

**ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Data
Monday, 11 June 2018 at 16:00 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/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-data-11jun18-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6ere7gb4uu/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/NC4FBQ>

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

Operator: Recordings are now started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you so much. Well welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all and welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Sub Team for Data call on Monday the 11th of June, 2018.

On the call today we do have Susan Payne, Philip Corwin, Lori Schulman, Rebecca Tushnet, Brian Beckham. If anyone has joined only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now?

Okay, hearing no names, we have no apologies but Kristine Dorrain will be joining us later into the meeting. We will have two guest speakers today, Greg Rafert and Stacey Chan from the Analysis Group. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Ariel Liang, Berry Cobb and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder, if you would please state your name so that it appears clearly on the transcript. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Julie Hedlund.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you very much, Michelle. And could you go ahead and have the operator dial out to Susan Payne, she's asking and she's got her phone number in the chat there. Great, thanks so much, Michelle.

So welcome, everyone. Thanks so much for joining. And just to very quickly go through the agenda, we will return to the TM brand owners' survey questions. We had I think a couple of questions left there that we hadn't gone over. And we had some feedback that Susan has sent us as well that came in on the list.

And then we'll switch to the registrar survey. And you'll note that in the agenda pod are the links to those two Google documents that have updates in them. So please do use those links and Ariel is putting them in the chat as well. And just should be easier for us to follow along if we do that.

We will go ahead – I'll go ahead and bring up the original table just so that we can have for a reference if we need to look back at the questions. But at any rate, let's try to follow along in the Google Doc as we did on Friday.

And what I could suggest is as we did on Friday, I can go ahead and go question by question and see if, you know, read out any comments that we might have and – and, sorry, there was – a call coming in that just distracted me – and do it that way if – unless there's any other ways that people want to suggest.

And just as a note of any other business, we'll – staff will send around a reminder, the Doodle that we're looking at for forthcoming meetings that would be Wednesday and Friday and next week Wednesday, so we'll send a reminder of that after this call because I think we've only had a few responses so far.

So I'm going to see if there are any – if anybody has anything else they want to add or bring up before we go to the trademark holder survey? And I'm not seeing any hands up.

So okay, then going to the trademark holders' survey, and just noting the feedback that Susan had sent around, this was with respect to Question 65A and it was – Susan had offered to check the proposed bands in the following question, in the trademark owner survey with her colleagues at Com Laude and that question is, "If yes, how many trademarks have you applied to register in a domain names in a new gTLD during a sunrise period?" Multiple choice.

And her suggestion based on input is that we would do bands 1, 2-5, 6-10, 11-50, 51-100, 101-500, which could be split into two bands if preferred, and 500+. And I see that Susan's back. I don't know if you heard, Susan, I just ran through the response that you had provided on Question 65. And I'll just – yes, with regard to – sorry 6A, thank you very much, 6A of the trademark survey Ariel has noted.

And so I'll just ask if anybody has any comments on that suggestion or if there's anything that Susan wants to add? Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Graham: Yes, I took a look at that and for those questions where we had said that we probably should change the bands, that looks like an excellent change to me so I would support that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Michael. And any other comments? And I apologize but I see that I've just been dropped from the Adobe Connect room so I'm going to have to get back in. Apologies.

Ariel Liang: This is Ariel. Julie, there's no hand raised at the moment.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great. Ariel, do you mind – as I go back in, let me get back in, I don't know what happened here, I guess we need to go back to where we were at the end of the survey. And I'm trying to remember what number that is. I think – go ahead.

Ariel Liang: Yes, this is Ariel. We only have the Question 30 and Question 31 left, that's the last page of the Google Doc.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks for reminding us, Ariel, that's really helpful. So let's go to Question 30 and I'm getting back into the room now but if everybody wants to switch to that and now I am back in the room. Great. Thank you. So Question 30, and let me get to that question. Thank you, everyone, sorry about getting dropped from the room.

Okay, Question 30, "Are you familiar with how the TMCH exact match criteria operates?" And that's a multiple choice, yes, no, don't know or don't know, not sure. I'm not seeing any comments with respect to that question. Does anybody have any comments they wish to raise? I'm looking for hands. Not seeing any hands. Then going to Question 31, "Do you believe that broadening the," oh Michael has his hand up. Please go ahead, Michael.

Michael Graham: Yes, I'm just wondering as you're going onto Q31 whether or not Q30 is an entree question so that only if you answer "yes" would you get 31? And if you answered "no" then it would terminate the survey. I think that's the way it looks.

Julie Hedlund: That's a great question, Michael. Thank you very much. This is Julie from staff. Greg, Stacey, is that a gateway question, 30-31? And Greg or Stacey, if you're speaking we're not hearing you.

Stacey Chan: Hi, this is Stacey. Yes, I think that that works well as a gateway question so we'll add in a comment to make that clear.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much, Stacey, that's really helpful. Then on Question 31, we do have – we do have a comment, so Question 31 is, "Do you believe that broadening the comparison basis for issuing trademark claims notifications to include variants of trademarks and not only exact matches would be useful to protect the rights of trademark owners?" And Kristine's comment is, "This is not very clearly worded. I had read it twice and recall the group discussion for context, will think about how to revise." Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Graham: Yes, I'm not sure if there are other things that Kristine would revise it. The one thing I saw and I've made it on the document is to change that last "and" before "protect" to "to" so it'd be, "And not only exact matches would be useful to protect the rights of trademark owners," question mark. I don't know if that answers her concern but that was one thing that I saw in there. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much, Michael. Rebecca, please.

Rebecca Tushnet: Hi, Rebecca Tushnet. I mean, I agree that it's confusing. It's got a bunch of parts, and also it does seem somewhat directed to producing a yes answer. Right, so when you give someone a reason in particular you're often, especially if you don't give them a reason not to do it, you're suggesting to them what the answer ought to be.

So it seems like the – I too don't feel like I have enough confidence to completely redraft it but I wonder if there's some way to strip out the suggested hey, it would protect the rights of trademark owners if we did this, especially given the issues with things like over-matching that we did talk about where, you know, you might get a flood of notices that were completely irrelevant to you depending on what the mark was. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rebecca. Michael please.

Michael Graham: Yes, Michael for the record. Sorry, I haven't been doing that before. I think Rebecca's maybe one of Kristine's concerns as well. And I don't want to do

word-crafting online but I think if it could be revised so that it would be something like “Do you believe that the comparison basis for issuing trademark claims notifications should be broadened to include variants of trademarks and not only exact matches?”

Or “It should be broadened,” question mark and then cut out that last part “would be useful to protect,” that really would be one of the answers, if they say “yes” but I agree with Rebecca, I would like to remove that so that we don't have that suggestive element in there but we're still asking the question to get that more narrative answer as well. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Michael. That's a very helpful clarification. Kathy is asking what was the original question. So the original question is on – in the table that's in the – that you see in the Adobe Connect room, page 19. If you look at page 19 and you look at the middle column it says, “Do you have any evidence that broadening the comparison basis for issuing trademark claims notifications to include variants of trademarks and not only exact matches would be useful and protect the rights of both trademark owners and domain name applicants? Please provide this evidence of your – provide this evidence of your observations.”

So it looks like it's the same. Kathy, please go ahead. And, Kathy, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you. And I see Rebecca has her hand up as well. I think actually Rebecca's hand went up first so maybe I'll go Rebecca and then Kathy, please.

Rebecca Tushnet: Sorry, I'll put my hand down shortly...

((Crosstalk))

Rebecca Tushnet: Rebecca Tushnet. Yes, I mean, I'm not saying the original question is well crafted for a survey but it actually isn't the same at all in that it actually did have some mention of both sides of the equation on I which is precisely that

go stripped out. And I think – and I think Michael’s right that stripping it down further might be the best solution. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thank you. And thanks for that – pointing that out too, Rebecca. Kathy please. And Kathy is saying she needs...

Kathy Kleiman: Can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: ...permission to speak? Yes, we can hear you, Kathy. Please go ahead. And your mic is unmuted. Please go ahead, Kathy. Okay. Sorry, I don't know why we're not hearing you, Kathy, but – Michael, please go ahead, while we're waiting for Kathy.

Michael Graham: Yes, Michael for the record. And just to address that, I think you know, the question on Page 19 that you just read, I think that was really addressed in the – in Question 29, certainly maybe 28 as well where it was actually asking for, you know, the number of UDRP actions and others that were filed based on exact duplicates and variants, so that was getting at what the evidence might be of the number of complaints that were made based on exact and non-exact. But and that last question then I think is that broader question. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Michael. That’s quite helpful as well. So it sounds like we want to go ahead and – I think we’ve captured that we want to cut back the, you know, cut back the question. I think what we’ve got in the chat, I mean, in the notes, pardon me, is, “Do you believe the protection of trademarks should be broadened to include variants of trademarks?” question mark. And then we would encourage respondents to provide more narrative questions.

And Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: I’m going to try again. Can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we can.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Apologies for – I think you could hear me but I couldn't hear you. So I don't think we should ask a yes or no question, that wasn't the way it was in the original and I just – again, we're asking policy questions here and we're asking about a basis, so we wanted to go back to the original question it would be, do you have any evidence that – and kind of that's the way it was, not, you know, so going back to the original, do you have any evidence that broadening the comparison basis for issuing trademark claims notifications to include variants of trademarks and not only exact matches would be useful and protect the rights of both trademark owners and domain name applicants? It's a confusing question but it's not a yes or no question.

If we ask a yes or no question, we know what the answer would be from a policy perspective, that wasn't the question set out to ask, so I'd like to recommend not ask that question and go back to the original question which I know is complicated. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Kathy. Anybody have any thoughts on Kathy's suggestion to go back to the original question which, please, go ahead Michael.

Michael Graham: Yes, Michael for the record. I would let anyone else speak insofar as I did write these questions. My feeling about this is to give the opportunity to actually address the question which, although there's evidence up above, I don't think we've asked the survey respondents what they feel and this gives them the opportunity to be narrative in that regard.

Obviously it also – and it being a narrative answer, we would give it the requisite weight at the same time in order to be fair, I think this question should be asked of others as well in connection with their understanding and their opinion in regard to broadening or narrowing.

So for the registrants, for registrars, registries, I would include that same question if there's any – (unintelligible) in case there is a particular prejudice based on the – or a bias based on the audience that we're asking the question of. But I think it's worth asking and see if they have any response; obviously if they don't have a response that would be weighed as well and if they were to say yes, but not say why. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Michael. I have Phil and then Susan. Phil, please.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil for the record. You know, I'm fine with keeping some form of this in, but I'm not sure in the current form how useful it's going to be because when you think about, you know, I know Greg Shatan brought a paper to our attention that looked at this issue.

There's so many potential variations of an exact – beyond an exact match of added letters, added numbers, missing letters, missing numbers, trademark plus, you know, keyword and so really it comes down to if the working group grapples with this we're going to have to look at each potential variation and whether the potential for deferring infringement is or isn't outweighed by the added number of false positives that are going to occur with this type of system.

So I'm not sure how I'd reword it but I think maybe we could ask, "Please explain why – if yes please explain why you think the benefits will outweigh false positives" or something like that that gives us a little more information to go on. But I think in the end we're still going to have to go through a very exacting exercise of looking at what additional types of matches might generate a trademark claims notice. So knowing that, I'm not sure that a simple yes or no plus kind of open ended why without further guidance is going to be that useful. But, you know, I wouldn't argue to take it out; I'm just expressing some concern. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Phil. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Yes thanks. Hi, it's Susan. Yes, I think the concerns that Phil's expressed are – and indeed the concerns Kathy expressed are the reason why we drafted it the way we did, because you know, we are endeavoring to try and get something a bit more than just a load of people's opinions, otherwise, you know, to some extent we've already got those opinions, they've been presented by people on multiple occasions already and indeed we could all answer, you know, wearing a different hat we could all answer this survey now if that's all we're seeking.

So I think that was the point and that's why, you know, within the group I've no doubt we spent, you know, ages arguing about the precise language that we thought we should ask. And I think that was the point for asking about evidence rather than just wanting people's, you know, views expressed.

So it may be that language we originally had in this sub team isn't optimal for the purposes of a survey but I think hopefully when Greg and Stacey can understand what we're, you know, the – why we were asking for it perhaps that will help them come up with something that works better.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. So Stacey or Greg, Kathy's asking if you have some – any thoughts as well. Looks like there's some suggestion to go back to the original language that was in the table and/or to shorten the question. But Greg or Stacey, any thoughts or questions from you?

Greg Rafert: This is Greg. I think I would be inclined to go a slightly shorter version of the question just to make a little bit more understandable because I do agree that kind of reading a lot of the original question or what we have now is I think it's a little too lengthy and probably prone to misunderstanding. So that would be at least my inclination. Stacey, I don't know what you think.

Stacey Chan: Hi, this is Stacey. Yes, Greg, I do agree that shortening it would be helpful. I think something that we've been doing in I think other surveys or possibly earlier in this survey as well is asking how likely we think something about the TMCH is to have a certain affect. So for example if we wanted to continue with that format I think the wording may be a little bit less prone to be leading.

You know, how likely do you think broadening the comparison base to include non-exact matches would be to – this isn't the exact wording but something along the lines of how likely do you think this would be to have its effect? And then it would be a scale of not likely at all to likely, and then the open text field would offer explanations.

Those explanations could include examples of previous experiences from trademark holders, we could add a little bit of text to kind of guide respondents in that direction to direct them towards the original language of this question about the evidence that they've seen. Those are just some thoughts.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Greg and Stacey. Phil, please go ahead. And Phil, if you're speaking you may be on mute. We're not hearing Phil. Does anybody have any comments on the suggestion to change this into, you know, Stacey's suggestion about using language of, you know, how likely and then having perhaps a scale? Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes thank you. I suppose my only concern with that is that it's still essentially asking for kind of unsupported opinion. So I think however it's crafted I think the important thing is that, you know, sort of a yes or no answer, even if it's something along a scale, what we really, you know, what we're really after here is something, you know, some justification based on kind of experience rather than just you know, it would be better for me than the alternative. So, you know, it's the evidence that we want that's really crucial here.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. Lori, please.

Lori Schulman: Yes, the evidence is crucial, could it just be a simple as if no, please provide evidence; if yes, please provide evidence? So you get the issue of evidence in the question without having to rewrite the entire question?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. And Phil, your hand is still up but we weren't hearing you. Do you have a comment? Is that a new hand or old?

Phil Corwin: Sorry, old hand. I'll take it down.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Phil. So and Susan, please go ahead. Susan's hand went down. Kathy, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: I think we just have a time lag on the hand lowering.

Julie Hedlund: I guess we do. Sorry about that. Kathy, I think that's a new hand.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, I think so. So just seconding what Susan said about evidence gathering and back to Stacey and Greg and just to see if you understand that the purpose was to solicit – this is one of those questions where we're kind of throwing out a net to see if there's more information people have to provide us, not really to see what their opinion is on it, but whether they can shed some light really on what we're looking at with some concrete information.

That's really what we're looking for here so I'm not sure the scale works. I can see wanting to simplify the question but I think what we're really searching for here is examples, evidence, actual information. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy. And I see Stacey in the chat says, "Yes, we can certainly guide the open text fields towards providing evidence." Lori says, "Kathy, agree about the evidence; thought a scale might be more readable but if evidence is goal then we need specifics, not temperature." And Lori says, "Susan, thanks for explaining." So Greg and Stacey, do you have enough

information to redraft this question? And of course we're trying to capture as much of this as we can in the notes as well.

Greg Rafert: Yes, and this is Greg. I think we do. It's been very helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Well thank you very much. And I think that also addresses 30A and B because that's the why, why not, which, you know, I guess also would be redrafted based on this discussion. So we have come to the end of the trademark holder survey and are there any other comments or questions from anyone before we switch to the registrar survey? Susan says, "Hooray." Yes, exactly.

And there's the link to the registrar survey. So switching to that, and noting I think the boilerplate comment or the common comment that Greg has noted with the text where it says, "Please note that your responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential and that responses will not be identified by individual or company."

Greg has noted for discussion with the Data Sub Team and the ICANN staff, we understand that there may be an interest in receiving the raw survey data from us and just want to ensure that if we provide the data that will remain confidential. So that comment is just for our information. And Rebecca, please go ahead.

Rebecca Tushnet: Hi. Rebecca Tushnet. I've made this comment in chat but I just wanted to make sure it surfaced. If we're – just as a matter of how the survey is conducted, I think we should say if you think it's important that their responses might be quoted in a public document even if they're still anonymized because I think that's where we're headed. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thank you very much, Rebecca. And we'll be sure to capture that comment as well. I see that Ariel is putting it in the notes. Thank you. So onto

the introductory questions, a Question 1, "What registrar do you represent?" open text field. And Question 2, "What country are you, registrar, located in?"

There are no comments with respect to those two questions but we do have a comment from Susan with respect to Question 3. Susan says, "I think this should be limited to new gTLDs, shouldn't it? Is there any relevance to this survey in knowing about legacy gTLDs or ccTLDs?"

And then also with Question 3, "Do we want another band? Say, 101-250, 251-500, band 500 plus seems reasonable as a top end since there are approximately 700 open TLDs." And so I see Michael, you have your hand up, please go ahead.

