

**Consumer Metrics Project Discussion
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 06 December 2011 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 06 December 2011 at 1500 UTC. 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:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-cci-20111206-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC

Olivier Crepin Leblond – ALAC

Steve delBianco – CBUC

Wendy Seltzer - NCSG

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

John Berard

Margie Milam

Coordinator: You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is a CCI call on the 6th of December 2011. On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Cheryl Landon-Orr, Rosemary Sinclair and Steve DelBianco. From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have an apology from John Berard and also Margie Milam.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Nathalie. This is Berry Cobb. Just going to read off the agenda real quick since several aren't in the Adobe Connect. And then I'll turn it over to Rosemary.

First item for review today is just review the roll call and any - add any additional agenda items. The secondary item is to continue our Dakar session review. Subtopics include pricing as a function of competition; amend definition of consumer to include defensive registrations from a non-registrant perspective. And the third subtopic is a review a statistical measure diversity from Annalisa Rogers.

Thirdly if we have time and we'll - hopefully we will, we'll confirm satisfaction of our definitions that we have for competition consumer, consumer trust and consumer choice. And the fourthly we'll start diving into the tangible metrics that we've assigned for each of the definition.

Fifthly, which we'll start getting down to there's two deliverables from ICANN staff. The first is a draft device letter and the second the metrics matrix, which is started and has been sent out to the list. And then lastly, we'll review any other business. That kind of sounds like we may not get that far today.

So with that said, I'll turn it over to you Rosemary and we'll go from there.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. That's - thank you Berry. If we - so we start with the Dakar session review. And we were discussing pricing in our last session. I don't know if anyone else has had a chance to reflect on that but I went back to some examples from other parts of my life including the telecommunications sector where the regulator here does an analysis of prices once every 12 months.

It takes a small team of about three people almost the whole year to collect the data in a way that is robust and meaningful. So I guess I'm hesitant about this one not because it's not a good measure of competition but because of the workload in just pulling it together.

So what are others thinking about this one at the minute? Now I'm looking for hands. I can actually see hands today so that's a great leap forward except of course I'm not seeing any.

Steve DelBianco: This is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I'm - sorry. I'll go after Steve.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So...

Steve DelBianco: So we're talking about the notion of whether pricing should make it into competition on AT&T's idea. Is that right Rosemary?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes, that's it Steve, yeah.

Steve DelBianco: So just to recap where we were at then end of the last call, I had sent around to all of you some written ideas that came over from AT&T who looked at the measures we had for competition and said they would look at prices. And they were thinking both (retail) and wholesale both for new and existing.

And on the last call we had, there was quite a bit of consternation about the challenge of getting at wholesale prices and those would only be known by the registries themselves, the TLD operators. We'd have to get them to disclose that.

There was some...

Woman: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: ...(unintelligible) about differentials between say the prices during sunrise and the prices for premium names, maybe the prices for non-premium names that are available to the public because remember there are no regulations at all in prices charged. They can have multiple tiers of pricing at the same time and prices can change over time for any given name.

And then finally we said that public registries would have pricing that's interesting but sort of registries that don't sell to the public. A very tight community TLD or a .brand TLD. For them the pricing isn't so interesting.

So I'm sorry to take us back through that but it just helps me to crystallize where we were. And then Rosemary what specifically did you dive into with your previous experience and how does it shed light on the discussion so far?

Rosemary Sinclair: The telecommunications regulator in Australia does a report to parliament on prices paid by consumer across the range of telecommunications services fixed line and mobile. I think they've almost given up trying to do it for broadband packages.

But there's no disclosure on wholesale prices in the Telco sector because they're subject to commercial and confidence arrangements. But the point I was making was that the study of retail prices is a very time consuming study. And for that reason I'm - I hesitate about the workload in collecting pricing information.

So does that clear it up a bit?

Steve DelBianco: Only to the extent that you're articulating not necessarily whether it's a desirable piece of data but it's very difficult to gather. And...

Rosemary Sinclair: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: ...I have some questions - right. I have some questions for staff about that but...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...I know Cheryl's - do you want to go first Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Thank you. Cheryl for the transcript record. And I think Steve it might be a nice segue to your questions because why I put my hand up was following on and by some on what you then reviewed. They are worthy metrics. They are useful things. They are things that from a - and Rosemary and I occasionally see it on same sides of table here in Australia but we also see it on slightly opposite - slight tangential sides of table as well.

And as a consumer advocate in this space, not a small business consumer, but as just a plain old consumer advocate in the Telco space, these are hugely useful measures. But they are very -- put it in inverted commas -- expensive in terms of time to get collect and have a degree of trust in who's reporting what because you don't really want industry reporting on the industry at least from my perspective.

So that said, what struck me was the opportunity we might have to suggest that the review team that will be using our work do something that every other review team to date has done and that is have a costed study. It's - this is exactly the sort of not necessarily annual bills that Rosemary's describing we do here in Australia and (say) significant energy but nevertheless useful outcome to some of us.

But perhaps as I'm sure putting myself in a review team mode, what other type of study would be able to be done in a reasonable timeframe that a review team runs. If there's not third party operators out there now that are doing this such as a consumer watchdog type group that would have access

to at least a snapshot of these sort of figures, it would be an ideal study to propose that the review team when it's formed actually undertake.

So Steve, I don't know where you want to take it from there but that's the reason I had a rush of blood to the head. I'll go back on mute now.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Cheryl. Rosemary, is it okay if I respond to that?

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Great. So I share Cheryl's view that it would be valuable and I understand AT&T's point of view about the pricing. With respect to the difficulty, let's agree that if we articulate the need - sorry, the desirability of having both wholesale and retail prices for public and non-public premium, sunrise and non-premium.

