ICANN Transcription

The Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Sunrise Data Review

Wednesday 12, December 2018 at 1800 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-sunrise-registrations-12dec18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p3pmwo3sd4h/**

Attendance is on the wiki page: **https://community.icann.org/x/iQj_BQ**

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

JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RPM subteam for sunrise registrations call on Wednesday the 12th of December 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

CLAUDIO DIGANGI: Julie, I'm on audio only.

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

JULIE BISLAND: Claudio. Thank you. Okay. I would just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this, I'll turn it back over to you, Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Julie Bisland. Staff will quickly go through the agenda, and noting that staff also can lead this meeting until we have a subteam leader selected. The first item in the agenda is the updates on statement of interests, and we'll move into selection of the subteam leader, an introduction to the survey analysis tool, and then begin the survey analysis, followed by Any Other Business.

May I ask if there is Any Other Business? George Kirikos, please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. [inaudible] the mailing list, there's some rather severe issues with the quality of the survey results, and that raises questions as to how much weight to attach to them. So during the various prior calls that we had, a lot of people wanted to defer that discussion to the subteam. Now we're in the subteam, so I think we should really consider the severe statistical problems that were in these surveys and how much weight, if any, to attach to them. Thank you.

EN

JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you, George. I've noted that. Let me ask, item one, are there any updates to statements of interest? I'm not seeing any hands, so let me go to agenda item two. Oh, someone has their hand up. Go ahead, Mitch Stoltz, please.
MITCH STOLTZ:	I apologize, that was in error.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Oh. No problem. Thank you. So moving to the next item, the selection of the subteam leader. As we've done previously, subteams have selected their own leaders for these groups. Generally, the co-chairs of the working group have generally not filled that role. Usually, it's been someone [else] on the subteam. So, let me ask if there are any volunteers as a leader of this group, or any nominations for someone to lead this group. Kathy Kleiman, please go ahead.
KATHY KLEIMAN:	Hi, Julie. Good morning, everyone. Good afternoon. I wanted to share – for those who were on the last call, this is somewhat of a repeat, but just wanted to share the encouragement of Julie. Would love for more people to volunteer to be subteam leads. The co-chairs, Phil, Brian and I are specifically not looking to lead these subteams. We've had great success in members leading. So, if people would put their hat in the rings, it's kind of fun to do the administrative work, the organizational work, and certainly

appreciated by the co-chairs as well [of the] working group. So, thanks, and back to you, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Kathy. Again, let me ask, is there any volunteers or any nominations? And staff will also note that we'll bring this as an action item to the list, so decisions do not have to be made today. Unless there are any objections, staff will walk us through this call, and then we'll hope that we'll have a subteam leader by the next call.

I'm not seeing any hands or anything related to this question in the chat. So, I'm going to go ahead and note this as an action item and ask for volunteers and nominations on the list.

What I'm going to then do is move to the next agenda item, and that's the introduction to the survey analysis tool. Staff has created a tool to help the subteam to look at the originally agreed upon and refined charter questions, and then see if the data does or does not answer those questions. So at this point, it'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Ariel Liang, who will lead us through a demonstration of the tool. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Julie. I'm going to paste the link to the analysis tool which is viewed on the Google spreadsheet, and I encourage you all to check this [inaudible] on your own as well. And I'm also going to share my screen when walking through this spreadsheet, and that'll be easier for reference. And just check whether everyone can see my screen.

JULIE HEDLUND: Ariel, we can see your screen.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much. So, apologies for those who already heard this in the previous call. So as an overview, this table consolidates all the information related to the Analysis Group survey, and so you can see that in the first tab, it's called content table that lists information that you can click on, use the links and quickly jump to the various tabs that include all the survey results. And I will just give a quick overview of that.

So, column A, it's the most important three tabs. One is actual potential registrant survey response, and then the second one is the TM and brand owners survey response, and then the third one is the registry and registrar survey response.

So, all these three tabs have all the information from Analysis Group, so basically, the responses to every single question, and also the raw data they provided to the working group. And we consolidate all these things [inaudible] all these three tabs, so you don't need to click back and forth between all different documents to see them.