Michael Graham: Thanks. Michael for the record. I'm just wondering if those bands are accurate and I'll let someone who is with a registrar or works with them opine whether or not we ought to add a couple more whether there should be one between the 1-100, maybe 1-50. I don't know what the distribution is so any suggestion in that regard would be appreciated. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Michael. Susan, you had a comment about possibly adding another band in. Please go ahead, Susan.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. I mean, it was sort of a question to take the temperature from the group as a whole. But, yes, I mean, I was just assuming that if we, you know, if we recognized that there were about 700 that were open or open in some form, even if they had some kind of restrictions on registration, so taking the brand ones out effectively and others of similar closed nature, then, you know, 500 plus seemed like a good top end.

But I was uncertain and so, you know, in terms of that middle band it seemed to me – I don't know whether it makes things, you know, I don't know if having too many bands is particularly off putting for people assuming it's not off putting, it seemed to me that maybe splitting that middle band up and having,

you know, 101-250 or something like that seemed like a reasonable thing to do.

I can't answer, to be honest, whether anyone's likely to hit that or it may be that, you know, once you go something above 1 you always do all of them, I mean, I just – I can't answer that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. And I'd noted that I skipped over a comment from you too with respect to Question 3 and apologize for that. With respect to the change for the – or a note with respect to the first answer, which is “none” you note, “If they answer ‘none’ then I think most of the survey is going to be irrelevant, although we might want to ask them why.”

So do we want to – so and there's still the question of we – this is only relating to new gTLDs and so just wondering if anybody has any comments on those comments from Susan? And I see the Kristine has joined. Welcome, Kristine. And Kristine, in case it's not clear, we're on the registrar survey and we're on Question 3, and there were a couple of comments from Susan.

Susan Payne: Julie, shall I just briefly explain?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that would be wonderful.

Susan Payne: So really, you know, again I'm not entirely sure but I'm assuming, given that we're doing this survey about the new gTLD RPMs, it seemed to me that it was more appropriate for us to be asking how many of them does the registrar offer, because you know, they could offer hundreds of TLDs but they're not new gTLDs. And so that, you know, how many legacy and how many ccTLDs didn't seem terribly relevant to me. I mean, we know they're a registrar so obviously they offer TLDs. That was the reason for that.

And then I did think, you know, there's a distinct possibility that someone might answer “none” and then a lot of this obviously then becomes irrelevant

to them because we're asking things like what notice did they give, you know, how long, you know, how many sunrise registrations did they deal with, you know, when did they hear about reserve names? So all of that seems irrelevant if they answer "none" but I think it's a very relevant question to ask them why.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. And I see in the chat Kathy is saying, "Agree fully with Susan, new gTLDs," and I'm seeing also yes, and Kathy is asking, "Is this a gateway question with respect to if someone answers 'none'?" And "I think I agree too," from Kristine. And Michael says, "Susan, plus one."

So it sounds like both that – it sounds like that there's agreement that this is the change; that this is new gTLDs and that also that we want to ask none – or include the response of none but that we would want to know why. So this would be a gating question but we would still want to know why they answered none, I think.

And Susan, you still have your hand up so please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Sorry, not deliberately.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, sorry about that. All right so I think we've captured those comments. Anybody have anything else to add? Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. And I just realized that my mic was on so I apologize, you probably heard me chewing. I will mute from now on. I notice – and I'm just catching up so apologize if this is old news, but Susan has said that if the answer is "none" then – oh I see none to new gTLDs.

Okay, I was reading that to the wrong question. Okay, never mind so I was concerned that if they said they didn't offer sunrise registrations that we'd stop the survey. But it looks like we're not going to do that so never mind. I'm talking myself out of a question. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much, Kristine. Yes, I think the idea was that it, you know, how many new gTLDs, none, you know, but then getting – adding to that question to the – if they answered “none” then asking why so I think that’s the addition there.

And then, I’m not seeing any further hands up so going onto Question 4, “Have you offered sunrise registration in any of the new gTLDs that you offer?” And Susan is noting, “I think there may be registrars who only offered sunrise in some TLDs and their feedback on why this was is probably also useful.” And added – and Susan has added, “In all/substantially all and yes in some.”

And Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. I agree with Susan’s comment. This is Kristine. I think that we do want to find out why registrars may have picked and chosen which TLDs they wanted to offer sunrise registrations in because I think that will guide this group in understanding what was – what went well with sunrise and what didn’t, so I think that’s going to be a really useful question.

The other point I wanted to – and this is really just a wording nit for Stacey and Greg if the group think it’s useful, and maybe this is more for a question for Susan too, have you offered sunrise registrations – will there be registrars that are like well I didn’t offer them, like, you know, I participated or I didn’t participate, the registry, you know, creates the sunrise period and I onboard or I don’t.

I’m wondering if “offered” is the right word? And Susan is representing a registrar, might be, you know, best equipped to make sure that that’s the right word. I just wanted to have a – ask a question and see if we thought that was really the right word. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. And Susan please.

Susan Payne: I'm not sure I can answer that straight off but I can take it away and ask someone. I think that's the best I could probably do. It seemed all right to me on the face of it but I entirely take Kristine's point so why don't I take that away as an action?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Susan. Appreciate that. And I'll just note too, there's a fairly substantial comment from Greg in the document as well noting that the follow up questions that relate to the charter Question 5 and I'm not going to try to read all that but you should be able to see that in there.

And then on the sort of final bullet under this question where it says, "Did you encounter a sunrise period longer than 60 days for any of the new gTLDs in which you offer registrations?"

Question for the group from Susan is, "The sub team proposed asking, 'Did you encounter a sunrise longer than 30 days or 60 days?' It is particularly relevant for us to know whether any start date sunrises ran longer than the contractual 30 day minimum because it goes to experiences of lack of standardization," I'm sorry, "is a particularly relevant," question mark, "or are we really only interested in whether registrars had to deal with sunrises longer than the contract required? Shouldn't we also be asking this of registries?"

So any comments concerning Susan's question? Any questions about the – Greg's references to the charter questions? Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. I'm going to take the last question first. Susan, did you perhaps mark this doc up before we got that point? And I ask this because I believe at the end of the day, now we haven't seen the reworded questions, we did get to asking how long registry operators ran sunrises for, I think.

And if we didn't then we absolutely should be asking that question because I know we went and we asked the brand owners, you know, which – or we asked the registry operators, you know, whether it would be more or less harmful to them to have it longer, so I believe we did ask that so if not let's put a pin in that maybe for Analysis Group and make sure we are asking that question.

I think we do want to know what registrar's perspective was for sunrises that ran longer or shorter. I mean, we can ask the registries but we have to assume that some won't answer. And so data that we're not going to get from the registries can also be gotten from the registrars. So even if every registry that answers says, no, no, no I didn't run anything longer, if 25 registrars say oh yes, four registries ran a longer sunrise you can compare that data; that doesn't mean that either one is invalid, it just means you're getting data from two different sources and perhaps the people just didn't self-declare or maybe they didn't even remember that they ran it longer or something. So I think it's useful to ask the question of how long the sunrise ran also from registrars. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much Kristine. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Thanks. Yes, and then really my kind of question for everyone was, because I'm in kind of two minds about this, is, you know, when we originally drafted it we were asking about did you encounter sunrises longer than 30 or longer than 60 because of, you know, the start date sunrise and the end date sunrise runs for different durations but they're also quite different animals.

And so if we wanted to stick to understanding whether someone maybe did a start date sunrise but it ran for 45 days, then we won't get that information if we only ask about 60. But I'm uncertain whether we really mind about that or whether really what we mostly want to know is just, you know, did anyone run a super long sunrise. So I guess I'm kind of looking for views.

Julie Hedlund: And thank you, Susan. Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. Susan, do you – what do you think of this idea of saying – for registrars, of the new gTLD sunrise periods you offered approximately how many were 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, longer? You know, sort of a tick box and then they can say sort of, you know, guessing, you know, most, some, all. I mean, I know you're not – they're probably not going to want to go back and check them all but maybe they can give us a sense? I know there are some people here on this that want registrars to go dig through their files and do the work and maybe they can, but I would be happy with even just a general sense.

And then I guess to your other question really we're looking – I don't know if we're still just on the sunrise period one but then you talk about notice in advance as well. So one of the things I was thinking about as I read ahead on, “Did you get advance notice of the start date of either start date or end date sunrises,” I wonder if there's a way to compile all of that to a grid which would sort of get to you know, how much notice did you get for each – and so for the 30 day, for the 60 day, for the 90 day, how much advance notice did you get?

There might be a way to put the matrix around that, that would get one grid and get to all of the questions. I'm not entirely sure, though, we might have to think about how that might look. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. Berry please.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. Berry Cobb for the record. I'm only offering this up just in terms of managing the size of the survey but in terms of asking registrars or registries about specifics as it related to how long they ran a sunrise or how long they ran a claims, we have that information already.

