that we were asking sort of dumb, like, vague open-ended questions and we were hoping you guys could help us.

If you don't understand what we're getting at, most likely, neither will the registry operator. So, I think you can take them as a pretty safe rule of thumb. Some cases, probably not, and I've highlighted a couple places where I think the registries would get it.

But a lot of TLDs, most TLDs do not have registration eligibility restrictions. So, I think the problem we're going to run into is a lot of TLDs, especially small registry operators might not have any clue what we're talking about. So, we may wish to have, like, a little question mark there that explains it or something needs to happen there. I don't think there's a problem theoretically but the question, obviously, we asked it. But I think there's going to be a clarity issue with Question 21 and Question 21A.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Susan, please?

Susan Payne: Sorry. Trouble getting off mute. Well, I put my hand up before I was looking at the question properly because I was going to say maybe we need to have

some kind of a qualification to this question as in you only answer it if you had eligibility restrictions.

But I can see it, actually, (as is spreads a bit). It does intend that it's only answered by people who had eligibility restrictions. But maybe - maybe it needs to be more clear. So, you know, at least that would help a little bit. I still don't think it. I think the wording is vague as Kristine's been saying. But at least then, we would - we'd only get it answered by the people that it's been targeted at.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Phil, please?

Philip Corwin: Yes. Thanks. I agree that this Question 21 needs more specificity to guide the folks and the registry operators and answering it.

If I understand correctly, this would arise from a conflict where someone wants to make a sunrise registration and a new TLD with eligibility restrictions and they're eligible to do so. They're not uneligible party. So, why can't we just say have you had request for sunrise requirement from parties who are not eligible to register in the TLD, something more specific that I'll let them answer knowledgably.

Because when you just say balance, balance is a very vague term. I mean, balance, what against what?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Phil.

Philip Corwin: Welcome.

Julie Hedlund: And I see that Susan says good suggestion, Phil.

Julie Hedlund: Let me ask -- and Brian is typing. Greg, Stacey, do you have any questions concerning what the sub team is asked that it would let, you know, as far as guidance, that it would like here to be able get clarity on these - these questions. And I just want to note something, too, that Kathy had put something in the chat as far as an original question. But that's actually in the next block of questions, that one that did you encounter, any anticipated startup issues with these programs, I think.

So, I think we are still back on Page 4. But let me stop there and ask, Greg, Stacey, if you have questions that would help you in making these questions survey questions less vague?

Stacey Chan: Thank you. Thanks, all. This is Stacey.

I think these - all the feedback continues to be very helpful. I think in the instances where the wording is vague or confusing, of course, all the feedback is helpful and we would welcome redline suggestions or comments in the - - in the live documents that are in Google Docs for these kinds of suggestions because, I think, you all are much more informed about exactly what you're trying to ask respondents, we can certainly help in rephrasing questions so that they don't appear to be leading.

And so - and we can make suggestions for how to word questions that in terms of the meaning and the intended content of the question, I think, it may be best for us to defer to your direct feedback and wording. This goes back, I think also to earlier questions where I think Kristine suggested that the registry operators, some of the wording could be interpreted differently by different registries.

So, in those instances, I that would really be helpful for us to see your suggestions for the wording and we can help in wordsmithing from a survey providers' point of view but in terms of content, I think, you all are better suited for that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Stacey. I have Phil and Kristine.

Phil, that is a new hand?

Philip Corwin: It's my old hand.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Kristine, please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine Dorrain, again. And I - this possibly goes to a fundamental misunderstand of a purpose of this. We put this survey with our questions together knowing that we were not survey experts which is why we sort of have three different levels of what's the high-level question we wanted to get at, what specific data did we want, and what sort of anecdotes or stories do we need?

And when we put this all together, we'd truly believe that at the time, we would end up with, you know, several weeks and calls of meetings between and, you know, whoever the survey respondent was or the RFP provider was and the working group to go through and wordsmith.

This table you have is the result of the best efforts of this really diverse group trying to wordsmith and get to what we want them to go not being survey providers. So, asking us to go back again and try to re-wordsmith the questions that we took months to come up with, we knew that they were vague and we were hoping that the survey experts could come over the top and make them more survey-ish but using the data in the chart and the information across the varying columns to give yourself the understanding you needed to dive deep, but what we understood, you wouldn't get all the details.

And so that - I think that's why there were such an outcry of frustration when we were like we would have one call or two calls because I think we knew as a working group, this is going to take more than one or two calls with you. And I'm not - I'm not going to speak for the whole group. People can plus one me or they can negative one me or raise their hand.

But my frustration is that we knew that these questions weren't ready. We - if we need to sit down as a working group with you to go through them, we need the time to do that because we know these questions are not right and we - they can't go out as if. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine.

And I'm seeing a lot of plus ones in the chat as well. So, Brian, please go ahead.

Brian Beckham: Yes. Thanks, Julie. And this is Brian, for the record. And I hope this comment doesn't set us back.

