

Working Group to Protect the Rights of Others (PRO) teleconference

3 April 2007

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Working Group to Protect the Rights of Others (PRO) teleconference on 3 April 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made by the Chair, in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio recording is available at:

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/pro-wg-20070403.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

Attendance:

Kristina Rosette - IPC Chair of the working group

Peter Olson - IPC

Lance Griffin - IPC

Kelly Smith - IPC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC vice chair

Margie Milam - Registrar c

David Maher - gTLD Registries c.

ICANN Staff:

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Counsellor

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:

Jon Nevett - Registrar c.

Philip Sheppard - CBUC

Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registries c.

Coordinator: Thank you. The recording is now ready. Please go ahead.

Kristina Rosette: All right, excellent.

Glen, would you be so kind to take the formal roll?

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly, Kristina.

We have got on the call David Maher, registry constituency, Margie Milam, registrar constituency, Peter Olson, IPC, Mike Rodenbaugh, business constituency, Kristina, yourself - and (Mike) is also our Chair - - you are the chair -- Victoria McEvedy, noncommercial users constituency, Liz Williams for staff, Lance Griffin, IPC, and Kelly Smith, IPC.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: ...anyone?

Kristina Rosette: Excellent, that's great.

I had - in the agenda that I had circulated, which was very (bare-bones), the first thing that I put on the agenda was regarding the scheduling of the remaining meetings. Because I understand from Glen that in May, the first two Tuesdays are public holidays in Europe, is that correct?

Glen Desaintgery: That's right, yes.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right. In which case, I think it probably makes more sense to move the meeting. I am assuming that Monday would be least desirable for everyone.

Would anyone have an objection or a conflict if we were to move the meeting in May to Wednesdays instead of Tuesdays?

Man: Wait, Wednesdays at what time?

Kristina Rosette: Well, that's the next point.

Man: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Because I know that previously, we had been meeting at 1900 UTC, is that right, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: That's correct, right.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. And that in line of the time change, what that would essentially mean is for the folks in Europe...

Glen Desaintgery: Europe.

Kristina Rosette: ...which is Liz and Peter, that that is a 9:00 pm call now in line of daylight saving, is that right?

Peter Olson: No.

Kristina Rosette: No?

Peter Olson: No, it's 8 o'clock.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, so...

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, but if it were 19 hours, it would be 9 o'clock.

Kristina Rosette: Nine o'clock.

Peter Olson: Nineteen hours? What is the UTC?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Peter Olson: That's not the UK time?

Liz Williams: And we've got daylight saving now.

(Kristina Rosette: Yes, so you...

Peter Olson: But...

((Crosstalk))

Peter Olson: ...it 1900 in the UK now?

Liz Williams: Seven o'clock, yup.

Peter Olson: Yeah. Okay, but that means, you - the rest of Europe is 8 o'clock, isn't it?

Liz Williams: It's 8 o'clock, yes.

Peter Olson: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

So here is my concern. My understanding was that if we kept the time at 1900 UTC, that would mean that the call then becomes 9:00 pm for Liz and Peter. And if that's not correct, then we don't have an issue. But if that is correct -- and I'm reminding you to let me know -- then I was proposing that we move the call to 1800 UTC.

Peter Olson: So we've gone over to daylight savings time now just like you have. We just went - we were just two weeks behind. So, it's the same as before.

Kristina Rosette: All right. So right now, it is 8:00 pm?

Peter Olson: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: All right. Now, if we...

Glen Desaintgery: And right now...

Kristina Rosette: ...keep our visual time, it would be 9:00 pm, correct?

Liz Williams: That's right.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Then I would suggest that we move - for the month of May, we move the meetings to Wednesdays. And that's for the duration of the working group's existence -- that we switch the official time to 1800 UTC.

Man: Okay. So, just to make sure I got that clear, so the calls would stay on - at Tuesday at 1800 UTC through April and then move to Wednesday at the same time for May?

Kristina Rosette: Correct, correct. With the caveat that - I understand that many of us will actually be unavailable potentially on the first of May. I guess that would take care of the problem. So that would cover the INTA annual meeting conflict as well.

Man: Right, it was moved to the 2nd of May...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Man: ...(that piece of that).

Kristina Rosette: Right, all right.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...public holidays for May Day and for other holidays.

Kristina Rosette: Well, absolutely.

Woman: It's fabulous for us.

Kristina Rosette: Absolutely. So I think that works out well for everyone unless there's an objection I haven't heard.

Peter Olson: Well, for me, I'm still not understanding this. But 1900 UTC, is that 1900 London time?

Man: Nope.

Peter Olson: But I don't think...

Glen Desaintgery: London time isn't UTC anymore.

Peter Olson: Okay, okay. Now I understand it.

Kristina Rosette: All right, so we're good?

Peter Olson: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Man: So, obviously, Glen, you'll send out a revised schedule with the dates
for us all?

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly.

Man: Please? Please? Thank you.

Woman: Just another caveat, Kristina, just to make life even more complicated.

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Woman: We have a drop-dead date for the completion of this work by my
calendar on the 24th of May, which means that the 17th of May the
final report has to be finished so the people have got a week to read
it...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: ...and so that I can - and the reason why this is a drop-dead date for me is that on the 1st of May, I need to post the new TLDs report to the Web site to enable sufficient time for our Web site guys to - I have to send it to be posted...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: ...to Web site guys, and it's going to be a big job for them this time around because it includes all of the inputs from the - this group, from reserved names groups, from the IDN group and from anyone else who thinks they have something to say about it.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Woman: So, it's very, very important that those dates stick because the drop-dead dates for the work of this group sit right across.

And Glen, it's - I think only for the European, the Ascension holidays are the 17th of May. So, I won't be having a break for the Ascension holidays, which are also public holidays which is 17, 18, 19, 20 of May. But I don't think that's going to have any impact on the rest of the group at all.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, all right. I'll go ahead and send around a reminder...

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: ...the Ascension holidays. That'll be - and that's usually a long weekend for Europeans.

Woman: A very long weekend.

Glen Desaintgery: Uh-huh.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Not for this particular European.

Peter Olson: Uh-huh.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Just - but that's (just as a) broader range...

Glen Desaintgery: Sure.

Woman: ...of dates...

Man: So, that means - I mean, that leaves us four meetings this month, including this one, and three next month?