It was partially presented at the end of last year or when we were in Abu Dhabi I believe, so if you want details we can provide that, we can provide it by registry operator and those kinds of things if we need to get to it. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Berry. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Thank you. Thanks, Berry, for the reminder. I mean, I was about to kind of agree with Kristine's suggestion that it might be nice to have the, you know, how many 30, how many 60, how many 90, but given what you've just said I wonder whether we need to ask this at all? Maybe we don't need to ask about their experiences for longer sunrises at all if in fact – does your data, Berry, also capture that? I have a feeling it does, doesn't it?

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Yes it does. It's – it can be viewed at from different angles. The first would be whether they did a start or an end date sunrise; the second angle would be the duration and then I think a third angle especially around some of the TLDs where the basically an open ended claims window or a category of you know, we could classify it as extremely long claims window type of things.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Berry. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, this is Kristine. Well, and so we have the data then I don't – I agree, I don't know that we need to have this question in here anymore. I like the idea of maybe getting some – I know everyone's going to cringe but some information from the registrars about sort of what worked and I know we're kind of trying to dig into it with how much time in advance they get notice and you got changes and what you thought about it.

And I think that's actually probably more helpful at this point so we can sort of correlate the data that we already have with this new data and that would be my only concern is making sure that we can correlate the two. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kristine. So it sounds like we can jettison – let me see, if we look at Question 4 and we look at the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, sixth bullet I think, the one encountering a sunrise period longer than 60 days, is that what we are suggesting to eliminate but to keep the follow-on bullets that talk about notice?

Susan Payne: Yes, I think that's right.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And Greg, Stacey, any questions? Does that seem clear?

Greg Rafert: Yes, this is Greg. I don't have any questions right now. I think that does seem very clear.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you. Then we just – Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Okay, well I was going to sort of leap ahead because I'm guessing we're now on what I think might be called 4 – oh I've got numbers on mine. Anyway, the next one, the ones about the notice. And so – and Kristine had made a suggestion about whether there might be some way to grid that, the two questions about how much notice people received.

And I think that might well be possible; if it is possible I certainly think it might help people in answering it. But the only thing I wanted to flag was that – and this is really for Greg and Stacey is that there – as I said a bit earlier, that the start date sunrise and the end date sunrise are quite a different beast and so for the start date sunrise there's a contractual obligation to give 30 days' notice. And so sort of asking someone if they got one week's notice is not so relevant, you know, they should always have had 30 days' notice at the start.

So it is relevant for us to ask, you know, did you get less than that, just to know whether people were actually, you know, whether registries were not giving the notice that they were supposed to be giving.

But, you know, notice should really, you know, any notice should really start at 30 days and be longer than, whereas in the case of the end date sunrise, there's no contractual obligation to give any notice and in – so in theory a registry might announce you know, on one day that their sunrise is opening tomorrow. In practice that's probably extremely unlikely because of course that's going to impact on the number of registrations they get.

But, you know, that's the difference between the two and so if there was a way to grid this it would need to you know, it would need to take that into account.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan.

Susan Payne: Hoping that makes sense.

Julie Hedlund: That – thank you, Susan. Thank you. And I think Kristine is saying “Plus one, Susan. I agree, maybe no grid here because of the nature of the two different sunrises.” But let me ask Greg and Stacey, is that explanation about the two different sunrises clear? Do you think you'd still be able to do a grid or would it be better not to just to see if you have any thoughts or questions.

Stacey Chan: This is Stacey. Thank you. That explanation was very helpful and very clear. I do agree, because the time options for start date versus end date sunrises are different, it might not make sense to (unintelligible) grid and just keep them as multiple choice as they are.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine. I'm actually going to leap ahead as Susan mentioned because honestly the next bit needs to sort of almost be bifurcated as well. So when you ask then, "How adequate to consider the notice that you received?" I think you need to ask that for each type. So for the start date sunrises, did you get a – for the end date sunrises, did you get adequate notice?

I don't think if you – so it may be that registrars found that generally speaking notice of start date sunrises was fine, you know, you flip the switch, you're good to go; end date sunrises may have been a little more complicated, maybe they needed to have more notice or you know, maybe they needed something different. So if you just say, "How adequate was your notice of sunrise?" that doesn't really differentiate between the types so I think if we're going to do that we should make the "how adequate" follow each of the specific questions. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Kristine. And I note too that (unintelligible) I think actually Susan had made this point already, that notice for a start date sunrise should always be 30 days. The question for the group, should we also offer an optional text box for most/lease notice?

And I'm sorry, I think that was supposed to be the comment related to the – to the notice items and I – and if anybody has any objections to doing that, since we have skipped ahead to the bullet about how adequate (unintelligible) Kristine. Sorry, it's just hard to follow these comments sometimes. And I see (unintelligible) Kristine and Phil. Thank you for joining us. And Kristine, you have your hand up.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. Susan, can I ask what you might – I mean, I know that Greg had mentioned sort of do you have a sense of what people are going to actually answer here, can you give us a sense of why – do you think there will be data? Do you think people would fill in other days here? Something that you think you might get if we add an optional text box? Thanks.

Susan Payne: I'm really sorry, but I'm – I've totally lost track of where we are and what the question is. I think I'm having the same problem Julie was having where it's quite hard to marry up the comments with the document. Which question are we doing?

Julie Hedlund: And thank you, Susan. This is Julie. I think I have added some confusion in there too just because of having trouble following the comments. Susan, you had a comment or question for the group. "Should we also offer an option a text box to capture most/lease notice?" So that I think is a comment with – that related to the two questions about how much notice.

And where we'd broken it up into, you know, less than 30 days, up to 7 days, etcetera, and various number of days and we've noted that that's different, you know, depending on the type of sunrise.

But I think you're asking for an additional box where instead of just saying, you know, picking one of these, you know, up to seven days, whatever options having a text box that captures most/least notice so that people can fill that in, I think that's where we're at.

Susan Payne: Yes, now I remember. Sorry about this. Yes, I suppose because we were just asking about the average in these questions and so – and I think that's absolutely fine, but I did just wonder whether we thought it would be – do we think it would be useful to try to capture from an option where, you know, as the registrar sort of has a recollection that they – I don't know that, you know, the worst scenario they ever encountered was they got, you know, half an hour's notice.

Do we think it's helpful to capture that or I mean, it – maybe the answer to this is "no" and we may take a view that frankly if they got no notice whatsoever and then the way for dealing with that was to refer it to ICANN Compliance and it's not really relevant to the operation of the RPMs, it's a

matter of, you know, an issue about breach rather than anything else. So that was what I was thinking about. It was a question, I wasn't certain – I was a bit on the fence.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. Does anybody have any comments about adding a box to capture that information, sort of a free text box? Kristine please.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. I'm torn because the data analytical part of me is like we want all the data; give us all the data. At the same time I'm trying to be super mindful of what's going to be helpful and what's just going to be interesting. So I'm – in the absence of sort of coming up with any, you know, suspicions that the data might be, I don't see any benefit to adding an other text box when we've already been warned we don't want a lot of text boxes.

I agree with Susan, I think if there was an outlier hopefully someone would have filed a complaint with ICANN, and we would know about that. But – and again, you know, maybe perhaps – and I don't know if we're doing this but at the end of each section, you know, is there a place to put, you know, if you have any other comments or any complaints or any war stories you want to share maybe there's sort of a catch all that just says, you know, now that I've triggered your brain memory, now that you're thinking about all this stuff, you know, if there's anything you want to data dump, now's your time, now's your chance.

I mean, maybe we don't have to answer – ask if after every question, maybe we just have to say, tell us your horror stories at the end. I don't know, I'm torn as well but I don't see a specific data-driven need to ask another free text question. Thanks.

Susan Payne: Thanks, Kristine. That's really helpful. I think I'm with you on that. I think – I'm like you, I think it'd be extremely interesting but I'm not sure what we're going to do with it if we got that information, I'm not sure that it really helps us any. But I like your idea of a general kind of right at the end, you know, anymore,

you know, any war stories you want to tell us if people think that would be useful.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. Thank you, Kristine. Then we'll note that possibility of having something where people can share their war stories. Then thank you, Kristine, also for moving along to the next question and suggesting that – how adequate to consider the notice and noting that that – your comments on that, which we've captured, but I'll also note there's – in the sub bullet from that where it asks, "What do you think is an adequate notice?" So Greg has asked for the sub team, "Are these time options reasonable?"

And Susan says, "I think we have to ask this for both start and end sunrises or ask something like, 'Does it make a difference to your answer whether it is a start or end date sunrise?' You could get 30-day notice for a start date. There's no required notice for end date because they operate differently."