Column B in this tab that shows there are some questions that have very detailed responses that cannot fit in the consolidated table, that's why we have the detail listed in separate tabs, and you're welcome to check that as well. And they're mainly from the raw data that Analysis Group provided.

I will give you kind of an example to see how to navigate the table, because this subteam is dealing with sunrise-related questions, and for the actual and potential registrant survey doesn't really have questions related to sunrise, we'll jump directly to the trademark and brand owners one.

So this is the tab that includes all the responses from trademark and brand owners to the survey. You need to look at the column A, it's titled as agreed questions, so basically, this column includes the refined charter questions that are included in the RFP for guidance for the Analysis Group to develop the survey. And if you scroll down to this column, you will see the refined charter questions are starting from row 13 here.

And a quick note that we heard from previous subteams' meeting that staff will take an action item this column with the additional numbering of these charter questions, so it will be easier to reference. So we'll do that after this call.

And then if you look at column B, this is the actual survey question from Analysis Group, and we want to note that we didn't include some of the details, for example the logic of the questions, so for example if someone answered yes to Q1 and they're local to Q2, this logic was included in the final report, so we didn't include that in this table just to make the information [inaudible] adjustable and brief.

And then column C is the data subteam's draft questions. The data subteam spent months to develop the draft questions as guidance for Analysis Group to develop the survey, and then we also match the data subteam's draft question to the actual survey

question, and you can see some of the discrepancies, and that's just as a point for reference.

Column D is the responses from the trademark and brand owners, and we have included all the details from Analysis Group here. And if you scroll down the survey, the table, you will see some of the fields are colored in green. That means that some of the details, we cannot include in this table format, so you have to check the separate tabs following this tab. If you look at the example shown here, "see tab TM owner/24," so you just go to the right, and you will see this is the tab that includes the detailed response to this particular question.

For column A, that's the findings from Analysis Group, so basically that's the highlights they included in the final report, and we just copy paste the text over as another reference point for you. So that's an overview of this particular tab.

And then if you look at the registry and registrar tab, you will also notice there's some difference here, is that some of the questions in column [D,] they are color coded. It's because some of the same questions – some other questions were asked to those registry and registrar, and we want to merge these questions into one cell. And you can see the one colored in red is for registries and the one colored in blue is for registrars. That's why we have the color coding there.

Lastly, I want to mention that the table also has dividers, and if you look at [inaudible] tab, you see those first few questions are introductory questions we have here, and if you scroll down, you

will see there's a sunrise period for [inaudible] and under this divider, it's all the questions related to that topic.

And because there's a lot of questions that are related to trademark claims and you probably don't need to look at [above] these questions in this subteam, so that's just another way for you to quickly browse the table.

I will stop here and welcome your questions and comments, and apologies I didn't check the chat yet, so if there are questions there, I will respond. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel, and I'll just take a look at the chat too to see if there are questions relating to the example. And just to confirm something that's in the chat as well, and I think as you just pointed out, there's one Google sheet tool for both subteams.

So, you can, in this case, scroll to those questions that are relating to sunrise, whereas the other subteam would go to those that are related to trademark claims.

Let me go ahead and ask if there are any questions from anyone for Ariel. I'm seeing there's a couple people typing in the chat. I don't see any hands up. David McAuley's noting, "Fair enough, allows us to keep track of both groups a bit more easily." Well, and ultimately, another reason for this is because we end up with all of the information in one place, which as far as developing recommendations, makes things easier as well.

I see some others are typing. Ariel, while we're waiting to see if there's any other questions in the chat, is there anything else that you wanted to raise?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Julie. I think nothing else to raise, and I just want to repeat a point mentioned earlier, is I think for the sunrise subteam, you can focus on looking at the TM brand owner tab and the registries and registrars tab, because that's where the potential and actual registrar survey [inaudible] related questions are not included there. So, hopefully that will save some time.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. I'm just going to make a note of that. For sunrise –I think that will make things more efficient for us – we just need to look at the TM and brand owners, and owners and the registries and registrars. Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. I'm just making a note of that. Okay, well, thank you very much, Ariel. That was quite helpful. Let us then go ahead to begin the survey analysis. And let me mention something that was raised as a suggestion of how to proceed in the trademark claims subteam for the subteam to consider.

