Consumer Metrics Project Discussion

TRANSCRIPTION

Tuesday 21 February 2012 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 21 February 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.

Http://audio.icann.org/gnso-cci-20120221.mp3

On page :
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG / WG Chair
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Steve delBianco - CBUC
Olivier Crepin Leblond – ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - NCA
Jonathan Robinson – RySG

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Berry Cobb
Gisella Gruber

Apology:
Tobias Mahler - Individual

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

Gisella Gruber: Thank you very much, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone on today's CCI call on Tuesday the 21st of February. We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (Padmos Rodgrea), Jonathan Robinson, Steve DelBianco, Rosemary Sinclair who's just joined, welcome Rosemary. From

staff we have Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund and myself Gisella Gruber. Apologies noted today from (CBS Milas) (unintelligible) please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Gisella. Rosemary who just joined, we are just now getting kicked off and I was just going to run through the action items real quick and then we'll move over into the Advice Letter.

Rosemary Sinclair: Terrific Berry, thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay great, all right we have five action items, four are mine, one is Steve's. The first one which is still outstanding which is to review the requirement for gTLD registries to post conditions of registration on their own site in addition to registrars that would sell the second level registration. I didn't get to this action item as quickly as I wanted to, I've still been perusing the Applicant Guidebook and I haven't found any specific language to that just of yet, but I'm not giving up hope, so I'm going to keep this one open and I hope by our March 6 meeting, I'll have some more information.

With respect to Number 2, provide a working group count of TLDs registry operators, registrars - I'm sorry, registry service provider is what that's supposed to be - RSP and registrars. Earlier in the week or late last week, I sent out a spreadsheet that contained tidbit tables of the accounts, the only area that was allusive was exactly determining who of the registry service providers were behind the TLDs. The first parts - and it's really not conducive to bring up the spreadsheet on the Adobe Connect session, but I'm just reviewing off of my own Excel file, basically what I did was went out to the IANA database and copied their entire listing of all the top level domains delegated into the root.

And within each entry, it also contained a technical contact which in some cases did provide information as to who the registry operator was on the

backend and in other cases it did not. One example would be .ASIA. Their specific technical contact was just the .ASIA organization and a contact name behind that. But I do know through some other activities that affiliates have actually providing the backend infrastructure for that TLD.

So at this point, I'm not really sure how to get a valid, accurate count as to the service provider behind that, so I'm not sure how the working group would like to post the numbers into the Advice Letter, but again it belongs into the section of competition where we're looking at the overall accounts of top level domain registry operators, registry service providers and registrar. So with that said, there are 326 top level domains delegated under the roots, 11 of those are tests and 1 of them is infrastructure, so if we remove the 13, that would 313 top level domains delegated.

With respect to the count of registry oper- I'm sorry - registry operators, the number was basically rolled up by - and I don't have the email that I sent in front of me, of course not - it was basically 326 minus the multiple accounts of those operators that run multiple domains - I don't have that number in front of me real quick.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, on this particular one - on the competition table, this one was only on gTLD side, not including cc's when it comes to operators though, so it might be the number's are a lot lower if it's just the g side - the gTLD side.

Berry Cobb: Okay with that bit of information, you know, I thought I had provided that in the email - I really apologize that I don't have that up in front of me.

Steve DelBianco: Yes your email has five, I guess I'm just focusing on whether Item C on the email from you under 1C was for gTLDs or for all TLDs?

Berry Cobb: Yes Item C - unique registry operators...

Steve DelBianco: It's my recollection looking at Row 3 on Page 11 of our table that that should only be the g's - someone else can check me on that. If you look at Row 3 in the Table of Competition on Page 11. Thank you, I keep bringing it up on the screen.

Berry Cobb: Yes, yes it is only the g's and I guess I didn't make that distinction in the email that I sent.

Steve DelBianco: Because it makes it even easier to get C.

Berry Cobb: If I were to filter out real quick - so we basically have affiliates (new star), CORE, (bear sign), (mid counties cooperative), (domains limited) and that is it - so yes five registry operators for the g's as of right now.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Steve. So we've got the five registry operators, then for the total number of TLDs we've got that number, we've got the quantity of gTLDs before and we will have them after expansion. We've got the unique registry operators for the g's and I think the reason why I was confused about this one is we - there was plenty of discussion based off of how we modified our definition and removed the market rivalry among all TLDs. It used to be gTLDs, and now it's all TLDs, but yes on this specific metric, we're only counting the generics and so that's why I included the entire number within my email.

Then the next one, registry service providers before and after, like I said this is very illusive and I'm open to input as to how we might get that accurate number - fortunately it matches the moderately difficult to obtain and then lastly the quantity of registrars, which is 1000. So I throw it back out to the working group how we want to list these numbers into the Advice Letter.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve, if I might - we could dispose of this now Rosemary if you were onboard by just looking at what Berry has on the screen. And I'll keep a markup copy and put in the numbers for each of these rows.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, that sounds good.

Steve DelBianco: The first row was just the quantity of total TLDs, our target was an increase of 2X over 2011, and Berry I think you just told us that the number in parens under that 2011 would read 313.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: The next row was the quantity of gTLDs, not all TLDs, but just g's and I think it's (21).

Berry Cobb: Correct for generics - three generic restricted and fourteen sponsored.

Steve DelBianco: Good, you need gTLD registry operators, I think you just said it was five.

Berry Cobb: I did, and just again to clarify so I have affiliates (new star), CORE, (bear sign), (mid counties cooperative), (domains limited) and that's all the uniques that I see in my list.

Steve DelBianco: And the next row is registry service providers and that is also five - it's not the same five, one of them is PIR, but...

Berry Cobb: Yes, you know, wait a minute, so I - this is Berry, my mistake that makes six, I didn't see PIR there.

Steve DelBianco: Good, so PIR is in there, but they're not in the second list, because they use affiliates. So it's six for the third row in the table and it is five for the fourth row.

Berry Cobb: Very good. And then quantity of registrars based off of - which was pulled off of ICANN.org Accredited Registrar's List shows a cool 1000.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Rosemary that's it for me - so now I have values to put in the three year targets column for the first five rows on Page 11. Thank you Berry, wonderful work.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think it's really good that we've done this, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Cheryl for the transcript record, Berry I just wanted to make sure that even as a footnote, we - because particularly the community that I have this joy of interacting with most, there's a whole lot of (penitence) beyond me in the list and if we just had the footnote that says about the test and, you know, the difference between the total number and the 313 that we're quoting, it will just save us actually having to say it in presentation.

And the other thing was I - this week my capacity as a Board member is a ccTLD regulator, the - we were given a presentation which looked at the registrars for cc - our own cc, but also those who had interest in the g space, I'm just wondering whether somewhere, perhaps not at the stage of the report but, you know, as a side note there may be something useful to teeth out from the ccTLD registry community because they probably have some data as well that could help us. That was it for me.

Berry Cobb: Cheryl did you recommend a footnote...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...as well for the other items?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I wouldn't mind if there's - I mean I don't want to hold up any (unintelligible), you know, I think we can pick it up later or as a, you know, just in presentation or whatever. Then I was quite astonished looking at the

percentage market share information and who wears what hats, just from my own perspective. And I suspect, you know, this will be another $200 that we could pick some information from as well.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, Cheryl that raises an interesting point, I wonder should we think about pulling this information as an appendix in the document that we release the public comment. Are there other views on that?

Steve DelBianco: One for me Rosemary, I believe that Berry Cobb's email content could be a big footnote that would be referenced in all five of these rows.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, perfect.

Steve DelBianco: And that footnote would appear only on this page, rather than sort of an appendix.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay fine, yes I agree with that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, I had the same reaction Cheryl, I was just really surprised and I thought thank goodness we asked for this information because it makes the work real and robustly (banks) on numbers that I don't think many people are aware of.

Berry Cobb: And that - this is Berry, so I'll take the action item just to revalidate my bulleted list and then I'll send that back over to Steve to create the appendix for that.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Berry.

Berry Cobb: And so if I may this still kind of raises one question about the quantity of unique gTLD registry operators before and after expansion. If we're looking at the universe with respect to competition and TLDs, why would we omit

ccTLDs registry operators of ccTLDs in this number? Or at least call it out separately - and I'm not saying that as...