But I - I wanted to ask the analysis group folks. When we were discussing the idea of a survey sometimes ago, there was - there was some concern that we wouldn't be getting meaningful data but that we would just be getting sort of rehash of anecdotes and opinions that we already had in front of us.

And to be perfectly honest with you, when I look at these questions, you know, that this Question 21 is a good example, to me, that fall squarely into that category.

So, I guess my question is, based on your guys' experience with doing surveys, how can we take, you know, the idea of a survey and put the questions in to a form that will give us actual and meaningful data as opposed to, you know, if you look at the question, did you have to balance those restrictions against sunrise requirements?

Well, let's say 60% say yes, 40% say no or vice versa or whatever, I guess the question I'm struggling with is what does - what do those responses tell us? Sure, on the one hand we'll have, quote-unquote, "data" but I don't think it's the type of data that we're looking for when we talk about, you know, evidence-based policymaking.

I hope that makes sense. If not, I can try to clarify. But I guess I'm just kind of struggling to see how some of these questions move the ball forward for us. Thanks.

Kristine Dorrain: Brian, it's Kristine...

Greg Rafert: Yes. This is...

Kristine Dorrain: Go ahead.

Greg Rafert: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Please go ahead.

Greg Rafert: Okay. You know, this is Greg for the record. No. I mean, it's a really good point in question. I think, you know, in a number of cases maybe - I don't know, maybe not Question 21 specifically, we've tried to kind of move in that data direction.

So, I think the grade questions are good example in some of the multiple-choice questions where there are not just yes, no, don't know responses but some, you know, kind of meaningful options that people can select.

For question in like 21 in particular, I think it's helpful to know kind of what your overall reaction to that and if you think that it isn't moving the ball

forward and there is a different type of data that would be useful, I think it would just be helpful for us to understand what that would look like.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine. I feel like all I'm doing is providing historical context. I think one of the problems that we're facing also and Brian has not been participating in this working group for now but you hit it right on the head, Brian.

So, way to go. Either you did your homework or it's just intuitive for you. But basically, the original charter questions for this company for this sub - for this interesting group were not actual charter questions.

They were - I can put out a public comment period. A whole bunch of people voting for their comments and it could have been just random Joe Schmoie people. Everything people said got chunk into one document and it was all equally valid. So, some random off-the, you know, top-of-their-head person that doesn't even know but ICANN could have made some random comments and where you're considering them.

So, what we are trying to get at a lot of these is are these anecdotal questions because we know we want data, we absolutely want data but we don't even know why some people said what they said.

You know, we have people that say, the sunrise period should be 120 days for instance, why? Nobody ever said why in the charter like there is no basis for these charter questions.

So, we're having to go back and try to guess at why it is the community might have said we want this, we want that. You should do this, you should do that. And so, a lot of it is just trying to pull in whatever information we can and I

agree with Brian, it's very hard to convert those sorts of open-ended like what the hell is going on questions into yes, no data-driven questions.

And so, we appreciate that this is a very tough job. We know because we spent a long, long, long time trying to do it ourselves. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. And, Brian, I see your hand is still up, is that new?

Brian Beckham: I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So, I'm wondering looking to all of this, you know, and just trying to think about how we can get, you know, better survey questions and, you know, recognizing that the sub team has spent a great deal of time trying to get these into, you know, as good format as they could and now, you know, need assistance in getting them into, you know, to be better, clearer survey questions.

You know, and I know that while the sub team anticipated having perhaps weeks to work on that, that was - that time was never something that we could provide in the timeline given the timeline, you know, directive to get data back within a certain period of time.

So, I see that they - we've got some, you know, expectations that they would have a lot more time working with the, you know, Analysis Group with the vendors as, you know, maybe thought we would.

That being said, I'm wondering, you know, here we are, we're an hour through today and we certainly had good discussions. But I'm wondering if there's, you know, another way that we can approach this that might, you know, as it is I think we're being able to get very valuable information, I hope, to Analysis Group real time, meaning that, you know, we're taking these notes.

The notes are, you know, going also to Analysis Group so that they have all these discussions and, you know, are getting direction, you know, how they can try to reward and rework the questions.

But I'm wondering if we, you know, could do - do we want a different approach? Do we want to just do what we're doing now, which is take as long as it needs to take to work through each of these questions and, you know, to have this back and forth with Analysis Group and, you know, or have them go back in this instance and try to suggest some different wording, you know, based on their experience as survey providers?

And I see there's some things in the chat but I want to note, you know, Susan says this is why this has been such a challenge. Bonnie says we're skeptical how these questions are translated into meaningful questions for the survey and she's been down this road before, how we translated desires for information to usable survey.

Kristine, we're passionate of this because we care, we don't want this time to be a waste. Kathy, would Analysis Group like to go back for another pass knowing more about our background. And I see Greg is typing, but Kristine, I'm going to stop talking and over to you, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you so much, Julie, and I appreciate Kathy's suggestion that Analysis Group could go back and take another pass. But given the fact that there are so many gaps in understanding and maybe just even in the way our questions were worded and how Analysis Group sort of needs to get that historical cover, I'm not sure they can.