This was something that was noted by Christine Dorrain – Christine, I don't mean to put words in your mouth, but just said – see if I get this right. From the last call, you talked about the need to focus on the refined charter questions, and then to look at the questions and then see how the data does or does not address those questions. But to look at those questions across the data, so to take the first of the questions. And staff notes, again, that we're going to renumber these or reflect the numbering that was in the original refined charter question.

So, say, take the first question, and then look at both the trademark and brand owners and the registry/registrars data to see how those may or may not answer that question.

Let me pause there and see if there are any comments [for that as a] suggested approach. And Kristine Dorrain, please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Just so you don't have to be the only one talking, yeah, you've captured my viewpoint exactly, and I do support that approach. I think that ultimately, our goal – the work product that we've been hired or asked – not hired, asked to volunteer to perform by the GNSO is to answer a list of charter questions and make some recommendations. And if the data allows us to do that easer, great, and if it doesn't, fine. But we still have to answer the darn questions. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Kristine. And I'll also note something else that was a point also that was made on the last call that may be

EN

helpful, and that is that we may find while looking at the data that not only can they answer or not the questions here, which are the questions that were singled out specifically for these surveys from the agreed charter questions, but we may find that the data may answer other of the refined charter questions as we go along.

And Griffin Barnett notes, as was discussed in the claims subteam, "I support the approach Julie's describing for how to organize our work here as well, namely starting with the individual agreed questions identifying which data relates to the question across all the respondent groups, and proceeding question by question in that fashion.

Just one moment. I'm just having to step away from the computer for a second. So, Ariel, Mary, please let me know if there are any hands up or any related comments in the room. I'm having a small crisis here. Okay. We're good.

ARIEL LIANG: There's no hands up, it's just typing in the chat. So, Maxim has a question with the cell we are on. So perhaps staff can suggest we start with the TM and brand owners tab, that's the third tab, and so [some row 13,] that's questions related to sunrise period [inaudible] perhaps we can start on there.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. I'm back in the room, and I see that David McAuley, you have your hand up. Please go ahead, David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Julie. I was just going to ask an admittedly minor question while you were having that crisis, and the question is, when staff send out the e-mail with the agenda, it would be nice if you could to include things repetitively, like the link to the spreadsheet, and perhaps also an indication for the upcoming call as to what tabs we're going to be looking at, maybe even what columns and cells. Anyway, that's just a suggestion. Thank you. Bye.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, David. That's a very good question. So, we'll do two things. First, at the end of each call, we're going to go ahead and indicate the action items, and in particular the homework for the subteam, because we do suggest that it will be important for subteam members to actually not wait until the next call to do some consideration of the questions and the data, but to identify – it'd be helpful for the subteam to identify what questions they want to address for the next call, and in preparation for that, then staff can send around, as you note, the link to the spreadsheet and also indicate where the questions we're starting in, what line number, tabs and so on. So, thank you for that.

So then moving ahead to what Ariel suggested, we do have some time here now, and we know there's a lot of information that we've now put in front of you. Do subteam members wish to start looking at a question and looking at the data here on this call? I see folks are typing.

[inaudible] to George Kirikos' note, if the subteam [notes] now what questions they'd like to deal with for the next call, then staff

can go ahead and indicate that in the action item and circulate that information right away, so not having to wait until this Friday.

I'm not seeing more hands up, but I do see some typing in the chat. Kristine Dorrain, please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hey. I'm trying to juggle too many tabs here, so bear with me. I [thought of a] proposal. I believe based on my participation in the original drafting for the sunrise, that the first question, the sort of overarching question that the subteam was trying to ask is going to be found in column A, row 27, and I think 28 – looks like it's merged.

The question about registry operator pricing was farther down in the list, and so I suggest that we start with, again, sort of the overarching question in 27, which talks about sort of the same as [inaudible] is this thing serving its intended purpose, what about the 60-day period? Are there unintended results? Should it be uniform? Are there benefits?

