

**ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Data
Wednesday, 20 June 2018 at 17:30 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-rpm-review-data-20jun18-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p50vuhjig87/>

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

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

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms Sub-Team for Data Call held on Wednesday, the 20th of June at 1730 UTC. On the call today we have Kathy Kleiman, Kristine Dorrain, Lori Schulman, Michael Graham, Philip Corwin, Stacey Chan, Susan Payne, it looks like we also have Greg Rafert on the audio only, and Rebecca Tushnet. At this time, we do not have any apologies for today.

From staff, we have Ariel Liang, Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, and myself Andrea Glandon on call management. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn it back over to you, Julie. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much, Andrea, and thank you everybody for joining. So, today, we are now looking at the draft survey on -- for the potential registrants and we'll be working off of the Google Doc, and we'll go ahead and put the link to the Google Doc into the tap. But, you'll note also that it is in the notes pod, there it is in the chat, and it's also in the notes pod.

And, so, I did note that we have a message from Lori and this one is actually relating to a qualification of registrants for survey. I think actually this must apply, perhaps, might apply to the registrant survey, and Michael is agreeing with the questions and Lori's concerns. So, Lori, do you want to give us a little context for this?

Lori Schulman: Sure. Thank you. I sent this to the list because I we've discussed it two times already on the live calls and I know we're on a time deadline, so I thought it might be appropriate to actually put it in more detail in writing for the analysis group.

I'm happy to read it aloud with the help people since I literally just sent it, but I still have concerns about how we're going to narrow down this pool of respondents for the registrar. You know, trademark owners could substantiate themselves with trademark owners through (unintelligible) registrars and registrees, of course, we know who they are.

But I still have some concerns about identifying qualified registrars to take this survey. I'd say using a generalized sort of consumer based paid test taker group could really have some pitfalls. It could also have some benefits, I'm just not sure, but I don't understand it well enough to have confidence that we'll be getting respondents that we feel we need in order to answer the question.

So I put detailed questions actually into written form and I'm hoping that we can get a response. I'll read it aloud so that you'll know what I've asked and then we can defer it from here. So, what I wrote was I know that we are

approaching today's meeting, and I wanted to reiterate something on the list rather than to absorb more time on the call.

On Monday, I asked about how registrants will be vetted for the survey, Stacey from the analysis group explained that there will be funneling type questions that will qualify survey takers as registrars and they will be funneled to the rest of the questions. I am still not clear on how the questions will be drafted in order to ensure that we're getting survey takers who understand what is being asked on their direct experience, because (AG) have to close draft questions already, if so, (may we see them)?

Using paid test takers for random consumer oriented surveys makes sense to me. For example, surveys on case preferences or product comparison.

However, using that kind of tool for something and technical as our survey still troubles me. This goes back to something that Rebecca had explained regarding making sure that we are getting responses based on actual experiences rather than risking survey takers ranking or establishing preferred answers.

If we want to clear the understandability of claims notice, then I think whether one had seen them before or not may not matter. However, I do think if we're targeting users who have made actual decisions based on actual notices, that we should only be targeting known purchasers who have received those notices.

It seems to me that only the registrars would know for sure and I still have doubts about surveying the general public to a paid survey taking systems, therefore, I think it is appropriate to set some real parameters here. I want to make sure that we have the best pool possible given the technical nature of the survey.

So, I have further questions, how does (AG) group plan to drill down to specific segments that we want, how will the demographic profile or what will the demographic profile look like, how would we know that the respondents have actually attempted to purchase, and have abandoned these based on claims notice, how these will be sifted after its collected?

For example, we should identify in advance what we're looking for in terms of age, employment, number of domains, number of abandoned, et cetera. I have asked this question twice and I'm still stuck on some of the details of the response. Perhaps the analysis group could respond in writing which would clarify what we are doing. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, thanks, Lori, and this is Julie Hedlund from staff and I put the questions just -- so that people can reference them into the notes section, at the top of the notes section, and I'm wondering if we could put -- if there's any responses that -- not to put them too much on the spot that Stacey and Greg might be able to provide right now.

And Susan Payne says, "I must say this has been concerning me too and I also don't really feel I have a good handle on what age you plan to do, so thanks Lori for raising this." And I see Rebecca you have your hand up.

Rebecca Tushnet: Rebecca Tushnet, Thank you. So I think Lori raises some really good concerns, but also her questions reflect I think a misunderstanding of the target group and -- as we sent it to the analysis group. So, in particular, it is definitely not my understanding, and I believe if you review the documents, you'll see this that we are targeting only people who have attempted to register a new gTLD and received a claims notice, that is emphatically not the case.

We are targeting those -- it would be great to find those, but those are not the -- one does not qualify for the survey only by meeting that condition. If that were true, then more of Lori's concerns would be real. But, in fact, the target

is the kind of people who are interested in either expressing an interest in doing so in the future or have proven that they are interested in by trying and succeeding or failing to register its new gTLD in the past.

