
ICANN Transcription

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

Wednesday 19, December 2018 at 1800 UTC

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

<https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-rpm-review-sunrise-registrations-19dec18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7q9dam610p/>

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the RPM subteam for sunrise registrations call held on the 19th of December 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room.

If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and to please keep your phones and

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

microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and with this, I will turn it over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Andrea. Let me just run through the agenda. Item one, review agenda and statements of interest. Item two, select subteam leader. Three, begin survey analysis. Four, AOB.

May I ask if anybody has any AOB, Any Other Business? Not seeing any hands up, then let me go back to agenda item one and ask if anybody has any changes to their statements of interest.

I'm not seeing any hands up, so I'm going to item two, selecting the subteam leader. We had an open nomination period that ended COB yesterday for volunteers or nominations for the subteam leader. As of COB yesterday, we have not received any nominations or volunteers for the subteam leader, and yes, okay, thank you, Susan Payne for noting again – going back to agenda item one, Susan Payne on the previous call had noted that she's now the secretary of IPC, and I'm going to note that again here as well for completeness. Thank you for that.

Now, let me ask if there are any nominations or volunteers for a subteam leader. And David McAuley, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY: Julie, hi. I can't volunteer at this time, but I do have a question, and that is, how many people do we have in the group? I'm assuming that there are some that are not present on the call and wondering if maybe we should try one more call to the mailing lists.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that, David. We certainly can do that. And Phil Corwin, please go ahead.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes. Thanks. On the prior call of the trademark claims subteam, we did get a volunteer for chair. We decided on that call to keep the nomination period, which includes self-nominations, open until close of business Friday, that's the last day that ICANN staff are working. So I suggest that we keep it open for this subteam as well and make one more appeal to the members on today's call. I don't know if there's any missing.

Just to explain the job, if that's a cause for hesitation, I wouldn't say there's no work involved, but it's not particularly burdensome. It's leading the discussion on a call, making sure it stays focused, making sure it doesn't go on endlessly, that things come to a conclusion. It's working with staff and working group co-chairs to prepare an agenda, and it's overseeing the initial draft of the subteam report back to the full working group.

Of course, that'll be vetted with the full membership of the subteam. So, those are the duties if anyone thought there was more involved than that. It's purely an administrative post, it's not

supposed to lead to any particular policy conclusion. That's up to the subteam as a whole. Thanks very much.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Phil, and I'll note that we will take the action item to resend the nomination announcement and keep it open until COB 21 December, and also, we will send it to the full working group. And I'm going to call out the question for Christine Dorrain in the chat. If no one volunteers, would the working group chairs rotate like they do for plenary meetings? And I'll note Susan Payne is saying that's a good suggestion. I'll leave that out there in case anybody else has any comments on that or if the co-chairs have any –

BRIAN BECKHAM: Julie, this is Brian.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, Brian, please go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Sorry to jump in, I'm on the phone. I want to express some personal reservation about that. I don't want to open up a can of worms here, but I'm already not a fan of even moving the subteams, and if the working group can't find someone to lead it, I personally am not raising my hand to lead it in subteams, for whatever that's worth.

I don't want to put it all on [John,] Kathy, or undermine Kristine's good suggestion, but for me, it's a no. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that, Brian. And are there any other comments on that, or on nominations or volunteers?

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes, jumping in, I respect Brian's views on that. The co-chairs of the full working group would prefer that someone step forward out of this subteam to take on the leadership role. If no one is nominated and accepts it or self-nominates by Friday, we'll have to discuss it on our next call, which will be the first week of 2019. But again, it's not a particularly burdensome role, and we'd prefer that the subteams be somewhat autonomous from the full working group. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Phil. And that is noted. So, if there are no other comments on agenda item two, I'm going to suggest that we go to agenda item three, the survey analysis, and we will go ahead and post the link to the tool in the chat room, and we can also share screen with it, although the easiest way to look at it is indeed with the link.

And to remind us all where we stood with the action items for the next call – or before I proceed any further, may I ask if there are any objections to the staff leading the call from this point in the absence of a subteam chair or co-chair?

