

**ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Data
Wednesday, 06 June 2018 at 17:00 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/gns0/gns0-rpm-review-data-06jun18-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5lozwx59jj/>

Attendance of the call is on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/FysFBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Andrea Glandon: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Sub Team for Data call held on Wednesday, the 6th of June, 2018 at 1700 UTC.

On today's call we have Susan Payne, Kristine Dorrain, Greg Rafert, Philip Corwin, Rebecca Tushnet and we have Brian Beckham who is on the audio only. We have apologies from Lori Schulman. From staff we have Ariel Liang, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Mary Wong, and myself, Andrea Glandon.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Andrea. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thanks, everyone, for joining. So the agenda today is to discuss the proposed survey questions and suggested changes by Analysis Group. And just to note, this is the opportunity for Analysis Group, who are on the call as our guests, to present the draft surveys and to in particular call out the comments and questions that they have for the sub team and for the sub team to also review the material.

We do note the short timeframe to – for the sub team to review the material prior to this call. But we do hope that we can – that staff and the Analysis Group can help to make this a productive session. And because we don't have a particular chair for the subgroup, staff would like to suggest that I could chair if that's okay with subgroup members. And then obviously turn it over to the Analysis Group to run through the surveys.

But let me ask if there are any objections to staff facilitating as chair or we are happy to have one of the members of the sub team chair, but we do realize with the short timeframe in getting materials out and so on, it might be easier if staff chaired. And I'm not seeing any hands up and I'm seeing no objection from Kristine, thank you, and no objection from Susan. Thank you very much.

And so we're going to suggest – oh I'm seeing people are having trouble hearing me. Is this better, talking louder? Let me just ask that. A little better. Susan says yes. Okay, I'm afraid I'm on the Adobe Connect audio but I'll talk a little more loudly. I did have difficulty connecting by phone.

So anyway I hope this is better and staff would like to suggest that we pull up the draft surveys in their clean form since the redlined form seems quite difficult to follow. And those also do contain comments from the – from Analysis Group.

And the order, as it appeared in the table of surveys that was also in the RFP appendix, is registry operators, registrars, trademark brand owners and potential registrants. And we'll go ahead and put that order here just so that you all can see it.

And okay, and Kristine is saying we can adjust the mic volume in Adobe Connect so maybe I will try to do that as well.

So we have the registry operator survey up. And we have it un-synced at this point so that you can all move it as you like. I'm going to see if we can – if you want to make it a little bit smaller then we can try to go to the comments.

Now unfortunately I see that the comments do not appear – do not seem to appear here in the PDF. There is the highlighting where some items are highlighted. So but I do see that Phil is asking, "Shouldn't we be looking at the redline so we can see how AG has proposed to change our questions?"

And so the comments would need – so, okay, let me ask this because Phil's raised the question first. What is the preference of the sub team? To go through the – to go through the comments, I'm sorry, to go through the surveys as redline or as clean versions? And staff is working on producing the PDF version where the comments show because we really do need to have that.

There's a special way you have to save it in PDF for that to work. And Mary is noting that staff did think it would be easier to review the clean versions for this call but I can say that the redline versions are quite difficult to read through.

Are there – is there anybody who's concerned about looking at the – Kristine, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, thanks. This is Kristine. And I'm not trying to belabor the point about not having time to review but I think this is one of our concerns is that we needed the opportunity to really look at what was added and review those redlines. So my purpose is I don't know if will help everyone else, I do think looking at the redline is very helpful. And so what I've done is I have the luxury of two screens and so I've opened the redline up on one of my screens and I have Adobe Connect up on the other.

So I mean, I guess we could sort of let, you know, decide if everybody has that luxury and if not then I propose that we look at the redline because I think what I'm seeing from at least the first page now that I've had a chance to actually open this, I think it's very important to find out why some of these changes were made and what the intent was of some of these changes.

And I know that I'm going back and asking myself, is that a question that we had originally asked or if that's a newer added question and there's just no way to know that unless you're looking at a redline. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Kristine, that's really helpful. So what here is go ahead and pull up the redline version so it's in Adobe Connect. We did provide all of the clean and redline versions to the list this morning and so we, you know, we could also – we could also ask if you wanted to it might be easier for sub team members to also try pulling up the document themselves but we're uploading it right now as you may see. So it should be coming up.

I'm noting just in the chat, while the document is coming up, that Greg and Stacey from Analysis Group could develop a – they say they could develop a separate document that shows how many changes were made to the sub team questions. And Susan notes that the redline is challenging but we need to look at it. And Kristine is saying I'm not sure we need any additional documents at this point.

So on your screen now, and many thanks Ariel, is the redline version of the registry operator survey. And you can adjust your screens point. Greg and Stacey might I ask you if you want to go ahead and start walking through the changes that you made and why you made them?

Greg Rafert: Yes, this is Greg speaking for the record. I'd be happy to start doing that. So this is obviously the registry operator survey. I mean, I think at a really high level the changes we made were to – where possible kind of move away from open ended questions.

Some of those just became kind of simple, multiple choice; others we converted to what's called kind of like a five point liker scale. We – if we identified any potentially kind of leading language we attempted to change that. We also attempted to simplify some of the language so that it was hopefully a little bit more easily understandable at times.

And then there were – just to begin reducing kind of a relatively large number of questions, there were some questions that the Data Sub Team had developed that we're proposing basically be removed from the survey. I think at a really high level those are the changes that we implemented in both the registry operator survey but across all of the other surveys so for the different groups.

I think in looking at this first page of the survey that hopefully everyone has up now, you also see text in brackets basically at the end of I think almost question or in most questions. Those are essentially kind of coding instructions for when we move the survey to being an online survey and out of this Word document.

So for example, when it says brackets open text field, that's going to be an area where someone can just type essentially whatever they would like to type. Hopefully it's relevant to the question at hand.

There are also – you'll see on this first page there are some brackets that say, multiple choice, yes, no, no, don't know, not sure is the options. There they'll be required to select one option and only one option. And then as we move down the survey you'll see some other questions where the options are a little bit different and we can talk about those as we get to them.

Let me pause there and see one, Stacey, if you have anything to add that I missed that's kind of for the high level overview and then if there's any questions before we move on?

Stacey Chan: No, I think that pretty much summarizes is. So you all notice that we've moved away from the grid style and turned it into more continuous kind of document style.

In that process at times, I was going to mention, we did take out some of the open ended anecdotal questions. We tried to keep as many of those in as possible but there are instances where we kept in the data style questions which were easily yes, no, or a numeric response and dropped the adjoining explanation.

And so if those are important questions and you would really strongly prefer that we include those then, you know, we're open to that conversation.

Greg Rafert: And I think what we'll...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Greg, just to let you know Kristine, I'm sorry, Kristine Dorrain has – Kristine please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, thanks. This is Kristine. I have a question. It's unclear from the redline, I see where you've said like, you know, it's a numeric field or a text field, are any questions required or is every single question optional?

