

**Consumer Trust Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 17th April 2012 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Participants on the Call:

Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG / WG Chair
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Steve delBianco - CBUC
Olivier Crepin Leblond - ALAC
John Berard- CBUC / GNSO Liaison
Tobias Mahler - Individual

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:

Carlos Aguirre - NCA
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Wendy Seltzer - NCSG
Jonathan Robinson - RySG

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the CCI call on the 17th - sorry - of April, 2012. On the call today we have John Berard, Rosemary Sinclair, Tobias Mahler, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond and Steve DelBianco.

From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Jonathan Zuck, Carlos Aguirre and Jonathan Robinson. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks - oops, sorry about that. Okay so if we go to our agenda now we've got some action items to review first up. And Berry was to create the summary of the Costa Rica transcript. That's complete. And second was myself to send a summary of the issues that I saw arising from the workshop. So that's been done.

So - now this was for everyone to reach out to - oh sorry about this - government contacts about consumer metrics. I spoke to Peter Nettlefold from the Australian government on Friday and took him through the Costa Rica presentation.

He was extremely interested in the work. But of course because it was the first time he'd been through it he wasn't able to provide a lot of detailed feedback. But he undertook to do that. But in terms of a response from a GAC member I thought it was a very positive response.

So he certainly will be interested in this work as it progresses through the next stages. And he was - I think I could reasonably say overall very welcoming and comfortable with our work in its draft form.

Are there any comments on that or perhaps additions in terms of reach out to government contacts from others on the call? If not then if we go then to Action Item 4 which is a similar action, I guess. And that was with Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Rosemary. Steve. Made the offer, got no reply though. And again our offer was to do a Webinar to give GAC members an opportunity to hear more

about what the advice is. But under no circumstances did I expect the GAC to file any written comments during our comment period. That's just not like them to do that; I think you'd agree.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: I guess our best effort is to prep them so that when they're asked for advice - and again the Board did not formally request the GAC to provide advice; it simply passed a resolution in Cartagena in December of 2010 and expected the relevant parties to just read the resolution.

While we were in Dakar I put this question to the GAC and was told that, no, they had not received a formal written request asking for their advice. So I still take it on board that we ought to prompt - and maybe I ought to do this in a letter to Bruce Tonkin or someone. But we ought to prompt them to make an official request.

It wasn't necessary for the GNSO, ccNSO and ALAC but it will definitely be necessary for the GAC.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. And we could certainly do that. Rosemary here. Peter Nettlefold said he thought the GAC would be very interested in this piece of work. He said it was, you know, right up their ally to use one of the colloquialisms. So perhaps if we prompt Bruce or suggest to Bruce that they discuss it at the Board I suppose is the right thing to do.

The other thing I could do is to just follow up informally with Peter to let him know that we've offered to provide a Webinar briefing. And perhaps he could come at it from the other way.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Please do. But the Webinar, Rosemary, is a means to the end of getting the GAC to comment...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...on a request - a formal request for advice. And you know how the GAC works; it could take a couple of months for them to debate and deliberate and come up with advice. We would hope they would look at our draft and use that as a basis so they could do their work more quickly.

But we need to get into their queue the notion of giving the Board advice. And to that end a Webinar is a way to help jumpstart them in that process. But the Webinar is not the end it's rather the beginning of the GAC's work on this.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's right but yet I suggest that because the only person we have engaged thus far is Peter Nettlefold. And it seems to me the Webinar has at least the prospect of engaging a few other GAC members all, as you say, Steve, preliminary to getting them to provide advice.

Peter did say to me that they're going to be very engaged over the last few months reviewing the first sort of new applicants - applicants for gTLDs. So he was indicating to me already that their timeframe is not our timeframe if you like. But that's to be expected really I think.

So I'm having to take the action to chase up with Peter Nettlefold. Do we want to pursue the Bruce Tonkin option, so to speak, as well?

Steve DelBianco: If so I'm willing to do that but let's see what everybody thinks.

Rosemary Sinclair: If there aren't any other views on that I actually think it's quite a good idea, Steve, because it also (keeps) the fact that our work is progressing in front of Bruce who's one of the key people on the Board on this topic.

Okay so that's Action Items unless there are any further comments? So the next item is...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Cheryl, this is John.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, John.