We'll lay it all out. We may end up saying that it's difficult but we keep it in our document in our advice as something...

Woman: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: ...the review team consider during it's one year - approximately one year review period that it could contract for a snapshot study of those items. So I believe that it makes sense for us to burn a little bit of time to articulate the things and get them into a matrix like the one Berry circulated.

And it definitely - it might well come up with the difficult label in Berry's nomenclature. But we'd have - we'd want to note that it might not be something that was routinely available but could only be done in a snapshot study.

But having said all that, let me ask Berry. Registries and registrars are under contract to ICANN. Is ICANN allowed to request - to require its registry

contract partners to report in an automated way its wholesale prices for domain names?

Berry Cobb: I think Steve it's very - I don't know that I have enough knowledge to answer that directly but I will take it as an action item to review with the policy team and find out for sure.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. While you're at it, ask them whether ICANN is allowed to require a simple automated dump of retail prices from registrars. If the answer were yes to both of those questions, we've addressed the data problem - the difficulty problem...

Berry Cobb: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: ...if it's available. And I honestly don't know. I mean many of the registries have it in their contracts. Their contracts are public. We know exactly what the wholesale cost of .com and .net is and we know - well, we would only know by going to GoDaddy's Web site and see what they're charging for com and net names. But I realize that an automated gathering is so much better than one that's - that has to be done manually.

And when we say something is difficult, we might have - we might have another flavor of meaning with respect to that. That it's non-automated or we're unaware of how we could even get it because non-automated is difficult but there's another category called doubtful. That we're doubtful we could even get it at all. Why don't we - why don't we think of that as a fourth category for each metric, which is doubtful? We're not - we don't even think we can get it.

Woman: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that's a really good way forward on that issue both including pricing but exploring it in that way in terms of collecting the data. Okay. So anything else that we want to say on that?

Steve DelBianco: All I would say - this is Steve Rosemary. All I would say is let's capture whether it's in the matrix or in the notes. Let's capture the multiple flavors of pricing.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: (Wholesale) versus retail, premium, non-premium and sunrise as three categories of pricing. And the notion between available to public or single registrant gTLDs. So if you capture all those, you might just throw away the non-public...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...single TLDs. You might throw those away. And if it turns out of all those data points I just mentioned that the only ones we can get are wholesale, wholesale non-premium, that's fine. That would at least be more than nothing. Thanks.

Rosemary Sinclair: And Cheryl's reminder that this of course is all fodder for review - for the review team to consider was very timely. And the other point for reflection on this I guess will be if we have some sort of opportunity for comment by the community on our thoughts.

So I think you're absolutely right that we should include this in a detailed way in our work. That's it. That's the right thing to do. Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah and Rosemary, it's Steve. I think you're really onto something there in that we were asked for advice to the Board on metrics and three-year targets.

But in there we should have as part of the advice what you call fodder for the review team. It's (unintelligible)...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...advising the board to do anything right now.

Rosemary Sinclair: No.

Steve DelBianco: But remember the whole point of advice was to have the Board look at what we gave them, advice, turn to management and say all right guys, you're likely to be measured on the following targets, metrics. So, you know, get busy adjusting your management processes to achieve these metrics.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: But at that point we don't want to flush the fodder away. The review team when it's formed a full year after the first TLD's in there. So roughly December of 2013 that the review team is formed one hopes they dust off the fodder part of this and consider booking a study or consider looking whether that data is available at the time.

Rosemary Sinclair: Indeed. Indeed.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) needs to have an appendix to it I guess I'm saying.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. It needs a bit more fishing out doesn't it?

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry. So in terms of...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...actions on my part, I'll make sure to add that the different pricing categories within the matrix and then basically - and also including the doubtful category as well as we evaluate each metric.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And then lastly basically the fodder that Steve just mentioned about that would be language that will be included in the draft advice letter.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's perfect Berry. Yes. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Berry.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So that means now we can step to 2b which was to amend the definition of consumer to include defensive registration from a non-registrant. Also from AT&T. Now did you do that yet Berry in our definitions?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I have not. I think that that was still - I think if I recall appropriately from our last call it was still kind of up for debate as to whether that should be done or not.

Rosemary Sinclair: Good, good. Yeah. That's going back to the definition metrics you (think of) where we define consumer as Internet users and registrants. Steve, would you might just remind us of the AT&T points here?

Steve DelBianco: What they said is quote you may wish to amend the proposed definition of consumer.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: The issue is that complaints about defensive registrations do not always result from a registrant but rather from a trademark owner.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: And perhaps that definition can be tweaked to include them. So the idea would be that if a company doesn't want to have a domain name, it isn't a registrant. It simply complains and tries to prevent others from pretending to be that company's domain name. And they have a - they have a point. It's a bit subtle.

And the last thing I want to do is to pretend we're using this as an exercise to carry water for the intellectual property (unintelligible)...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...users and registrants and we ordinarily view the registrant - the trademark community as part of the registrants and they're doing it to protect users.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So we're (consistent) with their views. But I'm uncomfortable modifying our definition in a way where it said users, registrants and trademark owners. I just don't like the optics of that. I understand the point is it's users and registrants and potential registrants who whole trademark rights.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So I think that I would like to note - not change the definition and the advice but note that in our definition of consumer, which is users and registrants, we're expansive in our notion of registrants to include potential registrants of all the trademark right and want to protect it without necessarily becoming a domain name registrant themselves.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: How do you guys feel about that as a note to that section in the definition rather than changing the definition?

Wendy Seltzer: This is Wendy who just joined. And says eek.