Thanks, Christine. I'm not seeing any objections. Let me then proceed to read out the action items from the last call, analyze whether how the data in row 28 to 32 of the TM and brand owners tab answer the agreed question five subquestion 5A and all the subquestions of 5A in the spreadsheet. You can see the link there, and in fact, I'll put it right in the chat room right now. Hold on.

And so I'll read the questions. I see your hand up, George, but maybe I'll go ahead and read the questions first. Actually, I'll go to you first in case you have anything you'd like to mention to us before I read the questions. George Kirikos, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Thanks, Julie. Yeah, it's actually a question based on the preface to the question five, which was analyze whether and how the data in row 28 to 32 of the trademark and brand owners tab answer the agreed question five. As I pointed out in this subteam call for the trademark claims, we shouldn't just be looking at the trademark and brand owners tab when answering question five. We need to look at all the tabs, because they all impact the potential answer to these questions. Particularly the registries and registrars definitely had questions and answers with regards to the sunrise period. So we shouldn't only be looking at what the trademark owners answered when trying to answer this question. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, George. Let me ask my colleague, Ariel Liang, to explain a little behind the staff thinking in identifying the action item, and we'll also note that to the extent that other data apply to

these questions, we certainly do ask the subteam members to indicate where they think there are other data that apply and to call those out for us in case there are areas that we've missed.

But let me ask Ariel to explain what was done here with this tool in identifying the questions, relating the questions to the data.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much, Julie. Sorry for repeating this point, as some of you already heard in the previous subteams. When staff [designed] this tool, we look at the charter questions and also look at the original data subteam's draft questions that are matched to the charter question, and then we match the [inaudible] questions to the charter question, so it's structured based on the original data request table.

And in fact, indeed some of the charter questions are also mentioned in other tabs, and we make sure the wording of the charter questions is consistent so we can easily identify for example if question five is also asked to registry/registrars, we should be able to see that reflected in a table.

And our intent is to bring some structure, organization to the information and so you can go through it and organize the way and start with, for example, this tab and then we can go to the next tab if there's further information that answers this question.

So, that's just staff's thinking behind that. Thank you, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Ariel Liang. And just looking at the chat, George Kirikos is noting that the registrars and the registries definitely had a lot [inaudible] Sorry, but I'm getting an echo. I think someone has a line open. If you would please mute your line when not speaking.

Thank you. And just going back to the chat, George Kirikos is noting that the registrars and registries had a lot to say about the sunrise periods, and they were asked, as Kristine Dorrain notes, so we will also then plan to look at those questions as well as they relate to the sunrise periods.

So, looking at then the question five, 5A – [inaudible] still have their line open. Thank you for that. So, 5A, does the current 30-day minimum – Maxim Alzoba, I see that your line is open and it appears that you might be trying to speak. Are you trying to speak, or may we ask you to mute your line? I think it is creating an echo.

Not hearing at this point, but going back then to 5A, does the current 30-day minimum for sunrise periods serve its intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that many registry operators ran a 60-day sunrise period? And then there are several subquestions. Are there any unintended results? Does the ability of registry operators to extend their sunrise periods create uniformity concerns which should be addressed by this working group? Are there any benefits [observed] when the sunrise period's extended beyond 30 days? And are there any disadvantages?

And Kristine Dorrain, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. Thanks. I probably should have called this out last week because I was aware of what the homework was supposed to be. I think one of the problems we have here is in trying to sort of go through these in the order in which the survey questions, the survey went, I think we are getting through the questions backward.

I mentioned this on the last call and I'm going to say it for the benefit of the people on this call. Our goal, our output at the end of this meeting, it's supposed to be three, four, five or whatever phone calls, and so at the end of these three or five hours or whatever we've got scheduled for this, we need to be able to answer the final agreed list of sunrise charter questions. And that was the link that Ariel put in the chat at the beginning of this meeting.