Steve DelBianco: I have an answer for that, it's because of the target. If the target is something like a 2X, it makes sense to think about the five that are in there. If you add it in - 290 more, we'd be doing a bunch of mathematical gymnastics to figure out what a reasonable target would be, you know a 1% increase.

Berry Cobb: I understand, but aren't some ccTLD registry providers possibly providing services for new g's?

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh undoubtedly.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, you said operators and then you just put in service providers - which of the two are we talking about, operators or service providers?

Berry Cobb: My bad, service providers.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so if we talk about service providers, that's the fourth row, by focusing on the g, we get a relatively modest 2X multiple, (if we included all the) service providers who help to run the cc space, there's 290 and I have no idea how many service providers are running those 290 ccTLDs, it's not part of your draft note either.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, haven't we covered both basis the way we've got it structured? We've got everybody, and we're looking for two times increase on that and then we're looking at unique registry service providers and then we have a two times increase on that. If we were to put them all together, we'd be going for a, you know, .1% increase, so I think we've covered both of them and it's good that we've done it that way to the point that Steve just made. And I guess if the community feels strongly another way they'll let us know in public comment. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Yes I see clear that fourth row, you know, Berry's right on that fourth row, we didn't say the word g with the service provider, we did for the operator, but we didn't say it for the service provider. And it was my impression that we were focusing on g's just like we did in the row above.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes - Rosemary, that was my impression too, in fact I'm making it up as I go along by reading in the gTLDs into that line.

Steve DelBianco: Well Berry, let me just ask you, what would happen to the numbers if in fact you went out and figured out somehow how many registry service providers were running the backends for the 293 ccTLD operators? And if you got a number like 250, we would have 255 present. If - I don't think as a group we had said we wanted to see what kind of an increase in that number.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, I agree that it would definitely influence not only the actual number but certainly, you know, it would be, you know, several decimal places versus a 10% or 15% increase per se.

Steve DelBianco: Yes and I believe that we are likely to see a roughly 10 if not more operators of new gTLDs, but it won't be 100, because the registry service provider backends, there is quite a bit of consolidation if you look at the way the registrations have gone so far for the new window. (Mines) the machines put in for 50, (Oz) registry puts in for a lot of imminence because the applicants got the message that ICANN wants to see experienced and financially strong registry service providers for the new g space.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: A lot of factors leading to a consolidation, and I feel if we were to get to ten - 2X of five, we were to get to ten, we're doubling the number of competitors in that space, and that contributes to competition. But if we set a goal much higher than that, we're going to run into the other policy objective of having experienced and capable providers.

Rosemary Sinclair: And that would affect confidence if the consumers actually knew about it.

Steve DelBianco: I think you're right. I'd argue we stick with g and make it 2X times the current five. If we did it that way do you think that we still list moderately difficult to obtain, or does that go away? Berry?

Berry Cobb: For the - I believe we'll be able to obtain it, and the reason why I say this is - and I think I included it in the email is domain insight, he's tracking a list of who all the service providers are, the current and the new ones that are popping up. So one way or another, we'll be able to get to that number where it was moderately difficult to understanding who the provider was for the current cc's.

Steve DelBianco: That's what I thought you'd say, I agree with you. So we could take out moderately if this group has a consensus to focus on g's only.

Rosemary Sinclair: I'm happy with that on the basis areas input - it's Rosemary here. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Yes, that's great).

Rosemary Sinclair: Good.

Berry Cobb: Okay great, should we move unto the next section item?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, I think so, yes.

Berry Cobb: Great, Number 3 is for me to prepare for public comment, I've completed the forms, just waiting for the blessing from the working group that we're ready to go to print and as soon as we do, I'll create the pdf and send the forms over to the right team in ICANN and we'll get that posted hopefully tomorrow if everything's complete today. Action Item Number 4, I prepared the first draft for the Costa Rica Presentation, I sent that out to the list and we'll discuss

that as our fourth agenda item. And then lastly Steve submitted Version 6 of the draft Advice Letter. So with that, I'll turn that over to you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I actually wanted to - I was wanting to be finished Berry but I was going to take you back to the prepare for public comment, did I hear the words translation in that statement?

Berry Cobb: Did not.

Steve DelBianco: I think you did.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No I didn't think I did and it would be remissive of me not to ask the question.

Berry Cobb: I am now - I answered the question with a question, I take it the working group feels that the Advice Letter does need to be translated?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, Berry I really think this one particularly does, because we're talking about consumer trust and consumer choice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Too huge not to...

Rosemary Sinclair: ...we need to use all the tools we can to reach out to people in this public comment, particularly those people that we're trying to focus on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Berry, Cheryl here - Rosemary I'm sorry I have lost the ability to (meet) my phone, so my voice is in the background, I literally I wasn't going (strangling) and can't do a damn thing about it. The other thing is, if we get it in real fast Berry, I happen to know that the agendas don't need to go in for translation until sometime on Wednesday your time, so that would mean if we were submit this thing earlier, we'd be ahead of the pack.

Berry Cobb: Cheryl this is Berry, I'm not sure what you mean by the agendas.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All of that - the whole of the ICANN meeting agendas have to begin by Wednesday lunch time for translation. Now that's going to be a lump of work, going through the translation and language services teams, therefore if we were to get our Advice Letter in advance of that...

Berry Cobb: All right, okay I understand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: I will have to go back to other co-workers from ICANN to understand the translations process and - but I'll take that action item to get it done.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, just a question - how many languages, did you want the six UN languages?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It needs to be the six UN, but the bear minimum serve - off the top is the Spanish and French.

Julie Hedlund: Right, right. Yes typically when we've done translations for public - for items in the public comment then we, you know, we give the same amount of time, you know, to the translated items. So for instance if we, you know, so there's two questions here, first of all, do we hold up putting the public comment, you know, putting it up in the public forum for comment when the translations are done? Alternatively what we've done in some other instances where we've had this is we put the English up, then you put the other languages up for the same period of time but you, you know, you extend the English so that basically they all close at the same time.

                  And then, you know, so that they're all ending at the same time and then you start the reply after that. You know, there's no hard and fast rule that says, as

far as I know, that you have to do it a certain way, and I'm just asking if the work group has any thoughts there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Julie, Cheryl here, I agree with you wholeheartedly and more importantly providing we don't go under the minimum 21 days on the serve cycle of the public comment and then reply comments system that we're now running for the UN languages where we're (home) and host anyway. And I would think that the ACs and the hosts who do actually work in English would do nothing but appreciate the additional time in their agenda to get the work done and respond if they need to.

Julie Hedlund: Right okay, thank you very much Cheryl that was extremely helpful. I think we could then go ahead and get the English up right away, put in the request right away for the translations with the emphasis that, you know, certainly want, you know, Spanish and French as quickly as possible, especially Spanish, obviously up into Costa Rica.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: And we had asked for 40 days for - or we plan to ask for 40 days for the initial period. So well, you know, quite over the 21 minimum, you know, and then with the 21 day reply.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes all UN languages come in advance, you know, in excess of that where it will be (unintelligible) host and it will be a delight for me at large advisory committee effective to actually see a recent public comment, (so it) will go out with more of the minimum. There seems to be a false assumption that 21 is it, as opposed to 21 is the minimum.

Julie Hedlund: Right, now we did want to have a longer period of time and part of that is because we wanted to extend past Costa Rica and that is also I think a general rule of thumb that we try not to have public comment, you know if we

have a public comment leading up to an ICANN meeting that we extend the time, you know, because (we're all) very busy during that meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And in something as important as this Julie, I think you'd be very quick getting (Olivia) to write rather rudely to people (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: I don't know what you mean there Cheryl - no I do. So anyway, all right we'll take the actions and proceed accordingly.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, just with a general interest question, how long will it take (unintelligible) clockwise to get the first couple of translations done?

Julie Hedlund: I would be very - I would not be able to say because it depends on what they've got on the pipeline. Cheryl's right, if we can get our items in before they start to translate the various agenda items, I think that will help. And, you know, I'll try and see if we can get a ETA on a couple of them and let you know, it is - it's, you know, it depends on the length of the document and the amount of technical information and so on. So...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes I'm just thinking, Rosemary here, I'm just thinking in this particular circumstance, we're running into a increase workload I would imagine in translation just because of the upcoming conference.