John Berard: The only question coming out of that that I would have is as you read the document that Berry prepared regarding the conversations in Costa Rica do you see any real point of controversy or potential even deal-breakers in the commentary that we got? Is there anything in there that is particularly important for us to focus on and either accept or specifically speak to the fact that we haven't and why?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. John, this is in the context of writing to Bruce Tonkin.

John Berard: Actually it's in a bit of a broader context of the work overall. The question - so we've gone through the open action items and the question was is there anything that we should be thinking about. And so what I'm thinking about is the glide path to approval on the work of this group.

And I'm just looking at the two-page document that Berry prepared and trying to decide if there's anything in there that is anything more than a speed bump to us getting to yes. Does anybody see anything in there that concerns them?

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve in the queue.

Rosemary Sinclair: No I'm not seeing hands this morning for some reason or another. So, Steve, did you want to comment?

Steve DelBianco: Only to the extent that something that Evan Liebovitch, who's a member of our team, he said during the consumer trust session in Costa Rica - and it was actually endorsed by the registries in their written comments that came in just a few days ago.

And it is a bit of a speed bump, John, because it's the notion that we are only measuring within the scope of things that ICANN controls. We are not measuring impacts on consumer trust, choice and competition that occur outside of the DNS that ICANN manages.

And given that the registries embrace that I guess the - for them it's somewhat self-serving because they will claim that there is competition to what we're doing at ICANN. The competition comes from non-DNS related uses of the Internet. It's hard to say that an app doesn't use the DNS just because it doesn't use a browser; we still all know that it uses the DNS because it's not using IP addresses so it's still using the DNS.

So I feel like that could be a speed bump if it makes look as if we've missed a big piece of the puzzle. So I feel compelled to answer that by trying to clarify more so than we did in our draft advice - trying to clarify that we are only dealing with aspects of the resolution and registration that occur under ICANN's overview.

There might be some DNS activity that occurs outside of it. But it's just not part of evaluating the new gTLD program. Thanks.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Steve. Anyone else before we dive into Berry's summary? If not my suggestion is that we just work through the points in this document one by one. Should see - I guess if we understand the point and secondly what if any the impact would be in our draft. And I guess if there is an impact we should try to have a go at rewording the draft.

If that's the best way forward? Okay in taking silence as yes then if we start with the definition - we've got one from Bruce Tonkin. With the degree of consistency in how the second level names are being used. Pardon me. Consumer experiences how the names are used.

Could someone who was at the workshop perhaps just spell this one out a little bit more?

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry. Basically Bruce was the first one to ask a question for the review session there in Costa Rica. And, you know, I apologize, I probably didn't do the best job of trying to encapsulate everything that was said here. I certainly tried to organize by the - whether it be the definition or the metric across consumer trust, choice and competition and consumer.

The way I understood it - and I'll probably read directly from what Bruce had said - is that so in other words - and a lot of that's driven by ICANN registry by the second level names unintelligible they look at something like dot Com, there probably is a fairly consistent theme that most of the words or parts of the word commercial are therefore (unintelligible) dot Com as being commercial and not at all - but it is the degree of consistency.

And then he goes onto say if you look at something like dot PV that's an interesting case. One, because obviously the original purpose was a ccTLD but if you were to look at, you know, a random sample of the name you probably don't see Tivoli mentioned very much or Tuvalu mentioned very much and probably most of them around media and TV.

So his closing statement is so I wonder whether you might think about the wording there because I think it would be a degree of confidence for most registrants and users that a TLD at the second level was operating consistently.

And that now that it might be controlled by the registry but as a consumer that's not what you experience; you experience how those names are used on the Internet and what the content the emails, etcetera, and what is the actual use of those names.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: And that was with regard to Slide 9, which was up on the panel. Bruce had asked for that to be put up before he made that point. And Slide 9 was simply our proposed definitions of consumer and consumer trust.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So Bruce is suggesting some further degree or some further definition of consistency or he's suggesting we think about it; he's not putting forward a definition. And then I guess that raises for me our thinking about consistency, I think, was consistency of resolution and processes within ICANN.

Bruce is raising the point - his point is about the consistency of the consumer experience which perhaps is out of scope, I'm not sure.

