Consumer Metrics Project Discussion
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 03 April 2012 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 03 April 2012 at 2000 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Participants on the Call:
Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG / WG Chair
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Steve delBianco - CBUC
Olivier Crepin Leblond - ALAC
Jonathan Zuck - IPC

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Berry Cobb
Paul Redmond
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:
Jonathan Robinson - RySG
Carlos Aguirre - NCA
John Berard- CBUC / GNSO Liaison
Tobias Mahler

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you

                   have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good

                   evening. This is the CCI call on the third of April, 2012. On the call today we

                   have Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Rosemary Sinclair, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Steve

                   DelBianco. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Paul Redmond

and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Carlos Aguirre, John Berard and Wendy Seltzer.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Oh and Jonathan Zuck has just joined the call.

Thank you very much and over to you, Rosemary.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Nathalie, and welcome everybody safely back from Costa Rica. And that of course is the main purpose of our call today to review our session and I guess any corridor discussions before we - pardon me, as we go through the public comment period.

So I wonder perhaps, Steve, if we could start with your views as you were the presenter and then we can take comments from others on the call.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, Rosemary, I'm happy to start off. But Cheryl, Jonathan, John Berard, Olivier, everybody was sitting up front and participated. Berry was a big help as well and Jonathan Zuck from the audience. And it might be that those of you who were observing will have picked more up than I did trying to coordinate and call on people.

But I did want to summarize, I mean, it was a very lively discussion. It actually seemed as if a few folks in the audience had actually read the draft advice ahead of time. Shocking as that may be.

It was gratifying that Bruce Tonkin, Board member who authored the resolution - I know he called it his resolution but Bruce introduced it. And it - it looked to me as if Bruce approved of the direction we were taking. He even helped to answer a few questions from the audience when folks would push back on something.

And he is big on the fact that the community has to embrace the definitions first because Bruce didn't want to pay as much attention to metrics. He thinks perhaps the Board will do that but that the community ought to be embrace definitions.

But having said that his resolution called for advice on definitions, metrics and three-year targets. Right? So and while it didn't come up in that particular session earlier in the week I had multiple interactions with Bruce to try to clarify the timeframe as to when the three-year targets would apply - remember, end of 2014, end of 2015 - and how that would coincide with the work of the review team.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Bruce pushed back to say that there was very little precision implied by his set of three-year numbers and that he thought the Board when it decides to adopt whatever advice it gets will take care of aligning and sequencing the timing of those targets versus the review team.

In other words we didn't have to worry too much about that. And I think that the Gantt chart that we used on the presentation was sufficient to sort of finesse it a little bit.

Okay so - so my overall observation there was we had a lot of lively interchange. And I fully expect some comments to come in because it strikes me that when something is mentioned in a community workshop like that does that have, as far as staff is concerned, does that have the same effect as a comment that is filed in writing during an open public comment period? In other words will it be summarized by staff and should we consider it?

I'll stop there.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, Rosemary here. Berry, are you able to give us some guidance on that?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Not specifically right now but I will follow up with it. I would - I'll take a guess that says that the working group can informally consider it if we wanted to pull out transcripts and those kinds of things. But in terms of formal consideration it must go through the public comment process.

Rosemary Sinclair: Is there anyone else from staff who might have a view on that - or Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm certainly not from staff. Cheryl here from the...

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: ...non-staff end of the spectrum here, Rosemary. It's interesting you point that out, Berry, because in fact up until the new comment react to the comment cycle that has been very much up to the workgroup. And I've served on a number of workgroups where we have in fact quite deliberately taken in a public comment and treated it absolutely equitably including in the analysis and the responses to the analysis as we do written public comments into lists.

Now - and in some cases I've seen public comment periods designed to ensure that we take in things like for a at meetings so that that exactly can happen. That of course - and remember it's a bit rubbery because this is just coming out of a pilot into its first testing times with the new comment reply system.