Julie Hedlund: Yes obviously an increase prior to the conference and then of course afterwards as well, but at any rate it's something that needs to be done and, you know, we'll get it in the queue and we'll have a better idea at that point I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just one other thing - the advantage week now is (Christina's) been able to gather together quite a good and experienced team who know the ICANNies and really (unintelligible) relatively technical documents in high levels of accuracy in fairly short times and this is not what I would call a

technical document, so I'm relatively comfortable if we get ahead of the work wise, we should be pretty darn good.

Julie Hedlund: Right, right - you can be glad it's not something from the SSAC (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You got that right.

Julie Hedlund: All right, thank you very much and we'll try to get a sense of how long this will take, but we'll go ahead and get the request going.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: So Rosemary here, I think we're now going back to the Advice Letter Berry's got up on the screen. Berry if we just go through it slowly, if anyone has a point that they would like to call out that they should feel free to do so.

Berry Cobb: And Rosemary this is Berry, so the version that we're looking at was based off of a couple of comments that I had sent back to the list and so I - on this version I make sure to include where those comments were. So starting on Page 2, the first question I had was the substance of the working group and just wanting to have met the word joint, is this really classified as a joint working group - or as I understood, it was only sanctioned as a GNSO function.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here.

Steve DelBianco: (I think I can) answer that too.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...I don't think we want to go down that track again unless Jonathan Robinson...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Take the word joint out by all means.

Rosemary Sinclair: We had a working group that's worked very successfully jointfully, but I don't think we need to go there.

Berry Cobb: Okay great, thank you. The next change...

Steve DelBianco: Can I comment on that?

Rosemary Sinclair: All right Steve, yes go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, I'm okay dropping the word joint, but again this is a - it's not an aspirational paragraph, it was a descriptive paragraph and a number you remember in Singapore that descriptively at least, we tried to make it a joint working group by inviting participation and we continue to keep it wide open. So I know joint is a loaded term, so we should drop it, but I hope the sentence and paragraph still convey that we invited wide participation - that we all began to work together to organize it. So I hope it still reads as if it should have been and could have been a joint, you just want to take the word out to avoid...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (It's stereo) from the GNSO (unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, Rosemary here - I think it does Steve, because we indicated we reached out to everybody, the paragraph says that, (Olivia)?

(Olivia):   Thank you Rosemary, it's (Olivia) for the transcript, I totally agree with taking joint out just to avoid headache because it lists the GNSO ccNSO and they lack the same sentence, I think it's pretty clear that we work together.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, the only other thing that might be useful and it fits within at least
the previous pro forma (that hides you) in the wonderful world of GNSO, is
there's no reason why we can't have an appendix of the members of the work
group. That in itself we've - the rank can file description as who those
members are, it might also help to reinforce it Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Great, thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, in fact I'm not - I think it is somewhere, but we'll make
sure as we go through this letter.

Berry Cobb: Yes, it's the last appendix.

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh yes there you go, well done, great.

Berry Cobb: And which brings up this comment, so we don't have to do it I removed
Jonathan's duplication - Jonathan (unintelligible) duplication.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Right.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay so...

Berry Cobb: Yes the next change was this one, and I think Rosemary you had responded
back to the list about this change as well.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Berry, it was in the context of some earlier episodes where people
felt that things had been transmitted directly to the Board in that particular
case ahead of the community having a chance to really discuss and think and
make input. So I guess I was just being very, very careful here to make sure
that there's no suggestion that the working group is recommending some
ICANN staff get on with things ahead of the (grave comfort) through the

community. So I think we're okay now, but I would like to just call that out for other people to just consider it for a moment.

Berry Cobb: Steve, you good?

Rosemary Sinclair: (May) dropped?

Berry Cobb: No, you're still there.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, getting really nervous and the dogs as well.

Steve DelBianco: That's funny to ask it that way, "Is it me who dropped?"

Rosemary Sinclair: Well if no one answered, then I know it is. Now if you didn't know then quickly you probably would of heard cussing under my breath which is good for the transcript record

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary can I ask how this (unintelligible) - I have no problem with the sentence, I just want to know how this sentence avoids the slippery slide over appearing what group is making recommendations directly to the Board as opposed to putting forward consideration issues for the ACs and the SOs to advise the Board.

Steve DelBianco: I'd like to respond if I could.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, well that's what we need to be careful of Cheryl, so perhaps we just need to have another look at this paragraph. Rosemary here, I just don't want all our good work to wind up in an endless discussion at Costa Rica about the process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, how about something along the following lines and this is, you know, on the fly so I didn't put good English in here somewhere. In addition,

the working group trusts that the (IC) in their sole advice will anticipate that ICANN Board may blah, blah, blah.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that's the right position.

Steve DelBianco: But I - this is Steve, I want you to keep in mind that almost every paragraph in this document is written as if the - this is an Advice Letter to the Board. There's qualifying language that says this Advice Letter would of course be handed not to the Board, but rather to the ACSOs who may embrace all parts or none of it. We said that qualifier, but it is written from the point-of-view of a working group to the Board. So we begin to...

Rosemary Sinclair: Steve I see that.

Steve DelBianco: ...this paragraph, you can't stop there, we'd have to work practically everything and it might be better for us to simply make it seem as if - put it back in advisory terms, not imperative terms. Recommending that the staff begin collecting as soon as possible does feel like it jumps the gun a bit in front of the AC and SO approval and I know that as soon as possible really means after the ACs and SOs have given their advice to the Board, but it really means after the Board has evaluated all applicable advice and made a decision on definitions, measures and targets.

Rosemary Sinclair: Steve, Rosemary here, perhaps that's the way to deal with it because another approach is as soon as possible after appropriate decisions have been made or something like that.

Steve DelBianco: After the Board has considered and acted upon this advice?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes. The difference that I saw in this paragraph was that we were wanting people to get on with stuff now whereas everything else is subject to that qualifier about if there's an AC considering (unintelligible). So if we could

make that change Berry, is it possible to do it on screen so we could have a look at it?

Berry Cobb: It is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Probably not because it's pdf.

Berry Cobb: Yes, correct.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes.

Berry Cobb: And Steve I think you're driving updates, correct?

Steve DelBianco: That's right Berry, so what I wrote down was - the first sentence is the same, we anticipate the Board may want to have definitions, measures and targets early enough to become part of their management objectives, that's the same.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And then in addition it would say, "In addition the working group recommends that ICANN staff begin collecting the proposed metrics and publishing baseline data as soon as possible after the Board," I guess you could take out as soon as possible, but you could say, "After the Board has acted on advice from ACs and SOs."

Rosemary Sinclair: That's a terr- Rosemary here, that's a great construction, but I would leave in as soon as possible Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Oh I see.

Rosemary Sinclair: Our point is (unintelligible) time baseline starts happening quickly.

Berry Cobb: Everyone else okay with the end of it then?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, I think we can take that as a yes and just keep going, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Okay great, uh-hum...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, the only other thing on that is because things are so busy when these documents come out (between) meeting, it might be highly appropriate Rosemary for you as Chair of this working group to have a quite chat in a corridor to, shall I suggest perhaps the current ICANN member used to be on the Board of your own recently who may have vested interest in this to make sure that (sentence used) kicked out and looked at.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, I will undertake to do that, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay, this is Berry, the next paragraph just suggested a little bit more specificity in terms of the potential cost behind the collection of the data. The previous had just read third party assistant with surveys, by the looks of the list there could be other areas where ICANN may need to outsource some of those data needs and thus I threw in the word expense in there as well. Okay, moving on to Page Three, I don't believe we had...

Steve DelBianco: Hang on one second right there, if you could - right there where you say on the paragraph at the bottom of the screen Berry the initial draft is being posted for public comment on 21 February. I mean I do realize that it - that could slip a day or two and I'd hate to have to revise the draft, is it customary to indicate the posting date in the body of a document?

Berry Cobb: Julie would it be okay if we just said February 2012?

Julie Hedlund: I think that would be fine, I don't think we have to go a specific date.

Steve DelBianco: I mean if we needed a date Julie, I could say, "This initial draft was finalized," sorry, "Was prepared by the working group on 21 February and provided to staff for public comment posted."

Julie Hedlund: That would be fine too.