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, if I could add to that?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: The transcript is most useful because Berry provided a very great service for us by summarizing.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: The transcript itself - and all of you can find that, it's attached to the schedule for Costa Rica on Wednesday. It's the last hyperlink at the bottom of the actual schedule page for Costa Rica.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Put that hyperlink in if that would help.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: I'll put it in the chat. But I think it's really useful to turn to there on Page 16 where Bruce made those points. I just put it in the chat with the link to the note. And the word consistency could mean consistent over time but in this context I think Bruce meant that the use of the names in a given TLD are consistent with what the consumer's expectation was.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well okay so then...

Steve DelBianco: Because Bruce's words to us right before that on Page 16 he said, "So I wonder whether you might think about the wording."

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: "I think," he says, "It would be a degree of confidence for most registrants and users that a TLD at the second level was operating consistently in the sense of how its names are used."

That kind of consistency is not what - the first part of the definition is consistent, says that over time the resolutions will work.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: This consistency is consistency with the expectation of what that TLD is supposed to be used for.

Rosemary Sinclair: But do we not capture that in our work by talking about purpose - integrity of purpose? I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Perhaps we are but it sounds like Bruce - I'd love to get him to wordsmith it for us because he might say something like that confidence amongst registrants and users that a TLD is being used in the way that was expected. And he's implying there that expectations are formed in the eyes of the users. Maybe they're formed based on what the characters are in the TLD.

I think that all of us in this working group said that expectations are really a function of what was proposed by the applicant. They're the ones who propose the way in which they're going to use their TLD. And it's - I guess it's really up to each of us as users we may have a different expectation but I can't see that the applicants responsible for me having a faulty expectation, do you?

Rosemary Sinclair: No that's why I'm hesitating is I'm trying to capture the consistency among - that's - my better word is consumer perception or consumer reaction. You've used consumer expectation. I don't think we're going to be able to do that.

Steve DelBianco: If we could it gets away from the theme we've had which is holding ICANN accountable to ensure that applicants fulfill the purposes they have. And it's part of the contract if you're a community-based TLD. A community-based TLD must fulfill the registrant restrictions that it puts in. But non-community TLD or standard applications may make proposals on their mission and purpose since Question 18 but it's not part of the contract per se.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay if I take a really simple example from a whole other world - washing machines, pardon me. In Australia we have a whole set of standards about washing machines. And people who put washing machines into the market have to (own detect) to the relevant authorities that their washing machines fulfill the standards.

On the consumer side those standards are available to anybody who wants to have a look at them. But there could still be a consumer who's expectation of what their washing machine is going to do is way beyond the particular standard. And that's what I'm worrying about.

If we're going to try to pick up every consumer's varying expectations I think that's too difficult. By coming at it from the other side to say if you said that you're - if you're dot Bank and you've said you're going to provide highly secure, reliable services, blah, blah, blah and you don't then our, if you like, self regulatory tools is action by ICANN in respect of your - I mean, for (taking) to use the language I'm used to.

So - I'm still hesitating, Steve, about trying to capture consistency of consumer experience even against expressed purposes by our applicants.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh, Cheryl, all we can hear is scratching. And now I'm sorry I've been so horrible to you, Cheryl, you've gone away completely now.

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: It's possible that the working group will entertain a draft where we would analyze comments and indicate how we reacted to the comments. So at some point, maybe our final report, we indicate that some members of the community in Costa Rica indicated that the consumer's expectations should be part of this.

We would be able to reveal that we discussed it and that we didn't...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...we may say that we didn't feel it was necessary for the applicants to be responsible for all expectations but only responsible for the promises and restrictions that they had signed up for. And that might be an appropriate way to respond.

Because (Chandra), the very second one on here, (Chandra) who's with the Federal Trade Commission in the United States...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...said - kind of perked up. She perked up and said well if we're talking about users here I think we have to cover malware and the expectation of the lack of malware. And again that's inferring that consumers have expectations and that ICANN is responsible to meet all expectations.

Our working group had taken a narrow view to say that it was important that every applicant running a registry comply with ICANN policies and applicable national laws.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And a registry could be complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws oh but a registrant at the second level of one of their TLDs could be doing bad stuff.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And if (Chandra) is asking us to hold ICANN accountable to bad stuff that happens at second level...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...we could only go so far. Is that applicable to national laws on the hosting of that name and ICANN policies with respect to accurate accessible Whois or following ICANN policies to take it down.