Kristina Rosette: Right. And in fact, we had agreed to submit a draft on the 20th. So, we need...

Woman: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: ...to (really get going).

Woman: Which is a Sunday, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: What?

Woman: Which is a Sunday.

Man: May...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: ...of April.

Woman: I beg your pardon? Of May?

Man: Yeah.

Woman: May 20 is a Sunday.

Kristina Rosette: Right, but we would submit a draft on April 20.

Woman: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Okay, the next item that I had on the agenda is that without naming names, there are several of you that have not yet completed your TLD summary. I have had a fair amount of success at this point rounding up volunteers from the IPC and INTA Internet Committee. And at this point, I just need to know offline. I don't expect anybody to speak up

right now. But for those of you who have outstanding summaries, I really need to have them by, you know, first thing tomorrow morning, or I need an email from you saying that you're not going to be able to do them so that I can make other arrangements to get those done. But to the extent that you haven't submitted it and there's any way you (unintelligible), I would really very much appreciate it.

So that takes care of that agenda item.

Moving on to the survey, which I had expected to spend the bulk of the meeting on, all of you - for those of you who are able to be in Lisbon, we spent the entire meeting coming up with potential questions that we could include in our informal survey that will be distributed in the constituencies and then by the constituencies to each of their members.

I - Mike was very generous and served as scribed that meeting. And I just, you know, did a little cleanup, and that's the version that I circulated.

So, as an initial matter, I know that Liz has made some suggestions. And as I haven't heard from anyone else, I thought that perhaps we could start by just running through those quickly.

And a first suggestion is that we change this to kind of a check-the-box as opposed to encircle. The only concern that I had -- and I don't know if it's a nonissue or not -- is if we distribute this in Word, do we have any concerns or is there any issue that the survey will get changed as it gets distributed? That would be my only reluctance to...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...of course it will.

Kristina, I had a thought about - sorry, would you let me to just interrupt you? Sorry. I didn't mean to do that, but (would like to) just give some background as to why I proposed the changes that I did and then step people through what I think might be the solutions to it.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Woman: Is it all right?

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Woman: I put my academic qualitative-quantitative data collecting hat on when I revised - not revised, when I reviewed this. And there are a couple of things that are really important to me.

Firstly, we haven't been able to submit information correctly. And I thought that it would be sensible to turn this into an interactive PDF form so that people could actually just check a box.

What we want to do is have a (form) (unintelligible) for people who are interested in submitting any information back to us. It takes about four minutes and it is really a click-the-box. And if anyone wants to be - both, then they can type in material into a text format.

One of the challenges that I've got is that I will - imagining that we'll have about 2% response rate to whatever sample size we send out, I

must be able to collect information in a way which enables me to compare likes for like. So - because collecting this kind of information is not very helpful in a random way.

Kristina Rosette: Absolutely.

Woman: So, there are a couple suggestions. One is that document format.

I'll just pull up my email here (of actually) what I said, and I'll go through it quickly just to explain what I meant.

There it is. Sorry.

Here is the problem that people could change the form online just because the Word (unintelligible) that, but the PDF function might resolve that...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: ...and I can do that quite quickly.

I also couldn't see a (unintelligible) to understand who that I'd be responding to.

Now, Kristina, I'm more than happy that they respond to you. But if they're going to respond to anyone, at least be clear that they're going to respond to someone and how they do it.

Kristina Rosette: Right, right. And I left that open simply because I didn't know what kind of structure or capacity there may be administratively, (you know)?

Woman: So, the interesting thing about the administrative capacity is not the administrative capacity at all. It's actually their mechanism to verify information.

So, to kill two birds with one stone, I suggest that people - that we restructure the form and put me, unless someone else is going - to be form collector - they put me as the contact point for people to send information back.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Woman: But I don't care about doing that at all. I mean, that's easy to set up.

The other issue is that we need to explain why information is being collected and the use that we'll put it to. Now, do we want to have - and this is a question for the group: do we want to have anonymous responses?

Kristina Rosette: We have discussed that in the meeting.

And our concern was that on the one hand, if we didn't - if we require people to identify themselves, that we would essentially kind of self-select out in part because we did not have a - we didn't have any information as to what extent we could assure confidentiality. And also the practical matter, when you require somebody to put their name or their company name on something, they're going to think twice about doing it.

On the other hand, without identification, there is a concern about how do you validate, how do you verify, how do you make sure that that somebody from Yahoo, for example, actually was from Yahoo.

And one of the things that I had wanted to get some guidance on was to what extent we can assure confidentiality of the individual responses. I realize that, obviously, that the point is to get the aggregate data. So I'm not as concerned about that. But I didn't know to what extent we could assure respondents that their individual survey forms would remain...

Woman: Well, I think we can solve real fast.

If you are happy - if the group is happy that I receive the responses, then they will remain confidential because I can easily (come up) to anyone what I've received I can make it all up. I mean, I could do that right now without the survey. But I won't do that because that'd be a waste of time.

So we can assure people that the responses that they send in will be confidential, which means that we can probably get better-quality data.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: It still put the onus for me to verify where information comes from. And we've had experience in the past where people have sent forms and just sent in, you know, a bulk response, which really has not been helpful at all to skew results.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: So, I don't have any tolerance for that kind of behavior because it's a waste of time.

So, I'm happy to be the repository of confidential information if it means that we get better results, which I think it will (do).

It (denies those) people also to speak outside their constituency and (it denies) those people to speak. For example, the registry constituency will be pretty constrained in terms of providing a group view on this, and whoever is on here from the registry constituency, correct if I'm wrong. But I would prefer to hear from individual businesses that have had experience with running (unintelligible) and of other (unintelligible) mechanisms to make sure that we get good qualitative and quantitative data.

So, I would prefer that we did it that way so that we can argue that the way (in which we'd ask) information is actually robust and subjective - and objective.

Kristina Rosette: Sure. I mean, our inclination was confidentiality to the extent that we could guarantee it. And based on what you're saying, it sounds that we can do that.

Woman: This week, I'm not (probable), so that'll be what - I'll commit this week.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Woman: The other thing we've got to do -- and I don't know (if the people have caught up) with their email -- that Section 3 of what I said - (a little)

paragraph that said this is being selected for what purpose, the information will be used to assist the group to develop recommendations which the Committee may use (for its ongoing policy development) process.