I don't believe there was anything against it being up to the workgroup to define that. But what we might need to check is does it need a placeholder which can in fact be inserted by staff into the vehicle that is the public comment list for those issues to be reply-able to - for the want of a better

word - in the reply period just in case hard copy, pardon the pun, doesn't come into the list.

I guess that's something we should, A, check on and, B, discuss. Thanks, Rosemary.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Cheryl. Okay perhaps a way forward is - because I had a look at the transcript the day after the workshop and it did strike me that there were - there was some terrific discussion. There were two or three issues in there that I thought we ought to reflect on.

So is it possible, Berry, for you to do a summary of the transcript for us for our next teleconference? And then we can talk about those issues ahead of the review of the public comments that come in formally.

Steve DelBianco: And, Rosemary, this is Steve. Would that just be suggestions that were made and not just questions that came up during the public discussion?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Yes I think so, Steve. I thought there were - as I say I can't pull them out of my lower cortex at the moment but there were three or four what I considered to be, you know, really significant suggestions, comments, thoughts from people.

Jonathan Zuck: I mean, does it make sense to host a summary as a comment so that the people can reply to it formally as - given the new process?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's - I think that's a valid plan. Cheryl for the record.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, that was Jonathan Zuck before.

Rosemary Sinclair: And Rosemary here. Jonathan, yes, that makes sense to me. So the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary, Cheryl here. It could be something as simple as Berry popping into the public comment artifice - oops, did I say that out loud? Sorry. The - what I said as a placeholder with a link to the transcript saying that the workgroup will be treating the comments and questions and discussions raised in the workshop as a - as matter for - as matter suitable for a reply comment or something to that effect.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay so I think that would be helpful if Berry could provide the link. And I'm happy to go through and just give you my thoughts on the things that struck me just in a summary document. And I - Steve is suggesting in the chat that we identify the speaker and their affiliation and where possible list on some occasion it wasn't (unintelligible) who the speaker was but those of you that were at the workshop may well know.

So perhaps if I start the ball rolling by just pulling out the three or four things that I thought were interesting to reflect upon. And then if there were others - other issues that struck other people you could add those. Is that the best way forward perhaps?

Okay we're in the state of that enormous acclimation I'll proceed on that basis, eh?

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, this is Steve. I'm wondering if others who were at the meeting want to offer any observations on the pace and the depth of detail - the pace of the presentation, depth of detail, value of the discussion.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, how did it strike other people on the panel?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I'll jump in because I'm likely to do that at this hour of the day. In addition to what I - I totally agree with Steve - was I think a very worthwhile forum session. And I too was very impressed with the level of some people's depth of reading and understanding.

There was a couple of times when I thought I knew the documentation and the presentation fairly well that I was having to scramble through my lower cortex, Rosemary. Hang on, where the hell was that said? Oh yes it was on page whatever. Because people had gone down to the bare weeds - or a couple of people had. And that's great. So that was a big tick as far as I'm concerned along with Steve.

But I thought we also should note that this wasn't six of us in a room. This was a - I would call it near capacity crowd. And I suspect that, you know, if it had been in a slightly different fora location that we may have even had more interaction and even, you know, people on (seats).

You know, that said I think that's not a criticism of where we were rather a measure of the genuine community interest that is out there in this because there was plenty to compete with, you know, getting people through the door at that time. So I think that's another take home message be it more qualitative and not particularly quantitative I guess.

The other thing that I thought was well worthwhile was noting I thought the fairly reasonable interaction that most of us had in the individual community briefings as well. And obviously for the ALAC I'd toss to Olivier for response.

But actually no I think I ran that session, sorry, Olivier. But anyway one or the other of us can deal with that. But I thought it might be useful for the workgroup to know what came out of our individual constituency briefings even when they occurred as well. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Rosemary, this is Jonathan Zuck.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: I guess I'd like to add that I was actually amazed at the constructive comments that happened; that there was an overall acceptance of the work

that had been done. And that most of the commentary was in the fringes of some definitions and in the assessment of targets. And the incredible growth as an organization that discussing the targets represents I think is incredible.