Greg Rafert: So we can code it either way. I would typically require that the questions be answered, that's, you know, pretty standard survey practice and so that's at least what I would suggest. But we could allow them to skip questions as well.

Julie Hedlund: It's Julie Hedlund.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. Can I ask a follow up please?

Greg Rafert: Yes of course.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay thank you. Then I'm wondering if – and maybe I'm diving in too soon, but the first question, "What registry operate" is asking the registry operator to identify themselves sort of like what's your company?

(Unintelligible) you mean what's your company name because some people have – operate different registries under different names so I'm not entirely sure what you're expecting to get in that field. You're asking people to self-identify so this will not be an anonymous survey; is that the intent?

Greg Rafert: I think – so we can certainly remove the question. Our intent there was, you know, it's nice to know a little bit about the respondent so we, you know, for example, if larger registry operators tended to answer the survey differently than smaller registry operators. And so that's kind of the intent of asking you know, what – essentially what's the you know, what's the name of the registry operator.

But if you think that will cause concern among registry operators, then that question could be removed or they could – we could also indicate in the question that, you know, if you're willing to identify yourself, please do so but you don't have to answer it and you could leave the text field blank.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay and one more follow up, then. Thank you. This is Kristine. I'm unable to answer the question because I've literally just seen it and I need to think about it for a minute. But what – I would – my initial gut reaction is that that should be an optional question and we'd want to word it to be really – we want to word it to be clear because when I see what registry do you operate, internally at Amazon we actually call each of our TLDs its own registry.

And so even though our company is Amazon Registry Services, the name of the business that operates our TLDs, we would possibly like, you know, think

that that meant what are the – which – for which TLDs are you the registry operator?

So I think the question needs to be tweaked a little bit, I don't know exactly what it is yet but I think I'm going to suggest that we tweak that. Thank you and I'll allow someone else to speak. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: And this is Kathy. I'm on audio only. I'd like to join the queue.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy. Go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Kathy Kleiman for anybody I haven't met on the call. So question, Greg, are you going to be keeping a separate list of the registries, especially if this field becomes anonymous? Hypothetically you could wind up say with 50 Donuts registries which are similar to what Kristine just mentioned, you know, Donuts has a different name for every one of them. Some of them are really fun too.

So how do – what kinds of lists are you reporting to us the working group, the public, versus the kind that you're keeping in the background?

Greg Rafert: Yes, that's a good question and actually I think it's in – that kind of gets to one of the questions or kind of the notes that we had actually I think in the first comment in this document which is, you know, our understanding is that there's interest in getting, you know, at least a decent amount of the raw survey data that comes out of this and sharing it with the Data Sub Team. But, you know, I think some individuals, for example, registry operators, might want to remain – at least have their name remain confidential.

And so that was one question we had for the sub team was, you know, are you okay getting essentially an anonymized set of responses from individuals where we don't indicate who actually completed the survey? And it sounds like the answer probably will be yes but just wanted to confirm.

Julie Hedlund: And just to note, we have also Phil and then Susan in the queue.

Kathy Kleiman: And then Kathy back in the queue. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Phil, please go ahead. Phil, if you're speaking we are not hearing you.

Phil Corwin: Sorry. Now I'm off mute. Phil again for the record. Two comments. One, I would hope registries wouldn't want to be anonymous but if they are – if they don't answer Question 1 so be it. But I think we have to make it clear that if there's any question a respondent doesn't want to ask – doesn't want to answer, we're still going to count their other answers.

We don't want something like the INTA survey where nearly complete surveys are rejected because one or two questions were skipped for some reason. We should, you know, factor that into the weight we give answers if there's some question that the respondents choose not to answer that should be noted but we shouldn't require every single question to be answered for the response to be put into the mix.

And I think for operators like portfolio operators whether it's Donuts, Uni Registry, Minds+Machines, whoever, there should be one questionnaire going to them – I presume they have the same policy for all their domains unless there's some specialty domain with restricted access and we don't want one registry operator sending back 200 or 300 responses and giving that disproportionate weight. Those were my thoughts. Thank you.

Greg Rafert: And this is Greg. Just really quickly, I agree with both of those points and I think in terms of allowing people to skip questions what we'll do for many of these questions and maybe all of them, so for example, in Question 5, instead of yes, no, don't know, not sure, we'll just add an additional option which is prefer not to answer and they can just click that and then go to the next question if they'd like to.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. And I have Susan and then Kathy.

Susan Payne: Yes, hi. It's Susan. I think perhaps the answer to some of this might depend on how the registry operator selection is planned to be effected. And what I mean by that is, if you're going to invite specific registries to respond to the survey, then it perhaps doesn't matter quite so much if they decide they don't want to identify themselves or identify the nature of their registries for want of a better description.

But if you were, for example, just planning to kind of issue a bulk invitation to all registry operators of new gTLDs or via the Registry Stakeholder Group or something like that, then it becomes more challenging and there needs to be a bit more clarity than in the instructions that go out saying things like only, you know, only complete this once for all of your registries.

And weeding out people that we've discussed on the last call, we didn't want to be answering this survey, which would be the brand TLDs in particular, just simply because they don't operate sunrise services and it's not, you know, this isn't aimed for them wearing their brand TLD hat.

Now so again, if we were going down that path of just kind of bulk inviting anyone to complete the survey, then there's more reason for needing them to kind of identify who they are and if they don't want to be identified by name then we might need some other question that says just something like kind of what kind of registry you operate.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry, coming off mute. Following up on what Susan just said, if they're not going to answer the question of who they are, and following up to what Greg said about the value of knowing if they're large or small, is this – are we

looking – is our survey response looking at the policies of one registry or really the policies of 200?

If we make the field optional for, you know, for who are you, then can we make it mandatory for do you operate more than 10 registries, for example, so that we do know that the answer to that question, are you large or small, are we looking at a one shop field or are we looking at something across many registries? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. And there's no one in the queue at the moment.

Greg Rafert: Okay. I mean, I think it would be useful but of course I guess we'd be interested in what the Data Sub Team thinks, I think it would be useful to have that kind of question of, you know, essentially kind of how many TLDs are operating so we can have a little bit of an understanding as to how, yes, and, yes, and so I think that will be useful to include and as Stacey was noting, it's Question 2 up there.

But if you – I guess if there's concern that individuals might for whatever reason not want to answer that kind of question, and then would drop out of taking the survey, that would be useful to understand.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And Kristine, you are in the queue. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. Kristine Dorrain for the record. Yes, I agree with what Kathy said, I mean, I think there is, I mean, obviously we do want some demographic data. And I think when it says "approximately how many TLDs do you operate?" And then you ask them to provide a total number, I think that's a little bit incongruous because if you're going to ask them to type it in theoretically they're going to put an exact number.

I think maybe what you could do in order to kind of make people – I mean, Amazon's 52, right? No one else operates 52. If I write 52, you're going to know who responded to that survey, right?