We cannot make any guarantees that the information will be used in the implementation plan. So the Committee has to consider that and balance that. And then it's all going to end up (in the mess of the accounts) anyway. So, we just need to be clear about why our people are participating.

I also wanted to add a list of PRO Working Group members and add a list of survey recipient so that we could say this survey has gone to one, two, three, four, five, seven, ten, 100 people so we'll know what response, right, we can actually get back.

Kristina Rosette: I guess - and from your initial point, I mean, you can certainly feel free to, you know, revise that little second (internal) paragraph as you think it needs to be done.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: I don't have any qualms about identifying the PRO - the working group members. They're going to have to be identified anyway. But you would just identify names, not email addresses, correct?

Woman: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Woman: Just, you know...

Kristina Rosette: All right...

Woman: Kristina Rosette...

Kristina Rosette: ...all right.

Woman: Because you know, Kristina Rosette (unintelligible) computer blah, blah, blah, whatever.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: Not email addresses so they could be sent.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

I - the only thing I would have a question about -- and I would open this up to the group -- is to what extent it's feasible to think that we can keep track of survey recipients. Because at least kind of my idea behind all these was that we would distribute it to the constituency and, frankly, it will be up to them to distribute it as they (thought best). If they didn't want to distribute it and didn't want to have any of their members complete it, then so be it.

Man: You know, that's fine as far as it goes. Obviously, we want to ask them to distribute to it...

Kristina Rosette: Oh, yeah. Absolutely...

Man: ...all of their members.

Kristina Rosette: ...absolutely. But...

Man: I'm sure they will.

Kristina Rosette: ...there's no way to kind of, you know, I don't want to be in a position of having to ask David to give me a list of, you know, the primary contact people...

Man: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: ...for all the registry constituency. Or even worse, ask (Margie) to get a list of all 800-and-something accredited registrars. And I don't think that's...

Man: Unless those - unless, you know, those folks or anyone else gives a reason why they wouldn't send it out to their constituency, I guess, (is they'll say) that'll just happen.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...these guys that I think that you probably should do for the validity of the work, I think you should also send it to the (CCNSO guys).

Kristina Rosette: Oh sure. Absolutely.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Man: Great. Good idea.

Woman: Yeah, because there've been a bunch of those that have been involved in that kind of work.

Kristina Rosette: Do we need to send it to the GAC (unintelligible)?

Woman: Sure, sensible if you do it. You're going to verify the results anyway, so sensible to do it. If you can no responses, then fine.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: If you don't send it, you will, of course, get no response. So we could do it...

Kristina Rosette: (Right).

Woman: ...in terms of, you know, a comprehensive list.

Kristina Rosette: All right. And Michael will take care of the (RALOs), is that right?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...exactly. (Unintelligible) and take care of all those (tips).

Kristina Rosette: Right.

David Maher: This is David.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

David Maher: I hate to - and - bring in further complexities.

I'm perfectly willing to send the survey to the members of the registry constituency. Some of them have had (sunshine period). I am concerned, though, about the confidentiality or anonymity issue here.

I don't know for sure, but my sense is that there is some confidential information. And Liz, when we trust you and we love you.

Liz Williams: Thank you, David.

David Maher: But the...

Liz Williams: Not that much?

David Maher: Yeah, the lawyer in me tells me that confidentiality nowadays is a very sensitive issue. And it's one thing to send data, say, to an accounting firm where there's a professional obligation to treat information confidentially. But - I appreciate your kind offer, Liz, but I'm not sure that's going to help.

I have a (nagging) suspicion that some of my registry constituency friends will look at this and say, uh-uh, so.

Kristina Rosette: What would we - David, what do you think we would need to have in order to give them the assurance?

David Maher: An accounting firm.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, well, we don't have the resources to some for that or the time.

Woman: David, just go back a step and just tell me again what the concern is again? Sorry, I was listening, but I just didn't get a handle on it.

David Maher: Well, I'm - I can't give you chapter and verse on this, but my...

Woman: Uh-huh.

David Maher: ...suspicion is that for some of the registries that have had a sunshine period, the data asked for by the survey are, I guess, pretty close to home, to sensitive financial matters. And maybe, they won't look at it that way, I might - maybe, I'm (unintelligible), but I guess I know how people tend to be suspicious. That's all.

Kristina Rosette: So, the concern of people, David, as I understand it, first, there's a concern that they - some of these questions would be interpreted as requiring or speaking confidential, you know, business proprietary information...

David Maher: Right.

Kristina Rosette: ...and second, you know, notwithstanding Liz's assurances, and our, you know, our obvious belief in her integrity, that when it comes down to it, she has no fiduciary obligation to maintain a confidentiality?

David Maher: Yeah, sure.

Woman: But that's the other way then, guys. It's - all of that is - as all of that can be said. But the other thing is that we can't expect (that they'll respond). If they don't respond, they don't respond. It's not a question about trusting me or my integrity, it's actually the willingness of those who might respond to these questions. And if I wish to respond, then fine; if I don't, then there's nothing we can do to make them.

Well, we just to treat these survey results as the survey results...

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Woman: ...on (the basis). And frankly, David, I think part of what you've described can be handled if we had another look at the survey and my commentary about Number 5, the qualifying question at the very beginning of what those things are, what the questions are and what they, you know, what they're being asked.

But also, the list is too long. It's too onerous. If...

Man: Yeah.

Woman: ...we want to get people to respond, then it's too difficult for them to do it. Even though this kind of draft is very comprehensive, it's not qualitatively sound and objectively sound, and it's only a list of question. So there's no problem to turn it into something more objective. But not only that, it's too burdensome.

Peter Olson: This is Peter (in Copenhagen). The - there - perhaps there could be a way for the people to opt out of a particular question. Like if they go on to to answer this particular question because it's confidential.

Woman: Of course.

Woman: Yeah, (that's good).

Woman: That's a good idea.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Woman: I'm taking notes of who's speaking, so just keep going.

Man: Yeah, I mean, I was just kind of looking through this and, you know, I'm not sure, if I'm a registry, what in here I would consider remotely proprietary, David. But again, everyone would have the option to simply not answer any or all of the questions. I'm not sure what more we can do, practically speaking, to guarantee confidentiality, so I think we just need to move forward.