But the standard definition of target groups for research about comprehension is people either who have done the thing in the past, have -- or who express a real intention to do so in the future, because, obviously, those are really the people that we're interested in and the people who are only -- have only done it in the past or not actually as important.

So, it is emphatically the case that we need to carefully screen for people who meet those criteria, either passed attempts whether successful or not or future willingness to consider. But that is a very different set up and I just want to make sure that we're all clear on that.

Other than that, I think, in terms of screening and selection, the analysis group will be able to discuss those screening questions usually when you do a subset of consumers in a market like this. There are various checks that you engage in to make sure that you've got the right set of people and not just people who say yes.

Sometimes you do validation checks to follow up, sometimes you ask for specific things, but I believe that the announcement will be able to speak to that, but I just want to make sure that they're speaking to the correct group and not the subset with which Lori raised as if it were the whole group.

Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rebecca, then Michael and after Michael I'd like to turn it over to Greg and Stacey. Go ahead, Michael.

Michael Graham: Yes, Michael for the record and, yes, and I think Rebecca has pointed out exactly what my concern is and I think what Lori's question is, and that is how

are, you know, we going to handle that screening. So, I'll turn it over to Greg and Stacey.

Julie Hedlund: Greg and Stacey, please.

Stacey Chan: Sure, thanks. This is Stacey. So, yes, I think for both the registrant and the potential registrant surveys, the initial screening questions are, you know, have you registered in these domains or have you attempted, et cetera.

We certainly can also work in -- on additional questions as Rebecca mentioned that help us verify whether it seems that the registrants -- the people that are identifying themselves as registrants really are registrants that we're interested in. One potential area of confusion, for example, could be registering in a new gTLD versus having registered in the past and legacy TLD.

So, some questions such as what TLD did you register in can help us make sure that we're talking to the right people. In terms of a demographic profile with our (NSS) -- research now, (SSI)'s assistance. We'll be focusing on their North American panel, so registrants will be located in North America. The survey will only be distributed in English so they'll be English-speaking.

If we want additional information about the respondents, additional demographic questions could be added in the initial section of the survey. If the sub team would like to be able to, you know, the results by different types of demographics -- I'm just looking back at the questions, so in terms of whether or not the respondents really did see a claims notice or not, because of the way the nature is being distributed, and I think I understand this from Lori's concern, you know, because we're reaching out to people and asking them, "Did you attempt the registration?" And then, "Here are the claims notice, have you seen something like this before?"

That is really a recollection issue, an alternative way but a more difficult way to do this with, of course, be to try to work with registrars so that they'd attempt it to offer surveys to people as they are receiving claims notices, but that -- I think it's much more difficult than, of course, that would require coordination with registrars who would be willing to do that kind of thing.

So, there is some limitation there, however, I -- due to the nature of the questions, it -- this would be very difficult for someone to answer if they have -- actually don't have experience with those notices. Greg, I don't know if you have anything else that you'd like to add?

Greg Rafert: No. So, I think, you did a good job covering it all, Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you very much Greg and Stacey. Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine for the transcript. Thanks, Stacey, for that overview. So, I guess, maybe I'm also a little bit confused then. So, the first question as listed on the Google Doc basically ask sort of what category people fall into, "Did you try to register a new gTLD or not?"

Is that the question that the end group is going (SSI), are they going to be sending that out to people in order to determine who gets the survey to start with? Because if you look at the general population of, let's just say, like a super connected country like North America where, you know, there's commercials for GoDaddy on television.

You know, if you ask any random sampling of the population, "Have you registered a domain name?" They'll stare at you blankly. Like it's such a tiny percentage of people overall that's statistically speaking and maybe I'm putting words in Lori's mouth, but this is my question, but statistically speaking if you just put it to quote your North American panel, you're going to get this tiny, tiny group of people that qualify at all.

So are you putting the survey out to everybody in North America or is that first question of did you ever, is that determining whether or not you even get the survey? Or, maybe I'm just confused about the way the survey is administered.

And, also, I'm a little bit concerned in this group, we should talk more about it, but not maybe right now. Is this idea that we wanted to find out how the claims notice was taken in various places, and simply doing a survey of North American English absolutely does not accomplish that, and I know that that was a very big concern to, I think, at least Kathy and maybe some other people in the group, making sure that other languages are represented.

So I want to make sure that we have that covered at some point down the road, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Rebecca and -- so Stacey and Greg with respect to Rebecca's questions, do you want to respond? I'm just looking in the chat here too, that if you delete and have abandoned names on base -- based on a claims notice in my third bullet point, then I think it still addresses my concerns without being too narrow. This addresses Rebecca's point and Michael is saying, "Kristine, agreed survey cannot be limited to North America as a -- to be as comprehensive as we need to be." And Lori said, "And the community will chair the survey, a part of it is (connected) to North America."