And I think that maybe also goes to your comments, Kristine, about needing to sort of ask these for each of the two sunrise types. So maybe it's already been addressed. Not seeing any hands up. Kristine is typing in the chat. "Yes, thanks Julie." Okay so moving along then we have the next bulleted question have you experienced the duration of the sunrise period being extended when already underway yes, no, don't know, not sure? And I don't see any comments associated with that question, Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. This is Kristine. So what's - I just want to ask the group if we say - if they say yes what do we do with that information? We don't know whether that's good, bad or indifferent. Does it matter if a sunrise period is extended when already underway from the perspective of a registrar? It may be that it's a registrant, or brand owners or someone else but does it matter to the registrar?

And if it doesn't then we may not want to ask it because we're not doing anything with it maybe? I don't know. I mean oh I see down below it's sort of

like, you know, did you get enough notice, how much notice, again maybe. I would love to hear from others what the general purpose is.

And Kathy asked has it happened? Yes absolutely I can tell you Amazon registry has extended sunrises that are already underway or periods anyway maybe not sunrise but other periods so I think people do it. Susan go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes thanks. Yes I think it's more relevant once you get, you know, to the subsequent question is which asks about sort of kind of how much notice gets given and do you think it was good enough? I mean this is in there I guess because it is definitely a batch of questions that were in our sub team document asking about changes to the sunrise duration.

And I suppose it goes to, you know, it goes to this question about sort of how much standardization is there? How onerous is it, you know, that, you know, how easy was it for registrars to keep on top of things?

And I think the answer to that just from anecdotes from people I know is actually it was really quite difficult to keep on top of it all. This, you know, it was hard enough keeping on top of the original timings, you know, without then having to deal with changes to timings albeit that in many cases the changes to timings might have been welcome, you know, the extension of a sunrise might well have been welcome but nonetheless it went to the complexity from a registrar perspective.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Susan, Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. Yes I see what you're saying Susan and I think I get it. Would it be more useful instead to say something to the effect of not having experienced the duration of a sunrise period being extended when it was already underway was the notice that you - really adequate or in adequate? If adequate, you know, or what, you know, if preferable or if you

know what was the least amount or what was an inconvenient amount versus a convenient amount versus an inconvenient amount?

I'm just trying to figure out if we're going to get what we want to know because if we say yes a sunrise period was extended on average it was – I was given two days' notice. So they click the Two Days box. What do you consider to be an adequate notice?

Well I consider two to four weeks to be adequate. Oh but if you don't get to the why sort of I got two days' notice I don't really understand the impact. Is it just I prefer it, somebody had to scramble for five minutes, I just like to have two to four weeks' notice so I can send marketing emails to my clients?

I would - and I know we're trying to avoid narratives and that's – and I'm struggling here. But I feel like I want to know more about the impact here and I don't how to make it better. But I would love to see, you know, why was it a problem because we want to solve the why not just, you know, ten registrars thought, you know, four days was not enough.

I am open to suggestions so and maybe this is the best way to get to it. And maybe we just have to collect this data and make inferences I don't know.

Susan Payne: Hi. It's Susan. I mean risk is asking kind of the open ended anecdotal stuff. I mean maybe this is one of the ones where we have an open text box at the end that says please explain why, you know, at least in relation to the one that says what do you think is adequate notice or something like that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan.

Susan Payne: I mean we could even, you know, we could even potentially lose the question of because about how much notice people got because what we really want to get to is not so much what, you know, what we actually want to get to is what they think - how much notice they think is reasonable and why don't

we? Well less than rather less than how much, you know, how much they actually got in practice potentially if we're worried about having too many questions. So we could just ask have you experienced the duration being extended and then what do you think is reasonable notice and why

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan, Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: Yes I agree. I think Susan I like that idea. You know what's the amount of time that does work that's good and why? And of course any open ended text box would allow people to also explain, you know, what might have been awful about it so there's one giving a half hour notice? I don't know I am torn here. I really trying to be a good survey taker here survey preparer here but I'm struggling. But...

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Kristine, Greg and Stacey now that you've heard some of this explanation any thoughts that you might have?

Stacey Chan: Hi. This is Stacey, thanks. I mean I think we can certainly expand this question to include a follow-up why with an open text field. And something that we can do is just keep track of how many open text fields we end up keeping in the survey. I think there are several in here where we give people an option to write in an other on multiple choice type questions.

Those types of open text fields tend not to be as taxing as, you know, questions that are kind of standalone can you explain sorts of questions. So since this would be we're still kind of early in the survey but this would be the first kind of explain open text field. We can put in that kind of placeholder and, you know, if it ends up being a little bit long we can always revisit which ones need to be kept but that seems fine for now.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Stacey. So and but just - and also based on this conversation then I think I was hearing that we would take out the first of the two questions the one having asked how much notice but then keep the second of the two

questions about what do you consider to be adequate and then add the open box there. Does that sound right? Yes that's right Julie says Susan, Kristine please.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay this is Kristine. At the risk of upsetting the apple cart here what if we keep the thinking about the sunrise periods that were extended we, you know, sort of a grid. Well I was given one to two days' tick box next – how was this sufficient notice yes or no? So one to two days sufficient yes or no, two to four days sufficient yes or no, four to seven days and then instead of 15 plus then say, you know, 15 to 30 and then so maybe say 30 plus and then have an other. And then they can write in the number of days that they on average got and then can click yes or no sufficient.

That would also make it into our grid, make it all text boxy make it get some more data. And it would allow us to find out - get a little bit more metrics on how much this breakdown was. Now I think the \$10,000 question is because the difference in the upper bullet point is like one to two days, two to four, four to seven and up to 15. And from below you have one week, two to four weeks which you can cover but you don't have five to eight or more than eight.

So we might want to decrease the bands a little bit with one to two days, two to seven, you know, eight to 15, 15 to 30 two week or, you know, two weeks – oh not two weeks four weeks, eight weeks or something. I don't know we might want to adjust the bands a touch because what you really want to get is something really micro-short like a day or less, you know, two days or less. Then you want to get to that sort of anything over two days until a week is probably reasonable. And then you get to like people that want to get more than a weeks' notice and then you give people the kind of want two weeks plus notice and then something longer.

And then you can for each band you can then get a sense from people of how many sunrises they had for each of those bands on average on a guess and was that enough for them? And that way you get a bigger sampling

across TLDs as well. So if - you don't even have to be on average for the sunrises there were extended, you know, the ones that were one to two days was that good for the ones that were 15 plus days was it okay? I'd be more helpful okay stopping now thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Kristine, and Susan please.

Susan Payne: Thanks Kristine. I love that suggestion. To come back to the time bands I think I suggested and if I didn't then I meant to that maybe we needed to use the same time bands in - when we have those two questions maybe we needed the same time bands in both. And just to explain my thinking it was I was thinking about a situation where we're in the middle of a sunrise and if we think about it - and so that sunrise is either running for 30 days or potentially it's running for 60. But at some point after it's already underway someone's giving notice that they want to extend it. And it seemed to me that it didn't seem so likely that that was going to happen to early on.

And so the chance of us hitting something more than kind of 30 days' notice and extending it when it's already underway it just seemed like it seemed pretty unlikely. So I thought kind of 30 days and then, you know, more than 30 days kind of probably was fine because this is about, you know, it's already underway and then it's being extended. Does that make sense?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan. And Kristine is saying yes now I'm seeing your comment perfect. So Greg, Stacey is it clear to you what their suggesting now for how to and in particular how Kristine suggested this might be - these questions might be handled or redrafted shall I say?

Stacey Chan: Hi. This is Stacey. Yes I think so. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Then looking at the next bullet point and Susan has your hand up. Please go ahead Susan.

Susan Payne: Well it's about the next bullet point really. But, you know, I just made a really brief comment which was that I think we talked about this effectively this question in relation to the registry survey and we had a lot of concerns. And if I'm honest I couldn't really remember quite where we came down on that. I couldn't remember if what the outcome of that conversation was. But it felt to me like I didn't want to sort of open that all up again. And I wasn't sure really what we finally completed in relation to the registry questions but it seemed to me that this is the same scenario applying again. And so it may be that this is back with Greg and Stacey I just couldn't really recall.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thank you Susan, Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. This is Kristine. Yes I agree. I don't think we have settled this. I think we were still torn about whether or not we wanted these to be all open ended or whether we were going to be okay with the grid. I think I had thrown out the idea of combining this all into kind of one mega grid including like a 30 days and a 60 day start date or vice versa I don't remember anymore. And then sort of coming up with the right options because I think the options in the (unintelligible) are wrong but I think that I had suggested that I was going to try to give that a think and I'm going to try to do that today.

