
ICANN Transcription

**The Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Trademark Claims
Data Review**

Wednesday 20 February 2019 at 1700 UTC

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

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-sub-team-trademark-claims-data-20feb19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8ru14qylj7/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/9Z8WBg>

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

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RPM Sub Team for Trademark Claims Data Review call on Wednesday the 20th of February 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

Okay, hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'll turn this over to Julie Hedlund. You can begin, Julie.

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.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Julie B. Welcome all to today's call. So I'll just quickly run through the agenda, and then once I've done that, I will turn things over to Martin to chair the call today.

First on the agenda is the review of the agenda and the statements of interest. Then item two is the review of the INTA new gTLD impact study survey results with respect to the claims charter questions, questions one through five, you see there with the links, and Any Other Business. May I ask if anyone has Any Other Business?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Hi, Julie, I have a short Any Other Business at the end.

JULIE HEDLUND: And I'm sorry, what's the topic?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Just letting people know that – well, I'll do it now – the schedule's been posted and our meetings will be the Sunday and Monday in Kobe. Now that that's all official.

JULIE HEDLUND: Oh, thanks, Kathy. And staff can go ahead and put a link to the meeting schedule and chat as well. Appreciate that.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: You're welcome. And so back to the top of the agenda, let me ask if anyone has any statements of interest. Not seeing any hands, I'm not hearing anyone, then let's go ahead right to agenda item number two. And let me just remind all that we will end this call a little bit early, I think officially five minutes before the top of the hour, in order to allow time for the transition to the following call which some of you also attend. So let me now turn things over to Martin. Martin, please.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Hello. Can you hear me?

JULIE BISLAND: We can, Martin.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Perfect. Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone, to the call. Today, we're going to review the INTA new gTLD impact study survey result with respect to the claims charter questions. I see we have not that many new comments or [inaudible] we can go through these [quickly now] so we can have some more minutes to work on the next call.

Let's start with question one, [inaudible]. It's already on screen. Claims charter question one, is the trademark claims [inaudible] having intended effect? Consider the following questions

specifically in the [inaudible] notice as well as the notice of registry name.

A, is the trademark claims service having its intended effect [inaudible] registries and [inaudible] applicant?

B, is the trademark claims service having any unintended consequences such as deterring good faith domain name applications? And I see that we have a new comment from George. George, would you like to – oh, yes, he's already on the queue. He's a quick one. Go, George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Yeah. I filled out this past week the items I brought up on last week's call, so there's nothing actually new, and I think actually, Kathy added a comment regarding a page reference from Griffin. So there's nothing actually related to the INTA study that's been published in this document. However, I did actually go through the homework this week and found a few items, so I'd like to first make an overarching comment just like Susan made last week that this is an unrepresentative and small sample, 33 people, and so the past [statistical] criticisms of this survey have already been discussed last year.

Another point is that there's likely to be huge overlap in terms of the respondents of this report to the past survey that Analysis Group did which we already covered, and to the Analysis Group's other documents which had kind of like comments from different stakeholders. So we shouldn't be looking at these surveys as though they're independent random samples. It's often the same

people that are representing themselves repeatedly with the same comment, just in different documents. So we should keep that in mind when we look at this.

On page six of the INTA study, you can actually see that they had 39% of the people – of the companies that responded had between 5000 and 24,999 employees, and 39% had 25,000 or more employees. You could see that that's very unrepresentative of a typical business in general. And also, 27% had \$1 billion to \$5 billion in revenues and 52% had a whopping \$5 billion or more in revenues. We're really talking about a handful of very large trademark holders.

Also on that page, 67% were based in North America, 21% in the EU. So that just provides some background on why this survey should be taken for what it's worth, which is very little.

After question one, there was a comment on page 15 and also repeated on page 51, that 36% of those who are responding feel that trademark claims help, and so that should go into the table somewhere. I'll probably add it after this call. And also, there were a handful of comments on page 52 because there's a lot of anecdotal comments that were put in. It said that trademark claims are nearly another form of monitoring and are useful in perhaps 20% of cases where an inadvertent application is filed.