So it might be useful to identify four or five bands kind of by taking a look at how many are operated by various people and then have, you know, 100 or more, 50-100, you know, and then here could be smaller bands, 1-2, 3-5, I mean, because here's a lot of clutter in the fewer category. And there's not much in the larger category.

So I think you could have a dropdown there with bands and then that would let us classify answers by large registries tend to say, medium registries tend to say, small registries or micro registries or whatever. And then I haven't got this far yet but I'm hoping we're asking a brand TLD, do you operate any brands? You know, you can kind of screen by that too. So I do support the idea of maybe having a dropdown there rather than a text box. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: This is Greg. I think that's a very good suggestion so we'll revise that question to accommodate for the dropdown field.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. So there's no one in the queue. And I'll just, you know, this is all extremely helpful, this back and forth and staff is trying to note all these things as well to capture them. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: Great. Thank you. I think what we'll plan on doing for each of the surveys that we go through today we'll focus largely on kind of the comment bubbles that we've inserted as well as a couple of areas where we could potentially use a little bit of help or information from the Data Sub Team. But as we're going through the survey please feel free to stop us and ask us any questions about the specific questions in the survey.

So on the first page, it's comment bubble 2, one thing we wanted to raise as a possibility given the current length of the survey, it's relatively long, is the

idea of splitting the survey into two parts and asking some subset of registries to respond to one of those parties and the other subset of registries to respond to the other set just to make the survey a little bit shorter and you know, kind of down side of that is obviously we wouldn't be getting the complete set of responses from each registry but we might get more responses in total. And so wanted, so there are obviously kind of pros and cons to that approach and just wanted to get your all's input on that idea.

Julie Hedlund: And I see Susan with her hand up. Please go ahead Susan.

Susan Payne: Sorry. Sorry, lost my mic. I can understand why you're suggesting that, Greg, and I think there's – I think that might be welcome to respondents. But I don't think we're going to have a big enough pool of registry operators if it's one registry operator, I don't think we're going to have a big enough pool to do that.

We already had a discussion about whether there were even 50 and, you know, if you then do half and half, you know, how valid is the – are the responses if, you know, only kind of 10 or so people answer or 10 or so registries answer each half of the survey. I'm assuming they're not all going to answer.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. And Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. Yes, I agree with Susan. And I think I mean, looking at both Question 3 and Question 4, so you say, do you operate restricted TLDs, which is an undefined term, restricted TLDs is not an ICANN term, so no one's going to know what that means.

And then we say, Question 4, how many of your TLDs are community geo restricted terms, etcetera, so excuse me, you've already got two questions in there about restrictions.

I suggest here what you might want to do is say, "Of the TLDs that you operate, you know, what percentage would you say approximately are, you know, community-related, geo-related, restricted by eligible terms, brand?" you know, we can come up – we had probably etcetera in there because we wanted to come back and think about what the categories might be.

But we were interested in figuring out if the TLDs for – if someone says, I have – operate two TLDs and they're both geo, then their answers might be really – they might really struggle with a specific aspect of the RPMs.

Maybe they are – we ask some questions later about the way the sunrise period worked and then whether or not there was enough sort of – the – not the QLP but I'm having a hard time formulating my thoughts today – but the sort of the prelaunch founder's type programs for geo who wanted to have more options.

So there are some things that we think are specific to specific types of TLDs, there are some concerns that we think specific types of TLDs have and we're trying to get at that. And so by asking people to sort of self-identify how many of them are community, geo, restricted, etcetera, I think that that was what we were trying to get at there.

I don't think we want to send separate surveys to people. I agree with Susan on that. But I think we can parse the data once we have it a little bit better and, okay, I'll stop.

Greg Rafert: No, that's helpful background. So we'll revise those questions accordingly as well. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. And there's no one in the queue so back to you, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Great. Thank you. So I don't think we really have much in the way of comments or requests until we get to the top of the third page of the survey.

But I'll kind of slowly scroll down there and if there are any questions before Question 12, please just feel free to jump in. Sounds like there aren't – oh, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: No, Greg, just noting there's no hands up so please go ahead.

Greg Rafert: Great, thank you. So Question 12 is the question that begins with, "Would you support an ICANN policy that require registry operators to publish their reserve name lists." And we have – they can answer yes, no, or don't know, unsure. If they say no, there was a question as to why they didn't.

And we were hoping, I think we had one option that the sub team had put together which was such a publication would violate local laws. And we were hoping that there could be additional options that we would provide there but we were not aware of those exactly would be.

So if it's easy for anyone on the phone call, either now or after the call, can send us some options, that would be great. If not, I think we would just want to convert this question into essentially an open text field where they would type why not or their response to why not.

Julie Hedlund: And, Greg, Susan Payne has her hand up. Susan.

Susan Payne: Sorry, actually I had my hand up about a previous section, previous bit. I wanted to put it up just as you said let's go onto 12. So perhaps if anyone has anything they want to say in relation to 12 we could do that first, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Susan, I'm not seeing any other hands so please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Okay. All right well so apologies then, but I'm going to drag us back to I think it's the bottom of Page 2, I think, and there are various questions about numbers of sunrise registrations and pricing for sunrise registrations, which have been deleted and Stacey Chan has made the comment that questioned

whether registry operators would know this and also that the data would be probably too sensitive to get responses. Now of course these may have been deleted but moved somewhere else, and I'm, you know, this is kind of the first time I'm looking at this.

But I mean, this was – I think whilst I agree, I mean, I think we – when we were asking this we knew that it was quite sensitive. I mean, this is kind of the point of the survey is to seek to elicit some information about numbers of sunrise registrations and pricing. So I just – I'm not sure what the point is if we take all of this out.

Stacey Chan: So thanks, Susan. This is Stacey. So we did remove those I think I understand your concern and the interest in at least trying to collect the information. We certainly can. This was a result I think of us just trying to find places where the survey could potentially be shortened. And it seemed like this – those questions were – had high potential for being dropped just because the expected response rate was low.

When we worked on the TMCH review and we were requesting this kind of data from registry operators explicitly it was very difficult to have them share that with us on an individual basis even with promises of how the data would be protected. So it seemed like asking for that type of information through a survey instrument in this style would be unlikely to elicit responses.

Greg Rafert: And it also – I think another concern of ours was that it could also just lead to higher dropout of respondents as they were going through the survey.

Stacey Chan: Right. Right.

Susan Payne: Can I reply? And I mean, I guess I, you know, I completely understand that. I mean, that's, you know, having said that I had reservations at the this whole exercise from the outset, I mean, that's one of them is that, you know, it seems to me that we're attempting to get information which has been

attempted and failed. But at the same time, you know, these are things that we as a group you know, wanted to have.

Now maybe we won't get things like premium pricing but some of the questions about the one that was numbered 16 about having received complaints about your pricing levels or something like that or, you know, some of the higher numbers of that bunch that have been deleted, I mean, I just – as I say, I mean, I think this was the point of the survey and I'm just not sure why we're doing it.

