
ICANN Transcription

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

Wednesday 02, January 2019 at 1800 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-sunrise-registrations-02jan19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p9fxrtdtddb/>

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

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

JULIE BISLAND:

Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RPM subteam for sunrise data review call on Wednesday, the 2nd of January 2019.

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

Alright. I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to you, Julie. Please begin.

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

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks very much, Julie. So, I'm just going to review the agenda here, and there's also a note for Any Other Business. So, I'm reviewing the agenda. Item one is statements of interest. Item two is selecting the subteam leader. Three is to begin – and actually, that's continue survey analysis, and four is Any Other Business.

So, let me ask if anybody has Any Other Business they would like to add. Not seeing any hands, then let me go back up to agenda item one and ask if there are any changes to statement of interest.

Not seeing any hands for any changes to statement of interest, so let me go to agenda item two, selecting the subteam leader. As you may recall, we were asked to extend the time for the call for nominations or volunteers for a subteam leader, which we did up until the holiday.

We did not receive any more responses. Let me ask here if there are any volunteers for or nominations for the subteam leaders, anyone who is on this call. And by the way, we did also, as requested, send that call for volunteers and nominations to the full RPM working group list. We did not receive any comments there either.

So, let me pause there. Any volunteers or nominations? Greg Shatan, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Hi. As I indicated on the prior subteam call, I'm willing to serve either as the chair of this subteam or the co-chair of the other

subteam which has a volunteer for a co-chair who has some trepidation about serving as the sole chair. But if there are no volunteers over here, [inaudible] this side to be the chair or co-chair. I will rush in where others have [inaudible] and nominate myself. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Greg, and we will note your self-nomination, volunteering. Do we have anybody who would like to join Greg? Do we have any comments, support, opposition to Greg's volunteering? I see Greg is seconded by David McAuley in the chat.

Not seeing any further comments – I do have a hand up. David McAuley, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Julie. I would be happy to chat with Greg if he ever feels that he needs a co-chair in this, just to see what it would entail. I can't promise that I could do it, but I would certainly be willing to chat with Greg about it if he discerns a need for something like that. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, David. And just looking at the chat, Greg says if anyone else wants to chair here, you can co-chair the other group with Martin Silva. Greg, do you have any comments with respect to David's offer to speak with you? And I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead, Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Sure. Thanks. I think – first, I'm honored that David would even consider such a thing and with me. I don't necessarily think that this group needs co-chairs. I think Martin was looking for a co-chair because he hasn't had that much chairing or rapporteuring or facilitating experience and wants a cohort. I think there are good reasons, especially in big, sprawling groups like the main group, for co-chairs. And I'm happy to have a co-chair here, but I don't think it's necessary, nor am I looking for a co-chair because I think it's going to ease my burden or because I don't think I can do my best on its own.

In other words, I'm kind of neither discouraging nor encouraging co-chairs here. Not actively seeking one out, but that's kind of an off the top of my head reaction, and there are definitely some good things that might be involved in having a co-chair or a vice chair or somebody who, if I get hit by a truck or by a conflict, then he can step in and not put that burden on staff or one of the co-chairs of the big group. So I guess that's a longwinded way of saying maybe [inaudible] but I don't really think it's necessary.

But again, I'll also bow – it's not my decision alone how many chairs we have, certainly. So it's a group decision, and I will go with the group. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Greg. Then you have been seconded. I'm not hearing any opposition to your being co-chair, so in absence of that, I think that we can proceed with you as chair at this point

as we have no other volunteers for co-chair. We don't necessarily need one. So, we have you as chair of the subteam.

And let me ask, then, if you would like us to – we can go ahead and proceed to the survey analysis. And if you would like, staff is willing to take us through the comments. I think that we found in the previous meeting that we don't necessarily need to read the full comments, but if you would like us to, we can.