So there's a preamble. If you look at the preamble questions, it says they're intended as level-setting questions. So we start with, is the sunrise period serving its intended purpose having [inaudible]? Have we been able to document abuses? And then it goes into sort of specific questions that came out of the original charter, sort of what we're calling charter questions but were just a random list of collection of questions.

Which digs down into what George was saying. Basically, do registry operators [inaudible] question five? How [inaudible] into the 30-day, the 60-day, whatever? We can't get into 30-day/60-day until you've decided if there were abuses of the system.

If the system's generally working fine, then you can talk about things like, well, should there be slight tweaks? So we can't talk about slight tweaks until we get to overarchingly, does the data, do the people in this call, do the people in the community think sunrise is generally working the way it's supposed to work? Is it catching anybody – is there any collateral damage?

So I'm very sorry that I didn't call this out before, but I really think question five is not the place to start here. Thanks.

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

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Thanks. Yeah, I think a useful survey response was in [inaudible] F28 and G28 on the trademark and brand owners tab. It indicated that only four of the respondents missed registering the domain name they wanted in that 30-day period, which seems to indicate that those 30 days was more than sufficient.

Another piece of information – I can't find it right now, but somewhere, I read that there's often 30 days of advance notice before the sunrise period even begins. I think it's on actually the registries and registrars tab, cell G35. Let me just try to find it.

But so you can't just only look at it as a 30-day sunrise period on its own. It's the fact that they've been given notice before the sunrise even starts. So they have, I think in my view, more than ample time to register the domain name that they wanted, given that notice. Yeah, it's G35 on the registries and registrars tab.

Going back to the trademark and brand owners tab, cell F31 indicates that people believe by a huge margin that a 60-day period would be preferable, but that kind of is asking, do you want more money, or do you want more sunshine? If something is free without any tradeoff, [everyone's going to say,] "Of course, I prefer more to less. I want more time to do the ICANN [call-in] period, I want more things in general." More is preferred to less, economically. So unless there is a tradeoff attached to that, people will always answer in the affirmative. That was kind of a weak question. I wouldn't necessarily attach too much weight to that unless you actually look at the costs associated with that, which are kind of obvious by looking at the other tabs when the registrars and registries don't necessarily want the same thing. Thank you.

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

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. I think Susan is next. I'll defer.

JULIE HEDLUND: Apologies. I did not see Susan's hand up for some reason. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you [inaudible]. George, the notice period that you refer to, that's something that spills into the rules. If you have time, maybe you'll want to go back and read the rules in relation to the sunrise.

There were two different versions that registries could select between, and one ran for 30 days, but if it was going to run – and names would be allocated on a first come, first served basis, so on day 1, if you applied, you would get the name allocated straight away. But because of that, because there was this first come, first served thing from day one, there was a requirement for a minimum of 30 days' notice.

The other version was the end date sunrise, which runs for 60 days, and names are not allocated until the end, hence the term end date. And because of that, there was no obligation to give advance notice of the sunrise period itself, although obviously, some registries would have felt that it was in their interest to do so, and certainly, registrars would have wanted notice.

So they're slightly two different things, but you're absolutely right, the duration of the sunrise period isn't the only thing, there's also the question about the notice. But the point with the 30-day one is that essentially, the clock is running right from day one, so in the 30-day start day sunrise. So in terms of a brand where there are multiple brand owners with the same brands, you need to be applying earlier rather than later. And that's where questions about the notice and duration in particular come into play, I think.

But to go back to the general point of how long should the sunrise be and these questions about duration of sunrise, I would agree with you that we can look at the brand owner responses, but I

think we should also be looking at responses from the registries and registrars, such as they are, and taking into account, of course, that relatively few of them choose to respond to the surveys.

But I think the registrar responses on this point – and I think it's from line 33 onwards in the registrar tab. Really telling, registrars in particular generally were saying that they thought longer periods would be helpful to them, both have noted [inaudible] duration of sunrise, and indeed gave – as you scroll down the answers in that section – a number of reasons why.