I came away with a very positive feeling about the potential for this document and for the next review process of the new gTLD program because there was a fundamental acceptance of what we were doing. And the discussions were - on issues like targets. And once you're discussing targets you're pretty far down the road philosophically I think.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes. Rosemary here. When I read the transcript, Jonathan, that was exactly my own reaction. I thought there's no time being spent here on process discussion or old issues. Everybody's actually dealing with the material before them. And I felt the contributions, as I said before, were really thoughtful and, you know, it gave us material to work with and chew over.

So I have the same reaction just from the written transcript. I thought this was a really good discussion and people were interested in the work and could see the potential of the work as a policy framework which I thought was great.

Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier here for the transcript. I was just going to build onto what Cheryl had said but also comment on the general session which we had.

I was very pleased with the turnout. I was surprised that we didn't get anymore pushback from some parts of ICANN on how far we pushed those metrics. So I was quite pleasantly surprised.

And I thought we were going to get a lot more comments in the public comment period. Okay it's not closed yet so there are always some that will arrive towards the end.

On the At Large side of things there is a small team that is currently working a small comment. It's actually not to do with the metrics themselves it's to do with the use of the term consumer.

And I know how many times we've defined consumer but it's still something which some parts of the world have in their throat primarily because consumer - and I've already shared this with you - but in some parts of the world consumer has a totally different connotation.

And that's of course not something that the group itself defined. It was the way that the question was framed by the Board itself. So it might well be that the comment is more aimed at the Board rather than at the working group since the working group just did what it was asked to do. So that's in regards to this.

With regards to the ALAC session I'll let Cheryl quickly brief you through it because I think I wasn't in it for part of the session so I kind of missed out on some things. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Olivier. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Following up on Olivier. The definition of consumer was challenged by some who asked - questioned not challenged but questioned. They said is it professional users or regular citizens as consumers. And we said both.

We explicitly excluded contract parties but we really don't care if it's a business, it's a registrant or a domainer who's got multiple registrations versus an end user or an individual who registers their own domain name. They're all registrants and end users and it doesn't really matter whether they're professional or individual. I hope that - wanted to see whether the team felt that that is the spirit in which we mean consumer.

Rosemary Sinclair: Just while people are thinking - oh Cheryl. Cheryl, did you want...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I used the wrong de-mute keys because there's two different codes depending on who's teleconference servicing we're using. ICANN has two different providers and naturally of course they're different keys aren't they?

Sorry about that. Okay Cheryl for the record now I've sloughed through trying to get myself unmuted. I'll come back to Olivier's point later but I did want to pick up on what Steve was just saying. I think the - well in fact it's still Olivier's point. But it was the beginning of his point not the question to me.

The issue that some of the At Large community were making, Steve, was not disagreeing with those criteria. And, yes, I believe as that is defined there is - with a couple of exceptions obviously - general consensus not complete consensus on that from our community and that's fine; we're very diverse.

But what was raised and what I think is important is there is in the translation of the use of the term consumer in some language.

Steve DelBianco: Oh I see.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...and almost derogatory terminology associated with it. It's...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...right? And to that end I think we do need to address it and be very clear about how we are specifically classifying, quantifying, allocating, you know, expectations on that word. And that I'm happy to just do in footnote. But I do think we probably need to recognize it.

And really, Olivier, I think we don't need to take too much time talking about the At Large response. I think it was in general with the exception of the discussions around this term of consumer and particularly issues that Evan of course has raised with the workgroup previously; a very much a go-forward attitude not a roadblock or (unintelligible) attitude from our community. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. When I was - I guess in the transcript there was some discussion about this translation of the word consumer I think from some colleagues in Europe - am I right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, okay so what I thought I might do is go back - and Cheryl will know the people that I'm talking to. There's a communications consumers group here who have links with the international consumer organizations. And I'm happy to just take that issue back and have a chat with them about whether this arises in the work that they do internationally and if so how do they handle it. So I'll do that and then report back to the next meeting.