But we'll bring up the document and we'll unsync it so that you can read the comments yourself. And then perhaps we'll just note where we are with respect to whose comments we're discussing, and then we'll capture the discussion in the notes.

And so at this point, I see Mitch Stoltz's hand up. Mitch, please.

MITCH STOLTZ:

Thank you. Happy new year, everybody. I just wanted to bring up that on the last call, we discussed, and there seemed to be consensus that rather than sort of diving straight into the survey questions, that we really begin with the overall questions that are the charge of this subteam, and among those begin with the broad question of whether sunrise is achieving its stated goals. So, I hope that we do that.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mitch. I think that was the intent in how these particular Google docs, Google tools are set up to capture the comments, but this is a good opportunity for me to turn to my colleague, Ariel Liang, and just have Ariel talk us through the

document you have before you on sunrise charter question 5A and its subquestions. So, I'll go ahead and turn things over to Ariel for a brief description of what we are seeing here. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you very much, Julie. Happy new year, everyone. I'll just paste in the chat the link to the Wiki page on that document or the worksheet developed for each of the sunrise [agreed] charter questions. So, what Mitch referred to, that was actually the first worksheet related to the preamble charter question, but we want to remind the subteam that [with the] homework, we were looking at [sunrise] charter question 5A, which is the document in front of you in Adobe Connect. So, [we haven't looked] at that preamble question yet, but we'll get there.

And then on the document that you're seeing now, the first [inaudible] instruction is pretty self-explanatory, and we just want to highlight that to staff, identify some of the [inaudible] that the survey [inaudible] they help answer the [agreed] charter question 5A, so we highlighted these numbers in the bullet point. And then you can see the actual [sunrise] charter question 5A, the exact text.

The highlighted in yellow is because when Analysis Group [developed] the survey, these questions were communicated to them, and they incorporated these in the design of the survey questions. So, that's why they're highlighted in yellow.

And in the table here, you can see that we requested the commenters to put down their names and to explicitly state

whether the [inaudible] answered a question, and if so, which subquestion the [inaudible] assist answering and how the [inaudible] answer it. So that's column four, that's where [inaudible] comments.

And then the last column is for you to indicate which [tab and cell] number after survey analysis tool that your comments relate to. And for the first row under the header [of] staff summary of what's discussed in the previous meeting, so that's basically a summary.

And then after that, you can see Kristine and George had provided input there. So, that's pretty much it, and so again, if you want to look at other worksheets developed for the other charter questions, please reference the Wiki page. And we see that Griffin has submitted a comment, and thank you for incorporating them into this Google doc. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Ariel. That was extremely helpful. And one thing that came up on the trademark claims subteam call was a discussion around whether or not we are formulating recommendations at this stage or conclusions. And the staff sense was that we might note areas where there might be perhaps an indication of a possible preliminary recommendation, but this exercise is really more to say whether or not the survey results are assisting in answering this question and how they do so or not.

If we do see anything that seems to be arriving to the level of preliminary recommendation, at least for the claims subteam, then we can do so here. If it's desired, we can call our something that

may seem like a recommendation in some kind of a different formatting or font within that fourth column rather than setting up yet another column, just because that makes the table even more unwieldy than it already is. So, just to note that in case a similar question arises in this discussion.

Without further ado, we'll pass over the summary that staff captured from the last call, but of course, if anybody has anything they wish to add on that first item, the first row, please do put your hand up and let us know. Otherwise, we'll move to Kristine Dorrain's comment, and she's indicated that survey results do help to answer question 5A, particularly subversions two and three.

You'll see her comments there, at least for me, showing up in a pink color, and tab titles and cell numbers. Let me ask if there are any comments, questions relating to Kristine's comments. And I see that George Kirikos is typing, but I don't see any hands up at the moment.

And there's ah and up, here's George Kirikos. Please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

e, I just had a small note to make, that in the yellow text, [there's like] numbers one, two, three, and then four. Presumably one of those should be like [IV] to keep the numbering roman numerals. So it's just a small formatting point that I wanted to point out.