So, we could perhaps look at those as well. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Susan. I have Kristine Dorrain and then George Kirikos. Kristine, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thank you. I put a proposal in the chat, and again, we're talking about 60 or 30 days, but we haven't even decided if sunrise is even a good thing. Is it doing what it's supposed to do? is it being abused? We are putting the kart way before the horse to dig into the minutia without if it's even working.

And maybe we've all decided it's working, it's fine, it's not really hurting anybody, whatever, carry on. But it will be dumb for us to spend one or two or three weeks hashing out, is it 30 days, is it 60 days, is it start date, is it end date? And we haven't even decided if the sunrises work.

I really propose – and I would invite people to yes or no this. It's a summary table that I just linked to, that Ariel linked to in the beginning of the doc, so it's been linked to twice in the chat.

Please click on it and open it. That is the document that we have to fill out at the end of our three to five weeks. I really think we need to start with this document, start filling it in, and George is doing a fantastic job of cross-referencing. Here's some data that's relevant, here's some data that's relevant.

As we go through, staff can fill that in right in column two, and we can start filling in this information. But [we] need to work on these questions. I was part of the subteams that created both these and the claims questions, and it was really – we spent a lot of time actually organizing the questions to flow top-down so that they made sense. They're not 100%, but at least they made relatively decent sense. If we start from the top down, we should work as a funnel from very broad down to the very narrow. And I think that will help us, and we'll use the really great data table that staff created to have on our hand, we should all print it out and be referencing it as we're filling in this table. But I think that we're doing it backwards if we just sit and talk about some people like 30, some people like 60. Reasonable minds vary. Let's fill in this table, top down, and plug in the data where it applies and as we deem it to be valid and as we deem it to fit. So please let me know if you agree or disagree with that, because I really think we're working backwards right now. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Kristine. And George Kirikos, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. I agree with Kristine that we definitely have to look way beyond just the trademark owner responses and asking the fundamental questions, is the sunrise a good thing, etc.? And we're not going to find the answer to that just by looking at these questions. We have to look at some of the other data we've collected.

Just to go to Susan's point earlier about the registrars [inaudible] the sunrise, I do believe that his was probably skewed by corporate-oriented, brand owner-oriented registrars like MarkMonitor and CSC. I don't know if we have a list of the registrars that responded to this survey, whether one could determine whether that was a factor in the survey responses.

Also, perhaps – I don't know if the various registries kept track of the data as to which registrars accounted for most of the sunrise registrations? Was it the GoDaddies and Tucows, or was it more the MarkMonitors, CSC, and those kinds of registrars, [inaudible] etc.?

If we had that kind of data, I guess we could see which registrars the trademark owners tend to use, whether that perhaps disadvantages some of the other registrars who didn't even bother to add the capability for sunrise registration. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, George, and I have Maxim Alzoba, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me? Okay, I hope so.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, we can hear you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: [inaudible] items. First, [inaudible] with registrars, I can say from registrar side that many registrars decided to wait until sunrise is ended, because for small registrars that don't have [inaudible] developers under their belt at the time, [inaudible] registrant is too much. [inaudible]. And small and medium registrars, they usually decide to wait until the sunrise is over, so they don't have to implement [inaudible] at all. Because sunrises of this kind didn't exist in the past, so not many of them decided to invest in it.

The second item is about [inaudible] understanding of the 60 days and 30 days. Because of the way ICANN wrote these papers about RPMs, there is no [way a registry] could do 60 days in the case of first come, first served scenario. So, if a registry decided to go with the first come, first served, it's a 30-day notice period, and then, only then, 30 days of sunrise. So combined 60 days.

If the registry used the highest bidder option, it's only 60 days scenario. So, I believe that the question [inaudible] owners about this. So it's like comparing different items, [inaudible]. So, I believe we don't have clear answer to question, and if we read the RPMs [addendum,] we will see that 60-day period is for end date sunrise. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Maxim. I think we got that. And I know you had also put something in the chat. To the extent that we may have had difficulty hearing you as you were speaking now, we'll check to see what you also put on this in the chat. Kristine Dorrain, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Again, I'll defer to Susan who's first.