But the word consumer is used very, very broadly in international policy circles. So it's why I was a little surprised...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's exactly why I would make that rationale a footnote.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is that the original language in the Board resolution and to the common usage. But recognize for - because we are in fact - this is one of those times

that, you know, we're actually stepping outside of those who are in the know and in the language reading it - we actually do...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...want the end user world to engage with the documentation that we recognize that there is a - oh what the - what oh you didn't mean it that way type reaction that we might get.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes, that's a good way of handling it. So I'll have the discussion and just bring something back to the next meeting. And Steve is reminding us in the chat that in fact the Affirmation does use the word consumer, that's right so.

All right were there any other thoughts from any discussions either in the workshop or in the corridors or in other workshops?

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, it's Steve. I'll note that we were given 10 minutes to present it to Council at the very end of a six-hour marathon session. We did take two questions from councilors. But we did get through it in nine minutes. And really just teeing up the ball for when we'll have the opportunity to share the advice with them later on. I mean, they're very preoccupied with a lot of other things right now.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: But I acknowledged the contributions of you and everyone else in the group and Stephane at least seemed to appreciate the effort.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well that's good. And what about the GAC? There were a few discussions happening informally?

Steve DelBianco: That's right. And I had gotten a letter - a note back from Heather Dryden, that's the Chair of the GAC - who wanted us to put it on the agenda over the weekend. So Berry Cobb and I, Cheryl, while we were there all weekend in GNSO sessions waiting for it to come off. And of course I met with Heather and Suzanne Rydel and said we'd be ready.

The GAC was - the GAC was otherwise occupied. They feel as if they have no staff. I know they're borrowing at least two very qualified folks from ICANN staff right now.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So I don't really think they're as understaffed as they claim. But it never actually made it to the agenda. And Stephane did not bring it up during the weekend Council session. We were prepared for it but it never came up. So there was no formal presentation to the GAC at this particular meeting.

Now I have met with the US Patent and Trademark office here in Washington. They invited me to come in and present it. I've done that. I'm going to be presenting to INTA, the International Trademark Association, next Monday. The US Justice Department official has asked for a meeting.

And the nature of these meetings is just to present - it's literally to go through the presentation and take lots of their questions because they're trying to formulate whether and what they would say in their own written comments.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: But unfortunately we didn't get a chance to put it in front of the GAC even though we tried.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well I think that series of presentations is serving the purpose that we really have in mind of - as we would say he's socializing the work with people.

And the fact that they're interested to do that as they're reflecting on the advice that they may give that's exactly what we wanted to achieve.

So even though it's being done in a different way than perhaps we might have thought at the beginning I think the outcomes - we're getting there on the outcome which is all that really matters.

I wonder do we know who was there from Australia because that's the other contact that I could make to just refer the work to the Australian government for their consideration.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And, trust me, he is well and truly ripe for the briefing. And I've prepped him nicely, Rosemary. You follow in with a second blow.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right well if everybody is happy about that then I'll go back to (Peter) and tell him that we're at a juncture where he should take a look at this work now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, terrific.

Steve DelBianco: So we still have only one written comment assuming that comments in other languages would all appear in the same place. Let me ask staff if they can verify that?

Berry Cobb: Yes they will.

Steve DelBianco: Okay so we still have one. And it's our friend Paul Toomey.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: A very constructive comment. But that's it; that's all we've got to work off of until we summarize the suggestions that came out of the transcript from Costa Rica.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. And I will do that. Okay so is there anything else that anybody wants to say about Costa Rica? If not is there - Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yes, Rosemary. As - this is Berry. Just kind of in touch with some of the other things that came out of the session. I think one of the bigger line items in the Q&A was around the definition of consumer trust. And it - when we do some of the summary of the transcript I think that'll prompt maybe a slight modification to that definition. I just listened to the session this morning. But that's all I really want to say about that.

The main reason I wanted to raise my hand here is more of logistics. The first item is do we think it's necessary that we meet on the 17th which would be our next scheduled session? And that coincides with the close of the public comment window. We can certainly discuss any possible public comments that were made. But I won't have enough time to necessarily summarize those for that session.