But as for Kristine's comments, I think there was nothing too controversial in them, so I didn't have any comment, negative, positive, with regards to them. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, George Kirikos, for capturing that. Yes, we'll change the four I's to a small I and small V. And then if there are no other comments, let us go to [George's comment.] And we'll ask whoever that was to mute, please. Thank you. And again, you can read George's comment in the document that is unsynced. Let me ask if anybody has any comments concerning George's comments. Or George. We'll turn things over to you, George Kirikos. Please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. Just rereading Kristine's comment, this is a point we discussed in the first call [of the trademark claims,] whether something was considered an unintended consequence or was actually considered an intended consequence.

So, I think for some of these, there's the question of the magnitude, whether the magnitude might be a way to distinguish between whether it was intended or unintended, to kind of avoid that debate. So, that was something that I wanted to mention in this call for those who didn't attend the first call. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, George. And Kristine Dorrain, please.

KRISTENE DORRAIN: Yeah. Thanks. Regarding that same comment [– I think and George got it in his,] so it kind of goes between both mine and his

comments – is this concept of unintended consequence versus a disadvantage. And I think that the two different types of sunrise periods was a compromised position. It was not clear how registries wanted to offer sunrise, and so they were given two different options.

One was largely preferred by most registry operators, but I think the unintended consequence here – and I think George probably hit on it as well – was this idea that people were confused by that and they didn't understand the difference, and then because there were so many TLDs launching sort of simultaneously or within a pretty short window, there was sort of a lot of tracking that had to happen. So we need to recognize that as a possible unintended consequence.

Now, could we mark that down as a thing people have learned and we wouldn't be subject to that confusion again next time? I would argue probably, especially since very few people did at end date sunrise. Most people did at start date sunrise.

But I think it's definitely worth noting in the unintended consequence category as we think about what went well and what didn't go well with sunrise. So that was the only thing I wanted to add there, and I think George and I sort of both hit on it, if maybe from slightly different angles.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Kristine. Then moving on to George Kirikos' comment. Does anybody have anything that they would like to say? Thank you. Greg Shatan, please.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Maybe this is a larger process point. At this point, these are all listed as comments of individuals which – and of course, individuals are entitled to their opinions in this group. The question is -and perhaps I should note if in fact I end up chairing this group, how do we go from individual opinions to consensus opinions, or greater agreement?

This strikes me as just being – there's a number of things here I disagree with, but the question is really whether anybody agrees with them other than George, and whether lack of comment means everyone agrees with them or at least doesn't disagree with them, or is just kind of waiting and seeing what happens.

So it's really kind of a process issue here, and assuming that the process is that if nobody says anything, these are at least creeping towards potential answers of the subgroup, I would object, or I would disagree with the characterization of serious statistical problems, both in this case and the other case.

The survey is [inaudible] and needs to be recognized as such, but that's not a statistical problem. I would also disagree that there's a skewing from corporate-oriented registrars. They are part of the ecosystem. So whether there's more or less of them in this than there is and whether we were intending to have a random sample – which I don't think we were – that we can't come to conclusions on that.

I think, also, that the ideas of – there's unintended negative impacts, again, the question is whether they're intended or not,

and whether they're truly negative or just kind of part of the process.

Of course, if there are no rules and it's the wild west there or positive consequences, I think we need to think – if we're talking about negative impact of policies, we need to think about the negative impact of not having those policies in order to have – but again, that's not anything we're going to get from the data.

And as I said on the last call, we're just trying to analyze the data. We shouldn't go too far afield, but we should understand what we can't conclude from the data.