Steve DelBianco: I think - do we really know what date it would be posted?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I mean I think it would be in our goal is to try to get it out - get it posted tomorrow actually if it's finalized today. But there are - I don't know of any reason that a specific date has to be included in the document unless you all want it there.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, then if it's okay Berry, I would just change this to indicate the working group, you know, concluded this initial draft on 21 February 2012.

Berry Cobb: Works for me, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Got it, thank you. Sorry.

Berry Cobb: Okay I think - so minus that change on Page 3, I think all of our definitions have remained the same from our previous draft. Anybody care to chime in on any other changes about those? Okay very good, Page 5 is just the footnote to the definitions. Page 6, the first one here was - just wanted to clarify that, you know, that ICANN staff hasn't, you know, we haven't conducted a formal assessment, you know, the assessment that was provided was really just a line in the sand for the working group to get started. So I really just wanted to clarify that and if that's okay with the working group as well.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, Berry I think we should just put indicating and assessment of difficulties and then we don't have to worry about that them.

Steve DelBianco: Could we say indicating Berry Cobb's assessment of difficulty - no just kidding, that's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't know if we really want to take care of his career Steve.

Steve DelBianco: (Yes that's done).

Berry Cobb: Okay and then the last change I think here is I just modified it so that the ICANN Board direct staff to identify baseline values, meaning that in the future based off of the advice and more momentum from there that, you know, that baselines would be created and just wanted to remember the fact that it didn't sound like it had already been performed.

Rosemary Sinclair: Sorry Berry could you read the paragraph, it's Rosemary here, I'm just not sure of that just now.

Berry Cobb: It should be the working group suggests that...

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...or recommends that.

Jonathan Robinson: Just suggest.

Rosemary Sinclair: And in fact that's - Rosemary here, sorry - that relates to the matter we were just talking about before, getting that baseline data.

Berry Cobb: Right. Okay I think that was it for any of the jested changes. How do we want to move forward with review of the metrics?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think there is - if you just go slowly and anything that people want to comment on, they should do that. I'm just - for me I'm pleased to see that definition of consumer keeps appearing because I think that's going to be helpful for people reading the document.

Steve DelBianco: Berry if you could hold there for a second - Rosemary if you could leave the first one up there, I think it's right. I wonder if we could word it more artfully under the three year target column? The very first one, we say the words any adverse decisions and I think what we mean by that is it's any adverse decisions for registry's who violated their own restrictions, you know, at the end of a dispute resolution procedure, would be undermining consumer trust. But is it sufficient to say the words, any adverse decision with target - not really. We would probably want to say the word, no adverse decision as opposed to any, because the target is to have none.

Rosemary Sinclair: And in fact, Rosemary here, more positively put the (time) have no adverse decision because the registry operators are actually, you know, speaking by their own words. So I think if we go with no adverse decisions it's better than any adverse decisions.

Berry Cobb: Everyone okay with no instead of any, to be really clear?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Fabulous. The words legacy TLDs are mentioned many times, does anyone feel as if we should define that in the little definitions on bottom of Page 6?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I do, a little help with any interpretation once people start reading translated documents.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, so we would define that as the number and existing companies. So we would be looking at the performance of that group of TLDs and then using that as the baseline I guess to compare the new - the performance of the new gTLDs. I think rectifying that at this stage would be helpful.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve, and it isn't always the number, sometimes it's an incident and so on. So perhaps I'll put in the definition to the word legacy gTLDs in quotes, I would say this refers to gTLDs that were in operation before expansion, and then we ought to give a date. And the reason I say that is to resolve ambiguity of whether ICM would be considered as a gTLD. And Berry it probably ought to be, if we count 2012, right? Because by the end of 2011, ICM was up in Triple X. I think that expands our numbers that we discussed earlier on the call too.

Jonathan Robinson: Well it's - Steve, it's Jonathan speaking and don't rush me I mean I think this is an important point because you could argue that, you know, they're the 2001 and 2004 rounds that were experiments or, you know, early stages in new gTLD programs. So I think it's pretty important to clarify that we mean gTLDs introduced on or off the, you know, 1st of January, 2012 or some specific date that defines very clearly that it's this significant new expansion of gTLDs as opposed to ones that succeed the originals that have come (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: And Jonathan, just to clarify you came in just at the end of that, we were defining the term legacy gTLDs which is quite the inverse of what you just said, but it's the definition of legacy gTLDs would refer to gTLDs that were in operation before the present expansion and - or I could say the 2012 expansion.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct, and that's what I was trying to - perhaps it's not as eloquently as I should of but tried to capture that, anyway I agree with that and feel that the date is important because one might argue that (unintelligible) travel and

others are not legacy gTLDs, but part of a new gTLD program, so it's very important to clarify that exactly.

Steve DelBianco: You would agree that for our purposes those are legacy?

Jonathan Robinson: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: And the other question is ICM and Triple X considered legacy as well?

Jonathan Robinson: It's got to be, it's got to be in the same class as those others because it - it's born of the other program - it's very explicitly and specifically not part of this...

Steve DelBianco: What was the date on which ICMs Triple X was made available for public registration?

Jonathan Robinson: (Sunrise) was September and general availability was...

Berry Cobb: December 6.

Jonathan Robinson: December, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Good, so having the words 2012 is the key. So we would be saying before 2012 when we refer to legacy?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And the words after 2011 would refer to the expansion, that's great. I'll make that change to the definitions on the bottom of Page 6.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Steve, and Berry we can keep going I think now - going slowly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Cheryl, sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Probably just a silly question and I'll be very pleased to hear that it's not an issue, I just wondered how well the use of the hash symbol which is all very great for us English speakers and Latin speakers to use, is going to work in translated documents? Or should we shift from the use of a hash symbol to the actual numerator or word number?

Rosemary Sinclair: I'm happy - Rosemary here, I'm happy if we just go with the word.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For example, hash to a whole group of people means fracture, not number.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, I would recommend using the word number. I know...

Steve DelBianco: You use the word quantity in most in most of the definitions.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, quantity's fine then.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I just got nervous when I saw the hash symbol.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I mean because they say three year target for instance increase in a hash symbol among non-English TLDs, it would be clear to say number, particularly for translators.

Steve DelBianco: Okay I'll make that change, I guess that will be in many places.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a global, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. And it's customary to have hyperlinks imbedded in a pdf?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: They don't have to be footnotes with the URL spelled out, do they Julie?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, Berry is it possible to just see if Julie can advise us on that?

Berry Cobb: Yes I'll take that action.

Steve DelBianco: If it is necessary then we'll spell the ULR out in a footnote underneath things rather than jam an entire URL into these little boxes. Question on this one, at the top we all agreed to put a qualifier up top that in the note registrations using privacy - I should say or proxy services - and/or, will not provide meaningful data - should I indicate, "Will not provide meaningful data and will therefore not be counted?"

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, I think it's good to be clear, yes.

Steve DelBianco: And is it right to say and/or? Because sometimes you can have both private and proxy, is that correct?

Rosemary Sinclair: I think - Rosemary here, I think it is right to say and/or.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so it would say, "Registrations using privacy and/or proxy services would not provide meaningful data and will therefore not be counted." For the purposes of - only for the purposes of the three rows here by the way.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes perhaps we put in this section.

Steve DelBianco: Really actually now that I look at it, only the first two rows.

Rosemary Sinclair: Perhaps it's some sort of footnote Steve, or asterisk for those two rows.

Steve DelBianco: Everybody work with me a second, we would have to throw it out for the purposes of our defensive registration.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: It wouldn't apply to the surveys, but what about the increased geographic diversity of registrar? I'll never know anything about a registrar's country of origin if they're hiding behind a proxy or privacy.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, so you can't usefully measure if it doesn't help you, and I think that's just the way it is.

Steve DelBianco: So I, you know, I'm wondering about how we communicate to the communities at the times we're going to disregard privacy and/or proxies. But suppose it's the first, second and fourth row on this page? That argument for moving it to a footnote instead of a note at the top, or both. What's everyone's thoughts about how to be clear?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here Steve, I actually like having the reference at the top, and perhaps the footnote explains which of the measures this will be relevant to. So Rows 1, 2 and 4 here. But I like the clarity of calling it out at the top of the box. Since I'm not seeing any hands...

Steve DelBianco: Yes I'll make the note and then on each of those three rows, I'll put in parens on each one, privacy and/or - privacy/proxy not counted.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, okay.