And then the second thing that I'd like to bring up is within ICANN Prague is already on deck for scheduling and those kinds of things. So I'd like to throw the question out to the working group as to what you expect our public visibility will be like there in Prague with keeping in mind that the milestone schedule listed below if we were to hit our targets basically we'll be submitting the final advice letter to the GNSO Council around mid-June. And I'll leave it at that.

Steve DelBianco: But, Berry, this is Steve. We would also hand the same letter I believe to ALAC and ccNSO and the GAC. You know, it's up to them whether they want

to go with it. But we promised them we'd share our draft advice with each of them, right?

Berry Cobb: That's my understanding.

Steve DelBianco: Okay good. So it could well be on all four agendas. Although the entire world will be focused on the strings that came out of the new application pool. So we'll be lucky to get much more attention than that. Do you believe that if it's - if it's given to Council on June the 12th do you believe that it has a chance of getting on the Council agenda at the end of June for Council to consider the advice?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. That's the exact reason why I'm bringing it up. So if the working group feels that we're going to hit our targets and I can go ahead and start to submit it to the agenda that starts to get formulated over time.

Steve DelBianco: So does anybody feel nervous about - Berry was good to put the schedule of dates here. They're at the bottom of the Adobe screen. Do we feel like we can do our part at turning around the second draft of the advice letter?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Berry, what is the date for the Prague meeting?

Berry Cobb: It is the last week of June which is starting on the 23rd of June will be the Saturday GNSO session.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay good. Well Rosemary here. My view is I think we can, Steve, given our track record. And it's such an important milestone that I would see that as really very motivating to have the work done so that it could be discussed with SOs and ACs in the Prague meeting. So for me the answer is yes. And, you know, we should really pull out all stops to be in that position.

But I would suspect that - well a number of people might seek an opportunity at that meeting for a short briefing on the work as part of the background to their own reflections on the advice.

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, it's Steve. If we believe there are people who want to brief let me encourage us all to do that in the next two weeks and not wait for June. Because...

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: ...it won't work for us to not have a stack of comments. It's really a failure of the process if people don't even look at it until June. You know, so you're exactly right; we'll do briefings for everyone and anyone. But the bias ought to be towards earlier rather than later so that we get comments filed. We have one right now.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I couldn't agree more with you, Steve. I think that's incredibly important. In terms of decisions Olivier can make sure that a reaction response final endorsement, adoption or whatever else may happen in the wonderful world of ALAC is on the formal work plan agenda, that's not a problem.

And I'm sure those of you in GNSO can micro-manipulate - your (pad) is actually in the car, (Alex). The GNSO as long as the timing is right for them. Olivier has got more control over ALAC than works in the GNSO world. And you may quote me on that. We know what chairs are supposed to do in the ALAC world.

But I'm very concerned that unless we get particularly into the GAC process sooner rather than later it's going to be a no-go again in June. And I'd be real keen to follow up with what Steve's suggesting a note off to Heather. And if we can find out via a chair to chair contact in addition to staff interaction what

the GAC has planned for themselves between now and Prague and see if they have nothing planned can we encourage them to do something.

I think that would be very important recognizing that a Webinar for the GAC is not going to be 75 people turning up. A Webinar for the GAC would probably be a briefing for three, four or five people who have been allocated the role to hold the sub committee activity and then the pen on such a response. And that's okay because that's how GAC works.

But the archive of that would be available and transmitted to the full list. And I don't think that's a bad thing anyway. But what governments need is stuff in writing and with our report as it is now and as it will be very shortly as we start responding to the comments it's in a form that can go onto various bureau desks at least in my totally biased view.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, Rosemary here. I think that's a good idea. And I'll make that suggestion to our Australian colleagues that - about the Webinar. Is - well, a question. Who's the New Zealand GAC member at the moment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Frank Marsh. He's a good guy. We'll have no problem with him as long as we do it before lunch.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes okay. All right well I'll get in touch with Frank and...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no because his morning time is free so - and remember we're talking about New Zealand. He's able to have meetings like before 10:00 in the morning local time.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...afternoon because the commitments are always - you just can't get time with him. I've worked on too many sub committees with him. You just literally don't even think about scheduling anything much after this time of day.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It just won't happen.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well I'll reach out to Frank as well so perhaps we'll have a, you know, a small group on that - on the Webinar idea. I think that's a great idea.