This is sort of a threshold issue for us as to whether we want to open our work to cover things that are sort of outside of the scope of ICANN policy. Interested to hear what folks think about it because it covers both issues.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, hang on. I've (unintelligible). Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier for the transcript. Your - just now were you're mentioning taking down second level domains based on content of the Websites or on the use of the domain? Because that...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Olivier, I was...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I know you're relaying this but I just note my surprise. I think it's something which people in At Large and myself included and let's just here, you know, I'm talking for myself here. But it certainly raises my eyebrows that ICANN would start having to do this sort of thing.

So then it becomes not only the Internet's domain name policemen but it becomes the Internet policemen at that point does it? Very strange.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I think this is the threshold issue for us.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: And we took (unintelligible) I guess in response to years of discussion around the edges, if you like, of the role of ICANN in supervising or dealing

with bad behavior on the Internet which role has always been rejected by ICANN.

So I think we are where we are which is that ICANN has carved out for itself quite a technical and smallish footprint. And I personally (unintelligible) would be within the parameters of that footprint.

Whether at the end of our work when people see what we've done we actually start a second discussion which is that some people may look at this work and say that's a great piece of work but it's not enough. And then ICANN has a strategic and policy matter to consider about how far beyond its current footprint the community is happy for ICANN to go.

If I could just finish this point - and it's interesting to have one's mind so exercised at five o'clock in the morning by these weighty matters.

It strikes me there's an analogy - and Tobias might have something to say on this one - in the mobile phone space where we have mobile phone operators and then there are many, many actors in the value chain some of whom do bad things.

But in that value chain there are very - there's very limited action roles for the operator. There's plenty of action for the (unintelligible) authorities and national regulators and all the rest of it. But the role for the mobile phone operator in dealing with the bad actors in that value chain is very circumscribed.

Anyway probably best that I stop talking for the minute and let's hear from other people. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier for the transcript. And I see Steve putting - using the Adobe Connect chat to show what was being said. And of course the quote from the FTC which basically speaks about taking

down of the second level domains when fraud is being committed and malware, etcetera.

I think the answer to that is to have a reliable and accurate thick Whois record for these domains. I'm not sure that ICANN has to start saying that it will be happy to take down domains depending on the due process or lack of due process.

One has to remember that in some places around the world this sort of tool could be used for political maneuvering. And I would be really careful that ICANN goes in this direction.

Now, you know, I'm saying this actually just to set the scene. I think in response to the question that has been brought forward on the - during the session I would totally agree with you, Rosemary, that we would - I think this group here should stick to what its purpose was then let ICANN find out if it wants to expand its mission through other processes but definitely not through the consumer confidence and consumer metrics working group.

That's my feeling. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Olivier. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Hey thanks. (Chandra) never said that this would imply that ICANN had to take down second level domains for illegal conduct. So I don't want to put words in their mouth. They simply said that when measuring consumer trust in the new TLD space that we ought to be assessing whether consumers are perceiving that the new TLD space is more trustworthy including with respect to malware.

And I'm trying to be as charitable as I can be about what (Chandra) was saying because I do know...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...that she understands that ICANN has a limited scope and mission so I don't really think...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...that she, working for the FTC, thinks that ICANN polices the second level.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: So we do measure, Olivier, we do measure in our survey. And I'm speaking of - if you could turn to our advice on the consumer trust.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And these were some things that Olivier, you came up with where - and I talked with (Chandra) afterwards to say, look, if we measure whether consumers perceive that the new gTLD space is more trustworthy then we'll pick that up in our survey.

Let me quote you. It's on the fourth row of consumer trust. It says, "The survey of perceived consumer trust in the DNS relative to their experiences before the gTLD expansion the survey would measure experiences with malware and spam as well as confusion about new gTLDs."

So I believe that the answer to (Chandra) is to point to that survey as a way in where we would measure the very thing she brought up without implying at all that ICANN has to take on new levels of accountability and responsibility for all conduct at the second level.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. And just to add to that I thought Olivier made an interesting point in terms of - and I'm just thinking structurally about the

document. If we describe our process which is to stick with the narrow footprint but remind everybody that in assisting others to deal with wider problems in the Internet ICANN's role in that is related to Whois or in our case it's related to conducting a survey of confidence.