I won't pick it apart further at this point, but part of that depends on how we're dealing with these individual comments as such. And I know we're going to have some from Griffin, and I'll probably put some in myself as well in my personal capacity. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much. I do have a comment concerning process. But I see George Kirikos, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Simply saying that you disagree that they're statistical problems, that's not very helpful, because I gave very detailed reasons justifying why they were statistical problems. Simply saying, "I disagree" really has no way to respond to that. You could talk about the sample size being too small, you could talk about unrepresentative, which I did, to say that [everything I said] was

correct [inaudible] reasoning. Find the flaw in the reasoning, don't just say, "I disagree" without providing a reason why. Because that doesn't really help the group try to achieve a consensus.

As for the skewing, I think it's pretty obvious. Well, to get a representative sample, you would want to have the registrars in proportion to the actual universe of registrars. You could tell from the results that there was obvious skewing in the sense that registrars that actually benefit from sunrises because they're corporate-oriented, i.e. the MarkMonitors, the CSCs, if those are overrepresented in the survey responses, then that is not going to be applicable to the entire universe of registrars, the GoDaddys, the Tucowsees who have clients that perhaps don't participate in sunrises because they're not geared towards trademark owners and where the cost-benefit analysis is much different because most of their registrants are not going to participate in the sunrises.

So, that needs to be kept in mind. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, George. And I'm going to move to Greg Shatan. And Greg, you are effectively the chair of this group now, so while I've been recognizing speakers, that's really just in a staff capacity as we've been walking through these comments. You're certainly welcome to take over. And anyway, let me turn things over to you for response and let me know if you'd like staff to be running this any differently than we are. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I guess because I'm not really prepared to chair, I was happy to let staff go on for this meeting. And also, grappling with the question of how I can express my views or whether others will express views that are similar to mine and therefore I don't have to do so, that being the other disadvantage of being chair. A chair isn't muzzled. I think there is the idea that the chair primarily sits above the fray most of the time, tries to help straighten things out.

I think I can certainly respond at much greater length as to why I disagree with George's conclusion that there were serious statistical problems, clearly, this was not a survey like one intended to predict who would win a presidential election where you'd need a very large or relatively large group of respondents. It was not designed to be such.

The survey was designed by the group and became what it is under the supervision of the group, and so trying to eliminate it or minimize it ex post facto, I find troublesome. I think that whether this was a relatively small survey and therefore you can't say to 1% - whatever the statistical significant number might be or the level of accuracy [wasn't important,] is not as important in a survey of this type, and I think we're kind of confusing survey types to think that this was ever intended to be kind of a big data-type of exercise.

But we can get into that. Part of the question is if anybody other than George agrees with George. Then we can get into why I disagree, but if nobody [agrees] with George and thinks that – wants to apply his filter or his view to this, then there's really no reason to spend a lot of time rebutting it. So, that's my point there.

And in terms of skewing, again, are we looking at some sort of a population here, looking at what has happened? Not necessarily trying to predict what would happen if every registrar had answered this. I don't think that was ever the intention of this survey.

And in terms of the [all surveys] of all registrars, I think actually a huge number of registrars are actually [inaudible] bots – or not really bots but slaves, so the idea of kind of being representative here is something we'd have to explore. But again, I don't think we're necessarily trying to be representative. We need to take this as we find it. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Greg. And I just wanted to get back to the question, the process question, and with respect to the individual comments which we have here thus far versus [big team] comments or working group comments.

So, at the subteam level, as Kristine Durrain notes in chat, we're trying to analyze the data available. [See if we can] coalesce around some ideas or themes [inaudible] we've got some recommendations or trends that we can point to where we see some level of agreement within the subteam, we could certainly note that, but as Kristine notes, we don't have a method of achieving consensus at this level of deliberation in the subteam or even in the working group. We don't have a way of indicating consensus in the initial report. Consensus is indicated in the final report.

But what we can do is we can reflect the individual or subteam comments, whether or not they're individual or from the full subteam, and that can then be [taken into] consideration by the full working group when these roll up to the full working group.

And to your other question, Greg – and I think [Phil] noted in the chat you are certainly welcome to express your individual thoughts taking off your chair hat. And staff also reiterates that we're happy to run this call as we are currently to assist you.