Just on the public comment I know we only have one public comment but it's a very significant comment. You know, and metric - the importance of, A, including innovation in our metrics and then contemplating for a second how one might measure it it's a very, very significant comment. And that's how I felt about two or three of the comments in the public workshop. They actually went to very substantive issues. So I'll pull those out.

And I think we'll have enough to chew on to need our next call. I don't think we'll need 90 minutes. But I would like to just leave the 17th available for - on our agenda. Are other people okay about that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely, Rosemary. Cheryl here. I've - I know you don't see the chat when you're running your fruit-based software. But, yes, I've been saying for some time that we can deal with not only the Costa Rica stuff on the 17th but also now obviously the points raised from Paul. And I'm not sure that it won't take the 90 minutes if we're going to get...

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...too deep into the weeds.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, it's Steve. Rosemary, real quick. I fully appreciate the thought that Paul put into his comment - Paul Toomey. But, you know, there isn't anything in there that actually suggests how one would measure innovation let alone set a three-year target. So he stopped well short of giving us anything that's actionable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well he does run a consultancy. Of course he stopped short of giving us answers.

Rosemary Sinclair: Although it's - you see it's a - it's a hallmark of - in the competition space when people are thinking about competition policy and the like; it's not only about prices and quality and demand. Always people say innovation is evidence of an effectively competitive market.

Steve DelBianco: All that is true. And we could add the word innovation to a definition. And when you turn to our table...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...we have no guidance at all about how we would design metrics or targets that allow you to assess innovation.

Rosemary Sinclair: No - and that's why I'm thinking that it's quite a meaty topic, Steve, that there is no guidance. But then, hey, we started with not much guidance on...

Steve DelBianco: Sure.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...you know, the other definitions measures - metrics that we came up with. You know, that all started with a blank sheet of paper as we all (report). So anyway it's certainly an interesting comment. Now...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Rosemary. Just following up on that which I think is actually pretty important. And I have put in the chat so it'll be in that transcript. We probably need to flag then to all the members of this workgroup that that is going to be something to chew on on the 17th because we do have members with experience in competition legislation...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...regulation. And it would be good to get them the heads up that they're...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...being here on the 17th and being able to at least, you know, throw something at us to chew on might be really, really handy.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay well how about if I include a little comment in my note to our list about that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that'd be well worthwhile. And...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...you know, we started with the blank piece of paper with the rest but we are very aware that, you know, time pressures are such that if we can get a leg up on this it would be really, really useful might be the way to encourage them to have the input we need.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay good. All right. So...

Jonathan Zuck: Rosemary, this is Jonathan - Jonathan Zuck, I'm sorry.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: I guess one last thing I guess I would mention from the workgroup that I'd almost forgotten was that Maguy Serad from the Compliance Team was there and was - seemed fairly receptive to the metrics that we had suggested for her team.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's good.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes that is good. And possibly, Jonathan, that's why there wasn't, you know, the expected volcanic reaction from others because we had thought very carefully about, you know, whether our metrics could be sourced. And we were always trying to work with, you know, what was available rather than build all new definitions - metrics rather - for people to source and worry about. So I think we had a good outcome there. And that's a very helpful reflection.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think Pam Little was in the room as well so you've got it at a couple of layers from Compliance. And I...

Rosemary Sinclair: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...certainly would have heard back from Pam if there was anything that stuck in her craw. She's pretty quick...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...on getting a hold of me when she needs to.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's true. And Steve does make the point that we had some very good support from important quarters.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well there is that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay so is there anything else that anybody would like to say about the workshop and about our next steps? We should just review, Berry, a little list of action items if we can do that? Perhaps if I run through the ones that I've taken for myself and we can see if there are any others.