Greg Rafert: No that's helpful. And, you know, we're certainly willing you know, to add questions like that back in. I think one of the purposes of this call and kind of our, you know, future interactions with all of you is to make sure that we're, you know, really asking the right set of questions and so we're certainly amenable to adding it back in, you know, with the caveat that there are – it does raise some kind of potential issues with the types of responses we'll get an respondent dropout.

Julie Hedlund: And I see Kristine has her hand up. Please go ahead, Kristina.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. Kristine Dorrain for the transcript. I fully support everything Susan said and I'm not going to repeat it. I wanted to simply mention also that one of the reasons why these Questions 11 through, I guess, 21 that are stricken, we know they're long, we know they're complicated and we know the survey was going to be really, really kind of Draconian with them, but we are open to rewording suggestions or other ways to sort of try to get at that same data. So you know, so when you say oh, yes, if you feel strongly we can add them back in, I think our working group also equally wants to work with you to see that the questions are worded in a way that might lead to answers.

I agree with Susan in that I also did not want to ask a bunch of these questions on a personal level, but have disagreed and committed with as we call it at Amazon, with the group and determine that we were going to answer

them – or ask them, and I think we do need to find some way to get this type of sunrise information.

If you look at specifically the deleted Question 17, “Regardless of your answers above, do you have suggestions for other polices that would have made sunrise more effective and balanced and protecting brand owners’ rights in your TLDs?”

I know that the anecdotal questions are tough but we want the people in the trenches to not only give us some data but also give us feedback, what could have been done differently? If we are going to launch a next round, and all likelihood we are, you know, what should we do differently? If sunrise was Draconian and egregious for you, give us the data.

But even if you can't give us the data, tell us what was awful, or at a minimum, tell us what you would do differently. People have – these gTLD registry operators have really great suggestions about stuff that they – ideas they've had and ways that they could come up with to try to fix the problems and this is our way of trying to gather it.

So I'm encouraging you to kind of read deeper into our questions and trying to figure out what we can pull as far as learning the knowledge from the people that have participated and lived through all of this.

I have a follow up question, and I don't even know if this for Julie or who, but, you know, we've skipped all of Page 2, and maybe I missed it at the beginning, what's our plan for going through this line by line and kind of tweaking? For instance, under the new Question 6, I think, “Do you offer premium pricing for names in the TMCH?”

Registry operators don't know what names are in the TMCH. They offer premium pricing but the registries don't know what names are in the TMCH. So the wording of the question is odd.

What's the best way that we as a group are going to fix this? Is that what tomorrow's call is about? So I'm really sorry to take us back to a purely administrative question. But those are my two points. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Kristine. And this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Really we want to make this as useful for the sub team members as possible and we didn't really mean to suggest any particular approach. And if we – if it's helpful to go line by line or just to – and I think Greg was starting to do that – and just letting sub team members bring up any issues that they note, like the one you just mentioned, I think that's an excellent approach. I think we are going to easily fill up the time both today and tomorrow at this rate so we do – and probably making sure we're thorough as possible is a good way to go.

So perhaps then we can go back to this page, at least go back to the note that you just raised with respect to Question 7. And so also then you would suggest not adding in the text for names in the TMCH? Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes thank you. This is Kristine. Well then in that case I need to back up even further because when we – if we do a lumped together Question 3 and Question 4, which is sort of I think my suggestion which doesn't have to be taken, but how many – what percentage of your TLDs were community, geo, restricted by eligibility terms, brand, and in that case you would also want to lump in Q 5, IDN TLDs.

And then we have the question of any second level domains and IDN scripts, which I can't remember why we have that; it seems odd, but I'll have to go back and look at my notes. And then if nobody else has any other questions, seeing no other hands, with questions up to the new Q6, then yes, I'm suggesting that we need to not say “for names in the Trademark Clearinghouse” because the registry operators won't know if they names in the Trademark Clearinghouse. I don't know if anybody else has any questions or thoughts about how we could word them?

What I really wish I had in front of me, and I don't, is like our original table because I have – and maybe there can be a link in the chat. But I'd like to compare that to what we originally had in the table and how it was linked to some of the other questions to figure out if that was sort of like a – like a transitional set of questions that – what we're building on and I'm not entirely sure if what we were going for there. Anyone else feel free to jump in, but I'm reading off here on Q6.

Greg Rafert: Yes, and that's all very helpful feedback by the way, and I think to one of your earlier points, we'll be sure to go back and add in any questions that we did remove like the ones that we were just discussing because I think that was very helpful background; I totally understand that and agree with that. I'd also say that you know, or certainly I think as we're going through it it's really also very helpful to get these kind of line edits for specific questions to the extent that after this call there are others, we're also happy to get kind of, you know, redlines sent our way so that we can integrate them into the survey instruments as well.

I will note, just on Q7, the original bullet in the Appendix A so, "Did you offer premium pricing," and then in parentheses, "during sunrise for names in the TMCH?" but we would...

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, I think I misspoke. This is Kristine. I said Q6; I think that's Q7, yes.

Greg Rafert: Okay yes. Yes, so we would definitely welcome any kind of revisions to that language from the group.

Julie Hedlund: And, Greg, there's no hands up right now so maybe if you want to just proceed then to Question 8 and go question by question that might be the right approach.

Greg Rafert: That sounds good. So maybe what – if this works for everyone, I'll just kind of call out question numbers and pause to let everyone review the question and then if there are any suggested changes we can discuss them. Yes, and so Question 8 is just on average were you sunrise prices higher than your standard general availability prices?

And I'll note, I think this question was designed to kind of address the question – or at least one of the questions that we removed where we actually asked them for this sunrise pricing. So this question could in theory I think be removed once we add in the other question.

Julie Hedlund: And, Greg, I'm not seeing any hands up.

Greg Rafert: Great. Yes and then there's kind of a follow up to Question 8 which is Question 8A, which you know, if your prices were higher, kind of during the sunrise, you know, what's kind of the kind of on average how much higher were your sunrise prices as opposed to the general availability prices.

Which once again, could get removed if we add in a specific question where we actually asked them what their sunrise prices were, or we could keep both. We might be – people might be a little bit more likely to answer the current Question 8 than 8A.

Not seeing any hands up, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Great, thank you. Question 9, "Did you take any steps to avoid overlap between premium pricing and sunrise registrations?" And then if they said, "Yes," there's once again a follow up which is Question 9A.

Julie Hedlund: And Kristine has her hand up.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine Dorrain. I am – I guess that we didn't write this, again, because it kind of goes back to the same – it kind of goes back to that

same Question 7 about premium pricing for names in the Clearinghouse. Because you can't – registry operator has to establish premium pricing before it launches and or, you know, at some point before a domain name is sold and the sunrise registration has happened after the domain name is purchased, right?