I think for this doc, maybe they could. Maybe we sort of expounded and given - I've personally got enough of it on monologue that they probably could go back through the registry document again.

But I don't know that they're going to have any of that history for the other sections. I think we probably need to take them through these other sections and, you know, if we have some time to actually go through and look at these docs before the next call, you know, maybe we'll go faster.

But I think we need to give them that background for the other sections as well. I don't think they will have obtained background on the brands or on the registrants just by talking about registry operators.

That's my sense. I just don't think that we're going to be there at this point. I also wonder - I'm also trying to be really mindful of the timeline. So, having them take another pass and then having us to have time to look at them and go back, I don't know that will be the fastest option.

It might literally be going through question by question real time and doing the best we can. But in a much more expedited fashion, knowing that we have our, you know, kind of our marching orders in the original doc in front of us. Thanks. Susan.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kristine. Susan please.

Susan Payne: Yes. Thanks. It's Susan. I can only really speak to the registrar section and in fact, I can only speak to the half of it because I haven't gone through the whole of it yet.

But I absolutely think that Analysis Group would benefit from us going through the registrar section rather than us just imagining that they can take another look. There's a lot of assistance we can give them and background that we can give them and I don't think they can do it on their own and have the information or they don't have the background knowledge is what I'm trying to say.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. So, over to Greg and Stacey. So, for example, with respect to say Question 21 and as we're proceeding here and giving you the background, do you feel this is helpful and then we can just continue with the back and forth of - where you're getting the background and then you may be able to ask questions or reformulate questions? Let me just leave it there and see if this approach is helpful to you.

Greg Rafert: Yes. I mean, the background is certainly helpful. It has been on that registry document so I have - I'm sure that it will be for the other ones as well.

I mean, I think kind of just thinking forward with respect to the call that's scheduled for tomorrow and I think there is a call scheduled for Monday as well, I mean, on the point I made a little bit earlier I think it will be - my guess is it will go a little bit faster when people have had a chance to review the document ahead of time.

And I think in particular we're possible to kind of edit the document in Google Docs if you have any suggestions to provide comments ahead of the call that would just I think help to, you know, we would take - we will look at those before the call and I think that would just help to make things to be a little bit more efficient.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Greg. And I have a question to the sub team, you know, and it gets back to the, you know, objection about the scheduling of calls kind of at the last minute that Susan raised.

And the fact that folks are still, you know, trying to wade through their various surveys and, you know, Susan noted she's only partway through the registrar survey. Would it be useful to, you know, but - we know we have the timeline but let's just hope that we are gaining some efficiencies.

I know it doesn't sound like it but because we're having this one-on-one, you know, back-and-forth with Analysis Group and we're being able to give them

notes practically in real time that they can take back and we also have the Google Documents, would it be useful to take a break say tomorrow to allow people more time to review and perhaps comment on the Google Docs and then reconvene the calls in this same format?

And, Kristine, you have you hand up. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes. I agree. I think there should - I think we do need a break. Also just as a reminder that - and I know that that's very generous and kind and I'm glad we're talking about this.

But to be clear, my schedule is completely booked for two weeks. So, simply giving me back two hours that had already just been taken is a way give me enough time. So, I want to do everything I can. I will skip that two hours scheduled for just this project.

But I want to just caution that don't expect that we've all thoroughly redlined five documents by Monday because I don't know about everyone else but if I've already got 10 hours of work schedule today, I've got to fit this in.

So, just - I don't want to be a whiner but just to be - just - we'll set expectations perhaps. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine, and I think it was you who suggested that rather than each - each and every one of the sub team members reviewing all of the surveys, I think there was a suggestion that the person who was sort of the shepherd of that survey, you know, would then look - be the primary person to look at that survey because I think everybody has, you know, other commitments and I see a lot of, you know, agreements to you to your suggestion, too.

So, Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes. Thanks, Julie. I did suggest that and I think that's right. I think that we, you know, the people that did the primary drafting will have that historical context. I'm hoping that the reason I'm the most vocal speaker up around this section is because this is the section I drafted and I fully expect that the people that drafted the other sections will take the lead in helping sort of provide that context for Analysis Group for their sections as well.

But to be clear and I want to set this expectation because I've - something about what Greg said made me a little concerned. You know, he talked about going through redlining the Google Docs so that they can see it coming into the meetings.

To be clear, we don't have 100% consensus in all of this. I mean, we've sort of come up with this doc that we've agreed on more or less. But we don't necessarily all agree in every point.

So, if I come in and say, for instance, and I think this came up yesterday's call, if you scroll back up in the current version of the survey, there's a question in there where we mentioned amending the registry agreement Question 12 in order to require registry operators to publish their reserve names list.

Now, I've said on this list and you would never know this but I've said that I don't think we need to mention it. Other people have said we do.

So, just because I say I support removing this, I think you need to be really careful and there's not necessarily a group agreement. So, many of us on this call, I would say every single one of us on this call has made confessions, many confessions and I have agreed to live with language I'm not happy with and Kathy and Susan and Rebecca and Michael and everyone else is all - Lori, we've all agreed to live with certain language even if we're not thrilled with it.