Steve DelBianco: All right and that would be on the first, the second and the fourth.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl supporting this in the chat, okay thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi it's Jonathan, I've got a brief comment or question here, you said the word service provider - registry service providers, I forget where that came from and I possibly missed it, but isn't it more common to call them backend operators as - to distinguish from registry operators?

Rosemary Sinclair: Uh-hum.

Jonathan Robinson: Although I understand what service providers is, I'm tempted to stick to a more standard term if there is one and it seems that the distinction that's made is when either is operating a registry from soup to nuts as it were or as providing the technical services in which case the convention as far as I know is to refer to those provided as registry backend operators rather than service providers.

Steve DelBianco: Let's check that real quick in the Guidebook - what does the Guidebook refer to it as?

Jonathan Robinson: Well I certainly know that it's a concept of the emergency backend registry operator...

Steve DelBianco: We don't mean that.

Jonathan Robinson: No I know, I realize that. I'm not sure the Guidebook - yes and that's a fair and good point Steve, if the Guidebook does refer to them as service providers then let's stick with that definition, but yes just a note to perhaps check that then.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, Jonathan you bring up a good point and way back on Version 1 of our spreadsheet matrix, originally we had these measures of competition and I'll just read them out, it was quantity at registry operators before and

after 2012 basically, quantity of backend registry operators before and after 2012 and so I recall the working group having discussion about whether that was confusion or not with using registry operators with the qualification of backend or not and that's when we made the change to the service providers.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, but Jonathan raises a very good point. If we're using a term that makes things clear for the working group, but is going to cause confusion when the document gets to people that haven't been on this journey with us, then it's possibly better for us to include - could we say registry backend service providers? Again we want people to focus on the substance of our work and not be worried about definitions. Or as an alternative, if it's used in the Guidebook then perhaps we just indicate that somewhere. But if - my concern is if it's causing a question in Jonathan's mind, then I'm sure that same question will be asked by a number of other people looking at the document.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve, I've gone through the Guidebook, I think it does argue for a definition on Page 6, let's pick a term we like and then the definition will be expansive, it will include the word backend and the word third party service provider, because the word third party provider shows up quite frequently in the Guidebook.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that's a great approach Steve, to just get into that clarity.

Berry Cobb: No objection from me.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) document might be the term we have in there now which is the word registry service provider...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...we have in there now, and I guess the definition, Jonathan you'd like to see at least the words backend and the word third party in that definition?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that sounds fine Steve, it's just to make sure we cover that. I frankly think service provider is not a bad term, but it's just a matter of making sure it's inclusive and understood as to what to encompass of the term. So yes, as you suggest that sounds sensible.

Steve DelBianco: Because the word service provider does show up, the Guidebook isn't as cut and dry on this as you might imagine and the word backend shows up only on two pages.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, it's interesting when you try and - start to measure things, how these little elements of confusion become much clearer.

Steve DelBianco: Yes the word backend it looks like it only shows up with reference to the emergency, so I think I would probably - Jonathan, if I were to use the worked backend, I might actually confuse them since the Guidebook never uses the word backend except for emergency. And yet your argument - you started this discussion by suggesting that most people think of the regular old registry services provider as the backend. So if I put it in there, I need to clarify it does not mean the backend...

Jonathan Robinson: Emergency.

Steve DelBianco: ...emergency, does not mean the emergency backend.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Yes Steve, I'm not sure I can offer something more sensible there, it's really just as long as there's a definition of what we mean by service provider is probably the best. So it's quite clear to anyone reading the document what the difference between a registry operator is, in other words someone who operates the entire registry, both in terms of contractual relationship with ICANN and the technical service division and that the service provider is

essentially responsible for providing the technical services to another company who is the contracted party of ICANN.

As long as it comes across clearly in that what we mean by that which we clearly understand, I don't feel strongly that the word backend for example has to be included in there.

Steve DelBianco: So it provides technical services to the Registry Operator who holds the contract with ICANN?

Berry Cobb: Correct, that's the way I understand it.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, yes so we're certainly - after making these edits I will circulate them tonight but I can tell you we wouldn't want to dump this into translation or have it posted until everyone's had a chance to take a look at these two changes. I'll do it with a redline as well as a final V7. Does it need to - would this document need to take out Version 7 and say - remove any reference to the word version? What's the right way to characterize it - is it final draft, initial draft? Need some guidance from staff on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Final draft.

Steve DelBianco: And yet after public comment period is worked in, we would come up with what is then called a...

Berry Cobb: It will be the final version of the Advice Letter, I mean because this really isn't an issue report but it will just be the final version of the Advice Letter.

Steve DelBianco: Okay so where I have on the top of every page where it said draft V6, it will change to the words final draft, and everybody's cool with that, right?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, Rosemary here.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Berry Cobb: I guess we're ready for competition measures, right?

Rosemary Sinclair: That's right, yes they are.

Berry Cobb: And Steve this is Berry, I guess for our first four for accounts where there's a blank field for anticipated difficulties, we'll match the previous ones, none anticipated or whatever language you use?

Steve DelBianco: I think it was none noted, the Greek hash - I'll put that in. And for Robinson's - Jonathan Robinson's benefit looking - Jonathan Robinson, do you have visibility of the screen?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Steve, thanks I'm just toggling back in Windows, but yes I do.

Steve DelBianco: The first row it will say none noted and the target will read, increase of 2X over 2011 and in parens underneath it, it will say 313 and there will be a footnote explaining a very - I'm sorry, how staff came up with the numbers. The second one will read none noted, an increase of 10X over 2011 and in parens it will have the number 21, so the number gTLDs. The third one row will be none noted and the increase will be an increase of 2X over 201l and the quantity there I believe would be 7 including ICM, agreed Berry?

Berry Cobb: For the third row registry operators, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, Triple X makes it seven. And then the next row, none noted - we're fixing the row to say quantity of unique gTLD registry service providers before and after expansion. None noted for difficulty, increase of 2X over 2011 quantity and in parens the number would be 6, right Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes for the service providers and now that I think about the registry operator that's going to be...

Steve DelBianco: It's unique.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Steve DelBianco: You know, I may wait until I get your revised footnote before I put the numbers in.

Berry Cobb: Yes definitely, I need to run through the numbers. Because we know, you know, VeriSign has three, com/.net .NAME, PRI with one, so yes let me provide the numbers again before you post them.

Steve DelBianco: And for the benefit of the community who will read this, if we're not betraying anything confidential, it might be good to indicate that. The operator - is VeriSign the operator for .NAME or just the service provider? Who holds the contract for .NAME?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, VeriSign.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Berry Cobb: They bought the .NAME registry several years ago and also provide the backend surveys as well.

Steve DelBianco: In the footnote where we - since it's only seven different names, we - I'm hoping we can actually list them in the footnote, is there any objection to that?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, I can't see any reason why there would be.

Steve DelBianco: Great, the next row's the quantity of registrars before and after expansion, along with an indication of country, what about difficulty on that one Berry?

Berry Cobb: That one's easy, in the spreadsheet I sent it as a listing of the counts of registrars by country, so that's easy...

Steve DelBianco: Well done, and so the quantity number and the hash symbol would be replaced by the number 1000 and of course this would refer to the same footnote. The next one here that says new entrance, I would propose a tiny edit, is it right after the word new entrance - I will put new entrance in quotes and then move the part of it definition to tell people what that means for the purposes of this measure, new entrance or registry operators that did not operate a legacy gTLD.

Rosemary Sinclair: (I mean that sounds fine).

Steve DelBianco: Okay, I know we have it in there, but they have to read to the end of the sentence to see all that. And Jonathan Robinson, you see the prices are not targeted, they are simply to be gathered.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve, yes I saw that.

Steve DelBianco: Jonathan Robinson, the target for new entrance - we kind of glossed over that, did you have any reaction to a new entrance target of 20%?

Jonathan Robinson: No.

Steve DelBianco: We just pulled it out of the air.