So there are tools that ICANN uses to deal - or to make a contribution to the wider world issue. And we could mention those even if we maintain our sharper focus.

Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier for the transcript. Indeed I agree with both what you mentioned just now and also with what Steve has just said as well. Maybe - I just wonder, you know, having had a question like this maybe we haven't been clear enough on the fact that we are looking at the metrics themselves and are not making any recommendations for action from ICANN on what it needs to do afterwards with them.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. But that's also, Olivier, a very interesting point. And as you were saying that I thought - I wonder if one of the other things we need to put somewhere in the background to our work is that it's very important that people work with the definition and the metrics at the same time because you get a much better understanding of our definition of consumer trust by actually going and looking at the metrics we propose.

And then secondly, Olivier, your point is that our process is to assist people to measure a range of things relevant to promoting competition, consumer trust and consumer choice without getting anywhere near the stage of identifying what the relevant policy responses might be depending on what's found. That's further down the track than we are.

Heavens, do we feel brave enough to go to Jonathan Zuck's point? Oh Tobias...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: That's an easy one. Why don't we skip to Ray Fassett?

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: And a bit of background Ray Fassett represent the dot Jobs gTLD which is not part of the...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...new gTLD space. But Ray is one whose TLD has petitioned for a change in its charter in order to be able to...

Rosemary Sinclair: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...expand the entities that it would register at the second level. And it was - they're having an ongoing dispute with ICANN over compliance because they changed without seeking a change and ICANN held that dot Jobs had violated its charter. And they are in the middle of a - is it mediation or arbitration, I forget which, over whether dot Jobs should be allowed to continue violating its charter or should it pursue a charter change with community input?

So having said that they have a point of view on this. And I know that I was probably not as polite as I should have been with Ray but I felt he was trying to use our forum...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...to advance his own cause. And he's in the middle of a compliance proceeding and I didn't feel like that was really appropriate.

Rosemary Sinclair: So, Steve, Rosemary here. If we can put his particular issues to one side are you able to explain to me what the - or is there a relevant core issue that we should be thinking about in terms of our work or are the comments really related to the other matter (unintelligible)?

Steve DelBianco: Well that's an excellent question. And I think the others can chime in. There is a (internal) issue here and that is whether an applicant's answers to Question 18, where they describe their mission and purpose, should in any way form expectations or be something that we would measure later on to see if they met their mission and purpose.

And our group has thus far held that it is. I mean, if it's part of the application, it's part of what will be used to determine the scoring or whether they - whether the application is objected to by governments or trademark holders, whether it is objected to by law enforcement agencies.

So I believe that Question 18 - everything that's in the application should matter even though I realize that for a standard application it probably doesn't go into the registry contract.

So companies are allowed to change their mission and purpose over time. Dot Jobs may be able to do that but they have to pursue a community-based method to do it as a sponsored TLD. And I think in the case of a gTLD under the new round they could in fact change their mind about mission and purpose without seeking community input because it's not in the registry contract.

For the new world dot Jobs could make this change unilaterally but I still think it would be relevant to measure the extent to which applicants switch their mission and purpose and make changes like that.

I'm not making a value judgment on whether that's good or bad but I think it reveals that a program like this if it's going to rely heavily on representations that are made in the application...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...well then it shouldn't - it shouldn't try to create false expectations that registrants will stick to that - that applicants will stick to the promises they made in their application. So I know this is a sore point with some applicants. But Question 18 does matter, I think it does. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary in quick response and then to Olivier in our very short queue. It seems to me taking my own point about going from the definition to the measure we actually required somewhere quite a deal of transparency about purpose; that consumers ought to be able to tell by looking at the registry's Website what their particular purpose was.

So if there was a change of purpose then that ought to be publicly and transparently available for people to see. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. This is Olivier. I'm going to ask a question which might totally betray my lack of knowledge of the Applicant Guidebook. Isn't there a possibility of - well let's say a community application, for example, to become non-community application or a geographic application that becomes non-geographic. Doesn't this need to actually be mentioned?