And then for trademark claims, trademark registration is higher and more difficult than obtaining domain names. The owner of the registry trademark in any jurisdiction might be considered to be authorized by the trademark office to use the mark, therefore I feel that trademark claims have mitigated the risk. That's the literal

comment. So those were the only ones that I found relevant to question one. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, George. Kristine, I see you also in the queue. [inaudible]

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. And I have reviewed this data before, but also, like I mentioned in the chat, I was on vacation. I apologize for not getting my comments in earlier.

I wanted to respond briefly to George's suggestion that on slide six, that the numbers were not representative. I understand where the point of that – and I agree that it probably doesn't represent necessarily all of the universe of the way trademark – people who have trademarks operate.

Oh, and in full disclosure, I think I said this before in a different context, but Amazon was one of the companies that did not respond to the survey because it had to be completed and we weren't able to complete it. So we don't have an opinion on this slide.

But the reason I'm bringing this up at all is I am wondering – we asked the question, is the trademark claims service having its intended effect of deterring bad faith registrations? Who is the target audience? Whose marks are we trying to protect?

So if we're looking at slide six and we see a lot of people who have participated were in North America, well, if you take all the trademarks around the world, the people who are likely to need this sort of protection, where would they most likely be located? I don't know the answer to that, but I'm wondering if it's not as skewed as we might think.

If we're really talking about really big companies having proportionately more brands to protect, is the data really as skewed as we might be thinking? I'm not sure we're going to get there, but I'll [enter] my comments on the chart as well, but I hesitate to just throw out the baby with the bathwater here, because I think that in some cases, we're reaching our target audience. We are reaching people with big portfolios of brands who spent beaucoup bucks on protection.

So I just want to throw that out there as a little bit of a rebuttal point as well, and I will also put my comment in the doc. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you, Kristine. I see there's some [activity in] the chat, and [inaudible] agreeing with what Griffin's saying. If anyone wants to [inaudible] continue the discussion, it's your time, or you want to add something [inaudible] this question, you can come up to the mic, Griffin or Michael. If not, we can move to question two. I'll give a few seconds [for you to react.]

I also see we have – I think we have a Kathy new comment on question one. Is that correct? Kathy, are you there to verify?

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm sorry, what's the question, Martin?

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: I see that there's a new input with your name on the [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN: I think I was asking Griffin for a citation on something.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Yes. That's correct. [Comment from] Kathy Kleiman, "Page number, thanks." Yes, you're asking Griffin for a citation. That's right.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sorry, Griffin. And I just want to apologize, Greg made me do this on the sunrise where I put in some stuff in and I didn't put the exact page numbers, so I guess to be completely clean about all that, we should have the sources and page numbers. So thanks.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Perfect. I don't want to move forward if people are engaging heavily in chat debate. If you want to bring it to the mic. Okay, Kristine already said her piece in this. Rebecca. We have Rebecca on the chat. If she's not coming to the mic, I can read her comment. It's [inaudible].

[inaudible] argument. First, [inaudible] entities we're trying to benefit. If that's not the case, then the standards for what is [effected] are different. Two, [it sort of] sounds like the question being asked [inaudible] big brands are successfully offloading some of their enforcement costs to relatively smaller entities like registries, registrars [inaudible]. That may be [inaudible] too, but it's worth discussing normatively as well.

Does anyone want to add on that?

KATHY KLEIMAN: My hand is raised. Martin.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Oh, yes. Go, Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. So let me see if I can build a bridge between the comments, and if it's wrong, let me know. I think we're coming to a clear understanding of who's actually involved in the survey. Initially, it was presented as kind of members of INTA, and this is what INTA thinks. But my understanding is that members of INTA – and having now gone to an INTA meeting – are very diverse and go from very small to very large.