Woman: I'm happy to go to the Bahamas after I've received the information if...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Well, you know, if you go to the Caymans, you know, (Frank) is there already so you'd know someone.

Woman: Oh. Then good.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think - I guess one thing though. These questions can be read obviously quite differently if you're a business that owns a domain portfolio or if you're a registry that...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...that holds a domain portfolio for lack...

Kristina Rosette: Right...

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...of a better word. So...

Kristina Rosette: ...right.

Woman: Which certainly, Mike, raises issues of if we have anonymous answers and we don't know from which kind of business or perspective that people are answering the question from, it's not actually quite difficult to discern what people are actually saying. Perhaps they will be come obvious.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah. Well, I'm wondering whether a different survey makes sense for registries and registrars on the one hand and other people on the other...

Woman: It's too hard to collect the information, Mike, and it's - we have to ask the same question of everybody at the sample. And (like I said she's not to answer them or they) answer them in different ways. And that's the job that I need to do to unravel what they've actually said.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Woman: But it's really important to ask consistent questions just for the integrity of the data.

The other thing that I have noticed that we did have is that the survey was going to be sent on one of the dates and we need to determine what that date is...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: ...and when it'll be returned, looking backwards from the draft report and backwards from the (drop-dead date) of the completion of the group.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah. Well, we need to obviously get it out this week and ask for it back within a week.

Woman: I would say in two weeks. Two weeks back, so.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Well, but here's the question that I had.

I think what we (were) trying to do - when we were coming up with the question was to kind of go through the statement of work and try and develop questions that would be targeted to the various areas that that was intended to cover. And I am, you know, obviously more interested in getting more participants than less, but I would certainly welcome the suggestions from anyone on the call as to how we can cut down the number of questions but still make sure that we're covering the type of issues that we're supposed to be covering. So that is really my concern.

I mean, it seems to me that that as kind of a baseline, we have to ask, I would think, just four or five questions minimum just to establish who the survey respondent is in a broad sense.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yup. And I guess also I'm thinking - I hear you, Liz, but I'm not sure that it makes sense to ask everybody the exact the same questions. If you look at some of these questions...

Woman: Yes.

Man: ...they're just not applicable to some parties.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...Mike, if we design two separate surveys, number one , it certainly will not go out this week; and number two, I'll be dealing with two different sets of information. So, what I'd prefer to do is have an option for (list one) wanting to say...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...question doesn't apply.

Kristina Rosette: Right, that's fine.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, okay.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: So which questions, Liz, would you suggest that we eliminate?

Liz Williams: I'm just (trying to) stand up and walk around, have something different to do. Hang on a minute. I'm not back.

If everyone's got it in front of them, we can quickly run through this, and I'd like to see whether we can frame the questions better.

It's unlikely that - if - unless they will wish to -- that they'll identify their business or interest, that they're a member of an ICANN constituency is interesting but not critical, that they are a member of any of them.

And (he asks) opens up more questions (about if they're not than why not). And then we have to start off, you know, helping them to get to (be one).

I like the list at Number 4, but we need to have those tick boxes there...

Kristina Rosette: Right, right.

Liz Williams: ...(in order) do it. And I'm assuming that A-T-T-Y makes - equals attorney.

Karen Eltrich: Right, I was just trying to be short there.

Liz Williams: Yup, that's fine. But I'll have to explain that.

I think -who's the registrars on the call?

Margie Milam: This is Margie. I'm one of the registrars.

Liz Williams: Oh, hi, Margie.

Margie Milam: Hi.

Liz Williams: The Question 5 I think it relates to your things unless, David Maher, that the registry can answer on behalf of the registrar about who actually fill their names.

David Maher: I doubt it.

Liz Williams: Yeah, I doubt it too.

So that means that we need - (there's a) registrar-answerer. We need an answer there. And then, as a registrant, we need those answers...

Kristina Rosette: Right...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...from the Internet community here.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, that's right. We would answer in two capacities there.

Liz Williams: In that case, (unintelligible). If you're registrant, then if A - (5A_ is if you're a registry or registrar. I'm copying as I'm going. And then, B, if you're a registrant or a domain name holder.

Kristina Rosette: Why don't we combine registry and registrant? Because as a practical matter if we're not going to - I mean, we would want to know - and I don't mean specifically as to which registry, but it would be helpful to know from the registry just so that you would put the other data in context.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: Because I think we're now at the point where we've had multiple registry using the same protective mechanism. So it's not the case where we could say, dot-info, this must be affiliate.

Liz Williams: Yup, okay. That's fine.

Kristina Rosette: Or that (unintelligible) this must be affiliate.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Just going through the questions, one of the things that I said in my little notes, if people haven't read it which is likely, I've said in Section 5, we need to (unintelligible) qualify collection - question at the very beginning about (unintelligible) protection mechanisms necessary (unintelligible) introduction. And we need to (unintelligible) these question as an option (unintelligible) of the questions you pose...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: ...because...

Kristina Rosette: No, that's fine. I agree with that (unintelligible).

Liz Williams: ...(unintelligible) towards the presumption of sunrise periods being included. I mean, it's not necessarily the case.

So, that's just me having no particular view other than making sure also there's one that (gives them an) option to present to information that is demonstrating a choice that they might not want to make.

Kristina Rosette: Sure. And I would suggest, unless anyone thinks otherwise, that we insert it between what is currently 4 and 5.

Liz Williams: Yup. So new question. Because, of course, this is going to the NCUC chaps -- and Victoria...

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah.

Liz Williams: ...you're on the phone here.

Victoria McEvedy: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: I would imagine that your lot will have some to say about that.

Victoria McEvedy: Sorry. About - I'm sorry, about what?

Liz Williams: About - the question about whether we think sunrise periods are a good idea at all.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I'm having a bigger - I was just - I'm afraid the reason I wasn't concentrating on that is I'm having a much bigger problem with this whole exercise. And I'm just - was just wondering, I mean, I know I think (unintelligible) which is probably (why I'm having a problem with it). So please, just forgive me if I ask you to go over material you've already discussed, but what - in the process of the - all the exercises, what weight is going to be given to these responses? Because, you know, that means that, obviously, (unintelligible) have to try and get all kinds of this. There could be an awful lot of (weight) for our constituencies to try and balance the business interests. And I also probably need, you know, a very close look at this in terms of the wording because, you know, like any survey, you know, it's pretty well established now the way you ask a question can prompt a particular answer.