But I do think that whatever we ask the registry operators we should ask the registrars almost exactly the same. So - and I am supportive of trying for a grid here as long as we do leave the open ended option and so people can fill in if there's something that we had considered as a problem. So I'm mindful of the fact that Greg and Stacey and I think rightfully believe that we could probably guess at the vast majority of responses here. But I do want to make sure that we keep that open ended nature and I think the group had not agreed that the grid here was the right answer. So I want to make sure that whatever I think about and not - and I would just be proposing it of course that whatever we think about always leaves room for the text here. But I think we can turn it into one kind of master grid that should apply to both. Thanks?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Kristine. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I agree with Kristine on that. And we've offered suggestions on the registry side that, you know, wherever you talk about, you know, allowing trademark owners to register domains containing their marks you also have, you know, that entrepreneurs the noncommercial users coming in and wanting to register for noncommercial purposes. So you extend one – the balance on both sides also marketing as I talked about in registries there's an issue of marketing and kind of the cost when you - I've been hearing more and more about interrupting of rollouts the sunrise and marketing efforts something that we should be getting some more input on. I don't have a lot of detail but it's not just technical and operational all of those are definitely questions now for the registrar but issues of marketing which may be more for registries.
Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Kathy. And staff will go back and look at the notes also from the registry survey discussion on the grid. We can send those around and hopefully that will help you too Kristine with respect to some of the thoughts that you were going to formulate. Then we'll move along noting that that one will have to come to – back to. And that's also same for the follow-on bullet. And then for the next one what effects on your business do you think will result from all registries being required to run the same standard – standardized term sunrise period? And several changes there from Susan and Susan please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes thanks. I just wanted to explain my thinking here. I just felt we needed some more bullets. Maybe they're not the right ones although hopefully some of them might be. But I was trying to think about what the impact or what the benefits or disadvantages a registrar might think of when thinking about standardizing the sunrise terms. So I'd welcome feedback either kind of now or later from people on whether they think there's sort of reasonable additional bullets.

- Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much Susan. Does anybody have any comments on the suggestion of additional bullets that Susan has put in here or of course one could also add comments in the survey as well? I'm just - Kristine please.
- Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. I think these look good. I meant I think as a, you know, a registrar and a registrar that consults with the registries pretty often I think Susan's got a pretty good handle on what these options are. And I think this is really good. And I like - I mean, you know, we've been trying to have that open just in case we miss something. And I think this is good thanks.
- Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much Kristine. And then there's an additional bullet if yes is either 30 or 60 day option better for your business or is there an alternative duration of sunrise that you consider would work better please say why and any comments or objections to that as a new bullet, Susan please?
- Susan Payne: Yes. And just to explain this was something that was in our original document. And I felt that we were asking various questions about the two forms of sunrise. I thought we kind of lost this along the way that one thing we were trying to understand from registrars was whether they found the start date or the end date sunrise better from their perspective. I think most registries did one version of the other but there were, you know, there were registries that did base options. And we also particularly had been keen to understand if registrars thought that, you know, something different to what they were being offered was actually better than was available to them. And so we - I thought we needed to try and capture that.
- Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan that's helpful, Kristine please?
- Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I was going to type the chat but for some reason I'm getting a huge lag. I don't know if that's me or Adobe. Yes I think this is a good question to ask. I am wondering if it's just misplaced. So at the top you say, you know, did you offer a, you know, did you – did you participate in sunrises, did you participate in any more of the days which we might be

really, you know, might be getting rid of? And then we talk about how much notice we got. Like it seemed like that's more the right place for it but I'm not (made) that suggestion. I'm just wondering if this is almost more of a preliminary question than a concluding question to the section but I'm just throwing it out for discussion. I don't know what other people think.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Kristine. Anybody want to comment on Kristine's question?

Susan Payne: Sorry think I've got my mic on. I was going to type as well. I'm not sure I've got strong feelings. I'm happy to have a suggestion that maybe we put it somewhere else. It might well be more helpful when we start introducing the idea of two different durations maybe. Perhaps that would work better.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan and Kristine. Yes I'm wondering if it needs to -- this is Julie from staff --I'm wondering if it needs to be moved up? And Kristine please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Oh okay it looks like my comment finally went. Yes I think it's just a - it's a suggestion for Analysis Group to consider. I would defer to their judgment as to where it goes at this point until we see a more final version of the survey.

Julie Hedlund: Great thank you. And as staff -- this is Julie Hedlund from staff -- so we will note that there was numbering originally of the sub-questions but I see your note Kristine in the chat about needing numbers instead of bullets. That was I think in the original Word document but I think perhaps when it got turned into Google the sub numbers got lost. So very definitely I think the intent was that there would be sub numberings rather than just the bullets. And so...

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Oh no this is Kristine. I just said thanks. That helps. I just thought it was yes I just - it's hard to be like and the fifth bullet down.

Julie Hedlund: It they were meant to be there. So...

Kristine Dorrain: Yes thank you.

Julie Hedlund: ...at any rate it was not an intentional omission let me put it that way. And so on the next bullet for lack of a better way of identifying it is if yes would it - and this is the follow-on to the above bullet so perhaps these need to go together. Would it increase, decrease or have no effect on your operating cost if registries provided either the claims period or sunrise period? So these seem to be tied together. And then Susan notes this is not just about operating cost for the registrar we need to know advantages, disadvantages. Susan please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes thank you. See I'm not sure this does tie in with the one immediately above. I think as drafted currently it's kind of if yes to the way back at the beginning where we asked if you do sunrises or not.

But I did wonder and I put a comment in there about, you know, kind of - I slightly wondered whether this was the right place for this question because we haven't talked to these survey recipients yet about the claims at all and yet we're sort of saying to them suddenly we're going wouldn't you rather have just the sunrise or the claims?

So I did wonder whether actually it lived somewhere further down in the survey. But again that's kind of sort of part - I guess partly something for Analysis Group to consider.

But then yes my other more substantial comment was it's not just about operating costs. I mean obviously it may have an impact on our pricing costs for registrars but we wanted to know, you know, benefits and disadvantages.

And so when we - and I think later on if my memory serves me correctly we do ask something later on about we - the - where this may more happily live about sort of, you know, pros and cons. So maybe we could sort of, you know, kind of park it and pin it to move down.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan. And I'll note that you have a similar comment with Question 5 not being the best time to ask this question as it's in the middle of questions about sunrises. Reserve name questions are also related to sunrise. And then Kristine says agree this is a concluding question along with war stories. And then Question 6 also has the note I think we should move this since it's a question about claims.

So I think we have three questions there that will need to note that they might need to be moved around once Analysis Group does some more editing. And Kristine please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. I want to make sure that I'm not leaping ahead to Question 6 so if we're not ready to discuss it yet are we just talking about Question 6 or are we going to discuss Question 5 first still?

Julie Hedlund: I think we - the only thing we've talked about so far is - with Question 5 is just noting Susan's comment about not being the best time to discuss it. And so please - I see Susan has her hand up. Please go ahead Susan.

Susan Payne: Actually I sort of don't. I threw myself out of the Adobe Connect room. So I'm just trying to get back in so I don't know how I've got my hand up at all since I'm not in there. But I yes I mean I think there was a question about whether, you know, there is this issue about, you know, if and when we ask this question it's not just about operating costs.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And Kristine - and actually Kristine has her hand up and then Kathy please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. So okay so backing up even beyond Question 5 thinking of questions that need to be moved down. So the one where we - where – that Susan just mentioned was would it increase, decrease or have no effect on your operating costs if registries provided either claims or sunrise?

Thinking about moving that down and on not limiting it to operating costs I think we need to just would it, you know, what - would it have a, you know, positive, negative or no impact on your registrar business if, you know, claims if the registries provided either claims or sunrises instead of both and something like that. And then I think it does have to go after we have fully asked questions about both. But Susan I think that probably gets to your point of, you know, is it positive, neutral or negative I guess? Thanks back to that question and then we cannot be leaping had to Question 5 and six.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much Kristine, and Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy. Do we want to finish that section before we go on to Question 5 because that's what my comment is about?

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead Kathy. Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: I'm sorry Julie could you say that again?

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry yes could - please before we go on to Question 5 and six I think you had a comment.

Kathy Kleiman: No my comment is a Question 5. So when we're ready...

Julie Hedlund: Oh I see what you're saying. I'm sorry to misunderstand. Then I think we are ready to go on to Question 5. But I see Stacey has her hand up. Can – let me just go to Stacey first just in case her question is about the bullet before Question 5, Stacey please?

Stacey Chan: Thanks Julie. This is Stacey. And just really quickly yes it is about that bullet before Question 5. I'm fine with whatever people would like to move the question. And I just wanted to suggest that to pull the focus away from operating costs we can wear this question very similarly to the question just two bullet points above where we're asking what some of the benefits or costs would be associated with having a standardized term sunrise period then similarly asking about the benefits and cost to this other option of I mean either the claims period or sunrise period? So instead of asking just about operating cost we could have all these other options that have been expanded upon in this earlier question.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Stacey, and Kathy please?