All right, that is...

Greg Rafert: This is Greg, if I can...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Greg Rafert: ...I'm sorry, if I could quickly (jump in), Julie? So with respect to kind of the administering of the survey to research now, (SSI)'s panel, there, I think -- so, basically, what research -- because what I will do is using everyone that's a

member of their North American panel, they will get that first screening question that's in the Google document, and then if they answer in the affirmative that they did, for example, register domain name, then they'll go on to the rest of the survey, so that's what we kind of -- at a really high and somewhat simplistic level how it will function.

And, then, I guess we'll probably need to have further discussions on kind of extending the survey beyond North America, because I can tell you kind of the budget was already very tight for doing this in North America, and to extend it in kind of using additional panels, and additional languages adds to cost pretty significantly.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Greg, that's quite helpful. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Could you -- Greg, maybe could you explain a bit more about the cost, because I'm assuming that this goes out by email to people who have given their details or by phone or something. But, it's not clear to me, I don't, understand why using a different panel of people would necessarily make a difference on the cost.

And, particularly since, you know, building on Kristine's comments, it seems like, you know, when the initial screen of question goes out to the North American panel, there may not be as many people kind of saying yes as you need. Can you give more detail on that?

Greg Rafert: Yes, I'd be happy to. I mean, so I think -- we've been talking with our (SSI) as these surveys has been kind of getting developed, and at least in discussions with them they did not have any concerns that we would, you know, kind of get too few responses based on kind of the extensiveness of their North American panel.

And then, on the cost side, it really comes down to, you know, if it really comes down to coding the survey in additional languages, and then having to have review responses that are coming in not in English, if that make sense.

So, it's really kind of the writing of the survey, the coding of the survey, and then reviewing the data if it happens to not be coming stuck in English.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Greg. And I -- I'll just note that there are some -- okay, it stopped now. I was hearing some background noise. So, I guess I'd go back to Lori, perhaps, since you had asked these questions in the first place. Is this helpful to the questions that you have asked? Do you have more clarifications that you're seeking?

Lori Schulman: Yes. I'm going to have to sort of bottom line my concern and I guess if I have to put it into sentence, it would be unconfirmed that the pool of these paid survey takers will not pick up the real applicants with real experience, it's going to have small -- we know the population is. That's my concern. That's my concern -- has been my concern all along with making sure that questions are understandable, not too long, not just for the registrants but for all group.

Again, thinking back to your response rate and thinking back to validity of the answers, I'm extremely sensitive to how this survey will be perceived by the community if they don't get this right. And I think it is worth taking the extra time to give us all a comfort level that the pools that we're approaching are the right pool.

And as I've said in my question, I think it's much easier to identify registrars, registrees in trademark owners than it is with the extremely broad complex and dispersed registrant group.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much and Kathy please.

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy. That valid concerns, I thought we might ask staff, Julie and Mary, whoever was involved in working at -- as you know, we weren't -- co-chairs -- sub group team members weren't involved in the outreach to -- in the RFP on this. Could you talk a little bit or a lot about what you put into the RFP, and, you know, what the guidance was on this particular issue, because in some ways I would think we're now bound by the terms in the agreement of the RFP, which is what the analysis group responded to.

So if you could provide some insight on that, it might give us some guidance as to what our flexibility is in this case. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Kathy, and so I -- and let me just call out a note that Mary put in the chat that the staff understanding is that the surveys will be conducted only in English and this is a cost limitation, perhaps the sub team and (AG) can discuss whether within that limitation the geographic coverage can be extended.

And just some other notes, Lori says, "I like that link." Let me ask if Mary or Ariel have a comment also on the constraints or the scope, shall I say, of the RFP, and I see Mary has her hand up. Please let's go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Julie, and Ariel can jump in to supplement, but as I've typed in the chat, the understanding based on the published RFP, and we can put the link to that in the chat as well to refresh your memory, as well as the budget was that the survey would be conducted in English only. And that in terms of reaching potential registrants that the subcontractor used by analysis group which is now (SSI) will use their methodologies to target a group of up to 200 respondents.

So there are no specific detail about how that is done aside from, you know, paid survey takers and that it will be done by (SSI), given their experience and ability to reach those respondents. Hopefully, that's helpful and Ariel if I've left anything out that you can recall, please go ahead.

Ariel Liang: Thanks. This is Ariel for the record. There's nothing else to add, Mary has captured it all and just to reemphasize, it's really due to a cost issue and it's already operating under a very tight budget, and then to accommodate other languages will be a very, very difficult to achieve. So that's why we have to spell out in the RFP that the staff understanding is the survey should begin conducted in English.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Ariel, and then just noting in the chat Kristine is saying, "Section five, survey of potential respondents, relevant charter question three addresses translation how did this get missed?" Lori says, "If we can't do the job correctly, then I have some fears about how this will be accepted by the community." And, Michael please.