Steve DelBianco: Which part of that Wendy? The part where I'm backing away from AT&T's idea or - I mean did you hear all of that?

Wendy Seltzer: No I didn't. I'm sorry. I only heard that we consider user of a domain - registrant of a domain name to include potential registrant because of trademark concerns and...

Steve DelBianco: So AT&T - on the last call Wendy, AT&T has submitted in writing some ideas after they saw the presentation we gave in Dakar. One of their ideas were quote you may wish to amend your definition of consumer which is currently Internet users and registrants.

The issue is the complaints about defensive registrations don't always come from a registrant but sometimes from being a trademark owner who may not want to register the name.

Wendy Seltzer: If they don't even use the Internet, then I'm happy to say their concerns don't matter.

Steve DelBianco: But hang on. I mean maybe I run an old style bank and I don't want anyone to register my bank's trademark name because I don't want it to fool customers into thinking that that is my bank Web site. So a domain name...

Wendy Seltzer: They're still and Internet user.

Steve DelBianco: Well, so hang on. Given what I just said, I didn't think it was - I didn't think it was wise for us to expand and change our definition to say something like

users, registrants and potential registrants who own a trademark. I don't want to go that at all.

On the other hand, I said as a footnote to our definition, which we don't want to change, we'd say that registrants can also include potential registrants who want to protect their trademark from abuse of registrations that don't necessarily want to register the domain name.

Something like that gets them into the definition, satisfies what AT&T asks for but it doesn't change our definition.

Wendy Seltzer: So this is Wendy. And I would say I would prefer to note that they are among many sorts of Internet users. And as such, they're included in the definition already rather than...

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Yeah there is and I put my hand up earlier and in fact did hum, when we were reviewing what AT&T were asking for but then felt somewhat more relaxed when Steve wasn't carrying the banner. But going back to the do not change our current definition but perhaps put some form of footnote. And I was very comfortable with that Steve.

But what I was going to say is perhaps that footnote as I was listening to the debate then, I just went back to language that is used in other parts of the DNS world and that's the delegation and re-delegation.

Why do we not simply use a footnote that indicates that we recognize and that we assume that the collection of data would recognize that there are significantly interested parties in these things and that their interest and complaints from their interest might need to be measured as well rather than

pull out any particular significantly interested party at the trademark. And it's merely being one of them.

I certainly am against changing our definition but I'm happy to wordsmith over whatever it takes to find a footnote that recognizes the interest but does not shift the definition.

What I would like to do is have that interest just bundled into a nice big term like significantly interested party knowing that we will have a bona fide framework of interpretation on what a significantly interested party is in the world of domain names and coming from delegation and re-delegation work now running between the GAC and the ccNSO. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve.

Woman: Rose - sorry Steve.

Steve DelBianco: I was going to say that I think Wendy's really on to something because that bank who didn't want its domain name would still fit our definition of consumer because it's worried about its banking customers as users of the Internet, worried about them being prodded and therein lies it's a consumer. Because all we're really talking about is whether folks who don't want - have their own domain name are allowed to be a consumer.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. I'm very comfortable - Rosemary here. I'm very comfortable with Wendy's suggestion as well. And I see the broader category of Internet users as the place to talk about - was it significant stakeholders Cheryl that's the known term? Got Cheryl on mute.

But that idea of Cheryl's of using language that is know in other parts of the DNS to describe the breadth of interests that are reflected that Internet user phrase.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. If I could, I don't agree with stakeholders and significant interest. We really are trying to focus only on consumers, which are users and registrants. We don't it to include contract parties. We don't want to include...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...that fulfill a role. If we just use the traditional nomenclature of stakeholders and interested parties...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...you suddenly are saying that part of the consumer trust - part of the whole consumer angle is not consumers anymore. But I don't think we want to do that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. That's a fair comment. Wendy, what was the phrase you used? Would you mind just repeating that?

Wendy Seltzer: I don't recall using any particular phrase.

Rosemary Sinclair: I thought it was some usefully broad way of capturing the breadth of Internet users. Perhaps we just, pardon me, leave Berry with that problem and note that captures the breadth of Internet users without stepping us over the line that Steve has just reminded us of in terms of contracted parties - significantly interested parties.

Okay. So anyway, the position is we don't want to change the definition but we're happy to include a footnote to explain the breadth of interested Internet users. Have I captured that correctly?

Steve DelBianco: I think so.

Woman: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Great. So we can...

Berry Cobb: (Unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: ...now move to...

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this...

Rosemary Sinclair: Is that Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Just so I get this clearly, so the definition itself remains in tact but there will be a footnote that this is inclusion of significantly interested parties. But do I also make reference to potential registrants that hold a trademark right or are we just going to just strictly significant interested parties?

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. This is Steve DelBianco. I did not think that significantly interested parties works without some qualifier to say that interested from the perspective a user or a registrant. So I don't think it's good to go down that path.

I'd rather us articulate that users and registrants include those that represent their interests, potential registrants or potential users who may not actually have a domain name of their own yet or may not be using the Internet yet.

That potential really scratches the interest that AT&T had all along. But the notion of potential still doesn't change the perspective of a user and registrant. Significant interest could go well beyond the interest of a user or registrant to become the interest of a vendor or a contract party.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Pardon this cough everybody. So Berry are you okay to explain that in the footnote without using, pardon me, the phrase significant interest?

Berry Cobb: (Unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: We want to really capture the focus of Internet users and registrants but to broaden that so that it's not just current Internet users and registrants but can be potential Internet users and registrants. But that's the perspective we want, not the perspective of vendors or contracted parties.

Steve DelBianco: I mean after all it's so rare...