So, I also would caution you taking the comment of any one person and incorporating those comments also without making sure that the rest of the group is in alignment. Second comment I would like to say is one of the things that struck me when I went back into the Google Docs this morning was that there were no edits to the first part of the doc based on our conversations yet.

So, to the extent that Analysis Group is sort of already making changes and is already sort of making redlines and edits, I think it would be very helpful for us to also see that in the Google Docs because the - and maybe it's because I'm looking at the clean version.

But because I would like to get some feedback on if what we're telling you is sinking in, are you getting it and if questions one through 12 you've very clearly gotten what we're talking about and all of the changes, you know, that we've talked about are made, I'm going to have a high degree of confidence that the rest of the changes we're going to make are also accurate.

But if you're still not getting it then I'm going to also be concerned that we've got to dive deeper. And so, I hope that's positive feedback, that's not meant to be negative at all, but it's sort of like a feedback loop, right, getting, you know, kind of plus and minus going back and forth. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'll just myself in the queue. I maybe misspoke. We do have the Google Docs but I don't believe that we have invited Analysis Group to be entering edits in there.

So, if you're not seeing edits, it's not because something has been done that's not been reflected to my knowledge. And before I go to Greg, I'll just note that there's been some recommendation to meet in Panama.

While we have two weeks before Panama and I think that - and I'll defer to the, you know, sub team here but I think that we've got some good

momentum and if we are waiting for Panama, then we very definitely will see a huge shift in the timeline.

And, you know, do keep in mind, too, that the timeline is part of the RFP and, you know, there are budgetary, you know, cost issues with expanding the timeline as well. So, staff would just like to respectfully suggest that we know everybody's very busy but we do hope that staff can assist in moving this along as far as possible prior to Panama. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Yes. Thanks, Julie, and this might sound a bit contradictory given what I was saying earlier on about - concerns about how fast (the ration is). But I just like to support what you said.

I don't necessarily want to do two-hour calls every day when I haven't had a chance to look at the documents. But I also think it would be a good idea for us to sort of pause our work hoping that Panama is going to - you know, because we're face to face, it's going to somehow be a solution because, you know, frankly, we're still on the registry segment.

We've already spent like how long three hours on it. We'll never find even three hours when we were all free in Panama let alone, you know, the kind of 12 hours that theoretically might be needed.

So, yes, I think a face-to-face meeting to iron out some issues might be really useful in Panama. But we can't imagine that we'll get this work done there.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. So, and I note a few comments here, yes, Greg is confirming yes, Analysis Group has not been invited to edit certainly. Analysis Group is now invited to edit based on whatever guidance they've gotten so far and so, we'll make that clear.

And Mary is noting, is there any objection to use the next two weeks? So, I think I'm seeing that there is. Their support for us is continuing.

So, let me bring us back. So, to Question 21, Greg and Stacey, do you think you have enough background and guidance thus far in that question to do some words mapping or shall we continue discussion on that?

Greg Rafert: No. Sorry, this is Greg. Yes. I think we have enough guidance on Question 21. That was very hopeful.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Question 22, any issues? Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. Thanks. This is Kristine. I just - I'm not sure if we're asking these questions in the wrong order because I think this question actually kind of goes before questions 20 and 21.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: And I apologize, I have to step away again.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. No problem. Let's take a look. So, questions 22 is which of the following pre-general availability programs that limit participants. I'm looking then back at the chart here.

Greg and Stacey, I'm trying to view where this matches up. I'm sorry.

Greg Rafert: Yes. We're also currently looking at the Appendix and looking for that information. But I think it's kind of a more general comment. You know, if...

Susan Payne: I can tell you...

Greg Rafert: ...there are kind of questions about the (follow-up) survey and thinking about which questions should be coming before certain questions. We're happy to adjust the ordering of the questions. But that's a very helpful feedback assuming we kind of - we agree that it should go up earlier.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. And Susan says Page 4. Yes. Were you speaking, Susan? I'm sorry.

Susan Payne: Yes. I was just - I was going to say it's the - certainly, the version I'm looking at, it's on Page 4 on the second block set. It's actually right at the bottom.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So, yes. So, right.

Susan Payne: But I think the key point is that the question was how could and we're now just saying should they and I'm not sure that that's the same thing. I mean, we're already asking should they in Question 21 really, aren't we?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Greg Rafert: Yes. And I think you will see this occur from time to time. This was an attempt to move away from having just as many open-ended responses. You know, if - we could have a follow-up to this question. So, if they say yes then we could then ask how. But it does have another question to the survey and an open-ended question to the survey.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you and...

Susan Payne: Apologies. I didn't put my hand up. But could I just...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Susan Payne: I think the point is - my point was that I think 21 is seeking information from them about whether they think there needs to be something changed or perhaps - well, perhaps, it isn't quite asking that.

But - Okay. You know, maybe you're right. Maybe you have to ask should they be changed and then you say how. But the real point was we wanted to

say - we wanted to establish if people are saying things need to be differently dealt with, then they need to be suggesting a practical solution rather than just sort of statement that something needs to be done differently.