Rosemary Sinclair: Olivier, Rosemary here. I'm sorry but my brain is fuzzy this morning. Would you mind just going over that point again? And I'll promise not to be reading anything in the chat whilst you do it this time.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay, Rosemary. Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier here. The question I was asking with regards to the Applicant Guidebook and the mission purpose. For example a community - well an application that is

tagged as being a community application is one thing and it might be changed to a non-community application later on.

Similarly speaking for a geographic application - let's say dot London. Dot London then that becomes non-geographic later on. Or the - well I wouldn't say the other way around because you can't do that. But you start geographically and then you move out of the geographic stream; you make it a commercial thing.

I'm not sure it's just a question here. Change of purpose as defined originally. And if it is just given in Question 18 then that's fine, so be it.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve, Olivier. I don't believe anybody could change their designation from standard to community or vice versa. But they can change the purpose as stated in Question 18. And if it would help folks - I can't paste from the Guidebook because it's not a PDF you can paste from.

But Question 18 under - it's called mission and purpose. And the applicant is required to state the mission and purpose of their proposed gTLD. And then next to that ICANN has said these words, "The information gathered - this information is gathered in response to Question 18 is intended to inform the post-launch review of the new gTLD program from the perspective of assessing the relative costs and benefits achieved in the expanded gTLD space."

I mean, it mentions the post-launch review of the program. If we can't consider Question 18 in a design of how the program will be reviewed then I must have missed something earlier. But Question 18 is indeed relevant to us.

You asked whether the applicant can deviate from what they said in 18. And I'd look for staff to verify this but my belief is that there is nothing binding

about your answer to 18 once you've been approved. And I'm speaking of a standard application not a community.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. So, Steve, what you're saying is that people have to provide a specific answer to Question 18. But once their application is approved - or this is what we're wanting to check then - they can change their purpose.

I'm coming at it from the other way saying whatever they say originally in answer to Question 18 ought probably to form the core of what they put on their Website as to purpose. And if they change that purpose then our measure would suggest that in order to be compliant they should update the Website with the new purpose.

And that's what's relevant to the consumer because the consumers aren't going to be wandering around in the Applicant Guidebook. They - as far as they will go probably, speaking very practically, is the relevant Website so it's important that that's updated.

So if we start with...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: That's all in the Choice section, Rosemary, isn't it, the choice metric.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think so, Steve, yes. But you could be clear that if you were, you know, choosing an (A-star), what you thought was an (A-star) but it actually was an (A-star) and give it B-minus. So I think (unintelligible) choice, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Right, and just to clarify Question 18 is really only there to help us...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...do our reviews. It is not scored for purposes of determining the applicant's minimum score.

Rosemary Sinclair: No it's the summary of purpose so it is not that we would use for our - well consumer choice definition and metrics.

Steve DelBianco: It would be because we're asking one of the metrics to be comparison - let's see if that - do we ever ask for a specific comparison three years out between the actual purpose of a TLD and its Question 18 answer? Let's check that.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: And my belief is that we do not. We do not ask...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: We did not. But I am confident we will get such a request from trademark owners and specifically INTA. I met with them last Monday and gave them the slide presentation. And it was...

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...one of the first things they said is that this part of the definition is essential but I don't see a metric checking it against their original purpose. And they had full understanding that an applicant can change their mind about the purpose without any penalty. But they just wanted to know let's figure it out.

I came back and said that might be rather expensive because you'd have to go through several hundred TLDs, go check their Question 18 and then compare it to the way it's actually being run today.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes. Which is sounding very complicated and expensive. All right now, Olivier, I'm not sure of that example what - oh Berry is coming in on that one. That's perhaps a side matter.

Well I think we've (knotted) that one out a bit without getting ahead of ourselves by coming to any conclusions. But certainly I think we've nailed the issue in that particular point that Ray was making.

Somewhere in the chat, Berry says it's Steve's answer to this question in the workshop was that it wasn't - that Question 18 is not the only question relevant to what we were trying to accomplish. And I didn't quite understand that comment from Berry.

Berry Cobb: Hi, Rosemary, this is Berry. Pardon. In the dialogue between Ray and Steve I think Ray - the way I understood it or perceived what he was saying as - that our current definition of consumer trust was more subjective than it should be. And he was actually corralling us that the definition should be tailored towards an individual TLD based on their Question 18 response.