So I think Kristine has helped clarify that this is – as we look – [George has helped clarify and Kristine has followed up,] but this really is a survey. Those who responded to this and made it all the way through are very large companies with very large budgets

and very big brands. But it's only 33, and again, most of those, 52% are companies with a total annual revenue of over \$5 billion.

So I think it took us a while to come to that understanding a year or so ago when this was presented, but I think we got it now. and then I think Rebecca's question makes sense to me. What does that mean, and how does that change the impact of what we're looking at? But I think we have some clarification now on who's in this study, who responded to the survey. So, thanks.

Thank you very much, Kathy. And don't worry, Rebecca, as long as you write in the chat, we can keep that on the record. We'll keep the mic open for a few more seconds in case someone wants to step up.

[inaudible] questions [inaudible] you're talking about the INTA survey itself. Michael, you can have the mic.

MICHAEL GRAHAM:

Yeah, just a quick comment, and that is that although the INTA survey was answered by larger corporations, largely because they're the only ones that either had the time or the information to complete the survey as it was asked, and the survey again was designed for use by the CCTRT and not by this review, at the same time, I think it should be pointed out that trademark owners, regardless of their size, have the same sort of interests and concerns in regard to domain names. And in fact, smaller trademark owners may have a more larger impact by the domain name system than larger owners. This is something that's hopefully going to be studied in ongoing and new surveys within

INTA among trademark owners, but that survey, just by way of background, was sent out to all the regular members of INTA, which include SMEs as well as individuals and larger corporation. But I think the information there is enlightening. It's not dispositive, but none of the information that we have from any of these sources is dispositive. Thanks.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, Michael. I see Rebecca and Kathy have their hand up. Rebecca, you're next.

REBECCA TUSHNET: Sorry if there is background yelling. I apologize. So I think actually, you would need a lot more evidence of representativeness to make the claims that the concerns of large trademark owners are the same as the concerns of small and medium trademark owners.

In fact, my experience is to the contrary, and it seems like what evidence there is, for example the evidence about the success rates and rejection rates for small trademark owners in the PTO for example is that it's very different from the success and rejection rate, and encountering oppositions and so on for big trademark owners.

So I actually see no reason why this empirically shown pattern in registrations would be different in that they have different experiences. Where you go from that is certainly a question on which there can be a debate, but to claim that this is somehow representative of their concerns or experiences seems to me

completely unevicenced, and in fact, counterintuitive based on the things that we know about actual national registrations and other things in which SMEs diverge from big trademark owners. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, Rebecca. I see Michael has his hand up. Oh, he's put it down. [inaudible].

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Yeah, I took down my hand because I don't want to get into a he said/she said, but having practiced in the area for 28 years with large, small, medium companies dealing with trademarks, they do share some of the same concerns. So I don't want to go back and forth with that, but I think we shouldn't be making statements that we can't support empirically when we're looking at whether or not there's information in any of these reports that is useful to provide insight.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, Michael. Greg, you have your hand up. You're next.

GREG SHATAN: Just adding to what Michael said, I can only [speak] primarily from personal experience and experiences of those around me, and I've represented large, medium, small, tiny trademark owners, and I say there's a great deal of overlap in the concerns and issues

that trademark owners have across the board. It's obviously not a complete identity, but the overlap is strong.

With regard to the study on PTO success, I haven't read it, so not sure exactly what it says, but my gut reaction is that a lot of small trademark owners are filing pro se without the help of a trademark lawyer, and that those tend to fail and get opposition, or rather, [inaudible] a lot more often than those that are handled by attorneys. I would be interested to see if they controlled for that, how big the difference would be. So also control of the fact that larger trademark owners are often filing for variations of trademarks that have already been successful. So to the extent that there are differences in experience, I think they are not ones that would necessarily indicate a difference of interest. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, Greg. I have Kathy, and I do take account on the chat saying that we should stay on that. I think we're discussing the validity of [inaudible] we are not that far this time, but it's true that we should [inaudible] questions. But we don't have that many input in each one in any case. So Kathy, you're next.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. I think it's an interesting discussion. So I think we know what the survey is, and I think Kristine really summarized it well, the nature of the companies that responded are large. But as long as we're talking about personal experience, I'll just throw mine into the mix. I've had 20 years representing small- and medium-sized

business, and mine are on the other side. They're the innovators, they're the entrepreneurs, they're the ones who don't yet have their trademarks. They're the ones who [receive] trademark claims notices. We've already talked about how much they're chilled by it. They don't know what to do.