We wanted people - either we wanted registries to be able to identify what they think would work better from that, you know, from that perspective that they could accommodate better than the current roles.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. Greg, does that help clarify?

Greg Rafert: Yes, it does. We'll do another follow-up to Question 22. So, if they answer yes to should, then we'll ask how.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Question 23, anybody want to raise any issues on this? It's perfect. Sorry. I'm not seeing hands up, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Okay. In that case, we can move to Question 24. Here we actually have a question and I guess the issue was this is kind of further the question in Appendix A. It was focused on start-up issues with these various programs and I think we just wanted to make sure that you are only interested in data with respect to problems that registries ran into regarding start-up issues and not kind of later on if the program was continuing to operate.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And, Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Apologies. I don't think I'm answering that question but I think 24 is sort of if yes to 23. So, maybe that that's your intention but it didn't - it doesn't actually say so.

So, you know, you're going to go and announce the 24 if you did run one of those programs. That was the intent.

Greg Rafert: Yes. So, that's a good point and that's (something to think about). But it's certainly reflected in the document.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. So, Kathy, go ahead, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. This is Kathy. Greg and Stacey, this may be one of the areas where kind of you're coming in from outside may help. It depends what you mean by start-up issues. These are programs for startup and we kind of assumed that in our discussion.

So, did you have any unanticipated start-up issues? I think for us it means do you have any unanticipated issues with these programs because they are by definition start-up programs, not ongoing programs. They all have to do with launch.

But that kind of clarification may be a really good, you know, the question you're raising may be a question others have. So, thanks for raising that.

Greg Rafert: No. Thanks, Kathy, and that's helpful. So, I think what we will do for this question is just remove the word start-up.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kathy. Thank you, Greg. So, that's - so, please go ahead, 25 I believe. And, Kathy, you said no, Okay. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: I'm just going to dive in. This is Kathy. I wish I had five screens in front of me because I keep jumping back and forth and then losing my hands. So, we all need lots of screens. ICANN should buy them for us. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Of course. Anybody have any comments on 25? Not seeing any hands up. 26? Any comments on 26?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. This is Kathy.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Does this capture, and I don't have all the information in front, but isn't - somebody correct me if I'm wrong, so, Question 26 is how are we able to reconcile your plans for limited registry, you know, all the different types of launches with sunrise and claims and I thought we were looking more or at this point in that question, wouldn't it be more broader and especially if we're going to an open text field of how would - not how did you do it but how would you want us to do it, how would you like to be able to reconcile your plans.

Because what we may hear about again is the problems that they hit and we've heard about this from GOs and others. But, you know, again, shouldn't Question 26 be a little broader, how would you like to be able to reconcile future plans for limited registration period approved launch, et cetera with sunrise and claims? Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kathy. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: I'm just going back at the original document and it, I mean, it just seemed, you know, well, it's there up in the box. I mean, the question how were you able to reconcile.

And so, you know, if - there's then a follow-up question which is what suggest do you have for resolving any issues. So, that would only be something that you don't - if you'd encountered any issues.

But, I mean, yes. So, if you encountered in Question 24 any unanticipated issues with the program, then a follow-up might be, you know, what do you think would work better. But I don't think we should be, you know, I don't think we should be changing the tone of the questions that we did all agree.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. And let me have Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Right. So, good suggestion from Susan that we're missing kind of what suggestions do you have for the future gTLDs rollout. You know, what rules or any would you recommend for resolving these issues that you've raised and here I'm reading from our original - the sub team's original document, you know, what rules, if any, would you recommend for resolving these issues that you've raised above and the question that's on our screen, how could pre-general availability period be made more accessible and successful.

So, to Greg and Stacey, how would we - and to Susan kind of how do we put that kind of broad future-looking question back in because if the policy, you know, the working group is going to be working on the policy for the future. So, how do we put that back in? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Greg, Stacey, any questions with that?

Greg Rafert: No. I mean, I think we can add a question that's more forward looking and just have maybe an open text field. I know I sound like a broken record but that's, of course, been - that's had another question with another open text field in it. So, I've continued to be a little bit concerned about the length of the survey.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Let me - actually, Susan also is typing. I'm just wondering, is that - are we introducing a totally new question or are we trying to reflect one of the original questions? Susan Payne says, but you only answer if you encounter problems.

Okay. So, we could have it as a question you would - maybe it wouldn't bad - lots of people would never hit this question at all. So, perhaps, maybe that's the way that we can mitigate this - the length a little bit and that it really only kicks in if you use or have a reason to answer it.

Greg Rafert: Yes. That's a good point.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And now, I forgot where we are. Sorry. We were on 27, is that correct?

Greg Rafert: Yes. I believe so.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. 27, please. Any comments? Thank you. I'm not seeing any hands up. 28? These are related. Please, Susan, go ahead.

Susan Payne: Hi, Julie. Just another tedious one as I'm presuming that there's some gating in here somewhere so that if you didn't have any idea on TLD, you didn't - you don't have to answer this.