Jonathan Robinson: No I think to some extent that that's got to be a strong, what is a view of competition? I mean really to - this is about putting a figure out there that is - that people are - that in public comment I would expect people can either say that's ridiculous, that's no where near competition, or that's too strong, that's too much, that's too high of a target. I mean it's very difficult to set what one

man's competition might be slightly different to another. So I find it difficult to have a reaction to that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, Jonathan that's kind of the tenor of the discussion we had when we were grappling with this.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood, and I think there's a point where this has to be put out for a comment and that's - and see what reactions there are for that and I remember Steve's previous comments on this, as long as it's not ridiculous that people will shoot us down for an absurd figure, but it's very difficult to say what's there. Frankly it will be very difficult to get 20% I would expect, I mean there are significant challenges to getting people to register new gTLDs, but let's see what - how, you know, how it's responded to.

Steve DelBianco: But again this just means that of the new registrations at the end of three years, and let's suppose there's been 100 million new registrations at the end of three years, this would say that 20% of the new registrations in the new gTLDs would be held by zones that are run by "new entrance." So we're not even guessing the quantity of new registrations as a percentage of the total, it's simply which of the new ones belong to new entries. Does that need to be worded differently?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, you know I think we've got that right, you know, we've got shares of new registration held by new entrance.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry, so but to get that percent of new registrations, we have to look at the whole of all registrations...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...and so hypothetically in the legacy world, let's call it 100 million registrations, that means you have to have 20 million registrations and new gTLDs by the end of three years. That's pretty stiff to me.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary, when...

Steve DelBianco: Would you just repeat that?

Berry Cobb: So the way I read this, the measure - measure the percent of new gTLD registrations and gTLD's run by registry operators that did not operate a legacy gTLD. So to get the percent of new gTLD registrations, we have to consider all registrations that exist out there today and...

Steve DelBianco: No I disagree, it's just totally up - you count the zone files, if we have 500 new gTLDs, you would count up the total number of registered domain names, and that's your denominator.

Berry Cobb: All right, I guess you're - all right.

Steve DelBianco: Numerator is which portion of those 500 new gTLDs were run by a new entrance defined to the left, A divided by B is equal - we're saying it should be at least 20%. Now I'm translating what I was thinking when I wrote this down after we had our call, but if anybody thinks it ought to be something different, this is a great time to say.

Berry Cobb: I almost hate to say it but the formula you just mentioned in written word would be awesome, just because, you know, my first read of it again and spacing out on what we discussed last week is I immediately think about the universe of registrations and then some number derived of that of the new gTLD registrations.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, so is there any construction of words Berry that can clarify it do you think? Or can you suggest? The share of the new gTLD registrations.

Berry Cobb: Yes, every time I read it, it seem clear.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes. Rosemary here, I suggest we leave this and we'll just have to see what we get back from public comment. So why don't we press on then with this - where are we? Seven?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: I believe that takes us to the end.

Berry Cobb: Can we go to the appendix so we can cover the legal note?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, we need to, let's see, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Berry sent this over to me from ICANN Legal, I added the first paragraph and the final note in italics, please give it a look.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, I thought that I think it's important that we include the legal advice for the people that are aware of that particular issue, but the statement over at the end I thought was fine.

Steve DelBianco: Even though there are statements effectively negates any importance to the legal note, it's (unintelligible) I might add.

Rosemary Sinclair: I don't think that's right, I think the legal note is very important because it's focusing on key issues around the consideration of competitive markets. What we're saying in the note is that we don't think that anything that we've asked for raises these issues. Other people may think differently about that...

Steve DelBianco: Well you know what, my final paragraph was just meant to imply that ICANN just measuring something is not the same thing as making a recommendation. But if you're okay with the final paragraph, I don't want to create a problem where there is none, are we good?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, I think it's fine.

Steve DelBianco: Then I guess we're done with the draft - I could probably turn this around in
15 or 20 minutes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, now do we...

Steve DelBianco: What's next on the agenda, the PowerPoint?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here, we have one issue in the chest that's being raised by
(Carlos), I - it's a very complicated issue and I don't think we're going to be
able to progress it, but I just wanted everybody to know (Carlos) has raised a
question possibly evaluate and devoid the conclusions between registries
and registrars which I think is going to the issue of vertical integration, what
will be the question to do in this context. (Carlos), do you want to give us a bit
of background on this issue? As I say, I'm just not sure that it's one we can
progress through with this particular piece of work.

(Carlos):   Thanks Rosemary, I was thinking about a competition I'm concerned about
what was - what would be the point solution and situation and I think we need
some measure to give us light in the market that is my opinion. But after that,
I the appendix my concern, I think that somehow it's a big concern. I don't
know what is the question for the in this context to see it's there, the situation
occur or not. It's complicated to explain to me, but I think you are on this side.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Rosemary here, it's a very complicated issue and you're right we
need to be cautious given the legal advice. I think what we're doing Carlos is
laying the foundation with the number of measures and the kind of metrics
that we have in place. And if we dump the developments in terms of the
number of operators in the market, then down the track there may be some
material that people could use to think about this issue. But having watched
competition regulators even in places like Australia try to riddle with
Collusion, the evidentiary base that you need takes years and years to

develop. So I think at the moment we can just appreciate the concern, but it's not something that we can pick up in this particular piece of work.

Are there any other views on that? And while people are mulling that over, I'm sorry to do this but Berry would you mind getting someone to call me because my battery is about to run out, I'll put the number in the chat. So I think we're done with the document now, you can go after the changes for public publication and we're looking at the slide pack. I'm going to have to disappear and wait for the call, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're going to call Rosemary now, thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay, this is Berry I have the first draft of the December metrics presentation posted in the Adobe Connect window. Essentially I pretty much lifted some of the main slides that was used in Dakar with exception of updating the definitions and metrics portion of it. Probably one think to note as we - just as we go through this is that given the quantity of metrics that we have, it would have meant 20 extra slides, so something for the working group to consider is I'll be happy to bring those into the PowerPoint if we wish to only present from PowerPoint. Or if maybe it will be better to move over directly to the Advice Letter instead of just trying to bring in the highlight.

So with that in mind, I'll just run through each of the slides quickly and we can move on from there.

Steve DelBianco: It's probably pretty much identical to what we showed in Dakar, it just has the cool Jurassic Park logo.

Berry Cobb: Yes, that's very true. I wasn't, you know, again I just created this in my own little world, I wasn't really sure how much the working group wanted to rehash some of the same substance or contents that was created in Dakar, however I figure we might have a much bigger and broad audience this time around, so we want to bring those who weren't familiar with the topic up to speed. So

that's why I went ahead and included them in here. And this is also just to confirm we - well the final schedule is not out yet, it still looks like we have our 11:00 to 12:30 slot, so that's just before lunch and doesn't compete with the GNSO.

One small risk is there might be a RPM session that overlaps with ours, so we might be competing for that topic, but none of that is final just yet.

Steve DelBianco: Berry this is Steve, the first slide - that's the first time I've seen the CCTC abbreviation - it shows up again a few times. But CCTC doesn't even match the words in our working group label, is there a reason we picked it that way?

Berry Cobb: Yes and no. There was a change - the shorthand usage were - are, you know, they're generated internally to ICANN and for us tracking the various projects and several months ago there was never really ever a use consistently, it was either CCI or CCCI and you'll notice in our email listing, it's (CCI-DT), this use of (CCTC) is the most recent version that's being used on the pending project's list and everything within the GNSO, so my intent here was to just make sure we're using the latest and greatest.

Steve DelBianco: But where did it come from? Because it doesn't fit the words, is it just jumbling the words choice and trust? I can't figure that out.

Berry Cobb: I quite honestly can't answer that, that's how it showed up on the pending projects list and that was the designation given. So I've just been using that. If preferable, we can just remove it altogether, I don't think that it really adds any value to, you know, everybody just calls this the consumer metrics working group anyway.

Steve DelBianco: Then I propose dropping the acronym, we're the most acronym happy group on the planet - let's see if we can defy convention.

Berry Cobb: All right, I will do that. Okay, so Slide 1, basically the goal for today's workshop, provide an update Dakar, review the draft Advice Letter and then allows community to participate and discuss the topic. Each other, thoughts about other goals that we want to accomplish during our one and a half hour session.

Steve DelBianco: Just to clarify Berry, we would be in the middle of - I guess towards the second half of our public comment period on this, right.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: No, I think you got it right. That's about the appropriate discussion.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Slide 3. This is just again taken from the Dakar slide and which highlights the affirmation of commitments section that pertains to what we're trying to accomplish here.