Now, I have Brian Beckham and David McAuley in the queue. Brian, please. Brian, we cannot hear you.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Okay. I'll try to dial in and [inaudible].

JULIE HEDLUND: Or we can dial out to you. If you want to dial in – we could go to David McAuley while you try to do so.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Julie. I'm just responding to the point you just made about process and individual comments, etc. I'd like to sort of say that in my view, what Kristine said in her pink comments there were rather cogent.

And on the idea of confusion and trying to create some clarification, I'd like to second something that Griffin said in his Word document that he sent around. There was a sentence in there that said there should be a single dedicated and reliable

online resource where sunrise periods are clearly stated and where the timing cannot be changed more than a certain number of days before the intending opening, closing dates.

I though that was a good idea. I don't know, maybe such a source exists today, but I don't know where it is. And it seems to me that that would be valuable, something that showed the TLD, the open date and the close date. It would allow the registry operators to maintain the flexibility they currently have about [using] end date or start date, and 30 days, 60 days, whatever. But it seems like an awfully good idea.

And so in light of your request that we sort of indicate where we stand vis a vis some of these comments, I just wanted to say those two things. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: [inaudible] I can't hear you. Oh, I'm sorry. I was on mute. Brian, was that you joining? If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

BRIAN BECKHAM: That was me, Julie. Just wanted to check before I speak. Can you hear me?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, we can. Thank you so much.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Okay. I just wanted to briefly respond, and I'd welcome Phil and Kathy's thoughts on this in respect to some of the things that have been said, both verbally and in the chat, on the survey. As far as I'm aware, this is a first, surveying registries, registrars, registrants on trademark claims, sunrises, clearinghouse, etc.

And I think if George wants to make criticisms about the survey, if Greg wants to defend that, if people have different views on that, I think that's all well and good. But it is what we have, and so I would suggest that we accept it for an imperfect study, use the data for whatever purposes are useful for our discussions. If people want to make broader comments on the more statistical side of things in the public comments, then I think we would say people are free to do that.

But I just wanted to say it may not be perfect, it's what we have. I don't want to beat a dead horse, but I was one of the opponents of doing surveys in the first place, so I suggested probably a year and a half ago that we're likely to get a lot of repeated anecdotes and information that we already knew. But be that as it may, it's what we have. Let's use it and move on. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Brian. And any other comments on the comments from George Kirikos? I see Mitch Stoltz, you have your hand up.

MITCH STOLTZ: Yes. Thank you. I guess I would suggest that because here the survey is not the only input that we have, it's not the only evidence

or data that we have, so I guess I would suggest that – not that we disregard it entirely, but that we do keep in mind all the limitations that George has pointed out, and that we consider them together with the other information that we have.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mitch. Any other comments? Kathy Kleiman, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Hi. Yeah. Happy new year, everyone. To both Brian and Mitch's comments and Brian's [inaudible], I agree with what Brian said, let's take this Analysis Group survey for what it's worth, which is more discussion. We wanted something from registrants, registries, registrars, trademark owners, more than what we had from the working group members themselves or the people, the community we were hearing from at ICANN meetings that could take the time to come to our meetings.

So, we got some material. We should definitely think about its limitations, but let's keep moving forward. It's more data, more insight, and let's keep pushing forward to see if it helps us shed light on things.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kathy. And I have Greg Shatan. Brian, I also see your hand is still up. Is that a new hand or an old hand? I see that it's gone down. Greg Shatan, please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I would agree with others to say that we shouldn't get bogged down arguing about kind of the methodology issues but just deal with the data. As a process question, I don't remember exactly how the subgroups were chartered or set up, for which I apologize, but were they set up to analyze all of the data and inputs and information available about sunrises, or really just to – or at least primarily to look at the results of the Analysis Group exercise?