Wendy Seltzer: This is Wendy.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: As I understood the sense of the group, it was that we did not want specific reference to trademark holders.

Steve DelBianco: We agree Wendy. This is Steve. They way articulated earlier was potential users and potential registrants who are considering or evaluating the use of the Internet domain name system. I didn't think we needed to mention trademark holders at all.

Berry Cobb: Okay. This is Berry. I understand now. So thank you. And I'll make that update and send it out to the list.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. It's so rare in the world of ICANN that we get to focus on good old-fashioned users and registrants. It's so rare. I don't want to do anything to dilute that in this kind of a unique exercise. That's all.

Rosemary Sinclair: No. Rosemary here. That's what's the special element of this task because it does have that focus and I agree Steve. We don't want to dilute

that. Okay. Now that means now we can move to 2c, which is the statistical measure of diversity. And we've got Annalisa Rogers next to that item.

Steve DelBianco: I don't remember. I know I noted that Annalisa made the comment in Dakar. And I forget whether I was supposed to follow up with her. If I was, I apologize because I did not. Does anybody know her well enough to ask her for what she meant by metrics on diversity?

Rosemary Sinclair: I don't know her Steve. Rosemary here. But in fact I asked our head of the school of economics about this and he's put me in touch with a couple of the higher degree research students and lecturers who specialize in this field of measuring diversity in assessing competitive effectiveness. But I've not had a chance to follow up with them yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

Rosemary Sinclair: So - sorry Cheryl. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi. Cheryl for the transcript record. You asked the question does anyone know Annalisa well enough. Well she's one of the very active people in - as an At Large (Directorate) leader in the North American (unintelligible). So I'm happy or I suspect Olivier and I are happy -- I'll just speak on his behalf now seeing as he can't speak for himself while he's on a train -- to follow up specifically with her on that.

But knowing her particular philosophy and interest in new gTLDs, I would second guess her to be thinking about the diversity of community versus non-community internationalized domain names, you know, a whole lot of metrics that we're already looking at but yeah, that there could be some other measures she has in mind.

So if you perhaps let - you follow up with your people and I'll see if Annalisa can give us a little bit more info on this for our next meeting.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well that would be good Cheryl because then we'll have a - sorry, Rosemary for the transcript record. We'll have a DNS focus and then a broader competition policy focus.

And I'd just like to capture the comment from the chat about the definition of significantly interested parties. And could we take an action Berry perhaps at our next meeting or the one after to just have a look at that work. I'm not suggesting we change anything we've agreed to do. But given that that work is going on in another part of ICANN, it might be good to just have a look at it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, if you like, I'll (tic tac) with you on that because I serve on that workgroup. And the terminology will be out for public comment before the holiday seasonal break. So we will have something to chew on if not the next meeting the one after that.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So Berry, are you right with the actions in regards to 2c?

Berry Cobb: Yes I think so. First and foremost Rosemary you'll get back with some of your colleagues at the university.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: And then Cheryl and Olivier will try to touch base with Annalisa to get more clarity around her intent on the measure of diversity.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. You know, it's ironic the definition of SIP from Cheryl's work was done in order to go beyond contract parties. But we are on the other end of

the spectrum. We are about users. And I fear the use of a term like that expands us to include contract parties.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: But in saying so if Cheryl's chat on this is accurate, I don't think it will end up serving our interest. But I too would enjoy learning from Cheryl how that cooks up.

And I had a point on Annalisa's diversity metric. I went back to my notes. When she asked about it, she made the idea. She said that for the choice, which is an area where we're thin in terms of metrics, for choice Annalisa said, "You can measure the geographic diversity of your registrants in new TLDs."

And I said, "Is there a metric for diversity?" And she said, "Oh yes there is."

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: So it's some sort of a new (unintelligible) measure of diversity. And I vaguely remember something like this in her statistics but it doesn't jump into my head. And it was specifically with respect to where in the world the registrants are coming from. Okay.

So if we were to determine from Annalisa what this metric is and if we have that information, we might try to do it. Now it's not trivial.

Rosemary Sinclair: No.

Steve DelBianco: We can't go into every Whois record and look at the country of origin. I don't think we can figure it out from the IP address or the name server. I don't even know how we would get - so this is certainly under difficult if not doubtful Berry. Difficult to get the country of the registrant...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: ...in order to be able to compute the metric for diversity of geographical diversity of registrants. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Good. Thanks Steve. Okay. So that I think then takes us to agenda Item 3 which is to confirm satisfaction with our definitions at the moment. And Berry sent around an email, which I've got to say I found a very easy format Berry with the Excel spreadsheet.

So is it possible to pull those up on - in the Adobe screens or do we just have to each go and get copies out of our inbox?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...Berry. I can try to put it up but it's been my experience that Excel doesn't really visually display well in Adobe. So it'd probably be best for everybody to just pull it up on their own.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, try to cut and past from the definitions tab and just cut and paste it into the discussion area. Is that possible?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. While all that's going on, why don't I read and then we can just see how we go. So the first definition that we've got is consumer. And we're saying consumer is Internet users and registrants with that little footnote that we've been discussing before.

Steve DelBianco: Let me note at how impressed I am that everything that Berry did here he reused our new batting order of always showing trust, choice and then competition. And it's everywhere. He's got it that way in all the phrasing, he's got it that way in the tabs and that helps. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes it does. It does help. It's great. So thanks for that Berry. So the next one then is consumer trust. And we're saying that refers to the confidence registrants and users can have in the consistency of domain - of name resolution from registrar to registry and the degree of confidence among registrants and users that a TLD registry operator is fulfilling its proposed purpose and is complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws.