And then Steve had replied back, well, Ray, it's not just about Question 18 it's about Questions 28 through 35 which gets into the rights protections mechanisms and all the other promises that the registry makes on their application. And that was the point...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...of my text in...

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh. Thanks, Berry. Yes. Okay now anything else on that particular point? If not now Evan raised I thought quite an interesting point. I wasn't really sure what we could do with this. He acknowledged the limitation of scope within ICANN versus consideration of other forms of access for Internet.

Is this where we - was Evan talking about - yes, I think he was talking about (unintelligible) services. But when I thought about that I thought even if that's so then at the end of things you get yourself to a domain name at which point ICANN (unintelligible) becomes relevant.

Oh Steve just put Evan's point in the chat so...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: And, Rosemary, that's Evan's point as transcribed directly from our actual advice document. Because we noted it at the top of Page 3 in our advice.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And it's interesting that the registries picked up on what Evan said and brought this up earlier.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: I still don't understand how we can do anything else than acknowledge this point since we can't literally go out and measure.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay so perhaps if we...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...DNS that don't do resolutions and registrations.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible) considering this perspective. (Unintelligible). Ah, got it. Yes. Yes. I agree, Steve, I think we can just note that because it's going out of this issue of scope. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier for the transcript. I wonder whether this could not just be a number. Today we have a pretty rough idea of how many DNS and non-DNS addressing systems are out there and that could be a number.

It could be interesting to see three years down the line what that number would be. Admittedly it's really a fringe thing. But that would fit under the consumer choice because the consumer would not only have a choice in the DNS but a choice with other systems that are totally unrelated to the DNS.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Although I must say I'm not quite sure how - well I know how this can be measured obviously, just finding out what the number is, getting someone to survey this quickly. I'm not so sure how it affects the actual validity of the metrics for the DNS itself.

But what it might do though is to say that no - well there might be an interesting thing in seeing the growth of alternative addressing schemes compared to the growth of the DNS itself. And I'm just talking here, what is it, brainstorming here so.

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure. I think a lot of us are doing that this morning, Olivier. Yes, so Steve makes the point that a number of these other forms of access - a couple of layers back is going to a DNS element of addressing. But there are others that are not.

And I guess it's what should be in ICANN's strategic interest to help aid you on whether the domain that ICANN is responsible for is diminishing over time as other addressing systems emerge.

Now - now we've got the little problem of whether this is...

Steve DelBianco: Can I get in the queue, Rosemary?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. And I appreciate you spotting what I put in the chat because as Berry said this could be a scope issue, the threshold issue.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: But it also might be a genuine disagreement on indirect versus direct.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Using an app and the app is using the DNS the end user's experience of that app relies upon the DNS even if they didn't directly see the URLs. So I don't buy that because it's indirect it's completely outside of ICANN. It's indirect use of DNS and the DNS is still ICANN's purview. So - and I don't believe that an app - you choosing to use an app is choosing not to use the DNS. And I believe that was part of what Evan was getting to.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And on the other hand if it does use the DNS then it is within ICANN's scope whether a browser showed the URL or not. And how does one ever measure - if we felt it was worth measuring how would we measure the percentage of time that end users are relying on apps that don't show the URL versus apps that do? That is the direct versus indirect.

Or should we try to survey three years from now the percentage of Internet resolutions that are done without the DNS at all where, what, where you have an IP address directly? If I have a direct access to a resource using the IP address I'm still using the routing system, I'm still using the IP - TCP/IP addressing system and that is all still within the purview of ICANN.

So I don't know how one gets around the ICANN managed part of the DNS.
Somebody educate me.

John Berard: Steve, this is John. I asked the same question when the subject came up in Costa Rica. And it strikes me as not. I mean, just the application is to a URL as the URL is - or as a, you know, the underlying numbers that you then apply a name to, the logic is all the same then you just - it's just a different layer of the same technology. So I'm not quite sure I understand the distinction trying to be made.

Steve DelBianco: In the forum in Costa Rica Evan then tried to expand with an example, John, because I was as confused as you. The example he gave was the fact that there's a QR code at the bottom of their pictures that were done for them on the tag that they were wearing around their neck.

And Evan said that's a QR code which leads to a URL. And that could be a random URL. The point I'm making is that this kind of thing needs to be considered. When you're talking about consumer trust and consumer choice it's about how are they getting to their content? Do they have trust in one way of getting to content versus another way?