So I'm just - I'm really just concerned that the whole exercise and the ways of the exercise in light of, you know, our working objectives and what have you, which (unintelligible) what they are. I mean, and as I said, I apologize for making (unintelligible) this.

Liz Williams: I think, Victoria, I can give you a quick answer. This is straw-poll stuff, It's (unintelligible) stuff. It's not robust, it's not statistically significant. And it is a very nice introduction to a very serious question about the section of rights of others, what ever that might look like.

If you refer to Recommendation - (to take) - just getting my other piece of rubbish. Don't stop, hang on.

Recommendation...

Victoria McEvedy: I mean, you can tell me the point unless - I mean, I don't need to (unintelligible) recommendation. I mean, I trust you. Whatever you're talking about will be...

Liz Williams: Well, it actually helps people to understand it. With respect to Recommendation 3 of the (unintelligible) Report, it says (unintelligible) must not infringe the existing legal rights of others but will recognized or enforce it (under) generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, so - okay, you can - that's sort of proves my exact point. You know, all people who are involved (unintelligible) the world are going to be very, absolutely, you know, how am I suppose to balance that up from our constituency's point of view when this whole exercise is about rights?

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Victoria McEvedy: You know, this whole exercise is a form - it looks like it's about rights, you know? It's not about...

Liz Williams: That was my point.

Victoria McEvedy: How do you feel...

((Crosstalk)).

Victoria McEvedy: (He feels very) strongly about freedom of expression (and now) you're a member of the public, you know? So...

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Victoria McEvedy: ...this is a very (unintelligible) exercise. And I put a mark down there, that I would expect us to have very little (unintelligible) in the work that we're doing generally because the whole premise of this exercise is totally tainted, and I'm trying to - it didn't sound very dramatic.

Kristina Rosette: Yes. And actually, you know, as we've discussed in previous meetings, the ideal here was to make sure that we we're at least getting some public input as to what issue these protected mechanism themselves have generated.

I mean, I think we could all go around the call and say what you (see) - you think they generated. That's not necessarily going to be sufficient.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, okay.

Kristina Rosette: In order to just kind of go out and say, what issue do you think they generated, I think we need to have a context, I mean, in the sense that...

Victoria McEvedy: Just so - okay, in that case, the questions are probably - what I'm saying is, to pick up the other kind of - I don't think this form has the balance -- and that's my fault perhaps for not submitting the list (unintelligible) earlier. But certainly, from my point of view, I can see I need to put some input on to this form to make sure it's a

(unintelligible), balanced exercise and it really is picking up the interest of noncommercial users and pointing things out, you know, (unintelligible) focus to my mind.

And anyway, it's my fault. I could - I'd like to make some input to this form in perhaps (unintelligible) after this call.

Kristina Rosette: Great.

Liz Williams: Victoria, that's terrific. And I think that then it will resonate with you that I said in my notes that - in Section 5 after the qualifier question and the necessity to repeat the question as an option in each of the questions that you raise so that everybody - and I've said that the reader is guided by the choice of questions, and the current question is geared towards the presumption that sunrise periods would be included in the implementation around - for new TLDs. This is not necessarily the case.

So, this is only one set of data. The other set of data, which is really important for me, is the implementation and evaluation report for the new registry operators. And (unintelligible) around quite early in the process.

The NewStar report that related to the sun - their experience with sunrise periods -- excuse me, (yawning) -- so that's actually going to be another set of important input.

I don't think you should get too exercised about ways or about numbers of constituencies or about what's going to happen to it because it's quite a long process to take place to see whether in the

implementation guidelines we would proceed with things that said, let's do it how we've done it before.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, so - okay, thank you. That's helpful.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: So just to recap then, I mean, we were, you know, (we we're divided) into working groups and what have you -- I think I'm on problems analysis group -- and you were saying that apart from the report that we've all submitted and the NewStar report, this is another one of the base materials that is going to go into consideration?

Liz Williams: (Unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. In that case, I think that probably the noncommercial users constituents would probably need to consider and perhaps propose to the group some other raw materials to go into this process because I'm not - I'm just not sure that their concerns are going to be picked up by these exercises, quite frankly, and which is, you know, just because freedom of expression concerns are quite unique.

So perhaps, I can take - there's something I need to take back and then come back again on the (list). And again, these issue are all my own fault and not perhaps (you're) more intimately involved are things develop, (okay)?

Liz Williams: What I'm just going to do, Victoria, whilst you're speaking I'm going to send you the link because you were not part of the group when this was sent around, which is the set of evaluation reports that were done

for a museum (unintelligible). And I'm just going to do that as we're speaking.

(Unintelligible)?

Just keeping going down on the list of questions, the things that I had thought were also interesting, for example, in Section 8, to pick up Victoria's point, do you believe rights protection mechanism should protect rights - about rights - to protect rights of others (than) those listed above? We need to have far more detail about what other kinds of right are - they are rather than just (me) talking (from) geographic designations. But I'll pick that up in the next draft if you send - if anyone wants to send more text.

That's it for me for the moment. Does anyone have any extra bits and pieces that could be taken out more than put in?

Woman: Should we - in terms of eliminating questions, should we aggregate 23 through 26 into a, you know, part of the here's a space for comment, you know? It would be helpful if you would address the following.

Liz Williams: Yup.

What did you say? Twenty-three to 26?

Woman: Yes. Because those are all really, you know, intended to go towards resource allocation.

Liz Williams: Yes.

Woman: And I had a question about some of those characterizations. I mean, I'm not really sure what low, medium or high means in terms of dollars or, you know, effort. And I don't know if you want to qualify that anymore.

Kristina Rosette: I think we kind of went back and forth on this in the meeting simply because it really was all going to be relative, I mean, in the sense that, for example, you know, what (Kelly) or Lance at Intel or Disney will consider to be a low amount of time. It could be, you know, a very high amount of time for a company with, you know, like a portfolio of (different weights).

So - but I definitely see your point. I just - I think I was at a loss. I think we're all at a loss as to how to do that.

Woman: Yeah. Yeah, I could see that. I just don't know how helpful it'll be to have low, medium or high. And perhaps, this is one of those when you put text as opposed to putting in category.

Kristina Rosette: Sure. Well then, maybe we could just lump it in with 23 or 326...