JULIE HEDLUND: Before we go to Kristine Dorrain, on that question, actually, the subteams were looking at beginning with the survey data but then moving along to the other data that has been gathered, and seeing how those data might also answer the questions, and then developing some preliminary recommendations based on all of that analysis to suggest to the full working group. And I see Kathy saying plus one to that. Kristine Dorrain, please.

KRISTENE DORRAIN: Hi. Thanks. I wanted to just agree with everything Julie said but add a little bit more to that. That's why, Greg, the documents that we're working off of now, rather than being the raw survey data, is actually focusing on the charter questions.

So if we look at the documents in front of us, we see that what we're doing each week, we're reviewing the data in light of the charter questions so that we're not just randomly like, "Do we like this data, do we don't like this data?"

So we [needed] the survey questions because we were trying to answer the charter questions. And to something I put in the chat earlier, this group is pretty representative. You look down the list of participants, we have registries, registrars, brand owners, and then people representing domain name registrants and the [inaudible] industry, that sort of thing on the call.

We are bringing most of the community's experiences to this call. Are we representative? Am I authorized to speak for registries? No, I'm not, but I'm representative, and I can bring a lot of our anecdotes and our story to this call. So, what we were trying to do is make sure that we weren't just an echo chamber in creating the survey questions, so that's why we were like, "Yeah, we're going to pull in anything new. What else can we gather? What other information could we glean from the community, and how else can we get it? Well, let's put out a survey and see if other people are willing to weigh in."

If nobody's willing to weigh in, we still have us. We're still generally the industry experts. So, we can do this. We can do this PDP without the survey. So we've got a survey. Is it beneficial, is it not? That's kind of the point of this, Greg, and the end of the day, of course, is we're preparing an initial report, which is why the new format is the charter question at the top so we can continually focus our review of all data, survey data, any other data that we can dig up, and bring that to bear on answering [inaudible] charter questions. And to the extent that we can't actually answer the questions with a recommendation, do what SubPro did, which is make some – I think they were questions or issues or something.

So I think that's the point, and to the extent that the survey doesn't answer a question, then we just move along and discuss the next one. That's my understanding, and hopefully, that helps clarify a bit.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Kristine. And George Kirikos, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. Just to go back a little bit, the homework assignment was to look at which cells of the survey, the spreadsheet, support or don't support – answers the various of the charter questions. So if you look at the [fifth column,] in which people aren't really talking about much, that's really the most important part. Those are the raw pieces of data from the survey that people should be referencing in their comments, and so that's what Kristine did and I did. So, I think that's where the focus should ultimately be, which pieces of the survey support or don't support answers to various charter questions. Most of the comments today have been kind of attacking my [asterisk] question talking about the methodology, which is an important point, because you can't really say yes when the methodology was so bad. The survey was really bad. I have a statistical background, so that's why I had the detailed analysis.

So, putting that aside, if you're going to have any use of the survey, you have to [inaudible] from that survey, which Kristine [and I posted when we read Griffin's] comment, but presumably, he has various aspects of the spreadsheet that he wanted to bring to the group's attention.

So, I think [inaudible] of the exercise was to have people go through these spreadsheets in detail and find the various cell references that help us answer the questions. I think that's perhaps the most productive way to move forward, tell us which data you're relying on. And I think we're starting this survey because it's the fresh data that we have, but we're supposed to also look at the other data later on, the blog articles, talking about abuses that happened during the sunrises and so on, because those talk a little bit more about some of the disadvantages that were experienced in the sunrise that weren't captured in this survey, because the survey didn't really ask [sunrise] questions to registrants. Well, normal registrants as opposed to corporate registrants. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, George Kirikos. We have Greg Shatan next, and then staff would like to make the suggestion that we -although it's not in the tool, Griffin did send comments related to this question and subquestions, and we could bring those up and talk through those as well. But Greg Shatan first, please.