I think that's a nice deep dive question for which most of the survey questions, we're able to get some sort of data. Again, whether or not we agree with the validity of the data or applicability of it, but I think there was an attempt to get a significant amount of data to answer the questions that are not enumerated right now but listed in row 27.

So, my proposal is that we start there and attempt to review the data across both the trademark, brand owner, and

registry/registrar tabs in order to see if we can start to answer the questions in column A. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Kristine. Very helpful. I'm sorry, David McAuley is asking, row 27, and we're in the trademark and brand owner response tab. So that is the third tab over counting from left to right.

Anybody object to Kristine's suggestion? Folks are typing. Griffin Barnett says, "I support Kristine's suggestion." Thank you. And then David McAuley saying [it's been fine.] So, shall we go ahead and start that now? We have 30 minutes. Any objections to starting that now? Kristine Dorrain, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. Thanks. I know we're trying to move quickly, but I have a feeling we're all just going to sit here reading. We can try and see if the initial pass at it fires any conversation, but there's a lot to read and digest and apply across, and don't think any of us are in a position to want to do that real-time and then speak out in defense of any specific position at this point. It looks like Griffin might be [throwing] the same thought in the chat, and George may be too.

I just think it's a whole lot – you guys have done a ton of work, this tool is super useful, but it does involve a lot of clicking and cross-checking back and forth. And my only caveat to that – and I don't like to cut a call short when there's a lot of work to do – is that everybody in this call needs to be overcommitted to doing the

homework, doing the reading, and really deep diving and understanding before the next call so that we aren't stuck trying to read and catch up.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Kristine. I think that's very helpful, and I'm just then – not seeing any dissent to that. Then the questions that we'll look at for next week's call are in the trademark and brand owner response tab. That's the third tab from the left, and we're looking at cell 27, and we'll number those so that they match the numbering that was in the original refined charter questions.

So I think we're looking at the main question, which is the first question, and then I think there are sub questions to that. And Kristine, you can correct me if I'm wrong. Those would be the ones we'd identified for next time. Kristine, please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yeah. To be clear, I think row 27/merged with 28, they're column A, where it has the star, I think that was question one, if I recall, and I want to say that the little minus signs were subs A through D on this. This was a multi-part question, and unfortunately, I think we best look at it in that context, because it was designed as a whole, and it was sort of an overarching question, and then sort of the sub part that you have to answer to really get to the main question. So I don't think breaking it up here is going to be very functional for us going forward.

So we're just going to have to dive into this question, including all four subparts. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you very much, Kristine, for clarifying that. And I have David McAuley. David, please.
DAVID MCAULEY:	Thanks, Julie. And thank you for what you said, Julie, about calling out that assignment. I just wanted to confirm that what I was saying earlier is to sort of reiterate that assignment in the agenda e-mail. I recognize what Kristine said, that it may be very difficult to discreetly [put in assignment,] but at least to point us to the tab, column, etc., whatever it might be, and with a link to the spreadsheet. I think those kind of tools would be quite helpful on focusing. Thanks. Bye.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you very much, David. And we'll definitely do that, and in fact, I think what you'll see today, given that we have disagreement on this call, is you'll see the note, and then following that, you'll see an agenda with the links and the tabs called out. And we'll repeat that, of course, probably next Monday as well. But we'll get that to all of you very quickly so that you have that and as much time as possible to do some analysis.
	And Kristine is saying – okay, Griffin's saying, "[I share Kristine's] recollection regarding the structure of the question's subpart." Maxim, "Could we use digits [inaudible] read the sheet instead of [inaudible] number four?" Yes, of course, we can do that. And yes, Kristine is agreeing with David to repeat the links, "Yes, and repetition is good."

I see George Kirikos. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. I think we discussed this in the prior meeting with the trademark claims subgroup, but it's perhaps worth repeating here, that I guess for the next few weeks, what we're basically doing is going through the spreadsheet to – not necessarily answer the charter questions, but look at the charter questions, only with regards to the survey, but we also do have other sources of data like the March 2017 Analysis Group report and also the various blogs and other data sources with regards to sunrise abuses.