SUSAN PAYNE: [inaudible] Julie. Hi. [inaudible] I wanted to just quickly correct something Maxim said. A lot of what he said, I was agreeing with, but the bit about the duration of the sunrise, those durations, so the first come first serve and the end date version, they were minimum. So if a registry wanted to do a first come first served sunrise and run it for longer than 30 days, they absolutely could do so. They just still have to give the minimum 30 days advance notice, but they could run it for 60 days or 90 days. They could still be running it if they wanted to. The durations were a minimum for both of them.

So just to quickly correct that, because I think it is an important point. But I think you are right that we had a lot of trouble when we were working with Analysis Group on these questions, and they were very keen to kind of ask the minimum questions possible, and it was challenging to try and explain the distinction between start date and end date sunrises and why some sunrises were longer than others. So, I think your points about the [inaudible] compared is a good one.

Could I just go back to what George has been saying about the skewing by the corporate registrars, to use his terminology? Because that's why I put my hand up.

In the first place, I realize that I can't tell George what to do, but it's really quite annoying to have something typed in the chat which people then go to the trouble of responding to or correcting, only to have him then put his hand up and say the exact same thing on the call as well. And then that means then I have to put my hand up and correct it on the call as well even though I've already corrected it on the chat.

These questions were selecting in the sense that there was a pre-question, which was, have you done sunrise registrations? So if you are a registrar who tends not to do sunrise registrations, you are being selected out. And of course, corporate registrars would be some of those who, if they chose to respond to this survey, would have been selected in, because of course, brand owners with trademarks in the trademark clearinghouse are the ones whom are going to be utilizing the sunrise. So of course, the registrars that they worked with are the ones who are able to give responses and views and inputs on their experiences of the sunrise. That was the whole point. It's not skewing. Thanks.

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

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I think Kristine is ahead of me, unless that's an old hand.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think you're right. Apologies, Kristine.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: [inaudible].

JULIE HEDLUND: Things don't always show up the way they should on my screen. I apologize.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Oh, I hear that. Thanks a lot. I'm not going to echo – I essentially wanted to say everything Susan said, so instead of repeating her, I'm just going to add two points, which is that – and this addresses Maxim's concern about the 30-day minimum start date sunrise and the 30-, 60-day minimum end day sunrise. I got it backwards.

But the point is – and to sort of extrapolate on what the Analysis Group was looking for, they got really frustrated with us when we tried to sort of distinguish, and the reason we sort of dropped out this notion of start date and end date sunrise is because Maxim, you and I, and Susan on this call, probably we're the only three that really understand what that means. Maybe there's a couple others.

And so they just didn't want to have to go into the explanation of what type of sunrise it was. So it wasn't that they were retrying to not be complete, it was just very few registry operators did an end-

day sunrise, so it just seemed to be more inclusive to include the thing that most registry operators get.

And secondly, I believe – and I may get the number of days wrong, but I think Amazon specifically has about a 120-day sunrise. So you're right, we still have to pay the bills, but people can have a sunrise for essentially as long as you want for a first come, first served sunrise.

So, those are the only two things I wanted to point out. Everything else, Susan already gracefully said. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Kristine. George Kirikos, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Yeah. Just to address the prior points about skewing in terms of the registrar responses. I think even by Susan's own answer, it's acknowledging that the registrars who did respond to this are the ones that participated in sunrise, and they tend to be overweighted by those that are corporate registrars. And so I think people looking at the survey results naively – which is probably most people, given that they're only going to look at the question as is and not necessarily think about who answer those questions – might be lead to believe that that's a fair sample of all registrars.

So when I say the word "skewed," I don't necessarily mean that it's skewed relative to those who responded, I'm just saying that if people were expecting that that's a fair representation of all registrars, that's incorrect, that it's overweighted by those that are

corporate registrars, like the MarkMonitors, CSCs, [inaudible] as opposed to the consumer-oriented registrars like Tucows or a GoDaddy, or a probably much smaller representative in terms of volume of registration, the small brand owner-oriented registrars.