Steve DelBianco: Could I ask you to put the third paragraph, the third bullet, put it in red or something so people will focus on that? I like putting all the commitments in there in context but it's great to show them the one from which we got our phrases.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Over to you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Steve. Sorry about all that. I have no idea what happened. But anyway, I'm back now. So we're just I guess working our way through Slide 5.

Berry Cobb: Correct Rosemary. I'll bring you up to speed. Basically most of the content of this presentation were lifted from the Dakar presentation creating this in isolation at this point. I wasn't - I'm anticipating that our audience will be greater than what we had and more broad than what we had in Dakar.

So just to help bring up persons that may not be familiar - as familiar with the topic as others, kind of quickly go through just why we're here and just those kinds of aspects before we get into the true details of the advice letter and the metrics. And...

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible). I think grounding this presentation in that background is very important.

Berry Cobb: It's very good. The two changes we've made so far was just one, dropping the acronym ccTC. I won't rehash it but it was confusing. So we'll remove reference to that.

The goals for today's workshop seemed appropriate so far by the working group. And then the affirmation of commitments that Steve just wanted me to highlight the third bullet in red, which I just changed on the master.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: And moving on to Slide 4. And Steve, would you like this is red instead of blue just so that it pops a little bit more as well?

Steve DelBianco: I think so. Now I see where you got ccTC.

Berry Cobb: Right. Well but then wouldn't it be two Cs after the T? It'd be ccTC?

Steve DelBianco: No, never mind.

Man: Or we can go...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...C squared TC squared.

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh dear.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Moving on to Slide 5. Just the Board resolution. That doesn't have any ccTCC in it.

Rosemary Sinclair: No in fact Berry - Rosemary here. That's where the confusion came from because the kind of the header for the Board resolution was competition, choice and innovation. So that's where we got CCI from. So the fewer...

Berry Cobb: Right.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...of CCCs the better I think.

Berry Cobb: And then the funny thing was that it was still missing a C. And then to make it ever more confusing is, you know, the group started off as a drafting team putting the charter and then the charter states that it's a working group and it's really not really quite clear whether this is really just a drafting team or if it really is a working group. But I digress.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. That the most delicious thing about this group Berry is we just got on with the work.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Here, here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Moving on to Slide 6. Again, this was changed over or copied over from the Dakar session. What I did change was the order consumer, consumer trust, choice and competition versus what we had in Dakar.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, this is Steve. And Rosemary if I might, I would recommend instead of establishing, let's say drafting - focus on drafting.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. That's a good change.

Steve DelBianco: And instead of the word targets, could we put three year targets? Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Those are done.

Rosemary Sinclair: Great.

Berry Cobb: And what's funny about our Jurassic Park logo is the bird really gets in the way of some of our content, but (unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: You've got to learn to work with birds Berry.

Steve DelBianco: And we need to be a little more precise to name what type of bird it is. Is it just a parakeet or a parrot?

Berry Cobb: Well Cheryl you're a resident expert. What is that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Might be a bird of national significance.

Man: Is it a cockatoo?

Woman: (Unintelligible) Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Excellent. Okay. Working group purpose. This was directly lifted form the Dakar presentation.

Steve DelBianco: I think this is perfect. We need it.

Berry Cobb: Moving on to Slide 8. Efforts.

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: ...back to that Slide 7. Rosemary here. I'm wondering whether we should
                        pick up - I know we've got that provide of the specifics of what we're doing is
                        preparing draft advice to go to SOs and ACs. Again, I'm just...

Steve DelBianco: A great point.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...worried that someone will think we're going straight to ICANN
                        management with a whole range of stuff.

Steve DelBianco: Great point.

Berry Cobb: So this is Berry. So...

Rosemary Sinclair: Berry, Rosemary. I think if we just go back to the charter and lift the words
                        out of the charter.

Berry Cobb: I don't have that in front of me right now but...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...the document draft advice would be shared only with the ACs and SOs for
                        their consideration. Consideration before, you know, to provide advice to the
                        Board.

Berry Cobb: So I'll have to think about how to word that to keep it brief.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well it might - Rosemary here. It might be just worth not worrying so much about keeping it brief Berry but to just be very clear that we're providing advice to ACs and SOs for their consideration. (It has been) is to provide advice to the Board. And the Board's task is to consider that prior to convening the review team.

And I think the last dot point - the second dot point rather needs to be included as well. But out work is not intended to limit the scope of the future teams work in any way. That's very (important).

Berry Cobb: Okay. I will make that change post-call. But I'll definitely be sure to call it out so that when I send out the next version to gain working group approval that I got it right.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Thanks Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Slide 8. I've already changed the title and removed the ccTC just to the consumer metrics working group. This one was newly created and wasn't listed from the Dakar obviously. So I tried to be as concise as possible that, you know, we gained consensus on the proposed definition, gain consensus on the proposed metrics for each of the definitions.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Berry, we should then go to the targets - suggested targets for the definitions.

Steve DelBianco: Very good. Is there a way to qualify that for some of them the targets were - what did Jonathan Robinson call them, right?

Rosemary Sinclair: Aspirational.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. Or just suggested or an effort to start the discussion. I guess we'll say that verbally when we give the presentation.

Rosemary Sinclair: Straw man I think he called them.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. Probably could just qualify it verbally when we give the presentation.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Rosemary here. It's - I was just tracking through what the working group was asked to do, which is the definitions. I think it says measures and targets.

Berry Cobb: Right you are.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Rosemary again. I wonder in the last dot point we should be clear that we have asked for translations of our draft and the implication of that of course is that the response window is going to be open past the 23rd of April now.

Berry Cobb: Perhaps I just use the month and not the specific date.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. That...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...the week of March the 13th, I imagine - well, will there be any other translations already published by then?

Berry Cobb: Possibly but I really don't know what the schedule will look like yet. But we do have until - I man we do have up until the meeting to finalize this presentation and certainly we'll know more two weeks from now when we meet again on the 6th.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary. Berry, even if we just had another dot point, which the translations into languages other than English in progress. Just something to

indicate to people that what we have now is not he only opportunity for comment.

Berry Cobb: Yeah. I've added that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: We'll undoubtedly get a question that'll say that with the ALAC or with the GNSO once they've considered the final advice, would they put their advice up for public comment before forwarding to the Board? And I have no idea but is that something we know going in?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary. I don't know Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: ...on GNSO is the documents went after public comment. And then the Council had a discussion based on that - the feedback and then put advice over to the Board from that point.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. The ALAC...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...this comment period pretty much is the comment period under advice. Of course...

Rosemary Sinclair: Cheryl.

Steve DelBianco: ...after the Board makes the decision on these definitions and measures, they would probably post them for public comment at that point. But that would be the Board doing so.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, Cheryl here. That's correct. And in fact from an ALAC perspective, we would probably, and I'm not sure if and when Olivier has put it into his agenda for the ALAC meetings but that's perfectly possible for it to be discussed in dealt with in the face to face meeting during Costa Rica as a piece of ALAC advice because there's only 15 people who need to deal with that - the ALAC.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. (Next) Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay. The next slide, Slide 9, proposed definitions. I think we're all familiar with those. Unlike the...

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Could I just suggest as a matter of presentation that we don't try to squash these onto one slide and we put two on one slide and then two on the other? It's just much easier for people who are trying to read and engage in this conversation if we make it really as easy as possible for them to see those definitions.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Perhaps maybe in line with what we've tried to do in the advice letter, maybe I go ahead and create individual slides for each three of them and include consumer with each one of them.

Steve DelBianco: Or at least with the first two. It doesn't need to be on competition. And then you end up with three slides; one that has consumer and consumer trust, one that has consumer and consumer choice and one that has competition. How about that?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary. I think that's good. Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Take a quick (unintelligible) at that. Okay. That will show up in the next version. Moving on to Slide 10. Now this slide as crowded as it is, which I know we'll want to change, warrants whether we want to move over to review just the advice letter or try to bring in the actual metrics.

The bullet points that you see here are lifted form the Dakar presentation and at a high level still coincide with the detailed metrics that we have now. The - what the challenge will be is getting the quantity of metrics that we defined into slides, which I'll go either way per the working group's direction.