So, this isn't the full answering of the charter questions. We should probably talk about some of those other data sources at some point, either on this call or some future call, because in the last plenary working group session, we did point out that for example there was no research done into the various other data sources like the industry trade articles and blogs and message forums, etc. So, those are additional sources of data that will help to answer the charter questions. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, George. I've put myself in the queue here. I see that you're also in the queue, Kristine, but just to come to George's point, staff had mentioned on the last subteam call that if you look at the timeline – and we'll send the timeline around again to remind folks what's on there –according to the timeline, have three meetings to go through these data, the Analysis Group survey data, and then we have two meetings to go through previously

gathered data. So, we will be doing that, and we will look at those data against not just these charter questions but all of the refined charter questions.

So that is very definitely a task that the subteams will both be doing. Kristine Dorrain, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. I don't want to be contradictory. I would actually support a little bit more of a fluid approach. I think that when we're going through these subteam questions, we 're not just looking at these questions in light of the data. I know we've got some time to look through just the data, and that's fine. But to the extent that we're aware of other things that we want to bring in, I think it's helpful to bring it in now so people can start linking that up in their mind and doing homework.

I think just as we may discard data from the survey as being invalid, we may also discard a blog post as being a single point, one person's opinion. It's all useful information, but maybe not upon which to base a single decision.

So, I like the idea of – I agree with George completely. We can't throw away all of the other stuff. But I'm very worried that we're going to over-compartmentalize this and say, "This is a survey day, this is an industry publication day." No, when we're talking about this question, we should be bringing up the information [that maybe we] circle back to it for one reason or another possibly.

But I do believe that while we're there, we need to be attempting – our goal is to hammer out an answer to the question or a

recommendation based on the question, not to keep revisiting these questions two or three or four or five times.

So, I don't want to be contrary to staff, so I apologize if I'm coming across that way, but I would like us to be a little more inclusive going through it so we're not repeatedly going through these questions again and again with a different one each time. That would be my suggestion here. Thanks. And I'm willing to be disagreed with, if that's what everybody thinks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kristine. So, staff is going to discuss internally what we might be able to do to help in this regard. We do have a table where the subteam can enter in its result – well, deliberations, discussions relating to how the questions are addressed, so for each of the subteams, we have a table that we have briefly previewed last week on the working group call where the subteam can then bring in the determinations [inaudible] from this data, from this pool, and the determination from other data as well. And then we do have a list of the other data.

The difficulty – or let me just say that the aspect that we need to try to determine is how we can do this without getting too bogged down and still working efficiently.

So, let us take – staff take as an action item on how that might work. And I'm just looking at the chat here now. Hold on. I'll see if there's something else I need to pull from the chat.

So, yeah, Ariel's saying perhaps staff can create another column to indicate the status. And I see some support for that. But at any

EN

rate – okay, so we'll come back with a suggestion of how best to do this, either through and additional column or some other mechanism, and thank you for that suggestion.

And Kathy Kleiman, I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Hi, Julie. Hi, everybody. So, I vaguely remember that there's another table, and it may be the answer to both what this subteam is asking and what the last subteam was asking. If there is this table and it has the revised charter questions down the left-hand column, which I think it does, and then place to put in relevant data, you [inaudible] determinations, and depending on what determination means, we may be saying the same thing. But relevant data so that we can see what the Analysis Group said and new can see what, I don't know, so and so said, so that we put the data together so that it helps us go from this massive amount of data that we're looking at on the screen to more focused data that we're looking at in conjunction with the question in this other table. So, the question – different sources of data, and then it's really maybe column three, I think determination maybe is an answer. And to get to that answer, I think we need to see the data coming in from different places.