And going back to the data, I want to point out that in the registry and registrar [hyphen] Q15 and Q4F tabs, those had some significant pieces of data with regards to the cost of implementing a 30-day sunrise period, and that's relative to having no sunrise period at all. And I think it's fairly well-established by the answers to those questions, both the registry Q15 and the registrar Q4F, that there are costs to implementing those sunrise periods, and so that needs to be acknowledged. And that's also, I think, indicated in some of the other tabs, the registry Q29 for example, which is another tab, registry-Q29 further to the right where people are ranking the various possibilities of having sunrise and claims period. Having these be optional generated significant support. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, George. I'm not seeing any other hands up at this point. So, we did have a proposal that Kristine had made as far as looking at the summary table as a possible tool to fill in, so obviously, one can reference the surveys, the Google sheets at the links that we've been using, but we could fill in the relevant results into the questions in the summary table.

And we're actually displaying the summary table right now in the Adobe Connect room to remind you of it. and this is the one for

sunrise. So, and this is the one for Sunrise. There is a separate summary table for the trademark claims as well.

So, let me ask again what people think about Kristine's suggestion to use – this is a tool to use this as the place to coalesce the data that we think helps to answer the final agreed questions, and using – so beginning with the survey results, but also looking at other data. And I see there's a lot going on in chat too. But let me pause and ask if anybody has any thoughts on that suggestion.

And I see Mitch Stoltz. Please, Mitch.

MITCH STOLTZ:

Thank you. Yeah, I agree with Kristine's suggestion, including that if we use the summary spreadsheet that we're looking at, summary document, that we do it in order, because it does move from the general to the specific.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Mitch. And Kristine is agreeing to add rows. Staff will note that what you see in the Adobe Connect room, which we're not seeing right at the moment because it has – there [inaudible] screen – we see in the Adobe Connect room is actually a PDF document. But what staff is doing is turning this into a Google doc, at which point we can make it more nuanced. It was really just an example, so to speak, in PDF form [so that you could see a suggestion] format.

I'm noticing some agreement with Kristine's suggestion, agreement to add rows – I'm sorry, Kristine's suggestion. I don't

know necessarily that we would opt to have subteam members edit that document directly. We have to think about that, because as we noted on the list earlier today, using these Google tools, it may be that staff will have to gather comments – yes, and Kristine’s saying staff edits live during the call. Yes, we can do that.

And actually, I'm going to defer to my colleague, Ariel Liang, who has some comments. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much, Julie. [If] convert the system or table into a Google document, I think everyone in the subteam has ability to suggest edits and comments, and then your [inaudible] will show as redline. And I think it's possible that we can provide people these suggest commenting or suggest editing rights to the document.

And then for [this] spreadsheet, the survey analysis tool, unfortunately we couldn't do that because it doesn't have that capability [as a] Google document. And I notice that Maxime has a question about whether it can reflect who has commented what. So I sent you the list earlier that we created additional column just to document people's comments [inaudible] the particular survey-related data in the spreadsheet here, so you can see that here. But back to the summary table, I think once we convert that into Google doc, everyone can suggest edits directly and [show as] redline, so that's doable.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. And I'm just noting a couple of things. I think we could give people option also to send their comments to the list indicating with as much specificity, being as specific as possible, in that some people [may be constrained] from using Google, but I think to Maxim's comments, as Ariel noted, if we do it in comment suggestion mode, then we can see who suggested what, I believe.

Yes. And Kristine is noting that this is trying to see what we are coalescing around as opposed to individual proposals. Maxim Alzoba, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: If we decided to stick to e-mail mode, so we supply our comments via e-mail through the group, or maybe through secretaries, and then we will need to see what adds what in the final document. So, it's time for read only mode where we send our edits to the group via e-mail, but we [inaudible] to see what was added by whom, so we don't lose what we were talking about. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Maxim. If we did send comments, we would suggest sending to the entire list. But I think that staff would suggest that to the extent that people can use the Google doc and make the comments in the Google doc, we would ask that people do that, because then real-time, people who go into the Google doc will be able to see what others have suggested. And to Kristine's point, where there may be agreement, it may be that others can simply agree or may not need to add a particular comment because it's

already been reflected, whereas we would not be able to have that kind of synergy if everything is sent to the list.