It just I think to make it legible for a presentation at our meeting, it would probably be like 10 or 15 slides of metrics, which we can easily do. So I - whatever the working group would like to do.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. It's a question to me of whether would want to spend the time in that session talking through each of the metrics or in the alternatives we present in this kind of way but perhaps on three separate slides, consumer trust, consumer choice and competition; the range of metrics we're proposing and rely on anyone who has a particular focus on a particular metric to raise that in the public discussion rather than going through them one by one by one to let people bring forward the ones that they want to focus on.

And my thought would be to include them the way you have Berry but using three slides and rely on people to raise the ones they want. But I'm really interested in what others prefer particularly the other who will be doing this presentation. Over to you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Rosemary. This is the second to last slide so this is really the meat of it. Everything else has been context so far. What's the amount of time for the meeting - the presentation?

Berry Cobb: Ninety minutes.

Steve DelBianco: The first nine slides after you get rid of the title, that's at eight slides with no more than two minutes each so we'd be 15 minutes into 90 minutes by the time we got here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: I feel like a glutton for punishment. But if we put the table onto slides, there'd probably be one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, approximately ten to twelve slides with four table rows each. Pretty much what Berry just said. And that would be a font size similar to what you see on this font size here would be my guess. Berry we'd have to mock up a few to see how that would work.

So if you really have 90 minutes and you've only 15 minutes into it, I think 60 minutes, 70 minutes potentially to cover 12 slides is five minutes a slide, six minutes a slide. Six minutes a slide with four rows on it, that's doable. It's probably unbearable for the audience but what else would we do for 90 minutes.

I'm willing to do it. I want to make sure you guys all think it'll be an effective way to conduct the dialog.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary just in response to that. If you're going to do that, I still think it should be after what I would call the plain English version of the metrics, which is what Berry's got on this slide. I would break that into three print slides.

I think it's - I think it's very important to take people on the journey into the detail and give them a marker so that if they feel they're getting completely

lost in the tables on - subsequently, they can just go back to this helicopter picture, if you like, to remind themselves Steve what we mean.

By the time you get into, you know, percentage change in TLDs before and after this and that, you can get lost particularly when you're coming to this presentation after, you know, maybe two or three or four days of discussion.

So perhaps even if it's going to now look like a very weighty slide pack, we have what I will call the helicopter version on Page 10 of that slide pack. And then the table version to assist the discussion during the 90 minutes.

Steve DelBianco: This is (Steven). I would agree with that. So Slide 10 becomes three slides, one for each trust, choice and competition. We probably Berry want to revisit the Dakar shorthand, which...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: You did already. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: So actually how about this? Since we're going to break apart out definitions into three slides, would it maybe make sense to review the definition and then the helicopter version of the metrics for each? So consumer trust definition, consumer trust helicopter metrics; same for choice; same for competition.

And then I'll append all the detailed metrics after those six and we can get into the details as we see fit because one thing you didn't consider Steve is maybe like 15 minutes for questions or if we have dialog back and forth during the presentation. That'll definitely increase our time.

Steve DelBianco: You know, it's true. With the detailed slides up there, it wouldn't be appropriate to read them. It wouldn't. It's really having them so that questions could come up from the audience and we would quickly advance to the slide

with the metrics that are closest to what the questioner is asking about and maybe walk them through how we did what we did.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Rosemary here.

Steve DelBianco: And Berry, with respect to the - you were suggesting maybe you do the definition of say consumer trust and then you do the high level description; then the definition of choice and then the high level description. But I would argue that the three definitions we'd probably do them relatively quickly so that the audience can see that the way we've made a distinction between competition and choice.

And by spacing those two slides very, very far apart, it's harder for people to understand what we mean. Is it your idea that they would only be two slides apart? You'd have a definition and then high-level bullets on choice and then the definition and then the high level bullets on competition?

Berry Cobb: Correct.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...two slides for each. But I can go either way.

Steve DelBianco: In pairs. I think you're fine. Do three pairs. I think that's a great idea.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Let's just see how that works in the next version of the pack because remember it took us quite a while to get agreement on the definitions. That's hard consensual policy work.

So the point that you just made Steve I think is really important that, you know, you do have to look at those definitions as a group to get the full sense of what's being proposed in each one individually. But let's proceed the way you've suggested and just have another look at our next review session.

Berry Cobb: Definitely easy to reorganize slides.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Then basically closing out is just our next steps. On Slide 11 basically draft advice measures or in the public comment period. What I meant to say is the public comment period, not the forum. And that we'll basically take all the comments received. I'll get rid of the ccTC and look to incorporate into the final advice letter. And then some time in May we plan to submit the final advice letter to the GNSO Council.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Rosemary, Steve. A question for you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: If I make any edits to the advice draft...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...(unintelligible) tonight, how long do you want for this group to give a final signoff before we turn it over to staff for posting?

Rosemary Sinclair: Look, I would like to do it really as quickly as possible. So I'm - you're all Tuesday night, I'm Wednesday morning. If it comes out, how would people feel about turning it around in 24 hours? I think I might take silence to mean acclimation...

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...in this regard. So that's a real quick turnaround. Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: And they're not substantive changes. They're relatively small.

Rosemary Sinclair: No.

Steve DelBianco: I could mess up the definitions and Berry and I might get the footnote a little sideways so it would be great to have you guys give it one more look.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Sure. And Cheryl, I - Rosemary here. I've got a question for you. Do you want to include anything particular of ALAC? We've got our final advice letter going back to GNSO Council and that's right. But do we want to mention ALAC in any way in this next steps area?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Look, my guess is yes but without - I would prefer you to pop off a quick email to Olivier to ask...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...the exact words he'd like there.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. That's good. I just...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...quite possible that he may be thinking to have this something that is dealt with during the agenda...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...for the face-to-face meetings and that would be a nice thing to be able to say...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...and ALAC is planning on signing off, you know, tomorrow.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Great. All right. So I - Berry, I will do that. I'll get in touch with Olivier and just get him to have a look at Slide 11 and see what if anything he would like to incorporate there.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Great.

Rosemary Sinclair: Now. This is the trickiest slide, hey. You want to say what thank your or what a headache it's been or we want to get on with the rest of our lives now. And then the questions. Yeah.

Of course - Rosemary here. Steve you're quickly taking questions through the presentation so it's kind of final questions I think here at this point, isn't it?

Steve DelBianco: I would assume that the rest of the group believes it's better to take questions as we go. And of course...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...member of the working group who are present should be upfront as well, right?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Terrific.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I'm happy for that but I think if we just have a straw man well-known voice for the advocacy of proper definitions driving it, it would be quite useful Steve.

Steve DelBianco: In failing to finding such a person, I would be stepping into that role.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, come off it. Excellent news.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Now we've got I think a minute to go. So we're - we are getting really good on the timing on these calls. Is there any other issue that anybody would like to raise before we sign out today? And of course we're coming back in two week's time. Have I got that right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Rosemary Sinclair: The week before Costa Rica. Any final comments from anybody? Being none, I think we just say a great big thanks to everybody for another great call. Terrific contributions and well done Berry for all your working pulling the slides together and to you in particular Steve for work on the draft advice letter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bit here, here on that from me. You guys have been amazing.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, I'm just wondering if you would mind unofficially - not that, unofficially, saying to - when you have an opportunity to cross paths with Adrian Kinderis that Cheryl happened to mention some fascinating market share metrics that all registry international had presented to ccTLD (ADA) Board and that whilst she didn't give you any information on what they contained, she thought when and if they were going to be able to be made public it might have relevance to our work.

Berry Cobb: Can I record it and just play it back?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You can. You can actually give him that specific sound bite because he would appreciate that from me. Because he hasn't actually sent the Board the presentation and so I'm unsure about its public (ability).

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But it's the sort of thing that if it's being done in other spaces, it could be extremely useful stuff to have dragged in early on in this process.

Berry Cobb: I will pass along the message.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Besides Adrian's used to me interfering. And the other thing is Steve, I expect your feedback from not only the YouTube link I've given you but you should do a search on Steve talking on the call. So I think it's called Rio and somebody and they have an extensive vocabulary and we can compare notes later.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. Cheryl, I though you were going to ask Steve to practice and perform. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh dear. I want him to be a parrot expert while he's doing it.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right everybody. I'll catch you next time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Rosemary Sinclair: Bye.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you all. Take care.

Woman: Thanks everybody. Bye.

Coordinator: At this time that concludes this conference. You may disconnect. Thank you for your attendance.

END