Kathy Kleiman: Okay this is Kathy. To Stacey's comment again provided the grids include both sides the - well all the cost to the registries and registrars of course but also the costs and benefits the trademark owners as well as for registrants and both sides of that spectrum.

For Question 5 is this - let me read it out loud and then I'll ask my question. Would you and/or your resellers be willing to provide surveys to domain name applicants to understand what influences their decision to complete or abandon registrations?

Is this the question that relates to trademark claims in particular or every type of completion abandonment of any type of registration including say legacy gTLDs or country codes? I'd like to suggest that I think we're looking for additional information about the completion or abandonment of registrations following a TMCH claims notice for a new gTLD. But I'd refer this to Susan and others. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Kathy, Susan please?

Susan Payne: Yes thanks Kathy. That's why when I was going through this I did make a note and it probably wasn't really clear enough but I - that was why I thought this question was in the wrong place. And I think it might be this question and the one that's (called) six. I think both of those relate to information we were seeking on the claims services. And so I think they're out of place because Question 7 we go - we circle back to registry reserve names which are questions around sunrise again. So I thought both and six need to move down the survey and into the claims section.

Julie Hedlund: And - okay I'll go ahead to Kristine but I'm also noticing that Kathy you're making some changes to Question 5. So I'll go - Kathy please to you and then to Kristine.

Kathy Kleiman: Right. So to Susan even if we move this should we include that information in the question, you know, after receipt of the trademark claims notice? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Kathy. Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: I'll let it Susan answer the question first and then I'll jump.

Julie Hedlund: Yes thank you Susan to Kathy's question.

Susan Payne: Thank you. I'd love to know if Kristine is going to say the same thing as me or if we're diametrically opposed. But I think it's not just a case of us asking whether they would be willing to (unintelligible) name applicants about decisions to bound them when there's a trademark claims notice. Although I think that would be useful information but I think we've always struggled to get information about abandonment at all.

So I'm not ruling out the idea that it would be more general. I mean because we're simply saying would you be willing to, you know, would it be - would you be able in the future to operate a system where you survey your customers? And actually what I think is we may be want to ask in addition -

have an additional bullet which is, you know, not just not willing but, you know, this is completely impractical from our business model or something like that which I think is my suspicion would be the answer from a number of people.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan. Kristine please? Kristine if you're speaking you may be on mute. I think Kristine is typing.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks yes. Thanks this is Kristine. I commend Kathy for her restraint because we've all been dying to get as much information about abandonment rates as possible given that there just seems to be a lot of like sort of oddball anecdotes floating around and nobody's gathering it. So I agree with Susan we might have to dive in a little bit and figure out what specifically we want to get at here.

So would you or your resellers be willing to provide surveys? I mean there's a lot to unpack there. We a lot of our registers won't speak for their resellers. Some registers micromanage their resellers. Some are like very hands-off right? You know they might be willing to provide information about completion or abandonment of registrations after a trademark claims notice.

And I think that's certainly one really crucial piece of data we need to get but gosh I mean if we can get more for, you know, God forbid the next round of review that we do in ten years, you know, should we be trying to get more? Should we be leaving the door open?

And I (unintelligible) to say that but, you know, we've been looking for this data. So I appreciate your restraint but I think we should at least leave it open ended at this point and if we get our hands slapped and told we have to ask for less later then maybe we have to do that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. And thank you Kristine. And Kathy I see you're making some additional changes. Do you want to explain what you're suggesting?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. I took it out by mistake and I was just putting it back in. Trademark claims notices and abandonment after that would seem to fall squarely within questions that a review of all right protections mechanisms working group could be asking. Abandonment otherwise may get into certain trade secrets or business issues. I just – I, you know, if we want to ask them separately or one after another let me recommend.

So I haven't typed it in yet. So, you know, would you be willing to provide surveys to your applicants to understand what influences their decision to complete abandonment registration after receipt of a trademark claims notice. That's one question that I think we all agree is and Kristine just said is squarely within our purview.

But then if we want to ask and/or after, you know, any type of abandonment that I think we can ask as well. But I think we should separate them out because they may say yes to one and no to the other for different reasons. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I - yes I agree with Kathy. Absolutely we should for sure get maybe a little bit more specific on our purview. But I do like the idea of saying, you know, and from an ongoing basis do you, you know, what - and we can have maybe Analysis Group wordsmith this but – because I'm going to say it wrong but not just would you be willing to but sort of what Susan was getting at was would you have any sort of concerns?

And not trying to put ideas in their head but if people do have as to your point Kathy concerns about business trade secrets or concerns about operational, you know, effectiveness if you're sort of a distributed reseller registrar and you don't really have a good way to collect that kind of data and, you know, if you would just say, you know, I can't get that data like I'd be willing to I guess

but I can't get it. I mean we want to leave an option out there to say, you know, what are the sort of administrative, operational, technical, legal intellectual properly related hassles and concerns that you might have if we sort of basically suggested as a PDP you should always collect this data? There should always be a survey about why you didn't go forward.

I mean if we if somebody is - if we came up with that list we need to have, you know, do we have any data for why we shouldn't do that. And I think that's sort of this is a good place to ask that question. And I feel like that's kind of what Susan was getting at but I agree I think we have a definite mandate to ask about the claims notices received but we should be inquiring as to what our registrars might object to if we make this a big overarching issue because we did have quite a significant disagreement in our group about why we couldn't get this data.

And it was, you know, a pretty heated discussion about well no one will provide it because. I like to (confirm) data as to why no one will provide it then. And this is their chance to say. And if they don't speak up well maybe they're going to have to provide it then. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Kristine. And this is Julie from staff. Just to clarify then we're talking about, you know, retaining of course this original question but then adding additional questions is that correct to get more data? And Kristine go ahead please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. Yes I think we just make a note that we're going to basically ask this question twice one sort of the way it's written generally speaking with Kathy's addition that say's after receiving trademark claims notice. And then she just put in separate question at any time and any gTLDs.

I don't know if we - yes so maybe we want to just leave it open I mean not even limit for gTLDs. But we'll have a separate question that's broader, you

know, do you have any issues with providing the surveys to domain applicants generally and just see where we go from there.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great.

Kristine Dorrain: So I think Kathy's answered it in the Google Doc. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, and Susan please?

Susan Payne: Yes and I think one of the options as I think I mentioned was it might not just be a question of are they willing or not? I think an option that's a bullet that sort of says, you know, business model, you know, doesn't allow for this or operational - operationally impossible or something because I think if you are, you know, if you run a registration model whereby you don't know who your customer is until they bought the name then you can't survey them when they withdraw, you know, withdraw before purchasing I think is what people will - some people may well be saying.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan. So we're trying to get this in the notes but let me just ask Greg and Stacey if you have any questions concerning that suggestion?

Stacey Chan: Thanks. This is Stacey. I don't have any questions at this time. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great. Thank you. All right we'll try to make that as clear as we can in the notes. And so looking ahead to Questions 6 and if I've gotten this comment right I think Susan's saying I think we should move this since it's a question about claims. And I think that is the only comment associated with that question, and Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is (Christine.) I agree that this question should be moved. But my question here is a procedural question or formatting questions for Analysis Group. Here we see a drop-down menu. I'm assuming that by a drop-down menu you mean they can click more than one option because

there are some registrars that offer registration agreements in more than one language. So English, et cetera, you know, if you offer your registration agreement in five languages then they need to be able to select five. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And Stacey says yes that's correct. They will be able to select multiple options, very good. Then the next item Question 7 Susan says see original questions what were - we – what we were trying to understand is whether registrars generally know which names are reserved in advance or only when they try to register for their customer and how they are notified? And we also wanted to know if they had customer feedback about issues. And do we - so - but I don't see any edits to this question so let me ask whether or not this question captures what we had in our original questions, and Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I'm trying to read ahead here and thinking about Susan's comment I think her point is we're not - and I haven't read down all the way to key ten yet. But I don't know that we're getting the point here. So we have - are you provided a list of registry reserved names? And then on average if you were and I'm going to say the answer Susan you can correct me if I'm wrong but I'm going to guess the answer is yes by less than half. And just to be like a perfect jerk it should be fewer than half but okay.

Then on average how far in advance of the TLD launches are you notified of such reserved names which would be a fairly small subset probably of names I think. And then based on that average notice is it adequate? Well if there's no requirement to provide it I don't think we're getting at the right answer here if we're talking about adequacy.

I think we have to know should the registry provide such a list or is the way that they're finding out good enough? I mean are they just querying the registry operator? Maybe Susan can help me out here I'm struggling but I'm

trying to work through this. I don't think this is what we're getting at. Susan bail me.

Susan Payne: Yes you can see the energy levels were dropping is going through this document. So I sort of couldn't face launching into how to try to address it but I didn't feel we were going to get what we were looking for and I was somewhat hoping to kind of throw it back to what our original document had us seeking.