So the first one that I have is my own summary of issues coming out of the workshop. That of course will just be a thought-starter and others can jump in and add things that caught your attention so that's number one.

The second was I'll have a discussion with the consumer people about the international approach to consumer in a definitional sense.

Then thirdly those of us that have contacts in government circles should reach out to those people and just offer the Webinar or one on one briefings or whatever works in terms of an engagement strategy.

And then I've got the note to write about the innovation - the topic of innovation encouraging our colleagues with that experience and background to jump in and certainly to come to our 17th of April call if they can.

Now was there anything else...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Rosemary.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just on one of the action items you were just outlining the one in terms of reach out to our governmental connections. And I know - sorry for the rest of the world but I'm taking a totally antipodean view for a moment, okay?

It could be very worthwhile for you and I to quite deliberately suggest as a parallel but complementary activity to what we as a workgroup need to do with the GAC to...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...run a - offer a little Oceanic/Antipodean briefing. We could probably get either side of (Peter Nedelfolden) and (Ryan) and (Frank) and a few of the others. And, you know, we can grab (CG) and some of the smaller islands. Mainly because they have a whole lot of government - there is a regulatory government immaturity in the Oceanic space that I'm really concerned about.

And I know both Australian and New Zealand trade organizations and, you know, those well enough that I don't have to convince you. If the right government department said there was going to be a teleconference briefing and here was a free call number...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...they would be keen to be engaged. But if it wasn't put up that way they won't be.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I think you and I might just need to, you know, we might meet up in Cambria and try and encourage...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...them. And if need be I'm pretty sure we could get (AUDA) and...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...and (Zed) to come to the party fairly affirmatively as well. Okay sorry about that, guys, but we do need to do something Antipodean. I can't have Steve looking too damn good in the US, you know.

Rosemary Sinclair: Just a quick response and then I'll come to you, Steve. That would be a good reach out, Cheryl, also in terms of ccNSO if we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well when I said Australia I was talking (AUDA) which is...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I think you'll find that if we get - if we use - if we use Paul Szyndler who is our national and international government liaison, I mean, the man's on payroll, might as well abuse him - then that will link into ccNSO.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He's our ccNSO rep from (unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, okay right. Okay that's good. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Rosemary. I have a to-do item which was to offer to Heather and the GAC to do a Webinar for them at any time. And then we all...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...have a to-do item which is to ask your relevant contacts to comment on this advice before the 17th of April. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Good. So quite a focus on reach-out, yes. Now, Berry, was there anything else that struck you in terms of action items or follow-up?

Berry Cobb: I think we covered it all.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay good. Is there anything else that people want to draw to our attention or comment on? If not then I think we're at the end of this call. And our next one is the 17th of April. And okay I'm just waiting until Olivier finishes typing. We're having an interesting discussion in the chat about Antipodean. We'll probably have to offer a...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry...

Rosemary Sinclair: ...measure and the metric. I don't know about targets. Is it just anybody who lives close to a penguin? All right...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Heard on McDonald Island the only Internet community they have are in fact penguins. No humans live on that space but there's still ccTLDs.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right well on that hysterical note I think we'll draw this conversation to a close. And we'll look forward to the 17th of April.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Rosemary.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And thanks very much like was mentioned by Steve. Yes, the staff support it was - the work in Costa Rica was beyond a joke coming up to it. And I've never seen so many individual meetings. And some of the meeting logistics was not ideal.

I know it looked like the ducks were floating but I'm sure most of us recognize how desperately the legs were paddling under water. And I think we should

definitely formally mark our vote of thanks to all the staff support we had. It was - it was second to none and better than in many cases we could have expected considering the circumstances so thanks, guys.

Steve DelBianco: Amen to that.

Jonathan Zuck: Here, here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for making that point. And the recording - we've recorded our thanks formally. I'm sure we all feel the same way but it's so important to stop the merry-go-round and actually say it, Cheryl so thank you for that.

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: We will chat on the 17th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Rosemary. Bye all.

END