So you've got those who have achieved their trademarks, but then you also have those of us who represented for many years dozens, hundreds of new trademark owners, the future trademark owners, the future entrepreneurs, and their experiences are very different, of course. They're the ones who we're trying to balance and protect and allow to go through and register their trademarks and create their businesses as they always have.

So just to give both sides of the SME issue. Thanks.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you, Kathy. Okay, if no one else wants to jump in the queue, I'm going to move to question two, and in case anyone wants to keep commenting [inaudible] of course continue to do so, it will be a valid point until the end of the call, so you can do it.

I have George Kirikos in the queue, and I do believe that George is one of the few, if not only, new comments on this question, so George, you're next.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. The new comment is really just the old comment that I raised last week with regards to the Analysis Group report, just filling in what I said orally. I actually do have a new piece of input,

which was from page 53 of the INTA survey. It wasn't really a piece of data, it was more of a proposed change by INTA. After reviewing the data, they said that extended/unlimited period of time for TMCH warnings when domains are registered by a third party, and also increase the time for which TMCH claims notices will be sent to at least a year. Those are both on page 53, and so those relate to this charter question. And also on page 59, there was a comment by somebody that quotes, "Trademark claims is too short." That's all I had for question two. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, George. I don't know if anyone wants to add. Maybe Griffin or Michael [inaudible] they did some homework but couldn't [inaudible]. If not, then we can move to question three. Anyone else [inaudible] the mic? No? [inaudible] changing to question three. Perfect. And I see George is back up there. Go, George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. ON question three, I had that same statistic from page 15 and also repeat on page 51, namely that 36% feel that trademark claims helps, and also, there were some comments on page 52 that relate to this charter question. Somebody said that trademark claims are merely another form of monitoring and are useful in perhaps 20% of cases where an inadvertent application is filed.

And then for trademark claims, "Trademark registration is higher and more difficult than obtaining domain names. The owner of the registered trademark in any jurisdiction might be considered to be

authorized by the trademark office to use the mark. Therefore, I feel that trademark claim has mitigated the risk.”

And then another one, “It has helped mitigate risk in that they permit brand owners the ability to take action in cases of abusive registrations after the fact, but it failed to deter individuals from registering abusive domains in the first place.”

So those were the nuggets that I found in the document which relate to question three. Thanks.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, George. I see Kathy had a very small comment also [inaudible] for specific quotations on the text, but I see Kathy in the queue, so Kathy, you go.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes. A question for George. The comments that you just read, to what extent are they compilations, are they survey results? And to what extent are they individual comments? And I'll just add I think the idea that only a few, about 36% felt the trademark claims helped and then only to a moderate extent – that's somewhere in the middle of the survey, my page numbers didn't come out – but again, how many – I think what you were reading at the very end were individual comments and not necessarily compiled survey results. But I want to check.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: George, you can answer to that.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. Thanks for the question, Kathy. The numerical results, which were on page 15 and page 51, page 15 really just summarizes page 51, that 36% number, that is a survey result. On page 52, it's just – I guess they had freeform responses and so it had those freeform responses from a handful of people.

With regards to the 36%, for those of us that are on both the sunrise and the claims working group will know that [64%] felt that sunrise period were more helpful in terms of at least this survey. We might want to contrast that with the results that we had in the other survey. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, George. I saw before Michael's hand went up and it went down. Does anyone have any other comments regarding this charter question? If none – and I don't see anything on the chat as well – yes, we can move to question four. Thank you, staff.