And so you can set your sunrise pricing and you can set your premium pricing but again the registry operator doesn't know what is in the Trademark Clearinghouse when it sets the pricing even when it picks and chooses – even if it picked and choose domain names, even if it picked and chose brand names to set at premium pricing, it wouldn't know if those names would be eligible for sunrise registrations because it wouldn't know if they were in the Trademark Clearinghouse. So the question itself is not going to be answerable by a registry operator.

I would like to get more information about what it is – apparently you were maybe trying to sort of amalgamate some of the other questions into this, so what were you thinking or hoping to get with this question or maybe someone else can weigh in on what they think we could pull out of this question. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And thanks, Kristine. Susan has her hand up. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Hi, yes. And I'm sort of agreeing with Kristine at – and also sort of disagreeing. I agree that I think the registry operator you're correct that they don't know what's in the Trademark Clearinghouse, but I think this may – may be some kind of amalgamation of some of the questions we were asking originally about what did the registry do if they received complaints about their sunrise pricing or, you know, that they had set a name as premium that turned out to be a brand name.

And that might be a deliberate thing, you know, in the sense of there are plenty of famous trademarks which it's inconceivable that they were set at

premium without knowledge of the brands. But there are also, you know, equally it could be inadvertent.

And so I think maybe this is – this is how some of our attempts to get to that information have ended up being slightly reworded. Probably some of the stuff in the section that's directly above that Question 9 I think but I'm not – I'll defer to Stacey.

Stacey Chan: Yes, thank you. So this is Stacey. So this question actually is a question that we took directly from the appendix so RFP, I'm not sure if anyone has that open but it is in the first row of the survey for registry operators under anecdotal questions and it was phrased as, "What steps did you take to avoid overlap between premium pricing and sunrise registrations? If so, how did that work?"

So I'm not sure if whoever drafted that question is on the call and might be able to also explain what the logic was behind the question.

Julie Hedlund: I see that Kristine has her hand up. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. Yes, these were all drafted by committees, so – and no one person drafted them but this is was my section, which is probably why I'm speaking up the most on this section. This was the result – if you look at all the anecdotes it was a series of questions going from, you know, there was pricing, there was sunrise pricing, there was incidences where brand domains or brand names were marked as premium and what we're trying to get at there, and that's – I'm trying to refresh my recollection here, and it's hard to do in real time, I apologize, we want to know about the – did the registry operator consciously try to avoid any situations where they inadvertently priced domain names – inadvertently priced brand names as premium names?

Now, it's kind of the reverse because there are people in this group and people in the community who have made the frequent allegation that some registry operators targeted brand names for premium pricing and I'm not going to opine on that.

But there – so we agreed as a group that nobody was going to raise their hand and say, yes, I targeted brands with my premium pricing, we just – we just decided that was not going to happen. So what we thought we would do is try to come at it from the back way and ask about sort of set up – set the stage for sunrise pricing, premium pricing and then hey, if you noticed that there was kind of a potential for a problem, did you do anything to try to mitigate that?

And one of the reasons we thought we would answer that question and why it was listed as anecdotal is because we thought that that solutions that registry operators might have come up with to solve that problem would be something that we could take into account as a full, you know, under advisement for the full working group.

This could be great. That as I recall, and others on the call correct me if I'm wrong, but that I believe is how we got there. And unfortunately, again, to the point, 11-21 condensed down into just the new Question 9, that's the problem I think here.

So I don't know how to get at all of that in a new question or a new two questions, but that's sort of the back history and maybe that will help you guys as you're kind of re-crafting these. And it looks like Susan might be agreeing with me but I know she's perfectly capable of jumping on the call if she doesn't. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much. Greg, there's no one in queue at the moment.

Greg Rafert: Okay, no and that's really helpful background. So thanks, we can definitely take a stab at re-crafting either that question or a couple of questions to get at that point so thank you.

And I think with that we can go now down to Question 10, which begins with, "Did you check to see if your reserve name list..." and I'll see if we have any thoughts or questions on that question?

Julie Hedlund: Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. I really hope other people will join the call and participate, not just me. Or equally I expect everyone else to just talk all the time when it's your section, just so you know. Question 10, this could actually be a precursor to what is currently Question 9.

So if you did to see if your reserve names list inadvertently – or premium names list, you know, you could merge right, reserve names or premium names, either list included trademark names, so once you get to yes or no, if you say yes I did check, then you – possibly as a better segue, "Did you take steps to avoid overlap between premium pricing and sunrise registrations?"

And you could even ask another follow up, you know, I mean, it could relate to reserve names also like, you know, why would you reserve a trademarked name and then maybe let them answer.

Some people may have reserved them or allegedly reserved them in any case, so that they could, you know, make sure that the trademark owner didn't get cyber squatted. So there's, you know, there's some ways I think maybe to merge Question 9 and Question 10 there that I'm thinking about. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: Great, no thank you. That's very helpful.

Julie Hedlund: No one's in queue, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Great. We'll now go to Question 11, which begins with, "Did you receive," sorry, "reserve name for political or legal reasons?" And there's also two follow ups to Question 11 in 11A and 11B.

Julie Hedlund: No hands are up.

Greg Rafert: Great. We'll then move down...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And I take that back, Kristine's hand is up.

Greg Rafert: Great.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine. I'm afraid you're not going to get off that easily. Question 11, did you – when you – and I know that this is one question I think that we had and you just sort of copied right from the list, because I haven't seen ahead yet, I know that we get down later to the reservation or the use of names – excuse me – like geo or city TLDs for political or public policy type reasons specific to the use of the TLD. Do you happen to know is that a separate section or did you intend to sort of included that up here?

The reason I ask is because as the registry operator is reading through this, they may – I'm specifically thinking for those of us on the call who knows what Maxim's concerns are, Maxim is very concerned about you know, geos not being able to get like police and fire and some of those other words, you know, because they were in the Trademark Clearinghouse list or something and were not able to reserve those in the sort of initial launch period.

And so there – the person taking the survey, the survey respondent, might confuse this question with a question related to sort of an attempt to use

these names for community purposes as part of the purpose of the TLD. So I'm just a little bit concerned that the taker of the survey might misinterpret this question given that I know that we've got some questions coming up about the geo names and that sort of thing. Any thoughts or – there about how that might be related?

Greg Rafert: So this is Greg. I can certainly see why there would be confusion based on what you were just saying and that makes a lot of sense. We do have at least one question later about – or with respect to the community and geo TLDs, it's Question 22 in the survey. I mean, I think what I'm hearing here is we just need to be – I think we need to kind of take a shot at – or kind of take a stab at revising the language in Question 11 just to make it clearer to the respondent but I'm happy to discuss other alternatives.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, this is Kristine again. I don't know – maybe just to paraphrase, I don't think we need to make it specific to a respondent just I think we need to make it clear here that this is not – this is not the same as the reserve names question. But even furthermore, if possible or should we consider I guess and I haven't seen ahead to what did you say it was Question 21 or something, is it possible or should we actually lump those two questions together? I mean, I don't know.