Michael Graham: Yes, Michael Graham for the record and I will echo Lori's comment. I'm concerned about that at the very least it needs to go out to respondents in other countries, but not have it in other languages. I think all of us are aware of the criticism that we will receive in connection with whether or not this is a representative survey, so I'll leave it at that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Michael. And I see Kristine is typing. "I want to ask if there's any more discussion with respect to the questions that Lori had posed, because I'm wondering now that we're coming to the top of the hour and we have only 30 minutes left if we might proceed into a discussion of the draft survey?"

Kristine says, "The claims notice itself is already translated. I understand the survey would cost more to translate." Yes, the costs are significant, Kristine as the staff has noted. Let's go to the survey draft, yes, let's -- please do that and again we're following along in the survey, in the Google Doc and we will look at places where there are comments to be addressed.

So, starting with the introductory questions, question one...

Rebecca Tushnet: This is Rebecca Tushnet, could I get on the queue?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, please, Rebecca. Go ahead.

Rebecca Tushnet: Thank you. Rebecca Tushnet. So, I just want to say at least with respect to my comment, I think they all are just either the same comment or the placeholder saying see previous comment on the registrant survey since these are really the same questions.

I wonder if we could -- for time sake, we could ask people to identify anything that they think is new or different, because I know that my comments are not new or different from the previous survey. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rebecca. That's an excellent suggestion. So may I ask as people are looking at the survey, is there anything that they want to bring forward that is new or different from those concerns that were raised in the similar questions in the registrant survey?

And I see Kristine's hand up and Kristine before I go to you, let me also ask Stacey and Greg to be looking at the survey and thinking about whether or not there are questions that you might have about some of the comments in the survey that might be different from issues that have been raised previously. And, Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. Thanks, Rebecca, for that comment, because I was actually really confused looking at this thinking, "I thought we've made all of these comments before." So I don't really have anything new to add on any of the comments up -- I mean, because I think it's good.

Again, repeated, I think it's -- I see the intersection here of the registrant and potential registrants, so I -- to the extent that these are, you know, I don't -- I don't want to restate anything, but it seems like if this is a potential registrant survey, you know, the people in Group C actually would have gotten the

registrar survey in my opinion or should be redirected to the registrant survey, so that's like maybe my one new comment here.

Secondly, I'm glancing at question 11, for respondents that's in Group B or D, which is for people who registered a long time ago or have never attempted but would consider, which I think is our primary demographic for this survey. I'm liking the grid and the of influencing decisions at all.

And so, if nobody has any other comments on the other parts, because I agree that it's pretty duplicitous, I'd like to spend a couple of minutes just looking at this section. Because we talk about the cost of the registration, I don't know like money, time involved in completing, someone registering already claimed my domain name.

I don't know -- for the -- why those -- what am I trying to say. I'm sorry. This is our almost four of ICANN calls this morning.. I don't know why those options are being presented, unless they're to juxtapose against, you know, the one we really want to know which is receipt of the claims notice that they've seen.

And I'm trying to look up and see, like it looks like the header says, they've seen a claims notice or no maybe not, because it says header, it says, "Only for E through G." So for (QI), they haven't even seen a claims notice yet, so how would receipt of a claims notice -- oh, I see provide notice for respondent to review.

So I'd like to talk about that, maybe analysis group could weigh in. At that point, you get to see the claims notice, but it's only one of five and four of those factors are completely irrelevant to the survey.

So I was worried and maybe I'm trying to channel Rebecca from the last call, I'm worried that in this case you're providing a whole bunch of options that are kind of chaff, and we're going to miss the wheat, which really is this

receipt of claims notice and what they think about the claims notice if you're in Group B or D, which is our primary demographic focus.

So, in my opinion everything before Q11 is either for a current registrant or, I don't know, someone else. So can we talk a little bit about that organization please, because I think that's the part that's different, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Rebecca. And let me ask Greg or Stacey if you have some guidance that you could provide us as far as the organization.

Stacey Chan: Thanks. This is, Stacey. So I think your -- everyone has identified that this section is very similar if not the same as what -- was suggested in part of the registrant survey. And, I do recall for this section of the registrant survey, we've discussed some reordering of the questions, and so I think that same reordering could also apply here.

For this question, Q11, which is this grid. The question is, "Have you considered the possibility of registering a domain name in a new gTLD? Please rank important these factors are." I think I understand Kristine that you're suggesting that the real focus of this question is how important receipt of a claims notice is on the decision, and these other options are not that important.

I may be misspeaking, but I would guess that this question came out of an attempt to make a closed-end question out of an open-ended question that asked about why registration was -- would not be completed or how a claims notice would have affected the registration or something like that. And so we suggested giving the respondent potential -- identifying potential factors that were going in their -- into their decision, so that it would help provide some context to the importance that the respondent gives to the claims notice.