Is there any comment on that one? Okay. Let's go then to consumer choice. And that says consumer choice is evident in the range of options available to registrants and users for domain scripts and languages and for TLDs that offer choices as to the proposed purpose and integrity of the domain name registrants.

Any comment on that one? And the last one is competition. And the definition competition is evident in the quantity and diversity of gTLDs, TLD registry operators and registrars.

Now so any comments on any of those?

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Berry.

Berry Cobb: When we go to actually review through the actual measures, I included a Column H over there for specifically there are two measures, the quantity affect and registry operators prior to 2012 versus the quantity of backend registry operators after 2011. And for both of those I asked if should they be actually called registry service providers.

And the only reason I'm bringing this up is, you know, I guess there's confusion among the community as to what a backend operator is versus a registry operator. I just wanted to make sure that the team provided clarity that this isn't going to be confusing when we release this out for public comment. Should we be specifically calling them backend operators versus registry service providers versus registry operators?

And...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...clarifying question. Is the registry operator the actual applicant who's responsible to fulfill their contract? That's what you call the registry operator. And then you said the registry service provider happens to be any vendor that that registry operator happens to be using to run the - to run the zone.

Berry Cobb: That is my understanding. And if that - if we agree that that is true, then what is the distinction between, you know, if TLD registry operators are in fact the applicant, then what is the distinction between that and gTLDs?

Steve DelBianco: You're speaking of it in the definition of...

Woman: Haven't seen him at all - all day.

Rosemary Sinclair: In competition we've got quantity and diversity of gTLDs, which I thought actually meant the names.

Steve DelBianco: I think you're right. I think it's...

Rosemary Sinclair: Sorry Steve, go.

Steve DelBianco: You're right. It's the strings, not the entities. So that reads strings, entities and entities.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. So do you think...

Berry Cobb: So...

Rosemary Sinclair: Sorry Berry, go.

Berry Cobb: I was just going to say then should we make the distinction then that it's gTLD strings comma TLD registry operators comma and registrars?

Steve DelBianco: Sure.

Woman: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I think that's good. You know, because if you had that question Berry, you're right. Other people in the community will have the question.

Steve DelBianco: And Berry, for the purposes of how you started to ask, you were proposing that we clean up our metrics spreadsheet so that when we're referencing the - when we're referencing the entity who applied and made promises and is accountable, the one who signs the contract, that we'll consistently call that the registry operator, capital R, capital O.

And then we'll consistently call registry service providers as those - what we previously knew as backend. They don't necessarily sign the contract with ICANN. They sign a contract with the registry operator. And I realize that in many cases this is the same entity but we had members of our group who wanted to try to measure competition not only among those who signed the contracts but among those who run the backend.

Berry Cobb: Correct. Okay. I will...

Steve DelBianco: I'm onboard with your adopting that standard nomenclature.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. I think that's really good for clarity and so we've got - so the definition now would be competition is evident in the quantity and diversity of gTLD strings, TLD registry operators and registrars.

Berry Cobb: Perfect. I will make those changes and I'll denote that when I send that out to the list so that everybody is aware of that change.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Great. So that then takes us to agenda Item 4, which is to develop strategy to identify tangible, qualitative and quantitative metrics for each definition and classify access, no access, data does not exist, not likely obtainable. So that's a bit of shorthand.

So that takes us to the second page in Berry's spreadsheet where we start to actually look at some of the metrics. So we've got - oh gosh. Berry, would you mind taking us through this sheet. I guess when I look at it, I'm trying to just identify the metrics against the definitions that we're interested in. So maybe that's one recap of this sheet.

And then this is the first time I think we've seen the obtainable reportable comment, which is very helpful. And then you've got a number of questions that you're asking in the comments. So just in general is everybody happy if we proceed this way that Berry takes us through how this spreadsheet works? Is there anyone who wants to make a comment before we get going with that? No. Okay. Well let's do it that way.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Rosemary. This is Berry. Per what Steve had highlighted earlier, I tried to move forward with the order in which we wanted to approach each of these definitions. And...

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...hence the color scheme behind them. So starting up in Cell Bravo 3 is just the plain definition of consumer. And what I - essentially what I've done here is I went through the latest presentation that was used in Dakar. And for each of the slides we would define what the measure - we would have a definition for consumer trust and then the next slide outlined the identified measures that we thought were associated to that definition.

And so I basically extracted each of those bullet items and imported them into this spreadsheet. Mind you that I did take a hint of creative liberty especially where it comes into Column C and Column G for the source.

So with that in mind, consumer, we didn't have any assigned metrics to that. I left it white and there were no metrics defined. So hence, the not applicable at this time at any rate.

The second definition being consumer trust. And let me make sure I'm referencing the presentation just so I can help you understand the reason for my madness.

Rosemary Sinclair: Berry, Rosemary here. So all the green ones are consumer trust metrics.

Berry Cobb: That is correct. And so what I tried to do here, Column B is the actual measure and it is a tag - each measure is tagged by its consumer trust. And the reason why I did this is actually for the third tab within the spreadsheet so that I could create pivot tables against the data, which just allow us to compared the measure versus the category and also take a look at a kind of a roll up version of how obtainable versus reportable these are as well as the source.

So yes. Everything consumer trust is listed as a light green, consumer choice is listed in purple and competition is listed in light blue. And so for example,

going through the consumer trust slide - make sure I - so I know you don't have these pulled up.

Basically Slide 12 from our deck in Dakar defined consumer trust and hence that was on the definitions page. Then Slide 13 was a bulleted list of the proposed metrics for consumer trust. And so the very first one being percentage of up time for the registry and registrars.