Julie Hedlund: Greg, is that...

Greg Rafert: Yes, Susan. That's correct.

Susan Payne: Hang on. No. Sorry. At the second level, sorry. Ignore me. But I guess if you don't operate - if you don't offer IDN languages at your second level, then you don't need to answer that.

But, I mean, you know, maybe beyond the service that they just need an option which says not applicable or something because I'm, you know, just - because there isn't an answer that says I didn't do this.

Greg Rafert; Yes. I think that's probably the way to handle it.

Kristine Dorrain: That's actually a gating question earlier. This is Kristine, sorry. There's a gating question earlier asking if you offered second-level domains.

Susan Payne: Second-level domains or second-level IDNs?

Kristine Dorrain: Level IDNs, I'm sorry.

Susan Payne: Thank you. It's way higher. So, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Kathy, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. Just a quick recommendation especially since it's high up. Can we spell out things like SLD, second-level domains, just to make it much easier for people to go through?

I'm always amazed at who knows their acronyms and who doesn't. I think IDN is pretty well defined. TLD is pretty well defined. I'm not sure about SLD. So, I recommend expanding that. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: Yes. We'll be happy to do it. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Question 29, any comments? Then we have 29A and 29B, that's related. Kathy, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Please.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. Q29 question - Question 29B, I need more coffee, the registry doesn't send claim notices. So, that's probably maybe - maybe that - maybe we took that one directly from the survey, I'm not entirely sure.

But they would - registry would probably be aware of a claim's notice but you're probably going to best to get that answer from the registrar and if that's something that we put in there, I apologize.

Julie Hedlund: Great.

Stacey Chan: This is - yes.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

Stacey Chan: I'm sorry. This is Stacey. Thank you. We can remove that question.

Julie Hedlund: Kathy, please.

Kathy Kleiman: So, which one are we removing? Because that makes up my question.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. So, question 29 is did you offer extending claims and that's a registry question, 29 asks how long did you extend it and that is 29A and that's fine because that's a registry operator decision. But how many - did you send claim's notices, that's...

Kathy Kleiman: That's a registrar question.

Kristine Dorrain: ...would - registrar question. So, I think we have to know that - I think we have to remove that question.

Kathy Kleiman: Agreed. I was just about to say the same thing but we had outside noise here. So, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Kristine and Kathy. Question 30, please.

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: All the same questions as above. The question of technical burden offer - I mean, a lot of this is registrar. The technical implementation is registrar. The impact for registry is probably largely marketing and also the impact of having people come to them and say I'm trying to register - registrants or potential

registrants, I'm trying to register something and I can't register it or having anchors come through and say I can't register the domain because I'm getting legal notices that my lawyer says I shouldn't click through.

S, all of these tables as above just descend into a whole range of issues that I really think we could be helping define for the next month or so and I don't think we have time for it. So, just ditto for all the questions in these tables about this.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kathy. I see Greg is typing.

Stacey Chan: Hi, this is Stacey. We'll just jump in on phone. I do agree with Kristine's comment but I think these grids follow the same kind of format as in Q16 and Q17, only they're related to the claims period.

So, any changes that I think we can incorporate for those earlier questions that probably apply here but certainly tell us if otherwise.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Stacey. And Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay. I'm sorry. I'm trying to eat a little bit of breakfast here or lunch whatever we call the meal at 10:30 in the Pacific Time. I actually think and this is - we don't have to solve this now but I'm just going to lobby it out there for the working group to think about.

If we were to agree on sort of grid and I am going to give it some thought, I take Kathy's point completely, but I don't think we should toss out the grid with the bathwater just because.

Remember that sunrise and claims are kind of flip side of the same thing and then they've got - we've got one chart for 30 days and one chart for longer than 30 and then for claims, one chart for 90 and one chart for longer than 90.

I think there's possibly a way to come up with some sort of one matrix that digs into the various costs and benefits of sunrise and claims for different lengths of time while still also possibly gathering anecdotal data. It's kind of like just, you know, eating at the back of my brain right now but I want to make sure that we reserve a little time to think about that because it's possible that we end up with sort of one big concluding question which is so, you know, given all of this information, rank these following things and like good and the bad and the ugly.

You know, I think there's a possibility here. So, that's all I wanted to throw out there. Not that we have to do anything with it now but for the working group itself, I think it would be useful to consider.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. Any other comments? Please, Susan, go ahead.

Susan Payne: I like Kristine's suggestion and I wouldn't at all suggest she doesn't think about it further. But I am a bit concerned by this because it seems to me that, I mean, we're just asking for opinion and we're asking for opinion from one grid about, you know, the benefits or drawbacks that they're obviously going to, you know, going to rank the ones that matter to them.

And, you know, so, if you don't want - if you're a registry and you don't want to run a sunrise or you don't want to run a claim, then you're going to put, you know, it's not likely to prevent some of these questions and, you know, whatever have been you're going to put it's going to increase my costs.

You know, I mean, we could answer this reach of the respondents now without sending it to them. I'm just not sure what we get from sending this because we really know what was - we know what they're going to say and we'll just get a load of opinion but it's not based on anything apart from, you know, that, you know, them advancing their own positions.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. Michael, please.