Yes, I'm looking at maybe 23 as – yes. Is there any rationale, yes or no, I don't know, for lumping 11 and 23 together since they are kind of related similarly you've got your mindset going on the legal and political, maybe, maybe not, maybe it would be confusing. So I'm just literally brainstorming right here.

Greg Rafert: No, that's great. And I don't have a definitive answer at least for the moment but we will consider that. That's a good idea.

Julie Hedlund: No hands are up.

Greg Rafert: Great. I think we'll now move to Question 12, which begins with, "Would you support an ICANN policy..." And here we did take the – this language I think is taken from the Appendix A language. And I guess one thing just to note is – it seems at least technical to me and so I want to make sure that registry operators who are taking this survey will understand the language as it's been written here.

Julie Hedlund: Kathy has her hand up. Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, the first few times I read this question it almost required word – sorry, this is nitpicking but required is past tense and it made me think that this is a policy that already exists versus one that would exist. I don't know if there's a way to clarify that a little bit, but if people are going to be scanning these things, that might help. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: Yes, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Greg, did you want to finish responding? I'm sorry.

Greg Rafert: No, I'm complete but thank you for asking.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay. This is Kristine Dorrain. I, yes, I think you just copied this right off our lit and that's fine. I wonder if now that we've had a chance to think back, I know not everyone is on the call. Some of us, including myself, also agree that the, you know, reference to a modification to Section 1.3.3 of Spec 1 of the RA is sort of too much in the weeds and no one's ever really going to look that up and by the way, I don't know that anybody really cares how it happens if they think that registry operators should publish their reserve names lists, I don't know that anybody cares to how; they just care that it does happen.

It may be something worth just taking a temperature tomorrow, anyone on the call, if the group feels good about walking that back. I don't think we had a full consensus on whether that specific comment should be there, and it's possible that given time that people that felt strongly that it should be there may decide that it shouldn't or not, I can't speak for the group.

But I think we definitely need to add that to the list of things that we review internally. So for staff taking notes, could you make a note that we need to discuss that internally and see if our temperature has changed on that specific addition to Question 12? Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kristine. And noted for staff. No other hands are up, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Okay, thank you. I think with that we'll move to Question 13, which begins with, "Would you support a requirement to offer domain names on the reserve lists?" And then we also have follow ups here with open text fields to ask individuals why they either said they would or they would not support that.

Julie Hedlund: I'm not seeing any hands. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Great, thank you. So we'll move to Question 14 then, which begins with, "Would you support a requirement to notify brand owners when a reserve name matching a TMCH entry is sold to a third party?"

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy. I have a question.

Julie Hedlund: Is that somebody trying to speak?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, this is Kathy.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Didn't we say that – didn't Kristine say that, legitimately so, that registry operators wouldn't know when a reserve name matches a TMCH entry? So is Question 14 kind of in the category of impossible? More a question I think to our sub team than to others than to you, Greg.

Greg Rafert: Yes, no that's a good question. And it was on my mind as well.

Julie Hedlund: And Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, this is Kristine. I think – good point, Kathy, I appreciate the catch. I think in this case what we're really talking about is sort of a quasi-perpetual claims period. So what I think we're talking about here is that in some cases registry operators will have a reserve name list and once that reserve – and after the claims period is completely over, the allegation is that registry operators will sell reserve names but now the reserve names are no longer subject to the claims period. And so the brand owner never gets notified when that domain name is sold.

And so I think what they're saying is essentially rather than a claims period being linked to the TLD launch, the claims period essentially becomes linked to a specific domain name. So from a certain period from when a reserve name is then now sold or put out there, then it would be – when you take it off the reserve name list you have to offer it, but I think when you just sell it to a third party you don't have to notify the brand owner. And I think that that is the sort of gap that this specific question is trying to address, if that answers your question. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, sorry, my brain's kind of hurting on this one, but thank you for the explanation, Kristine. If we're trying to do a policy question through – I think we should make it a lot clearer because I don't – I didn't understand this question and I'm not sure others will either.

If we are talking about kind of a perpetual trademark claims question, I'm not sure this is the place or the way to ask it. I think that may be other, you know, it sounds like a question that could come from the working group in the introductory report, in the initial report. But I think here it's going to be very confusing. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kathy. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. You know, I appreciate that, that thought, Kathy. I think with probably as with every question, opportunities for improvement in the wording. I think this wording is fairly close to what we actually came up with as a group. And noting that we may have been dissatisfied with this wording originally.

I will say from a registry operator perspective, I don't think this would be a confusing question. I do understand that maybe for registrants or for, you know, other piece, that it might be a confusing question, and I think we're going to ask a similar question to brand owners, and so I think we definitely want to flag it and make sure that brand owners really understand the underlying background of why this question is being asked because I agree with you that I think that the average person is not going to understand it.

But I think in this specific instance, registry operator will understand this specific question, though I'm definitely happy to work on some rewording to make it a little more clear if you guys think it's important. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Kristine, again, if the registry operator doesn't know what's in the TMCH how do they know – how would they – how can they support a requirement for them to do things, a question directed to registries, for them to notify brand owners when a reserve name...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: ...something on the reserve list? They can't...

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, Kathy, I read the question to say, "Would you support a requirement to notify?" I didn't read it that the registry operator had to. I mean, this kind of done by the claims service automatically and because the – I think the theory would be like it could be all done, you know, electronically or whatever, I mean, I don't know that we're trying to decide the how at this point; I think we're just discussing if such a thing is theoretically possible the registry operator doesn't have to know what the – doesn't have to know what's in the Trademark Clearinghouse to comply with this, because the registrar who does know what's in the Trademark Clearinghouse and does ping the Clearinghouse would know when a domain name is sold off of the reserve list.

And so likely there could be some plugging and playing of, you know, EPP codes or some magic that I don't fully understand. So I take your point and I do agree that perhaps we maybe need to clarify that make sure people reading the question shouldn't get bogged down on the how.

But what would, you know, I think what we're trying to get at here is we want to now both registry operators – what they would think of that as a policy or as a suggestion and then like I said, I think we're going to ask other parties later the same question so we're trying to give everybody the chance to say, you know, if we make this policy recommendation, what do you think of that?

Does that help a little or you still think it should be waited – you know, we should wait until the public comment period to get that?

Kathy Kleiman: I think there should be a public comment period but if you're saying this is an original question then I'll go through it. I think a lot of people probably won't answer it because of kind of the levels of complexity, but we (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: So thank you for that for both of you. I'm going to suggest in the interest of time that we move along. Kathy, if you have any suggested rewording for this question if we do want to keep it in we'll certainly welcome that as well. Over to you, Greg.

Stacey Chan: Thanks. This is Stacey, so I'll be driving for a little bit here. This next section is on focuses on the questions about the sunrise period length, so if you're following along in the original appendix, this is on Page 3, answering the charter question, "Does the current 30-day minimum sunrise period serve its intended purpose?" etcetera.