And with the URS, I remember the providers subteam, the document subteam, the [practitioner] subteam had various inputs going in and found ways to structure them. So I think your thoughts are very constructive, of how we take what we find relevant and useful on this huge Analysis Group table, bring it into

another table, and examine it more closely with the questions. So, building on what Kristine said and what you said, I think we're on the path. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kathy. I've put myself in the queue. And apologies as to what I've said just a minute or so ago, it's not very clear. So, what we circulated last week to the full working group, we circulated two tables, one for each subteam, and then this tool. And the two tables, one for each subteam, are the tables where, I think as you just described, where after the subteams have reviewed the data, they will then put their determinations, deliberations, however you want to call them – maybe preliminary recommendations – into that table. So that reflects both what is gathered out of the analysis side of the survey data, this survey data, but also the analysis of all the other data.

So that's a tool that I think tracks what Kristine is suggesting, except for that staff and the working group and the co-chairs, I think in presenting this last [inaudible], were envisioning this to be done incrementally. But we understand the request to try to do this in a more integrated way. What we're trying to then think about is how to see if we can build on this survey analysis tool that we have in front of you where we're helping the subteam to analyze the data against the questions and bring in some of the other data as well. And that's the part that we're just trying to figure out how to do.

There is still each a table for sunrise and claims where all of the determinations and so on are rolled up together. So I hope that I didn't make things less clear. And I'll pause there.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, Julie, because we're not looking at the table, I'm not sure what we're [seeing,] but where do we put interim data gathering? So we get to something on this sheet or on another piece of data and we say, "That's relevant." We don't know what the answer is yet, we just know it's relevant to the question. Is that the other table that you're referring to? Since I have a vague recollection of it, having looked at it briefly.

But we need a place where we can kind of interim data gathering as a pre-step, unless anyone disagrees [inaudible] as a pre-step to determination or even the determination discussion, because data points only get us part of the way, but we need to gather them.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kathy. Let me go ahead and bring up the table that I just mentioned just so you can see an example. See if I – okay. So this is the table – sorry, the title is too long. Let me try that again. And apologies for the delay. It has a title that – Adobe Connect is very picky, and – here we go. Okay.

Alright. So, this is what we're calling a summary table. Review of agreed sunrise charter questions and data collected. So you can see that there's a list of final refined sunrise charter questions, and

we'll need to renumber here as we promised to do with the survey analysis table.

Then we have the relevant Analysis Group sunrise survey results, relevant data reviewed previously, and then we also then have the final column that we would come to, which is where the policy operational [fix] recommendations would be.

And Kristine is asking, "So this is a working doc that we're creating?" Yes, that's correct. And I'm just going to pull something out of this – no, it looks like – let me just ask this separately, we have a number showing up as 0046 ending in 6045. Could that person – okay, Kristine is indicating that it's Petter.

Okay. And Kathy is asking, "Can we have control?" Yes. The document is unsynced. So yes, Kristine, to your point, this is where the – so based on the analysis of the survey data using the survey tool, the analysis of relevant data previously reviewed, those observations we've put in here, and then from that, the subteam would fill in its various policy and operational fix recommendations that it would be then presenting to the working group.

And Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sorry, mute button didn't want to come off. I think this is great. this is going to help us a lot. One suggestion, subject to whoever our future chair is, is that we may need to create some additional divisions. I think we may be – and it's just the formatting, but when

we look at the preamble, is the sunrise serving its intended purpose? I think we may need an entire row just for that.

And then, is it having unintended effects? Again, data gathering may show us that – so rather than jamming it all into one box, I would suggest that [inaudible] gets its own box, so then we would begin to have a place to start putting relevant data and that we can work on together. Maybe it'd be a Google Doc, but I would recommend creating different boxes for every question and every sub-question. But this is great. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kathy. I think – so staff takes the suggestions for formatting. Yes, we will be putting the numbers in as was suggested, and yes, in the final table, we'll have everything rolled up so we won't have to have all of that.

How we further break down the table probably will depend on what we gleaned from the results, and so certainly, if it's easier to have a row across – compartmentalizing the different questions so that it's easier to see the results against that question, we can certainly do so. Since we're not quite there yet, we've left it relatively unformatted at this point.

Yes, and as Mary notes, the format is for display only, and we assume that the actual work will be in Google Sheets. So yes, that's very important, because it's going to be much easier for people to input, and we can arrange it so it's easier to link up to the various questions as well.