In question four, I only see George new input. George, you're also up. Thank you.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. That new input is last week's input that we had with relation to the Analysis Group report. After this week's homework, I did find a comment on page 53. This is one of the anecdotal comments, which is relevant to this charter question, mainly increase the time for which TMCH claims notices will be sent to at

least a year, and [in large] to include domains with only a slight spelling variation. So it was the second part of that comment with regards to slight spelling variations which relates to charter question four, which is about the exact match requirements. Thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you, George. And I see that some of your comments are not on the PDF, so do remember to put them afterwards in the call when they're open again like you did last week. I see you have your hand up again. [inaudible].

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. That was my plan. As I mentioned last week, I thought I'd give other people the opportunity to shine if they had input, so that's why I didn't put in my input before the meeting. But I'll do that after the call.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you very much, George. Anyone has any other comment on this question? We can move to question five and our last question. I do have one AOB I forgot also. We do have one more thing before we end.

George says, "Nothing on Q from me." That's true, because your comment is regarding – like the previous one, it's just an update on the previous data we analyzed. So if no one has a comment specifically to question five, we can have five seconds to [inaudible] the mic. If not, we're going to move on.

In the case we have to move on, I will ask staff, maybe Julie, or Ariel, to walk us through the next set of data that we're going to work on that I know is going to come up after this call. And George, of course, you can comment on [inaudible] if you want to. Go, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much. Also, refer to my colleague, Ariel as well, but so for homework for next week's call, there are a few remaining previously collected data sources that we can put out for homework to compare against the charter questions, and also, there are several additional data sources that people have submitted. Staff have gathered those into a spreadsheet, and those also will be put out as to be considered as homework for next week.

But I see that Kathy has her hand up, so I'm going to go ahead and defer to Kathy. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Actually, it's a question for you, Julie, and it has to do with workload. So, how many additional data sources are there from our additional data – the table we've been working off of with the Analysis Group materials and the old Analysis Group report and the INTA survey?

And then how much additional data is there? My sense is perhaps a lot, and that may be way too much to cover in the next meeting. So I wanted to ask you how much is on that new additional data table and how we can spread that out a little more evenly. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks. Actually, and I'm going to ask my colleague Ariel to help speak to that as well. And just also before I do that, just to note that of the previously collected data, these are data sources that the working group had seen previously. That's why they're previously collected data.

So we're hoping that this is more of a refresher. There aren't many left in that respect, but let me go and turn things to Ariel. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Julie. So to answer Kathy's question, the last three that we're dealing with on the previously collected data spreadsheet is that staff compiled summary data on sunrise registrations. That's the first one. And then the second one is really ICANN Org webpage about the registry operator and relevant [inaudible] sunrise trademark claims and other specific [inaudible]. It's not really a document [inaudible] It's really just a webpage on ICANN.org.

And then the last one is the transcript from the data [subteam] with Jon Nevett from DONUTS at ICANN 61, and that has some additional information. So that's really the last three on this previously collected spreadsheet. In staff's review, it's not really a lot to review, so we think it's a manageable workload.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Ariel. And let me ask, Ariel, how many additional data sources did people submit? And I should know this. I apologize.

ARIEL LIANG: There's a total of 10 additional data sources, and also, staff [are trying to] organize the spreadsheet in a way to help the review process be more efficient. So for example, we can sort them based on the charter questions they're responding to. But they're mostly blog posts and articles, so it's a total of 15 entries.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. That's really helpful. And Martin, if I may, I could go ahead and call on the two members who have their hands up, George and Kathy.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. I did post a link to the approximately 50 additional sources of data that I didn't have an opportunity to put into the Google docs. This is the 3.7 appeal that I had, was part of this suppression of these data sources, and I think some of them will be relevant to trademark claims. More of them are related to sunrise. And I do think that they should be considered in our working group work now. The alternative is that they get suppressed and I have to resubmit them once [inaudible] public comments, and then we do the work then. But I think these are the data sources that we know about, we should consider them now, I think. Having to do that [inaudible] with the extreme workload issues on top of the additional homework that only a handful of