So the first question is, "Did you run any sunrise period for longer than," I'm having...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Rafert: Sixty days...

((Crosstalk))

Stacey Chan: ...60 days?

Greg Rafert: Yes.

Stacey Chan: And the respondent can answer yes, no, or I'm not sure. And the follow up question is, "If yes, then for how long were you running that sunrise period?"

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Stacey. I see hands up from Kathy and Kristine. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Old hand. I'll take it down. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Vicky, this is Kristine. Why did you change the number from the original team question from 30 to 60 days...

((Crosstalk))

Kristine Dorrain: ...period is 30 days so why did you change it for longer than 60? Thank you.

Greg Rafert: You know, that's an excellent question. I'm not sure. I actually think that it should be 30 days.

Stacey Chan: Yes, I agree. This is Stacey.

Greg Rafert: Yes, I think it was a small error that crept in so apologies for that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Go ahead; no hands. I think Kathy's hand – Kathy, if you could put your hand down, I think it's an old hand.

Stacey Chan: Okay thank you. The next question, I think we've converted a question, so the question now reads, "How likely do you think a 30-day sunrise period is to have the following outcomes?" And we suggested a few outcomes. We are definitely open to and hoping that this group might have a few other suggestions.

This question, I'm scanning the appendix to try and see which question it was intended to replace. I think this was intended to get at the questions about do you think the 30-day minimum sunrise period is effective in preventing cybersquatting? Which is why "prevents cybersquatting" is the first option.

And, let's see, I think if the group is interested in other consequences that registry operators perceive to be related to the sunrise period that's what the other options are intended to get at.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine. I mean, I have to study this, my initial reaction is it took me a minute, "How likely do you think a 30-day sunrise period is to have the following outcomes?" because the current sunrise period minimum is 30 days, I think that the question itself needs to be clarified. You know, something along the lines of, does the current 30-day minimum sunrise period you know, blah.

And then – and maybe even forecast to the survey respondent that you're going to also ask them the same questions for a longer than 30-day period just so they know like why they're being asked because you're trying to get at is it better or worse to lengthen the sunrise period.

So then you can go to the next one and say, if sunrise period is mandatorily longer than 30 days, how likely is this outcome supposed to be? And I don't – I'm looking – trying to skim ahead to 19, "Explain the ranking you provided." Okay. So that could explain like, you know, people might say well 40 days would be fine or 60 days would be fine but, you know, a sunrise period longer than 30 days could be unlimited; it could be, you know, 120 days or 365 days or 1000 days. I mean, the answer will be different depending on what number longer than 30 it is.

And the problem is, is that your survey respondent is not going to – they're all going to have different ideas, you know, some people will in their mind think 60; some people will think 90; some people will think 120. And I think you're going to have to control for that and figure out like give them some sort of parameters to think about before they can answer Question 17. So I think the questions on Q17 and Q16 need to be reworded and I haven't had a chance to dig into the actual table yet.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. There's no other hands up, Stacey.

Stacey Chan: Thanks. Thanks, Kristine. I appreciate that feedback, that's really helpful. Do you think that it would be helpful on Question 17 for us to suggest a length of time for the respondent to be thinking about or alternatively we could insert a question asking them what they think the ideal length for a sunrise period would be? And then...

((Crosstalk))

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. I think some registry operators will say zero if you ask, which is fine but just so you know. And I think – and this is maybe even to Michael Graham's point in the chat about the – I don't even know like how complicated this would be as a survey, but if for each of these answers if they were allowed to rank on a scale of 1-5 for 30 day, you know, some period between 31 and 90, some period from 91-120, just some random, I mean, just obviously put an outside and then sort of see if there's a distribution of people that think, you know, small, medium or large are better or worse or whatever.

I think there could be possibility and then it wouldn't require two tables, but again that would be beyond my specific technological expertise of survey design. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kristine. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: So this is Kathy. Could you tell us what the original question was and also did you add the term "prevent cybersquatting"? And after that I'll stay in the queue. Thanks.

Stacey Chan: Sure. This is Stacey. So the question that I'm seeing in the original draft is, "Do you think the 30-day minimum sunrise period is effective in preventing cybersquatting?" With the follow up of, "Why or why not?" There are also questions focused on periods longer than 30 days, so there's a question that reads, "If you run any sunrise period for longer than 30 days," so that would

be limited to respondents who offered a longer sunrise period, “what were the benefits to the registry or to brand owners? What were the drawbacks? Were there any complaints or was anyone confused?” And then in parentheses, “Include complaints from potential non brand owner registrants.”

Kathy Kleiman: So a lot of it has been excluded, hasn't it? Including complaints from non-brand owner, non-brand owners. So this seems – I don't know kind of the balance that was in the original question doesn't seem to be reflected now in Q16 and Q17 because the sunrise period is a benefit for some, a burden, a technical burden for some, a registration burden for some. So I don't see that balance now reflected for both registries, registrars, registrants, trademark owners in these new versions. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you, this is Kristine. Yes, I agree with Kathy. I do appreciate your efforts to sort of quantify what we were trying to get at in looking at our original questions, they were extremely open ended and vague and looking for sort of detailed – descriptive, you know, textual answers. I think that to the extent that we, you know, you recommend that we have a way to categorize or enumerate, and I do believe that this working group would support any time we can gather data not just textual answers.

So maybe we can have a, you know, when we do meet as a group, maybe we – this can be another one of our action items to look back and actually walk through these suggested – these suggested – I don't even know – elements I guess, and determine, you know, if this really – if this does sort of address the concerns that we had listed in our more open ended questions, and if we need to add or edit, then at least the group can do that together as a group because I agree with Kathy, what you've done I think is a good effort but I don't think it's captured necessarily the full range of our concerns. And I think we want to make sure that we're not accidentally leaving something on

the table by going from the vague to the definitive, if that's even possible.

Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Kathy, you have your hand up still, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, so procedurally, and, you know, obviously this is with my co-chair hat off because I don't know (unintelligible), procedurally, you know, how do we do this in the tight timeframe? Do we recommend that Q16 and 17 kind of be deleted in their current format because it would take too long to revise it and because what comes back may not be helpful to the policy making process because it's not a complete and balanced set of inquiries that we're going after. Or do we have the time to go back and play with this?

And my sense is the latter, that we don't. So do we recommend that something that we have some serious concerns about just be deleted from the current survey and especially with policy implications, it might be something we can separately include in the initial report that we'll be putting out for Phase 1.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kathy. This is Julie Hedlund from staff, just putting myself in queue to answer your question. And I see Kristine has her hand up too. But just procedurally, the intent was that the sub team would finalize these questions with Analysis Group, which is what we're hoping to be doing now, and in tomorrow's call, and then Analysis Group would send the final version of the survey to the working group really just as a preview. We were not anticipating editing sessions back at the working group level; the working group was anticipating to accept what the sub team has produced with Analysis Group.