GREG SHATAN:

I think we've clarified a bit – which is good – kind of where we're going here. I would not say, as George did, that the survey was bad, because it's only bad if you attach expectations to the survey that were never really attached to it, certainly once it got going.

I think the better thing is to characterize it as taking it for what it's worth, but I don't think it's worthless. And I think hopefully, we'll

move from teasing out what we can from the survey results and then the other data and try to come up with some preliminary recommendations that, while they're not consensus, at least you get traction, as [Thomas Richter] likes to say.

I think hopefully we can avoid too much navel gazing on process. And I think that in the future, maybe we need to define that if we expect a survey to give the kind of results that one would get from a large-scale, expensive survey, that we either conduct that survey or no survey at all, or define up front what the survey that we're conducting is. Otherwise, we just end up talking about how unsatisfactory jockeys are as basketball players when all we did was get a jockey. We never tried to get a basketball player.

In any case, we can move along, and I'll let staff kind of finish out this call at least. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Greg. So, in the chat – so Griffin Barnett was suggesting that we could wait to look at his comments once he's had a chance to put them into the tool, so we could pick up with those next week. And then we're certainly happy to do that. And Christine is also saying that that would be fine as well. So, perhaps we'll go ahead then and pause here and pick up at that point next week, and also as to whether or not there are further comments relating to question five. And we could also tee up the worksheet for the next question as well.

I see that George Kirikos has his hand up. Go ahead, George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, I agree with that. We kind of talked about that at the beginning of the first call that this is perhaps maybe a soft review given that most people are still recovering from the holidays and might not have had a chance to do a full review like Kristine, myself and Griffin did in preparation for this call. So, having people have another week to review things now that they've kind of got a guide from the three of us might be helpful. Then we can go hardcore next week. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, George. Unless there are objections, we'll go ahead and pause here, and we'll pick up on the next call. And a question for homework, for those who have not had a chance to comment on this current question, which is one we've been discussing today, which is question 5A, we can leave this open. We'll unlock the document again for folks to comment. Griffin is willing to put his comments into the tool.

Let me ask my colleague because I don't have it in front of me, Ariel Liang, wah the next question is that we could also have teed up for next week, assuming that we are able to get to that question.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Julie. So, as I mentioned earlier, we do have the sunrise preamble charter question worksheet that has the overarching questions such as [inaudible] serving its intended purpose, [inaudible] unintended effects, and so maybe it's okay that we can go from there, but one caveat is when the survey was

developed, this question wasn't directly included in the Analysis Group's [work in developing] a survey, and the results may help answer this question.

So, we still definitely encourage – well, it's not an encouragement, it's more like the subteam should look into the survey results and see how the data helps answer this preamble charter question. And we'll put the Google sheet in the chat and you can look at it as well.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. And I see David McAuley has his hand up. David, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Julie. Real quick point. And I would request – I believe that staff normally does a very good job of this, but if you could, restate the homework question in an email crisply with a link and which tabs of the spreadsheet we're looking at, whether it's registry and registrars, trademark owners, potential registrants, whatever it might be, in an e-mail that goes out, let's say, by Friday of this week that could draw in some of the people who are in [inaudible] there are any that are not yet on the call. And I'd actually like that e-mail myself, just a crisp statement of the homework assignment. Thanks very much.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, David. We'll be happy to do that. And I think we'll be able to get that out today, or certainly before Friday.

So, thanks again for that suggestion, we'll be sure to include links to documents as well. And noting that my colleague, Ariel – yes, staff will send out homework Google doc to the mailing list indeed.

Thank you very much. Does anybody have anything else that they want to say before we adjourn today's call a little bit early so that folks can get over their eggnog hangovers?

Not seeing any hands up, then I want to thank you all for joining today, and also to those who joined both calls. And again, we hope that you're all enjoying a happy new year, and we'll look forward to talking to you all next week, January 9th at 18:00 UTC. Thanks, Julie.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, everyone, for joining.

JULIE HEDLUND: You can disconnect your lines and have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]