Woman: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: ...as well.

Liz Williams: Well, (since) - (unintelligible) take it out altogether because lumping it together doesn't resolve your problem of actually getting information.

Woman: Well, I think it's probably very useful to know how much time is, you know, either registries or IP holders or registrars spend on this. I mean,

I think that's, you know, probably relevant information. I mean, I don't know about the rest of the group, but...

Woman: So should we - do you think maybe we could just come up with some numbers that we will be comfortable with in term of, you know, what we think would "be considered low"? In other words, low we would replace with less than ten hours and, you know, medium would be, you know, 11 to 25, something like that.

Woman: Yeah, I think that might be more useful from a perspective of a registrant. From a perspective of a registrar that's implementing the process or a registry, that's really not very meaningful.

Woman: Right, exactly.

Woman: But - yeah. I mean, on the registrant front, I think that's probably useful information.

Liz Williams: Is this the right question now? Is time the question or is money the question?

Woman: Well, I think we need to do both.

Woman: We do both.

Liz Williams: Yup, okay.

Man: I think you'd probably combine. Time is money, you know? You know, if we're really looking to cut this down, then we need to start making some choices. Combining those two it would be a pretty easy one.

Also, I'm looking at Number 12. I'm not - (unintelligible) long questions where they need to look at entire lists of TLDs and I don't know if that's going to use very useful either.

I'm just thinking maybe we need to make a little more general, easier-to-digest (solution). Others are suggesting that this is just far too long.

Liz Williams: I'm not concerned about length necessarily, but I am concerned about fatigue (for) respondents. I mean, usually, (it runs down to about) eight to Question 18, to Question 20. And that's to say nothing of the importance of, say, you know, the most important question being at Number 30. But, (you know), it's a really important question, for example, in 12 -- (unintelligible) TLD -- in which you use or try to use the rights protection mechanism ta, ta, ta. I think it's interesting to actually kind of have the comparative data about kinds of registries and that it's useful to ask a comprehensive question. (Thus), for example, is it more likely that people use any of these mechanisms in the generic field compared to a sponsored one? Is the use of the sponsored model a way of minimizing the necessity for defensive registrations for example? And that's quite often, you know, kind of a useful tool and in cracking that particular nut. But if we don't get any evidence that tells us that that's actually the case, then (what's the point of this exercise)?

Man: Right. I agree with that.

Do we just -and we don't really ask that direct question now anywhere. Do you believe that a sponsored TLD is a good way to go to minimize defensive registrations?

Liz Williams: Well, you need to ask the question a different way. You need to say in the experience of sponsored TLD operators, was a stricter registrant verification system more effective in minimizing the needs for defensive registration for example.

Man: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: That's fine. I think 14 can go.

Liz Williams: Just the next one that says disregard the sunrise registration.

Kristina Rosette: So should WHOIS details be mailed (unintelligible) Sunrise registration?

Liz Williams: (So) delete that.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Man: I would leave that one in. It's easy, quick to answer and to be useful. I mean, that has been an issue. Some have had it, some have not. I feel pretty strongly it should be available...

Woman: Yes, so do I.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Man: ...so.

Woman: How about 19? How many defensive registrations they own in each TLD? Is that really useful?

Man: Yeah.

Man: (What do you guys think of that)? Maybe some of these questions designed around, you know, tell us about your portfolio, we're really only looking to find that out from a couple of different constituencies, right? Obviously not the registrars or registries. So maybe, we just handle those differently, Kristina, just to our constituencies, for example, and use that information in our constituency positions and statements.

Kristina Rosette: Well, I mean, I can see your point with regard to registries because they have the (right to reserve a name). But I would have to (bat) that, you know, speaking completely generally and (unintelligible) very blanket generalization, would be very surprised if there were registrars that did not have (to defend) their registration.

Man: Oh, absolutely, the big ones do here. You're right.

Okay, I'm fine of asking them this. I just don't know how much - it would be good to know if the (unintelligible), put it that way.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: Guys, I know that you're struggling with editing things out. Are you - I'm actually hesitating about doing that and actually just getting a really good survey with all the questions you want and seeing what responses you get.

Man: Okay.

Woman: I would prefer that actually. You know, I think people who care about this will fill with it out. And those, frankly, are the people - and, I mean, care about it from whatever their perspective is. And those are the people we need to hear from. If people don't want to fill it out, they don't want to fill it out. We can't make them.

Liz Williams: How do we deal with things like people who (are in a) portfolio of traffic names? Did - what do you call those things?

Woman: Cyber squatters? No, sorry.

Liz Williams: No, no, no, no. Not those guys.

Man: The domainers?

Woman: The domainers?

Liz Williams: The domainers. Sorry, I was trying to think of a politically correct term.

I mean, we have no way of - except in the most...

Man: Oh, they're in here. I mean, they're...

Kristina Rosette: We could (unintelligible) of internet (commerce).

Liz Williams: (Commerce)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: We have seminar business constituency as well.

Liz Williams: Okay. And, I mean, there are obviously people who've been around the place...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Man: Yes.

Liz Williams: ...that are available that we could send it to. But...

Kristina Rosette: Great.

Liz Williams: ...I think it's important that that Question 19 gets answered.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, absolutely.

Man: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, (Liz), this is just kind of design question.

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: Given that we are assuming and expecting constituencies who can afford this on and then it hopefully becomes some of kind of chain letter, is it - will it be possible to design it so that no matter how many times it has been forward it on that it'll still be active?

Liz Williams: I'll have to do a little bit of work on the (PDFs)...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: ...and on (active PDF).

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: One of the downsides - I agree with you Kristina, one of the downsides of this being forwarded is that we struggle with it becoming a chain letter when people attach more importance to it than is really necessary. And I think they'll expect the results. Now - and that has happened in the past. I'll be able to tell where it comes from because there's obviously a track record of particular times of responses. If people have been given instructions about how to fill it in, then I'll see it (unintelligible).

But that's - I think we need to get out as quickly as possible

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...as possible.

Peter Olson: This is Peter (unintelligible).

Why don't you make a Web site where people can key in all the information itself? And then...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Unfortunately at the moment, Pete, Marc Salvatierra is the only person doing really serious Web site stuff, and if I ask him to do anything like a Web-based form, which I have done in the past, he would kill me. So we're going to have to just deal with this, (which is) a very low-level Word-PDF task if it were something that was - unfortunately we haven't had enough time to do it, but I - and I could have done it, you know, several months ago, but we cannot do it now given the time it'll take because there are no resources within ICANN to do it.