So while that was one bullet in the slide presentation, it actually is two metrics. And so I broke that out between percent of time of registries versus Row 5, which is percent of time of registrars. And I took the creative liberty of trying to assign it a subcategory of these measures. I'm welcome to feedback and if it's confusing, maybe we don't even include these.

But I was trying to figure out a way to further delineate the metrics that we're reviewing. And so hence these - both of these are specifically associated with service level agreements that are denoted at least with the registry contract. Those specific SLAs that are denoted in the tail end sections of those contracts and so hence the category SLA.

Column D specifically outlines what that measure is. So percent of time registry. And now Columns E and F again this is kind of a thumb in the wind take - might take us to how obtainable and how reportable this data would be.

So for instance, percent of time registry I denoted it as easy because registry operators are contractually obligated to provide the registry reporting of their systems on a monthly basis. And they provide that to ICANN. So it should be easily obtainable for any future entity to report against it.

And then conversely Column F being reportable or trying to gauge the degree of how easy it is to report on the data, these metrics are fairly - especially in the new gTLD realm should be fairly organized and seamless from one

registry to the next. So it should be fairly easy to collect all of that data at a macro level and report on it in a fairly easy way.

And then lastly with Column G is the source of those metrics and ultimately the registry is the source of that data. So kind of that first one is an outline of the method that I was trying to achieve here and I'm certainly open for feedback on how to move through all of these.

The only other thing that I'll add before - if we need to go through each one of these or not is some of the bullet items. So if you take a look at Rows 7 and 8, (unintelligible) - okay yes. So Rows 7 and 8, which was the 4th bullet from the metric is UDRP and URS violations of new TLD registry operators.

So again, we were actually looking at two separate metrics within one bullet. And so what I tried to accomplish here - confusing you guys I bet. From the presentation it's bullet Number 3, number of alleged violations of proposed registry agreement.

And wow - I messed that up. All right. All right. Row 7...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...is tied to bullet Number 3, number of alleged violations of proposed registry agreement. So Row 7 is correct. But basically consumer trust is a category from a contract.

The measure is the quantity of violations of registry agreements post 2011, which is - so we're basically anticipating that registries that are delegated after 2011 start to fall in line with the metrics that we're trying to measure. Because these violations would be a proponent of ICANN compliance, we should have easy access to that data.

And therefore if we have easy access to that data, it should be fairly easily reportable and the source would be ICANN ultimately because they're the ones that are monitoring and measuring against the contract.

Row 8 is a mistake on my part because I misread Bullet 3. It did not include registrar agreements. And that's hence why I had the comment out to the right. We didn't have that in the presentation itself. Doesn't make sense to add this in as a metric.

And so then lastly, what I meant to do here is to give you an indication of the greater than 2011 or less than 2012 metric as some of the metrics further down in the list, especially during competition like around Row 28 is to gauge the quantity of registry operators before 2012 versus the quantity of registry operators after 2011, which are any new gTLDs that would come online.

And so that was the reasoning of the greater than less than and the year. So before we can go down through each one of these individually, and I'm not sure we have the time to do that on the call today, any questions or clarifications that - or suggestions to improve this?

Steve DelBianco: Berry, this is Steve. Fabulous job. I would say wherever there's an opportunity to educate us more, please do. For instance, the SLA for uptime, is it expressed daily, monthly, year to date and let us know what they mean by that.

And then things like quality, quantity of violations that - I guess a violation is something that's been finally ruled on as opposed to a complaint that's pending. Right?

Berry Cobb: Well I have to say that that's up for the team to define. I tried to throttle back some of my creative liberties and just try to extract what the team has decided on and agreed on at this point. If I have a greater creative license, I can certainly deep dive into those aspects.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I think that would be very helpful as Steve suggests because I have - this is the first time that we've seen this presented so clearly. And at the moment what it's doing Berry is raising all sorts of questions. And that's an extremely helpful thing to do.

So those definitions for example, and I'm just making these up, that a violation is when you have actually found that something is wrong and that's right at the end of the chain. A complaint is before that. And then we've got decisions. So I guess it's a matter of presenting those in a logical sense.

The comments that I had about the presentation of the table is I wonder if you could actually include another column which takes us to the initial measure that we suggested. Is that in the metrics? Is that where all of those metrics come from, those actually dot points that we put forward? When you're talking about the slides Berry. You're saying I've taken that directly from the slides.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So that's Column D is everything that we suggested.

Berry Cobb: That is correct.

Steve DelBianco: Right. But we had suggested many of them with just prose sentences. It was a challenge then for Berry to turn...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...granulize those into individual items.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. I'm - this is just an optics point. But it's - I want to make sure that we take everybody on the same journey that we have been on, that we've got a

definition and then we in our prose form suggested the things that needs to be measured. And then Berry has actually turned them into metrics. So it's just some way of capturing that journey on this...

Steve DelBianco: Oh I - it's not just the slide but the advice that we would draft, the document.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Would start with the prose - start the definition. We'll start with what was on the PowerPoint slides and only then would there be an embedded table of the individual metrics. I think that's - I see what you're getting at. That would help - that would be helpful to show that journey in the actual advice document. We don't have to do it in the spreadsheet though.

Rosemary Sinclair: You're right Steve. That's a much better place to do it in that advice document, not in this spreadsheet.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Understood on that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Sorry Berry.

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry. I just - I understand what you're referring to now and that made it clear. So when I do start drafting the actual advice letter, I'll bring that into play - the prose aspect and then embedding the table of the actual metrics. Then take the reader on that journey.

Steve DelBianco: Berry, it's Steve.

Rosemary Sinclair: Now...