So as the respondent says the claims notice is sort of important, what does that really mean? What else are they considering? And what else is

important? Maybe they are considering everything else that is involved with the registration process or the -- once they own the domain or not own, once they have the domain name, what they're going to do in terms of a website, et cetera.

So that was the intent of offering additional options here in this grid. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much, Stacey, that was quite helpful. I have Kristine and then Susan. Please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine. Stacey, that was helpful. So, I'm looking at this and maybe because this is so much shorter than the other one. I'm feeling like the potential respondents are getting a short shrift, but at the same time I'm also trying to be really excited about it, because a short survey means we're more likely to get a lot of responses, so yes.

So we're spending a few questions on -- with Group C, which is the people that tried to register and didn't, which is good, because we want to get those people. We want to get the people that tried and didn't keep going, because that's a huge problems, so we spend a fair amount of time with them.

Then, we jump down to question Q11, which is, you know, what are the following -- that rank those factors. Now, I don't know that we need to limit this question to groups B or D, which is the people who haven't actually even really tried, that just might be interested in.

So, I'm wondering if we want to make this Q1 I also apply to people in Group C, because, you know, even if they've done it, you know, we might want to get we -- we might want to juxtapose or compare someone who's actually attempted versus people who haven't attempted. So, I'm wondering if we're being too limiting by not letting Q11 encounter and cover everybody.

And then, the second question is, for these B and D people, are we getting -- how do I word this? We're asking B and D people which is people who have never registered yet and are just seeing a claims notice for the first time, and/or registered a really long time ago, and probably maybe haven't seen the claims notice in a really one time.

We're asking them two questions, essentially. That's it. That's -- the whole survey for those people are two questions. First question is of these five factors, what's the most likely to influence your decision? "Oh, by the way, here's a claims notice." "Okay, I understand what you're trying to do there."

And then, the second question is, "Why would you decide to abandon it if you saw the claims notice?" And then, we don't ask anything else and this is really a question maybe more for the group is do we feel like we're getting all of the information.

This is our chance. Do we have a follow-up question? Do you we -- you know, I know we have our open text field, which is good, but this is our chance. These people are seeing two questions. Is there a third? Is there something else that we need to ask them while we have them on the line?
Thanks.

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

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Yes, I'm looking at the same section that Kristine has so kindly highlighted and I'm just not really understanding what the point of asking this is. I mean, I sort of -- I understand what Stacey was saying and it's to kind of, you know, to see the receipt of the claims notice in the context of other factors.

But, it feels like this is kind of -- this question, no matter how interesting, it's kind of going to the wrong people, because these are people who are only potentially registrants. So, you know, they haven't done a registration in the

past, they haven't experienced claims notices, they haven't been put off registering because of a claims notice.

So, suddenly we're showing them a claims notice and then we're going like, you know, rate this in terms of this plus cost, plus, you know, time to register. You know, like -- I just -- I don't think these people are in a position to really be making that decision. They've hardly spent, you know, they've hardly ever seen a claims notice and I'm just not sure what we get out of this.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much, Susan. I'm just calling some things out from the chat. Michael said, "Stacey, your explanation turn open-ended question to close question is good. I was thinking the additional questions were not that interested in helping help mask the question we are asking, so it's not too prejudice answers." Michael says, "Kristine, agree we should include C as well as B and D." In the eye chart question.

Kathy says, "That's interesting, Kristine. A good possibility to think about." Kristine says, "Plus one, Susan, yes, it feels sudden and like it's lacking context." And Kristine says, "I'm not opposed to a short survey, I just want to make sure we're getting it all.

I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. I guess you're looking for suggestions as to whether or not we want to change the questions here, add questions here or provide some additional context.

Rebecca Tushnet: Rebecca Tushnet, please.

Julie Hedlund: Please, Rebecca.

Rebecca Tushnet: So, Thank you, Rebecca Tushnet for the record. I do -- I guess, I don't mind the short survey. I think it's great, unless we have specific things that we want to ask. I'm not exactly sure what they'd be. I think that the objections that I'm hearing are objections to the consumer survey form that is -- it is a

comprehension survey. So for these people, what is the notice mean to you, you know, what do you -- how would you think about it?

And that's how these work, I mean, because that's what a survey is, you ask people away from the actual decisions. Now, I personally would love it if we could get some of the people we've discussed, you know, maybe the registrees, if they're willing to send it to list of people that they have, maybe people who attempted, but didn't or people who attempted and succeeded.

We should absolutely pursue that avenue and send the surveys to them too. But for, you know, this group, that's what a comprehension survey is. That's - - so, everyone, I think, agrees that it isn't perfect, but it does give you more information than you had. So, I guess, I'm not worried about objections to the nature of the survey. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rebecca, and I have Kristine, please, and I will note Susan's comments in the chat, "I don't object to a comprehension survey, I just don't see that this is it." And Lori says, "I thought this was not a comprehension survey." And so Kristine and then Kathy, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine. So my ending was that this really is a comprehension survey for potential respondents. Other people not so much, but for potential respondents, it really is supposed to be short and sweet. "Here's a claims notice, what do you think of it?"