other people have actually been doing, you have to take that into consideration. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, and I have Kathy, and then I'm going to put myself in the queue. Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. So question back to Ariel, or to you, Julie. Are we talking about 18 documents for homework next week? I know we're heading into the Kobe meeting, very aware of that, but [are we talking about] 18 documents for next week?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kathy. I don't know that I would call them necessarily 18 documents per se. I know there's three that are – and I think George even has noted in the chat – fairly limited as far as what they contain, so the three [inaudible].

And then the additional data consists mostly of I think [inaudible] and blog posts, various links. So, let me just also point out that the additional data that we've received is the data that was sent in the form that was requested. So those are the data that we do plan to look at as part of the homework for next week.

And so thanks to those who did submit the data according to the procedures and the form that was requested. And as we did indicate in the procedures, based on the guidance from the

working group co-chairs, that if the data wasn't provided in the form as requested, then it's not been included.

But I see my colleague, Ariel, has her hand up. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Julie. I just want to add one more thing about the review of additional data. When we set up the Google form, we did ask the submitters to answer how the data responds to the charter question and which charter question this data is applicable to. So basically, I think when the subteam is reviewing these additional submissions, the task is perhaps to look at their comments, especially which charter question these data apply to, and how they apply, and then see whether you agree, disagree, or whether you have additional comments to that.

So I think the review process will be slightly different than how we did in the Google docs with the previously collected data, because subteam members were expected to actually answer which charter question – how the data fits the charter question. So that task is kind of removed. That's my understanding of that.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Ariel. That's quite helpful. And Martin, back over to you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT:

I don't have much – well, that was my only request for staff, to talk about the next week and the workload. If someone has any other

comment on it. I know there's some activity on the chat. If either George, Kathy or [inaudible]. If not, we can wrap up ten minutes before [inaudible] and have ten minutes to prepare of the next call. You have ten seconds to [speak now.]

I see George, you have the last word maybe.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, I'd like to know if anybody actually opposes the inclusion of those 50 sources other than ICANN staff, because these are valuable sources when we're kind of hungry for data, we have all these articles that could be relevant to answering the charter questions. I don't see good reason why people want to exclude them just because me and a few other people in good faith had extreme overload due to actually doing all the homework that nobody else even appeared to attempt. So we shouldn't be penalized by having these data sources suppressed. So if anybody actually is actually actively opposed to considering these sources, I'd like to know who. Thanks.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: I think Julie has her hand up. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Just [inaudible] procedural point, the procedures for submitting additional data were developed by the working group co-chairs. As a procedural point, those – they were fairly clear, quite clear how the data should be submitted, and people did submit the data according to those procedures. So I think that if

there's any change in that procedure, it would be something for the working group co-chairs to decide, not necessarily for the working group members to decide.

So, thank you.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Okay. Thank you very much, Julie. And yes, as a co-chair, I have to say the same thing. We did set out a process, and the appeal – the procedure that you say that you challenged, [inaudible] and definitely doesn't suspend anything we're doing. So unless the co-chairs all together, with all the co-chairs decide that we're reopening something, yes, we cannot accept new submissions for anyone. I hope that clears it up. We can continue this debate on the list.

JULIE HEDLUND: Martin, I'm not seeing any other hands up.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: No. We can [cancel] the call if you want so we can have the five minutes extra for the next call.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Reading something from the chat too, just to note that working group members will have the opportunity to comment when we discuss these additional sources, and if there's something that you can point to that helps to answer a question, that could form part of the discussion.

And thank you very much, Martin, for chairing today, and thank you, everyone, for joining. We'll go ahead and adjourn this call, and noting that we do start the following call, the sunrise call for those who attend at five minutes past the hour, so you'll have a little extra time. Thank you all. Bye.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you all. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, everyone. This meeting's adjourned. You can disconnect your lines and have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]