So, staff is going to respectfully suggest that we use the Google docs to the extent that people can, doing comments, but we do ask that people then identify themselves and not using the anonymous handles that Google Doc allows, because that would be, of course, impossible for us to identify who has suggested what. Yes, exactly. Noting to Kristine, Google will make you anon, so you would need to include your name even if logged in.

So, staff would like to suggest that we take as an action to convert the summary document into Google and set it up so that people can comment, and we can send that with a link in the action items. And then that would mean that we will be starting really at the top of the table with the first questions, looking at the sunrise survey result, but keeping in mind too that staff is working on trying to see how we can integrate other data as well that's been collected.

And in fact, actually, staff might suggest that it might be easier to have an individual Google doc for specific questions, as indeed, these could get quite lengthy. It might be easier then for reference just to have a Google doc per question. Are there any objections to that approach? George Kirikos, you have your hand up. Please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Instead of having multiple documents, I would suggest putting it into one document with multiple tabs, have it as a spreadsheet instead of a Microsoft Word document, word processing document, because with a spreadsheet, you can have multiple

tabs, you can put groups of questions on one tab and then use a second tab and so on. So that might be more simple to organize that way. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Let me defer to my colleague, Ariel Liang, who's much more knowledgeable about using the various Google options. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Julie. Regarding George's suggestion, unfortunately, we cannot do that in a spreadsheet format with different tabs, because it doesn't have the capability to track who wrote what, and the comments would be all [not redline,] and then people can easily delete or modify other people's comments. And that will create a big mess.

So we have to revert to a Google doc. And staff will explore ways to organize them, and maybe find a way to provide a link so everybody can see all the Google docs in one Wiki page for example. So we'll explore different ways to organize this. And unfortunately, we have to use Google doc.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. That's extremely helpful. And much as I'm just noting while it might be easy to use the list, again, you won't have much opportunity to see the context of other comments that have been provided, and so we really do think that while there might be some awkwardness, staff can try to overcome or at least

mitigate any awkwardness in using the Google docs through some organization that may make it a little bit easier. And as Marie is noting, yes, the [mailing list] function does not allow for collaboration, or at least not easily.

So, staff is going to take the action to go ahead and create the Google doc, and I'm going to – we've got seven minutes to the top of the hour, and given that we're rethinking how we want to approach this and we've got some work for staff to do, then let me ask if there are any more comments on the proposal to use the Google docs and this approach. We certainly will welcome comments once we get the tool set up, and we'll have a chance to see how it's used on the next call.

And with respect to getting comments in and not getting them at the last minute, staff can also ask that there be a cutoff period for comments before each call so that people will have a chance to review the comments in their entirety without something showing up at the last minute.

I'm pausing, looking for hands. I'm not seeing any. There's still some typing in the chat. I see a hand up. I see George Kirikos. Please, George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

I was thinking that since we did cover cover some of the data today, Ariel might want to put that data into the first spreadsheet or first document that's created. And that might set the example [inaudible] how to add their own comments. Because if it's just a

blank page, it would perhaps be daunting for everybody on how to add to that. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, George. That's a good suggestion, and we'll take that on as an action as well.

I see we have five minutes to the top of the hour. Perhaps staff then would suggest that we'll capture these actions and get them sent out today. And we'll work on the tool as well and have that ready for people to use. Probably, I would guess, by the end of this week.

And then let me say that we'll adjourn this call, and I want to wish everyone a very happy holiday and a wonderful new year. And we will look forward to speaking to you on the 2nd of January at the same time in 2019. And thanks all. I have [cats, so I'm good at cats.] I'm just responding to the chat, in case people think I'm crazy.

Thanks, everyone, and goodbye. And we'll talk to you next year, as they say.

ANDREA GLANDON:

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]