So, I do appreciate the short and sweet. I do appreciate the comprehension. I want to make sure that we're not going to have the people in the full working group poking holes in it, because we could have found out more information. So I just want us to give this some thought.

As somebody coming into the survey, I click -- I've never attempted to register a domain name, but I would consider doing so. Okay. Great. The

next question I get is what country do you live in. "United States." Very good.

Now, I see a question that says as you consider the possibility of registering a domain name, now this person has never done it, they don't even understand how you go about it possibly. They may be saw the GoDaddy commercial only when (Danica) was on it. That was it.

So, please rate how important the following factors would be in determining whether or not you complete a registration. Leave all aside the fact that I think the wording is even more complex, because people don't understand gTLD or registration and those sorts of words.

So I'm going to say money, of course, is the most important, time involved in completing process. "Oh, what is this receipt of claims notice?" Okay, click here to see that. "What if I got that? Well, I don't even know what that is, so I'm going to say it doesn't influence my decision."

Now, I go to Q1J, which is only the third question I'm presented with at this point. Our fourth question, not including the first two demographic questions. So, now I see, "Okay, so of the following reasons, why would you not proceed with your registration if you saw this claims notice?" "Well, we don't even know that they would not proceed, we just ranked it as being not important at this point."

But, again, we're giving them the option to look at the claims notice and they're going to give -- be given three options. "I don't understand it, but it seems important. I would think it would expose me to legal risk." Okay, or the process of completing registration is taking too long and would feel difficult to continue.

They have no context to click number three. Zero context, they have no idea if it's taking long or not. My guess is people are going to say, I don't

understand it and it seems important, because they wouldn't know. Now, the survey is over. We learned nothing except for they thought that the claims notice would probably be a low impact on their decision-making, because they didn't know what it was.

And they thought it was -- I don't understand it and it seems important. What did we learn? If that's the past that most people are going to follow and let's assume that we're right on that for just a moment, what have we learned? Have we learned what we came to learn? And if so, great, I'll stop talking and that's fantastic.

But if we haven't learned what we came to learn, then I think we need to figure out what questions are missing, that's all. Thank you.

Rebecca Tushnet: Rebecca Tushnet, please.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Thank you. I have Kathy and then Rebecca. Please, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: I'll be happy to go after Rebecca.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Kathy. Rebecca, please.

Rebecca Tushnet: Rebecca Tushnet. So, maybe this is my misunderstanding of how the survey is going to work, because I admit that I have not been able to follow every path, because it's presented in this linear way. So I thought and if -- and I apologize if I'm wrong that in fact you had the option to say, "It wouldn't change my decision," or, you know, "Maybe I don't know and we're given a chance to explain."

So, I think that if I'm wrong, then I absolutely agree with Kristine that we should actually give them the option to say, "Hey, I don't think that would change it." But, maybe the (AG) people can speak to what the past would be for someone who saw that, and then if they would only get the, you know, I'd

stop because -- options, and then I -- then I am going to add my weight with Kristine to say, "No, we should give them multiple options from that." Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rebecca, and I'll just note that Michael has also a follow-up question in the chat. "Would (AG) suggest that we use separate registrant and potential registrant surveys or a single survey that has two tracks based on answers. This could provide another means for ensuring qualification of survey takers."

So to Rebecca's question and to Michael's question perhaps before we go to you Kathy, if we could see if Greg and Stacey could speak to those two questions.

Stacey Chan: Sure. This is Stacey. So, for the first question about how we get to the question about how the claims notice has an effect on the respondent. Initially, in the grid where we're asking, you know, how do these different factors influence your decision, and there's receipt of a claims notice.

If they select, "It wouldn't influence me at all," or, "I don't know, I'm not sure," then, they will not see the follow-up question. Only if they say that it would influence them at some level, whether it's weekly or absolutely, anywhere in between there, then they will see this follow-up question of what are the reasons that those claims notice would affect you.

This last question does assume that if the claim notice has an effect on them, then they would abandon the registration instead of being strongly influenced by the claims notice to complete the registration. But that's how the filtering is planned to work on those last two questions.

And then, on -- now that I've answered that, I'm sorry I've forgotten what the second question was...

(Crosstalk)

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Stacey, it's Julie Hedlund from staff, it's in the chat actually from Michael Graham. So the question, "Would (AG) suggest that we use separate registrant or -- and potential registrant surveys or a single service that has two tracks based on answers? This could provide another means for ensuring qualification of survey takers." And Kristine is also interested in how the surveys intersect.

Greg Rafert: Yes, and this is Greg for the record. Yes, that's -- the latter is our (attachment). So, basically, there's -- the, you know, potential respondents to the survey will see the very first question in this document and then depending upon their answer to it, they'll either be funneled into the registrant survey or the potential registrant survey. We just divided the two documents up to kind of focus on each of the sub groups independently for this discussion.