Steve DelBianco: With respect to the violations, I think we want to be as clear as we can. It's probably a violation notice from ICANN. As you said, the source is ICANN. So is there such a thing as a formal notice of violations for either registrars or

registries at ICANN today? One I remember is .jobs got a formal notice of a violation or a breach.

Berry Cobb: Yes. That...

Steve DelBianco: I want to differentiate the notice of a violation from the eventual outcome because sometimes they'll be appeals, sometimes they'll be remedied within their applicable time and all that's great news. But we need something that can be plainly measured. And I would recommend that it's a formal violation notice or breach notice from ICANN.

Berry Cobb: Yes. I don't know the exact processes that the compliance team is currently using. As a part of our policy retreat last week we did meet with compliance and they are in the process of documenting the compliance processes. And so hopefully I can extract out the milestones for lack of a better word from the beginning to end of a compliance transaction.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. I'd love to select...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...in that process that is definitive and non-controversial. I know it doesn't mean it's final because things can be appealed and they can be remedied. We are looking for something we can measure which is an indication of what we're calling consumer trust. Thanks.

Rosemary Sinclair: Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thank you. So one thing that - I think this is a very helpful table. One additional piece that might help might be another column tying the measure to the particular phrase in the definition because going back and forth between measures and definitions on the trust item I noticed that, you know,

many - most of the measures here seem to go to the complying with ICANN policies and specifically complying with the rights protection.

We might looking over that say that's a skewed view of what trust means in the broader context. That might suggest weighting the metrics as we evaluate them and making sure that we have measures that apply to each part of the definition. So consistency of name resolution seems only partially captured by up time.

And I would wonder whether then there are metrics we could add to capture say are there wrong responses that are being sent out. Some of those come through takedowns. But are there errors in the system? Are there people misusing the system so that people get inconsistent responses?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. That - the point that Wendy's captured I think is where I was trying to go but rather inarticulately. If we took Column C and put in Column C consistency of name resolution and then moved what is existing in Column C over and then put all the measures that we're suggesting for consistency of name resolution next to that and then further down we would have confidence amongst registrants and users.

And under that we would have proposed purpose, complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws as three areas where we're looking for measures. So it's a kind of hierarchy if you like across the spreadsheet that I would find helpful and Wendy's just articulated that I thought rather well.

Now given that we're up against time, I wonder Berry if we could just use the last few minutes for you to go through your questions in Column H I think so that we can just understand those questions. And my suggestion is that in our next meeting we go through these measures one by one really. So does everybody agree with that approach? Hearing nothing, so Berry would you mind just giving us a bit of background on your questions in Column H?

Berry Cobb: All right. I will start with Row 8. And it doesn't make sense to include quantity violations of registrar agreements in this metric - in these metrics. And the reason why I stated that is then the bullet from the consumer trust presentation it only mentioned registry agreement.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve with a comment on that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Go Steve.

Steve DelBianco: I think that if a registrar is found to have violated accuracy of Whois or any other of the obligations under the RAA that that is a violation that affects consumer trust and should be noted. So I would concur with keeping eight although we have to drill into what the RAA calls for in terms of obligations.

We realize the RAA probably is going to be amended very quickly to include other sort of minimum disclosures that a registrar has to do and anytime they would fail to do that according to the RAA we want to take a note of the number of violations.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Thanks. And Berry, the ones in competition.

Berry Cobb: Okay. The Rows 30 and 31 I think we have already addressed...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...and everybody agreed that we should call them registry service providers versus backend operators so those are complete. And then lastly on Row 34 and 36 - let me find the presentation in the deck so I make sure I - okay, yes.

On Slide 10 there were proposed metrics for competition and the second major bullet states to evaluate market share of those suppliers before and

after launch of new gTLDs. Then there are two sub bullets; new entrant share of new registrations versus new entrants among all registrations including existing registrations.

And so when I tried to break this out, I kind of got the sense that how could we - how can we measure new entrants prior to 2012 because they haven't happened yet. And so I just wanted to make sure I understood what the intent of the group was with these measures and to evaluate or just basically validate whether I was going down the right road or not.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. Could comment on that if Rosemary if that's okay.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Absolutely.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. The new entrant statistic or measure would be a percentage. The percentage of the total new registry operators in - so the denominator is new registry operators. The numerator is new entrants. And that percentage would be what we would observe.

I guess it would be up to us to decide whether we think we can say three years out that that number ought to be 25% or something. We haven't gotten to what we would say is the target for that. But I concur with you Berry that there's no need to compare a before and after on that particular kind of metric. Some of these are not a before after. They're just an absolute measure of the new program a year into its launch. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: And so just so that I understand correctly, then Rows 34 and 36 could actually be removed where as Rows 35 and 37 are the true measure that we're trying to gauge here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. I - that's right Berry. We can remove the...

Berry Cobb: Basically it's kind of the chicken and the egg kind of thing where I was going.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes. It's really an absolute measure of progress going forward rather than reflecting back (currently).

Steve DelBianco: But progress is going to be hard to measure Rosemary because what if the number is 10%. If 10% of the new gTLD registry operators are genuinely new entrants, we won't know I guess sitting here a year from then whether that sounds like a good number. If we really did our job according to what the Board resolution asked us to do we'd be advising them on appropriate targets for that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. That's right. That's right. But I think that's going to be extraordinarily difficult. But they'll have a lot of advice to chew on in any case Steve with this lot.

Could we finish this call today and I'm sorry to be pressing everybody in this regard. It's just a timing thing for me. I wonder Berry could you just take us through this measures pivot, which is a new thing for me and something that Wendy can't even see so that's going to be a bit tricky.