I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. I've got nine minutes before the top of the hour, and staff has collected the action items with respect to what we want to start with for the next call, which we'll get out today with the agenda and materials as well.

Yeah, and as Kristine notes, this will look a lot like SubPro report. Yes. So, we did have Any Other Business that was raised. I know there's been quite a bit of chat about that as well. And Petter is asking, what's the time schedule?

That's a very good point. Now, this may change if we do try to integrate both the data from the survey and with the data as we're going through the other data that's collected. So I'm just going to bring up the timeline, actually, so I can show you more clearly what we had discussed and [displayed] on the call last week.

Okay, that is coming up. So, moving ahead, where we are now, starting today, we had the subteams begin analysis of the survey results against the refined charter questions. We had this as [one of three meetings,] so the 12th, the 19th, not meeting the week of Christmas, the Christmas holiday as ICANN offices are not open that week.

Resuming on the 2nd of January, and [inaudible] complete the analysis of the survey results against these refined charter questions, which may need to be a longer meeting, and then we had two meetings to review the previously collected data.

So if we're doing this holistically, as Kristine has suggested where we're looking at both survey data and other collected data, we

have five meetings to do so. So whether we do that as a combined effort or whether we do Analysis Group and the other survey data. We have, in essence, five meetings to do so.

And then we move on to the development of – okay, so then there's discussion of potential subteams [inaudible] on – sorry, phase one preliminary recommendations. Then we move into the possible [discussion] of individual proposals if it's determined that that will happen at the subteam level, but that is something that's still out for consideration by the co-chairs at this point.

And this is an extremely aggressive timeline. If you look up towards ICANN 64, we're leading up to subteams presenting their recommendations to the working group, and then the working group's discussing those recommendations in working sessions at ICANN 64.

And for reference, we'll go ahead and send this document along with the agenda and materials as well so that people can keep it in mind, and as there are updates based on the subteam meetings, we can make those updates.

And George Kirikos, please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. Just to go over what a few of us were talking about at the beginning of the call, there were only a few people in the chat room at that time, but there seemed to be some support for starting the call at 15 minutes after the hour and going to 15 minutes after the hour to allow small gaps between the two calls [to allow] a smooth transition between the two calls. So I was

curious whether we have broad support for that so the calls could go from, say, 1:15 PM eastern time to 2:15 eastern time, because a lot of members are in both subteams. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, George. Let me just ask if there are any objections to that. Kristine Dorrain, you have your hand up. And I'm not suggesting that you're objecting, but I'm just noting your hand is up.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I don't theoretically agree on the gap. I like the gap. I'm wondering if it makes it – and maybe we should have – I wasn't paying attention maybe to the end of the last call, maybe we should end it five minutes sooner and start [also] five minutes later or something.

The reason is because at a big company like this – I know that it's just Amazon, but we have a lot of meetings, and by basically starting a meeting at 9:15 and ending it at 10:15 or whatever time it is, it basically means that there's two whole hours that get messed up on my calendar for other meetings.

And I don't know if anybody else is going to have that problem, and if nobody else does, that's fine. But it would seem to make more sense to me to take five minutes off the end of the first call and five minutes off the beginning of the second call, and just make them a 55-minute calls if that's possible. Only so it doesn't jam up our calendars. Sorry.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kristine. That's actually a really good point, and that's what we had hoped to do from this last call, but didn't quite work out. But I think we can make – staff can help us all make a better effort at that, and to do with the 55, five and five on either side, start time. So we'll go ahead and try that and see if that works, because we do recognize that a lot of people do plan their calendars to have meetings start at the top of the hour, and so not doing so can cause them difficulties.

So I'm going to suggest to staff that we keep the times the same, and in fact, actually, all [inaudible] but that we ask the subteams and staff – we'll make sure that we end five minutes early and we allow five minutes for folks to join on the next call.

And with that, I have one minute before the top of the hour, so I'm going to suggest that we go ahead and close up the discussion, and [inaudible] go ahead and send out notes and agenda material for the next call.

Thank you all for joining, and we hope you have a good morning, evening or afternoon.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, Julie. Thank you, everyone, for joining. Today's meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]