Julie Hedlund: So, Thank you, Greg.

Rebecca Tushnet: This is Rebecca Tushnet if I can get to the queue.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, please. Go ahead, Rebecca, and then we'll go to Kathy. Thank you.

Rebecca Tushnet: So, I just wanted to follow up on that, so I had been, perhaps, under the misimpression that if someone said, "No, it wouldn't affect my decisions." Then, they'd get some follow-ups along the lines of, you know, I believe I have the right or, you know, a chance to explain why it wouldn't affect our decision too, and I would like to ask for that, because I agree with Kristine that that's important information too. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rebecca, and Kathy please.

Kathy Kleiman: So pausing, do we have a note about that, that Kristine and Rebecca agreement? And is it a...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we are capturing this. Thank you, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Two quick things. One is going -- one is about the original materials that we're dealing with and then one is about something that I came to notice only because Kristine pointed it -- you know, pointed our (dent) into it. So the first is that this actually does seem fairly close to the questions we sent to the analysis group, and I'll just read it to you.

Have you ever registered a domain name? Do you plan on registering a domain name in the next year? This is the potential registrant survey, of course. Would you consider one of these new domains? Have you attempted to register a domain name in one of these domains? If no, terminate the survey.

So -- and then it goes into questions that appear to have been put into the table, so if yes. So, I think that's just, you know, I think analysis group is working with what we sent them. The other is for -- with Q1I, I just wanted to point out I'm not sure the last part of the -- the last element of the table is one we want to keep.

Someone else already having claimed my domain name. If someone else has already registered that domain name in that TLD, you can't register it. There is no possibility of registering the domain name in that new gTLD with that second-level domain. So you might want to delete that last part, that last entry in the table, Q1I, suggestion to delete it, because I'm not sure what it means.

It would influence my decision if I could not register that domain name or in the process could you be looking at a different domain name. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy. Does anybody have any objections to deleting that last item in the grid? And, again, that is the one that says someone else already claimed my domain name.

Kathy Kleiman: And, this is Kathy, maybe the analysis group meant something different for that. So, I'll leave -- open that possibility as well, not -- it doesn't necessarily have to be answered in real time, but it's possible that something else -- some other interpretation is out there. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kathy. Stacey and Greg, anything that you would want to say about the inclusion of that item in the grid?

Greg Rafert: This is Greg. No, I think it's a really good (catch), Kathy. We will delete that last row in that grid.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you so much. I'm looking for hands. I guess, while people are perhaps still thinking, coming back to the question of the surveys being done in English and then if we wanted to go beyond North America, but still do the surveys in English, I guess this is a question to analysis group, could we do that?

I mean, we recognize, of course, we would love to be able to do it in all different languages, but the costs are just (too prohibitive) to do that, given, you know, our very, very tight budget. But if we stuck with English, would we still be able to go beyond just the North American set of panels?

Greg Rafert: And this is Greg, again. Thanks, Julie. Why don't we look back, we have research now on (SSI), and get a sense for how, if any, that might affect the cost of the registrant, potential registrant survey.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, great. Thank you very much. I really appreciate that. Does anybody have any other questions with respect to the survey? Is the discussion with

respect to question 11 -- are there any further questions or comments? I should ask Greg and Stacey as the discussion clear on what we're asking for.

I mean, there's an agreement on a follow up reason for notice not being a factor. I think there's understanding on how the surveys will branch and filter. Greg and Stacey, do you have any questions with respect to this survey and/or does anybody else have anything else that they want to add?

Greg Rafert: I, at least, do not have any questions, but I don't know if Stacey does.

Stacey Chan: This is Stacey and I also do not have any questions right now, Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And, Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. I -- the risk of sounding contrary, I just think our chairs are going to have to be prepared to answer the question from the working group, why did we not take the survey in multiple languages. It is one of the actual questions that we've decided on as of the new charter questions, and with this, I mean, the revised, restated, neutralized charter questions.

And, I think that we're not going to be able to answer the question. The question is, "What's the impact of (relations) and are they informing domain-name applicants of the scope, and limitation, and trademark holder's rights?"

And when you deep dive into that discussion and you pull up that transcript, and you listen to what we talked about, it was about making sure that not only does that the claims notice meet its need of informing people in the United States English speakers, but people who speak other languages. And so, we want -- we have questions about even asking registrars, do you offer the claims notice and other languages.

So, I think that we're going to have that question to answer to and we're going to have to be able to say something and hopefully the answer isn't, "Well, we

just can't afford it." "I don't know what the answer is." This is not just a question for today, but I think our -- we're going to get asked of that question at some point.

So, we should probably start thinking about how we're going to answer that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Kristine and I think from the staff site, as we've tried to suggest the short answer is indeed that in the very, very tight budget that we had, there is not the budget to translate the survey into two multiple languages, but staff can certainly help to provide some background on that as well to assist the chairs.