Michael Graham: Michael Graham for the record. Addressing Susan's point, I think the same holds true for, you know, all of the groups to whom we're addressing questions. All of them will have the opportunity with this type of question to you know, express their personal prejudicial beliefs perhaps.

But if it's followed up with a what is the basis for your perception, for your opinion, it might get at, one, whether or not there actually is a basis that they can quantify or, two, it's just a feeling in which case that might be something that we can take into consideration. I think far more important, of course, are the actual, you know, statistics, the number of metrics that we're able to come up with who this survey.

But I think giving the ability to voice, it's not a bad idea. I think the greater concern I would have would be and how it is analyzed afterwards. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Michael. I see Susan is typing, Michael, sure but then we'll just get a bunch of competing opinions.

Michael Graham: And Michael again and I think that's where we are now. I certainly don't think that it would be terrible to leave out, you know, open-ended questions that just allow you to express what you believe the effect would be.

But I think asking the question and then giving them - giving respondents the ability to explain the basis for that, again, might get to information that would be useful that we may not have asked about. And at the same time, in analyzing, I think it would need to take into consideration, one, if they're just expressing their feelings and they have not provided any statistical information that would back that up or if they have provided that information, then we could take that into consideration.

But, you know, whatever we determine for one of the groups, I think we should apply to all of the groups. So, you know, the same sort of questions, you know, has the new gTLD program affected the cost of enforcing your trademarks, yes or no. You know, we have to take out these general questions on all of these. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Michael. So, Greg and Stacey, do you have enough information to - that give you guidance on how to address these grid questions? Do you have any questions for the sub team that would help you reformulate? I know you talked about 16 and 17 is possibly guidance as well.

Stacey Chan: Right. Thanks. This is Stacey. Yes. I think we have enough information to at least try again and, yes, I think that we have enough information to try again and, of course, yes. The answer is yes. Sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Stacey, thank you. Then I will note for Question 32, Stacey, you had noted that that it's a very complex question. Is it possible to ask simple version of this question? And that is if you run a registry that has an eligibility restricted TLD that offered LRPs or QLP and ALP and other founders type program, et cetera, et cetera.

Does anybody - Michael, please.

Michael Graham: Sorry. That's an old hand.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Any thoughts on - does anybody have any thoughts on how this could be simplified? Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Coming off mute and flipping screens, there's a discussion, Julie, now in the Google Doc and I raised the question to Stacey's comment about Q32 doesn't just belong in the Q23 to 26 section above and perhaps it's now covered by the expansion we suggested a few minutes ago. I just put that a few minutes ago and Kristine said agree.

So, just pointing Stacey and Greg to some new comments in the Google Docs.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you and I see that just showed up for me. Thanks so much, Kathy. Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. Yes. Piggybacking, you know, what Kathy said, I think that there is this doc - and I understand organization is distinct as you can categorize things in multiple ways.

But this doc specifically has questions related to sort of eligibility restrictions, LRP, QLP, ALP founder kind of scattered throughout and I'm not sure - this is just may be something for Stacey and Greg to look at, I'm not sure if there's a way to pull those together in a way that doesn't disrupt less to the continuity and the reason why they were organized where they were currently.

So, if you go back and start all the way with the jurisdiction question, names reserved for jurisdiction, it kind of ties through those other questions about restricted TLDs, those other questions about, you know, sunrise and the ability of people to, you know, how sunrise impacted, you know, these programs, and then finally, we have this question.

So, there's at least four questions where I think grouping them will allow for a certain continuity that will allow us to streamline all of the questions because these - the person answering the question will already be thinking along the lines of that type of question or if you've already self-identified as not participating in any of these, you don't see these for it all in which case to Greg's point, you shorten the survey for that quite significant number of people quite frankly because a lot of people did not do any of this.

So, you would only show the people that did one of these four options. You'd only show them these four questions I think. S, I think that could be helpful. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kristine. Greg and Stacey, is that helpful guidance, does that make sense to you?

Stacey Chan: That is helpful. Thank you and I do think that it would be helpful to sell through these questions. I guess some follow-up questions are, for example, in the first question where we say if you run a registry with any of these programs, where there any aspects of the claim service that didn't work.

Is it - one question would be is it - does - is it important for us to ask this separately for people who offered an LRP and then ask for the aspects that were difficult for the LRP and then ask separately for the QLP, separately for the ALP, et cetera or is the information still useful if we ask just one question?

So, for any of these programs, where there any aspects within the work of the claim service which is how the question is currently phrased.

Julie Hedlund: Kathy and then Kristine.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. Good question, Stacey. I would recommend that maybe in the answer, you ask people to explain in light of whatever program or programs they offered so that will have - the data point will have that knowledge of whether they're talking about LRP and ALP or QLP.

So, I keep the question the same. I'm not sure you have to break them up although it would be interesting to see what Kristine says. But just ask them to qualify so that we have the data when it comes back. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: Yes. Thank you. This is Kristine. I also don't know that we have to break them up because we're hopefully gathering what - which ones they're offering.