And then we need to just very quickly agree our next call. I'm not sure what people's holiday season arrangements are. So if we could just do those two things very quickly (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, actually I'd like to just forego the measures pivot. Right now it's just a geek way to try to consolidate or summarize the details of the measures. Let me take all the action items and make these changes and I'll update this to the table. That hopefully will make a little bit more sense based on the peered approach of the definition as it's compared to each metric.

But in general the intent is just try to summarize and find where the biggest targets are within the matrix. And the idea is that we can just easily take - get a quick takeaway of which ones are going to be difficult based on their -

based on the actual metric itself versus which ones are easily attainable and reportable. And it's - anyway, I'll make a better matrix for the next version.

With respect to the next meeting, I believe we do have time for the 20th of December before the holidays if that's acceptable by the working group.

Rosemary Sinclair: I'm happy with that. What are other people okay with that?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Well let's...

Man: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...send that around just to confirm with everybody. But I think it would be great to have one more meeting now that we've got this spreadsheet before the end of the year.

And once again Berry, I'd really just like to thank you for a really terrific piece of work. That is very, very helpful in our discussions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Anything that anyone needs to say before we finish this call today?

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. Just wanted to ask about how do we proceed to the drafting of advice, which is the prose part and do we want staff to sort of take the first crack or one of us to step up? How do we think we were going to work that out? Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Steve, this is Berry if I may respond. From our last call it was an action item of staff to begin a draft of that. And that's on my plate as well. I'd just like to add that given some of the actions of today and some of the changes to this

matrix, I'm not sure I'm going to have the bandwidth to get to the actual advice letter.

So if the working group were willing to take it on just to kind of steer us in the right direction as to what they see as an advice letter back to the Board, I'd certainly sign up for that. If not and you still prefer staff to take the first stab at it, I probably won't have the advice letter available by our call on the 20th although I will commit to having the measures matrix complete, which I believe will be the brunt of our next meeting to review these line by line.

But for sure the first meeting of 2012 I will - would be able to have the first draft of the advice letter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary. Quick...

Wendy Seltzer: And this is Wendy.

Rosemary Sinclair: Sorry. I've got Cheryl and then Wendy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Wendy can go first. (Sorry).

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. I just wanted to say on timing I've just circulated this matrix among members from my stakeholder group and I expect others are doing the same. So it might be premature to begin drafting advice based on this.

Man: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Cheryl here. I was just going to say to have the matrix in the next meeting on the 20th look into the title, et cetera, et cetera, I think will give us a better position to take that back out to in my case CIC. And then we can get

some input before we start drafting advice. So I think looking into advice letter in the first meeting in 2012 is a reasonable outcome.

And I would suggest that a (message) the GNSO meeting somewhere the New Year's Eve part is probably going to work for that side of the equation as well. But certainly if on the 20th it can then take for the final meeting of the At Large Advisory Committee in December the material to them. Then it gives them a month to chew on that and get back to us, which I think would be a reasonable way forward. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Cheryl. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. When I forward this to my constituency members, I find I have to write the narrative before I attach it. And the narrative part is the Board resolution and the affirmation of commitment gave rise to how we did it and I usually do it by pasting stuff from the Wiki conversation.

I then lay out the definitions we've adopted. I would paste in the PowerPoint. And I did this for the GAC at one point. Paste in the PowerPoint pages that indicate the metrics. In other words, I do everything to tee it up before they even open up the Excel sheet under the tab called measures.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: It's that part of the draft advice that I feel we ought to do so that we are presenting that part. I realize that not all the metrics are in any way finalized yet and we haven't even talked about targets yet. But I for one would feel it helpful to get the first part of the advice letter drafted. That's the part that lays the story behind how you get to these metrics.

Rosemary Sinclair: If you've done that work Steve, are you in a position to share that with the rest of the group?

Steve DelBianco: Absolutely. I'd be happy to.

Rosemary Sinclair: That would probably save a lot of time and make sure there's a consistent background going out. And that might just give Berry a bit of a kick-start in the New Year.

But I'm also of the opinion that if we have the next meeting really working our way through the spreadsheet, then we'll be in a better position to get back to the advice letter to the Board and using the example that Steve's using currently with his stakeholder group would be a terrific way to start that piece of work.

Okay everybody. Let's leave it there. And we'll...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Rosemary. It's Olivier.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...reconvene on the 20th. Sorry Olivier. Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I'm sorry I wasn't able to - thank you. It's Olivier for the record. Sorry I wasn't able to fully contribute to this call because of very patchy connectivity. But I've listened to the last half an hour pretty quietly. I totally agree with Cheryl that we - I think we do need another version of that table. Version 1.0 I thought was just a very first draft. So definitely see a refinement of that before we actually share it in the At Large community.

So, you know, I think we should try and get that done ASAP and then when - after we've discussed it in the next call, then we can present it to the ALAC on our side.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Which is what Cheryl was saying basically but I'm totally in agreement with her.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like to hear that. Thank you Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Olivier. And Berry would you mind capturing the point Steve's made in the chat that we just need to be clear about what obtainable means and what reportable means? So if you could just do a little bit of thinking so we can discuss that at the next meeting.

Okay everybody. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: And Rosemary I'm really sorry. It's still Olivier just the second part of my remarks.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I think we've got many metrics for the consumer. I haven't seen any in the table for the user - the Internet user, the non-registrant. And I will send an email perhaps to suggest a few things on that.

Rosemary Sinclair: That would be very helpful Olivier and thank you for making that point. Yeah.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's great. Okay. We're ready to finish now says she slowly, slowly. Great. Okay. Well we'll reconvene on the 20th of December. Thanks very much everybody for a great meeting.

Woman: Bye. Thanks Rosemary.

Woman: Thanks Berry.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you (Julie).

END