Let me ask now that we have four minutes left here. Analysis group is going to go back and make the revisions based on all of these discussions. One possible path for -- than reviewing those revisions that might be more expedient is if staff could suggest it, perhaps that each of the authors of the surveys became sort of the point person to review the revised version rather than bringing the sub team back for multiple meetings to go over those revisions.

Let me put that out there as a possible way forward to review the revised versions that we will get from analysis group. Kristine, please.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. I cautiously do not object to having the original drafter be the first person to ensure alignment with what was originally there and to actually go back and compare it to the to the charter questions and to our recollection, because each of our point people did sort of take the lead on discussing this with analysis group.

I believe that the entire working group needs to -- the entire sub team needs to approve all of the questions or see them all, and have the opportunity to look at them all at least, just, you know, as a sort of making sure that we're all

in agreement, because we all have various recollections and memories of the things we've talked about.

So I'm fine with the first cut, but I don't think that we want individual people to just completely sign off. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Kristine, and I'm glad you pointed that out, because that wasn't really the intent of my -- that's not what I meant or the staff meant, so Thank you for clarifying that. And I know -- Kathy is asking about the timeframe and may I ask Mary if you wanted to address that question, please.

Mary Wong: Sure. Thank you, Julie. This is Mary from staff. And with -- where we are, there is the ICANN 62 meeting pretty much all of next week where the working groups agenda is already quite full. So there is currently a motion for another sub team meeting next week.

The week following which would be the first week in July is typically a week where there are no working group or sub team meetings. So the hope is that during this period, the analysis group can go back and, you know, update, revise, refine the proposed questions based on the information and feedback from the sub team.

Then, the sub team like Julie was saying with the initial suite being done by the person who led that particular group or, you know, target group, the sub team can look at what analysis group has produced. Bear in mind that even after the questions are finalized and we had suggested that for the full work group, given that the sub team has done a lot of work with the analysis group, that the questions are sent of course when finalized to the working group, but that it doesn't go through the same process again.

Even so and having said that, if you look ahead, if we look at mid-July at the time when the sub team can review and get back with the analysis group, there will need to be some time for the analysis group to program the

surveys, and beta test them, roll them out hopefully on a rolling basis which is a long (what) we are saying and answer Kathy's question that this likely puts the survey issuances out towards the later part of July, so late to end July.

And, if we, therefore, allow for something like a month minimum or thereabout for meaningful results to come back, it means the analysis group would only be reporting back to us in late or towards the end of August. I hope that's helpful, Kathy, and everybody, and we can certainly take that in more detail if you wish.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Mary, and I see we're right at the end time, but I'll just note the question in the chat. Thank you, Kristine, about asking if we could try to have a meeting in Panama. We've already had many complaints in the community about scheduling conflicts and conflicting meetings, and so the schedule is not only full, it's really overbooked.

And, so, I think that I we don't know how we would be able to try to fit something in there and apologies for that. And just what Kathy is saying, given that (U.S.) is taking a little longer, I think the timing with the analysis group will work.

So, then, next steps to capture, then we will wait then the revised versions of the survey from analysis group. We will note that -- look for the survey authors to through the revised versions, but also these will be going to the full sub team and anyone, of course, can comment.

And, Mary is saying all of these will put a bit of pressure on the overall phase one timeline, but that is perhaps inevitable, and necessary. And so, then, you know, once we get the final, final versions, we'll -- those will go to the full working group but just as a reference. And then, there'll be a programming phase and then -- towards the end of July perhaps to get the surveys out as Mary noted.

So, does anybody have anything else they want to raise today? We're two minutes after the end of the hour and we do appreciate everybody staying on. I have Susan, please.

Susan Payne: This is just a really quick one. Just -- I think the thing that we haven't really had a conversation about, leaving aside the chat we had at the very beginning about the registrants and potential registrants, but we haven't really had a conversation about where are the survey respondents for the other groups being selected from.

I mean, I know they're registrees and they're registrars and so on, but we had some early discussion about whether it just should be new gTLD registrees and whether it should exclude (brands) and that kind of thing. I think, you know, during the period between now and this sort of end of July date, when the surveys would go out, we -- I think we all need to feel comfortable that the right people are being sent in the survey or these surveys.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Susan. So staff can take that back with (AG) and perhaps we can provide some guidance in that respect and bring that back to the sub team on the list. And, as you say, in this time period where we're not meeting, perhaps, there can be just some discussion on the list on that as well.

And I see Kristine is agreeing. And, great, thanks -- yes, thank you, Susan. Thank you, everyone and again for all of these meetings, this has been extremely helpful and we thank you so much for spending all of this time. So we'll send some notes around and we'll hope to see some of you in Panama and for those travelling, safe travels.

Thank you, everyone then, and Andrea I think this meeting can be adjourned.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. That concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END