But yes I mean I think, you know, yes some, you know, sometimes they'll be some notice given in advance by the registry and sometimes it'll be a certain duration. But I think we also wanted to just understand whether generally, you know, generally whether as I said in my note whether you get sent a long list of reserved names or whether in many cases you only know it's reserved once you're already trying to register it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan. And I'm just I have pulled up -- this is Julie from staff -- Page 9 which does have the original questions. And one about getting feedback from your customers, providing experience with their reserve names, and then some examples how do you get notified of registry reserved names and do you have any comments in the proposal that registry should publish list of reserve names?

So that's just - those are the original ones there for your reference. So I guess the question might be do we need to go back to those original questions to see - or to see whether or not these questions here starting at seven capture the intent?

Susan Payne: Julie hi. It's Susan. I think the answer is I don't think we do think it captures the intent. I don't think necessarily the questions being asked are un-useful but I just don't think they get to the heart of what we were hoping to discover. So I'm -- I guess I'm kind of hoping that Greg and Stacey could have a look at this one again.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Susan, and Greg and Stacey. So I think the suggestion is we go back and look at the original questions and redraft this let me see which questions than it would be seven, eight, nine and so seven, eight and nine and ten also addresses reserve names as well. So do you have any questions Greg or Stacey or is it clear to go back to look at those again?

Stacey Chan: Thanks. This is Stacey. Yes I think this is helpful. This is helpful to have a little bit of - more understanding of the original drafted questions. We can definitely go back.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Then to go ahead those will be – we're taking a note the action that those will be redrafted. And Analysis Group will look back at the original questions in the table. On Question 11 should the claims period be extended, shortened or left as is? Susan says I think we want to know why both for the option they selected the ones they don't. For example they will probably say it should be shortened but we will also want to know what if any would be the technical operational or other issues if it were extended?

So I think that also is a suggestion that there needs to be some redrafting there to get at why they're saying extended, why there saying, you know, saying shortened or making that choice? And I'll just ask Susan to correct me if I'm wrong there. I'm not seeing any...

Susan Payne: Susan apologies yes I've lost the ability to put my hand up and I was desperately trying to find my comment and remember why I said it. Yes I think again I sort of went back to our original subgroup document. And I just like, you know, it's obviously interesting to get the opinion on extending or shortening.

But we really wanted to understand why just because, you know, because again, you know, we - with many of these questions we know which group we're asking and we've got a pretty good idea of what answer they'll give us.

But we need the justification for it to understand what the real issue is that they think changing the duration would address rather than just getting a whole bunch of registrars saying no, no, no the claims should be shorter or there should be no claim service at all.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thank you very much Susan. And I'm just noting too that Greg has noted that Questions 11 through 18 and he's just noting what charter questions they relate to. So I think we need then to have a sort of an option for people to explain why they've made one of those choices. And thank you Susan for the explanation.

And on question - so they'll be some redrafting there. And Stacey or Greg let us know if there's any question with that request, Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. And I - maybe I haven't had enough coffee and I deeply apologize I just want to make sure that we're all on the same question like Susan I'm struggling to put my hand up this morning. Q10 right this is not getting at any why, it's not going to be okay to just come up with three possible reasonable wouldn't like it and then how challenging it would be right? We're just completely revamping this grid. Is that my understanding?

Julie Hedlund: Hi Kristine. This is Julie. I think we had agreed to redraft questions seven through ten. But I don't think we talked about how we wanted to redraft ten. So I think - so thank you for that. And let's ask that comment then that do you have any suggestions for how we want to change ten and the grid in particular?

Looking there's a comment there. Susan says I'm open to suggestions but I don't think a Likert Scale really works here to give us information we want. We want to know if there are technical operational or other issues for registrars and what they are. And apologies that I had - I didn't mean to skip over that comment. Susan?

Susan Payne: Julie yes. So I started by kind of suggesting some more (intensive) language because we were - what we were interested in here is this we know that some in the community have said that they think that if names get released they ought to be brand owners ought to have an opportunity to secure them even though the sunrise period has finished. And the question didn't really get to that because there's - so what we wanted to ask was what if any challenges would there be?

And, you know, if there was a second, you know, if this group decided that we were going to make a policy recommendation that every time names were released there has to be a second sunrise or that, you know, brand owners must be given a right of first refusal or something, you know, what does that mean for the registrar? You know are there any technical, or operational challenges, or other or, you know, benefits? And that's where I said I wasn't sure that the Likert Scale really worked. It – and I know Greg and Stacey are going to hate this but it seemed like one of those ones that needed a bit of anecdote.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Susan. That's quite helpful, and Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. Just to reiterate what I copied into the chat I didn't want to muddy up the Google Doc. But scrolling back up to the list of ideas that Susan came up with again we don't really have numbers but the previous page where she has the whole list of business impacts from a sunrise period I think many of those would overlap as far as the business impact on a second, or subsequent or, you know, whatever that is quasi sunrise for reserve names.

We're noting that reserve names are often not released in batches they may be released onesie-twasie. So, you know, you have to think about I mean when we think about this question, you know, is this just if the registry releases 1000 reserve names, if the registry releases two reserve names, if it releases reserve names for a specific purpose I mean this is a super deep

and challenging and gets really complicated fast. But let's assume we can come up with a really good question. I think the list that Susan started above is helpful and may not hit everything in this particular category but I think it's a very good starting point. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Kristine, and Susan please?

Susan Payne: Yes thanks Kristine. Yes it might be a good starting point. I think as you say I'm not sure it does hit everything but yes maybe that is the way to go if we could try and come up with pros and con, you know, just some scenarios of increase decreased that might work.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And that we've captured that, Kristine please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. Just take 30 more seconds on this for the purposes of Analysis Group. So when we think about a reserve names list a registry can put five names or 5 million names of their reserve list right and not just not sell them. And they don't go through the sunrise period but then they go through claims later. And the registry can release those in any subs it wants sort of just, you know, let's put them out there.

And so when we think about this question as we're reworking it you have to understand that the various registrars will understand the wording of the question different ways. So if we release all of them, if we, you know, if there's batches of them, if they release some on a rolling basis week by week. So when you think about it, you know, there's obviously technical, and administrative and operational hassles that would go with sort of rolling sunrise periods.

There could be, you know, different cost concerns as far as integrating with the registry operator for that, that just literally there could be just a notification problem just letting everybody know that this sort of thing is coming if they're a registrar that notifies their customers. And then also the registry operators

release names for a specific purpose. So if you're a registry operator and there have been a few of these and I can't give you a for sure example but I know it will come up but someone has got a generic sort of top level domain and they realize that someone is not participating in the trademark clearinghouse. It's a big brand but they didn't participate.

So some people would put the brand on their names list and then when the brand owner contacted them release the domain name to the registry operator or to the brand owner. So it's not that the domain names are always released to the public generally sometimes they were released to a specific person for a specific reason.

So there's a whole lot of baggage that goes in this question. And so when we think about how we want to word it we have to consider that the various registrars will bring all that baggage to the question. Hopefully that helps doesn't confuse things. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Kristine. And I see we have two minutes to the top of the hour. I think we've made it through Question 11 kind of skipped ahead to 11 we're on ten now but I think we talked about 11 also. I'm just going to ask Stacey and Greg if you have any questions about the explanation for Question 10? I know Stacey you said no questions on Q 11. Anything – any questions that you want before we adjourn?

Stacey Chan: Thanks Julie. This is Stacey. Not at the moment. So we will take all of this information into account as we're reviewing the original drafted the questions for the section and as we're working these. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thanks Stacey. And of course some staff will share the minutes with you as well. And then let's plan to pick up Question 12 at the next call. We have a Doodle out. And apologies that the Doodle wasn't set for a maybe response for next three possible calls and staff will send that around again with a reminder. But we're looking at possibly then tomorrow - I'm sorry

Wednesday at the same time, for 90 minutes Friday also for 90 minutes and next Wednesday at the regular working group time for 90 minutes. So staff will send that around again and with it - looks like that will work out then probably the next call will be this Wednesday at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Kathy Kleiman: Julie this is Kathy. Does that conflict with one of the URS data...

Julie Hedlund: It does. It conflicts with the sub team for documents by half an hour and/or we can make it just a 60 minute call. And that actually is a question that staff was asking in introducing the Doodle. But if we get enough people who can attend at that time then we'll just have that overlap and staff will split up to manage the two calls.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And thank you all for joining. It's 2 o'clock. Go ahead and adjourn the call. Thanks very much everyone and we'll talk to you again soon.

Woman 1: Thanks Julie. The meeting...

Woman: Thank you.

Woman 1: ...(unintelligible) operator. Please stop the recordings at this time and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great day everyone.

Woman: Thanks much (Michelle).

END