Peter Olson: Well, you can outsource it.

Liz Williams: The time it takes to outsourcing and give instructions is the time that we need to actually get it sent out and done.

Peter Olson: Okay, but it just seems that it would compile itself or you get - all the information would be where you wouldn't have to chew it so much.

Liz Williams: Well, then, is anyone going to offer to do that? Can anyone post that?

Man: I mean, we could probably figure out a way to do it, I'm sure, you know? Let me look into that. Let me answer some questions about hosting a survey. You know, I can do it internally, but...

Kristina Rosette: Victoria, will your constituency members have an objection if Yahoo were to host it?

Victoria McEvedy: I (wouldn't have thought so) given that we have a problem with the whole exercise. (The wholeness of it is) going to make you difference. It's going to...

Liz Williams: It's okay.

Man: Well, I mean, we should talk more about that too, Victoria. You know, obviously, we're trying not to have an exercise that people have a problem with conceptually.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah.

Man: So, you know, to the extent you want to try to neutralize this or make it more useful for your constituency, which we need that input, you know, fact is, we just kind of need it now...

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah.

Man: ...we, so.

Victoria McEvedy: Sure, sure. Well, in that case I think we probably - it will probably - it will (unintelligible) then, I guess. But...

Man: Uh-huh.

Victoria McEvedy: ...you know, it depends. I mean, either we're going to decide to input into it and try and neutralize this or we're just going to go with it, it's just going to (one-fit through) the market and we're try and balance by putting more (unintelligible) in some other way. Do you know what I'm saying? So...

Man: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: ...I just haven't decided which. So, it may just...

Man: Or both would be ideal. I mean, you know, more information, the better...

Kristina Rosette: Right, absolutely.

Man: ...so.

Liz Williams: Victoria, I know that I don't need to say this to you especially after last week. But what happens with - the practical effect of balancing very, very diverse diametrically-opposed opinions is something that I'm terribly used to now. And one of the things that's reflected in reports that get publish for public comment I hope that people see that there is a balancing of opinions and there's also a balancing of resources.

You know, we know full well that some constituencies are not as well-resourced as others and we take that into account and we make (a big effort) to ensure that people views are (unintelligible) and (people otherwise have been putting it into a process).

The last thing that the Board will accept are - the last (that the Board) will accept is evidence of (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, okay...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...totally (hit it). (I mean), thank you (for that).

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: That's great.

And I'm sorry, guys, all of you - to all of you. And I'm not trying to be difficult here at all. And I'm - I apologize and I am - to my mind to this (unintelligible) before.

And (of course), you know, my thing is, you know, what I'm saying now is, you know, by having input into that - into this document, we sort of add legitimacy to it and make it into a more balanced exercise, where we might be able just to say, well, let's take those, and here we'd like to submit some more data from the other - do you see what I'm saying? I'm just trying to keep it clean conceptually.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, you're still - you're going to have that opportunity no matter what to present all the data you want.

Victoria McEvedy: I suppose so.

So I'm just - I hadn't really, you know, I haven't (thought through) whether it might be just a (unintelligible) the way it is and say, well, okay, but we'd also like to present other views and here's another way to do this. Or, you know, because (those are) questions I'm going to be a part for - from - for...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, I mean, a lot of them are. And there are lot of noncommercial users...

Victoria McEvedy: But not...

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...with domain portfolios and that have gone through rights protection (mechanisms).

Victoria McEvedy: Well, there are some, but I think there are - I mean, I don't - they're not really the voice that we try to (pick up) here and (unintelligible), you know what I mean?

Kristina Rosette: I would just encourage you to do it soon...

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah. No, I hear you.

Kristina Rosette: ...because we're running out of time and...

Victoria McEvedy: No, I totally hear you, I totally hear you. I'm so sorry.

Liz Williams: Yeah, Victoria, I'd also encourage you to do both and I'm not - because it's very, very important. And I think Mike correct in saying that there are plenty of noncommercial users that have an interest in answering the questions because it has a direct bearing on the (cost of distractions) at the - for the end user. So, if you're going to do it, then I'd really urge you to do both again.

Victoria McEvedy: I think (that right). It will be decided (unintelligible), wouldn't it? (You know), by the (commercial) users.

Liz Williams: I'm a noncommercial user of domain names.

Victoria McEvedy: What's that?

Liz Williams: I'm a noncommercial user of a domain name.

Victoria McEvedy: They're commercial. (Unintelligible) commercial, aren't they?

Liz Williams: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, okay. So, yeah.

Liz Williams: Think about it a bit further.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I'm sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: We need to...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I'm sorry.

Liz Williams: ...for the survey.

Victoria McEvedy: Uh-huh.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. So...

Kristina Rosette: Are there any questions that just absolutely, you know, (anyone on the call) have to come out either because they're pointless, we need to cut it down...

All right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I actually want to add another one.

Kristina Rosette: Get lost. No way.

Woman: All right.

Kristina Rosette: What do you want to add, Mike? I'm not saying you can. I'm just curious. I thought we beat the horse (absolutely - really) dead. But maybe not.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. Well, Number 30, I would like something, you know, long, substituting phishing or malware attack for, you know, an obvious type of squatting Web site or something like that.

I still don't want to give up on some sort of expensive procedure for obvious type of squatting along the ICM Registry proposal, along the lines of that one. You know, I'd like to ask people about it, what they think about it.

Kristina Rosette: Well, frankly, the other thing that we don't have in here is, you know, are there any other mechanisms that people have thought of that haven't been tried?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, or - absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: ...mechanism.

I mean, I had put there somebody's question that - where I put in - on the request of working group members by - that I received by email that I think we could probably, you know, take them out or revise them in such a way so then it's not as skewed.

I tried to think (it was the language a little) but, you know, 35, for example, bothers me as it's worded.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah. I mean, I was just looking - actually, that's the one about gaming, right?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, I really don't like that one, right, because I just don't think - it kind of presumes the answer.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Take it out.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Add instead something specific on the obvious type of squatting. That would be my preference.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

And then, 36, I would again try to prefer to change, you know, trademark owners to...