But please go ahead, Kristine, as well.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, this is Kristine. And I am mindful of making sure that we try to stay on task here, but I'm not – I like – so I like the fact that we're trying to quantify

this and I do understand that it could take time to – a day or half a, you know, on that call to try to solidify what modification looks like.

But, I mean, and we do have the questions that were deleted, but they are really open ended and really vague and I think that we have the potential to get some good data if we turn these into a dropdown or whatever this format is.

I would really strongly prefer to add a day, add a call and work through it if it's possible because I think, you know, what's the biggest pushback that everybody's gotten is we don't have numbers, we don't have data, we don't have any data. And anyplace we can take and we've asked the Analysis Group to do this, we've asked them to help us quantify some of these more textual questions.

And so if we can turn some of these questions into a more, you know, analytical, numbers-driven question, then I think we're going to win.

I'm happy to spend some time today trying to come up with some language and circulate it but I think we're all going to have to commit to doing homework and maybe even one more call but I really think we should try to get this question right because this is really important, we don't have good data about, you know, what the effect of a 30-day sunrise or longer is.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. So we do have a call, another 90-minute call tomorrow and really then, you know, we had anticipated sending the results to Analysis Group, you know, the combination of all of this sub team's comments to Analysis Group by this Friday.

If we do want to extend and had – add at least one more call and given that we are really only just four pages into one of the surveys, I think it seems, without a lot of homework, as you mentioned, Kristine, homework, it's hard to see how we would be able to complete everything by tomorrow.

And so that begs the question as to whether or not if we extend then we're going to have to consider what that does to the timeline and for – and in particular for Analysis Group to be able to meet what was, you know, what was the deadline that was given to them which was to have the surveys ready to go out the week of June – on June 20.

So just some of those things there. And we're really looking at six minutes left on this scheduled call. But I see you have your hand up, Kristine, and I see also Kathy has her hand up as well.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I, yes, I completely understand and I feel, you know, I feel bad, Julie, even suggesting it, but – and I think Susan started out the call pointing it out, but I don't think that we can sacrifice the quality of this survey.

We have clamored and clamored and clamored for some data because all we're doing is making decisions at this point off of people's stories. And so what is the point of doing all of this if we can't get some actual data? It's not point putting out a half-baked survey just to meet the timeline.

And I understand the pressure of the timelines. I agree with Susan, we've both pressed the timeline issue. But I don't think this is the place to cut the corner; I just don't think so. Maybe we need to hustle and have more calls, but I don't think we can cut on the survey. And I'll stop there. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And thank you, Kristine. I see Phil has his hand up but I just wanted to add, and I apologize, staff did not suggest cutting corners or not, you know, not, you know, working to make these questions better.

We're just struggling to try to see how we can do that within the timeline unless we get guidance from the, you know, co-chairs that we, you know,

change the timeline and send the surveys out, you know, at a later date. But let me go ahead and defer to Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, Julie. Let me start out by asking the question, in terms of timeline, is there a contractual requirement that Analysis Group get this out by a certain date? What are we dealing with contractually in terms of flexibility on this?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Phil. So part of what was in our fee was a timeline. And so, yes, to, you know, to an extent we've been – we've given direction to Analysis Group to do the work within a certain period of time. We – and I think that we can change that but that doesn't mean that we give Analysis Group of course less time to do what they're doing. That means that we change the timeline in a way that they get the same amount of time that they need to do the work and the timeline itself gets extended. We do have some wording in the contract about flexibility.

So that's why staff has been making the point that if the original timeline says that we, you know, want to have the survey out by the end of June, but say we add a week to the process, then that – and then we have to consider whether or not, you know, we release the survey during ICANN 62.

I think now we were talking about them going out before ICANN 62, or whether or not we release the survey in the beginning of July. But then we would not get the survey results back by the beginning of August according to the timeline.

So and that's for the working group to, you know, the sub team and working group and the co-chairs to decide whether or not we make that shift. And I see...

Phil Corwin: Okay, let me suggest this, and, you know, it shouldn't be given any particular weight because I'm a co-chair, but we did get the redlines just a few hours

before this call, which made for this call there was very little advance opportunity for people to review them. I think you know, we don't want to slip by much but I think if we need a couple extra days to make sure, given the importance of this survey, to making final decisions and the fact that ICANN is allocated a substantial amount of money to take this survey at our request, with the Council signing off on that, we don't want it going out half-baked.

So I would suggest, you know, and I plan to spend an hour or so going over the redlines after this call, identifying the questions that I really think need to be addressed in further discussion.

Maybe tomorrow instead of 90 minutes we can go two hours and maybe if we have to we can schedule a Friday call as well and get as much done – maybe we can finish this week on this review with Analysis Group if they're available for that call. Maybe we have to go a little bit into next week.

But so I basically I'm saying let's do the homework, let's add some extra time on the phone with the Analysis Group to get this finished as quickly as possible but try to finish before the weekend and if not, we may have to add an extra call or two early next week. We want to give everyone a chance for feedback on this to make sure it's right but we don't want to, you know, go over by weeks.

So I don't know what people think of that but those are my thoughts because obviously we can't spend 90 minutes on four pages when we have five different surveys to review. So we need to do this thoroughly but in a somewhat more expedited manner. Thanks. Those are my thoughts.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Phil. And I see Greg and Stacey have their hand up. Please go ahead.

Greg Rafert: Thanks. So this is Greg speaking for the record. You know, I think we are certainly willing to be flexible in terms of the timeline. We also very much

agree to kind of giving more time up front to getting the survey right is definitely where the time should be spent as opposed to trying to decipher answers that don't make a lot of sense at the backend of the survey.

I also think that in terms of the – of your homework, I've seen that term being used in the chat a little bit, I think if you all have a chance to review each of the surveys or perhaps you could consider dividing the surveys up amongst yourselves so that everyone doesn't have to review all five, editing in redlines and then sending those redline edits to us in advance of the call if that were possible, that would be great. That would give us a little bit of a chance to see what you're all thinking and would probably help to focus those discussions.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Greg. Appreciate that. So we're one minute past the end of time here. And so staff is going to suggest we haven't – we have the call tomorrow, we'll ask whether or not we – people's availability to extend another half an hour to make it longer. And then we'll also look at possible availability for say Friday and Monday of next week to – for additional calls.

And but then keeping in mind that we can't really you know, we also should be mindful not to add more time into what Analysis Group has to do so we're hoping that by, as Greg says, by making things, you know, more clear at this point that might provide for efficiencies you know, in the sort of final development of the surveys.

So let's do that, let me look and see if there are any other comments, and I'm not seeing any other hands up. So thanks again for staying on for another couple minutes and thank you very much, Greg and Stacey for all your help here. And we'll look forward to talking to all of you tomorrow. Thanks.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Today's meeting is adjourned. (Bob), the operator, you can disconnect the recording lines.

END