I'm looking - most people would not have offered QLP, ALP or thought like - those are kind of all one thing. QLP, ALP and founders programs are essentially one thing for one - you wouldn't offer all three of those.

Generally speaking, I think you may have people that offered one or more of the three categories, meaning it's eligibility restricted, there's an LRP or there's one of those initial types of programs.

So, I think that depending on how we end up with the questions, I can almost imagine the scenario in which we did - depending on how we word the questions that I can almost see a grid working here assuming that we still allow for that question of people with that what changes would you make to better align.

So, the most specific part of this question is what changes would you like to see because we are asking the people who ran those programs to identify how they could solve the problems they've encountered. We're less concerned about did you encounter problems because we know they did.

Yes, we'd like to gather data on what problems they encountered but we want to hear about what would have made their life easier. And so, that's the most important part of this question, less, you know, who had what kind of process. Thanks.

Thank you very much. So, any other on questions, Stacey, Greg? Was that helpful?

Stacey Chan: It was helpful. I'm just - I want to make sure that I'm parsing through the question now. Yes. That was helpful. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you. So, I believe it or not, we've come to the end of all the questions unless I'm missing anything. And so, Lori showed me this yesterday.

Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: This is sort of a suggestion for the working group to weigh in on and this is just an idea and I'm not - obviously, I'm not going to be offended if people disagree with me. But I would be willing to volunteer to while the Analysis Group is kind of redrafting the registry operator questions to be available via email or phone if they have a follow-up on the specifics because this is the one I drafted with the caveat that, of course, the whole working group would or the whole, you know, sub team would finalize and have the final say.

And I would also be willing to concede that sort of ability to offer assistance to the other leaders of each section as well if that would help streamline. I don't know if people are nervous about that or if that's something they would prefer to be done completely, transparently and on the list.

But if that could be helpful and if other people are also willing to volunteer similarly so when they get to their sections, when Analysis Group tries to redraft, I would be willing to do that. But again, I also understand where people would be really nervous about anything happening behind the scenes as well. Thoughts?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Christine. I see Michael is saying, I would be glad to provide TM brand owner question reference for AG. And I don't know that we need to get everybody is fine here but I can say thank you very much, Kristine, for that suggestion and thank you, Michael, because I think that that would give us some efficiencies in the process and, you know, and also because each sort of shepherd of the surveys so to speak would have, you know, probably more expertise than others having been the author of that.

I see other folks are typing also in the chat. A question for how we proceed with respect to meetings. Yes. So, Kristine says, to be clear, I would not be worth in the team but just providing context background. Thank you. I think that's understood.

And Greg and Stacey, does that sound good to you?

Stacey Chan: Yes. Thank you very much, everyone, for offering your time.

Julie Hedlund: So, a question, we do have on the calendar the meeting tomorrow. We don't necessarily have to go through these surveys in any particular order but the order as they appeared in the original chart was registry's registrars, brand owners, registrants and potential registrants.

Now, Susan, I noted earlier you said you had not been able to make it through, you did not have time to make it through all of the survey for the registrars. I think, Michael, you indicated that you had made through other surveys for the brand owners.

I'm just asking if, number one, does the sub team want to keep this call tomorrow and if so, where would they - what survey would they like to move to? While, of course, in the background, Analysis Group would be making edits to the registry's survey. It seems that there was similar time on registrar section tomorrow - Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Graham: Yes. I would be glad to go ahead with the trademark owner - trademark brand owner portion. I have not loaded any of my proposed red line. I can do that on the Google Doc tonight or this afternoon so that it will be out there. But I'll be glad to go ahead with that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. So, excuse me, and I know Susan is saying she will get through her section. So, let's go ahead with the TM brand owners tomorrow for

tomorrow's call. Let's suggest as I think I heard some agreement that we now proceed forward for the next two weeks.

And so, staff could do a doodle for additional call times and, you know, recognizing everybody's busy schedule but hopefully providing enough time that we could get through these and then also giving some real-time comments to Analysis Group so that they can be working on finalizing the surveys as we go so is perhaps to not lose time.

And I see Michael says, Susan, do you want the weekend? I can run the TM brand section. Kathy says, is there meeting tomorrow? I think we are meeting tomorrow, Kathy. I'm not seeing any objections to that to do the trademark brand owners survey.

Susan says, lovely, Michael. So, staff would suggest then to set up the doodle for calls following for the next two weeks and I also will include Monday's call since we had somewhat arbitrarily scheduled that. So, we'll whether or not we have availability for that call.

So, is there anything that anybody wants to raise before we close out here and we are minute before the top of the hour? Getting some typing in the chat. Lori says, yes, gladden for more works. Thanks, Lori.

Thanks, all. Yes. Thank you, Kathy. Thanks, everyone so much for joining for this call. Again, sorry for the forced merch but I think we've really accomplished. Thanks to all of you a lot here and thanks so much for all your dedication on this. And I hope you can salvage the rest of your day and we will talk tomorrow.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect online. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

END