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's the same as (30).

Kristina Rosette: ...prior rights owners because that could be anything, frankly. And that's where we're getting at. We're not talking about just trademarks.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thirty-six is just - there are so many different ways you can look at that question, you know? Who are the trademark owners...

Kristina Rosette: Well, that's why we were suggesting that we replace trademark owners with prior rights owners. And then, frankly, I don't really understand what that...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: ...is trying to get at.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I would just take 36 out...

Kristina Rosette: All right, out, gone.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...because the whole issue is that the system is being (unintelligible). Everybody is a trademark owner.

Kristina Rosette: All right, anyone else? Any other questions?

I know that we're not really as, you know, obviously, from the noncommercial perspective and the registrar and registry - and frankly, I think that was just a function of who attended the working group meeting. And certainly, I know that to the extent that there are other questions that need to go in here...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, well...

Kristina Rosette: And we're actually running short of time.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Could I just suggest a way in which we can capture the things that people actually want with another version tomorrow...

Kristina Rosette: Sure, absolutely.

Liz Williams: ...that you'll - will you take control of that or what - because what I need to do then is once I've got the list of questions (stable), then I have to turn it to a format that (I can actually use it).

Kristina Rosette: All right, so let me just to make sure that I'm clear. You want me to just find out what questions people want eliminated or what questions people want amalgamated?

Liz Williams: Yup, by close of business or whatever time you decide, then everyone needs to send in, you know, take out, put in, do whatever, and then send another version around, say, this is the version upon which the survey will be developed.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...gives Victoria...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: ...will...

Liz Williams: ...catch up too.

Kristina Rosette: Right. But you will - I don't - I mean, I'm happy to try and reword the questions in a way that I think makes them more neutral.

Liz Williams: No, you don't have to. I could do that.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Right, right.

Liz Williams: All I want is a (stable) set of questions.

Kristina Rosette: Sure, absolutely.

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: I'm just, you know, and kind of historically in this group, people have been pretty nonresponsive to email. And I think that'll just be my - part of my meeting summary.

Liz Williams: Yup, okay.

Kristina Rosette: I mean, I will get this report done, and if people don't participate then there's nothing that I can do about that.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: But it will be done.

So, okay. No, absolutely.

So let me just kind of run through it just so that I can tell people in this covering email what it is that we talked about eliminating and what we talked about changing.

First, that it would be kind of a PDF form. It will be identified as (responses to) be sent to Liz. We're going to assure confidentiality, request identification, give them two weeks to comply.

As of right now, we're going to eliminate Questions 1 through 3. We will add in between what is currently 4 and 5 a question about, you know, are rights protection mechanisms necessary in the introduction of TLDs.

What if we ended up deciding on 21 and 22? This is the one about, you know, characterize the average amount of time -- low, medium, high.

Liz Williams: Margie had ideas there.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Margie Milam: I think instead of actually putting categories, just let them have it in a freeform whether you put in content.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Woman: All right.

Kristina Rosette: Twenty-three through 26 would be kind of amalgamated into a kind of short box at the end. Is that the best place structurally to put that, Liz, to kind of put this kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: ...at the end?

Liz Williams: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Thirty-five and 36 will come out.

Should we move with - should we move - well, I guess, we can talk about order tomorrow. Like, for example, I was thinking 29 should be reworded and then moved to after the, you know, are rights protection mechanisms necessary.

Liz Williams: You don't have to worry about ordering, Kristina. I can do the logic of that later on.

Kristina Rosette: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...there has to be logical slides through the survey.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

All right, you will have that.

Let's see. Who is farthest along?

Peter, what time is it there? Nine o'clock pm?

Peter Olson: Yeah.

Man: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: All right, why do we say - let me just make sure I'm not going to commit - (give a final) to you when I already have a meeting or (another call), you know?

Liz, I will have something to you by 3:00 pm tomorrow - 3:00 pm my time.

Liz Williams: Your time?

Kristina Rosette: Right. So 24 hours from now.

Liz Williams: Cool.

Kristina Rosette: Unless you think that you need it sooner.

Liz Williams: Well, obviously, (unintelligible), but it's okay.

Kristina Rosette: No, no, no. I'm just talking kind of realistically.

Liz Williams: Yeah, sure

Kristina Rosette: And I'm getting a little concerned about time at this point.

Liz Williams: Yup. Then let's set the expectation for when it will be sent out.

I'll have to work with Glen to make sure it's distributed in all the right places because she has got (automatic) listed - lists that are comprehensive.

Kristina Rosette: Perfect.

Liz Williams: Let's aim for that.

Well, of course, Friday is Easter - is Good Friday, so...

Kristina Rosette: Right, and then Easter Monday. (And that's)...

Liz Williams: Yup. So we're just going to be a bit lost there. So let's try to get it out on the 10th...

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Liz Williams: ...because there is some designing and some narrative that needs to go out a little bit better.

Kristina Rosette: Right. And I think we should still work towards having a draft on the 20th, although, I guess, Margie and Mike, I'll email with you separately. Maybe we should kind of coordinate about what we can realistically get

done because that, you know, obviously, there's going to be a lot of placeholders. And they go from there.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: And I would just, you know, encourage everyone. I'm really curious. I mean, we will have a report done and I certainly have no interest in having it be, you know, completed by only certain categories of stakeholders. But people need to start - if they want to participate, they need to start participating now.

Victoria McEvedy: I hear you.

Kristina Rosette: I mean, Victoria, I don't mean it that way. It's everybody.

Victoria McEvedy: No.

Kristina Rosette: I mean, there are a lot of people who are working group members that haven't been on the call in weeks and, you know, that's obviously their prerogative. But, you know, at a certain point, that obviously kind of tempers the way (to their vote). So...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Kristina Rosette: All right. Well, thank you, everyone, as always.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh, just one last question.

So is it worthwhile for me to try to figure out whether we could host the survey for ICANN or is that just a waste of time and a (nonstarter?)

Liz Williams: You know what, Mike, don't worry about it. It's going to delay things.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Liz Williams: Yeah, but I do appreciate the effort.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Maybe somewhere else down the line. Okay.

Liz Williams: Thanks.

Kristina Rosette: All right...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks.

Kristina Rosette: ...thank you, everyone.

Woman: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: ...have a good evening and day.

Woman: Bye.

END