So he's suggesting that if I scan a QR code it leads to a shortened URL then I'm making a choice about how I use the DNS versus clicking on a link or typing a URL. And if that's his point I'm still confused about how that's an active choice being made by an end user.

Rosemary Sinclair: Interesting. We've got Olivier and then Tobias in the queue.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. This is Olivier for the transcript. I think we have to be very careful about mixing the DNS with TCP/IP. The DNS is the dynamic naming system which is a pyramidal system with a root that is run by ICANN, the A root and a system of roots around the world, etcetera, etcetera.

It's a means to put domain names, identifiers, to IP addresses because it's very difficult for us to remember IP addresses.

Now applications, mobile phone apps, could actually run on something totally different. They could actually have a static IP address. So that takes the DNS totally out of the picture because there wouldn't be this translation required between a name and an IP address.

The application itself could have an IP address which it stores, which it is there. And through its own protocols might decide to update the IP address from time to time. So it is something which does not use the DNS whatsoever.

And then when one look sat LTE networks in mobile phones that doesn't then have the TCP/IP layer. So you then end up with both the IP address and the DNS not being used. And one uses different protocols, etcetera. So it really is down to how many layers you can start losing. And the DNS being totally separate from the Internet - different network layer and so on.

We're looking at - I think what Evan was trying to bring forward was the fact that you could have total rival systems for addressing that would not be DNS-based at all. And that there might be more of these around in a few year's time. Indeed they might overshadow the DNS, who knows?

Is that clear now or...

Rosemary Sinclair: Thank you, Olivier...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...still confusing?

Rosemary Sinclair: Well let's hear from Tobias and then we can come back to the general discussion.

Tobias Mahler: Hi, this is Tobias, can you hear me?

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Tobias Mahler: Okay good. I discussed this at quite some length with Evan also in Costa Rica. And I think it's a really interesting point. But my conclusion is that within our context here it's not really something that is really measurable. And I'm not - I wouldn't necessarily consider it in the context of consumer trust; perhaps more in the context of competition or even further in the context of innovation.

If you look at the examples that were mentioned so far then this would - in the context of innovation one would often consider this as disruptive innovation. So these are kinds of innovations that happen outside your models. Suddenly someone is not selling CDs but is offering download of music. And that's not part of the music market and is not measurable. And so it's basically the whole theme is about something happening outside your model.

And I think it's something really interesting that ICANN should somehow consider but not necessarily within the context of what this group is doing and looking at. A, because it's difficult to measure and, B, because it's not really something the new gTLD program is designed to address or can in fact address.

I mean, if someone is developing something different that works better from any other context fine, no problem. It should be perhaps - perhaps one should see whether the measures should be taken to strengthen that or something. But it's really not something to be considered in the new gTLD context. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks, Tobias. Rosemary here. I think we've got an issue that we're going to have to mention somehow. Perhaps in painting a (game) the broader context in which our more narrowly defined piece of work fits.

I guess the point at the end of the day would be that if you have a domain name system where there is good consumer choice, good competition and good consumer confidence or consumer trust then any other addressing system which emerged in the disruptive innovation style that Tobias was taking would then have to compete on a quality basis if you like with those features in the DNS.

So again it seems to me that if we stay within our scope and assist ICANN to do the best possible job of managing the DNS not only from a typical perspective but taking account of these three consumer issues then that puts ICANN and the DNS in a proper place to enable consumer choice should we get to a bigger world where there are choices to be made amongst alternative addressing systems.

I have had consultants (unintelligible) say to me some years ago that we'll get to a time when none of us are worrying about URLs and the whole world will be app-driven. And I must say looking at the mobile phones of my kids I see lots and lots of apps and not too many URLs. Behind the scenes there'll be some DNS activity. But it doesn't seem to me to be impossible to contemplate a world where there is a different approach to addressing issues - capital A addressing issues.

Anyway again another issue for us to mull. Tobias, did you want to come back into this conversation? Your hand is still showing up.

Tobias Mahler: No, sorry, I just need to remove it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay no problem. Well good. I'm not sure, Steve, if that's absent domain names but I guess I'm foreshadowing a future where perhaps if I can use the examples of Google of the addressing world emerges from nowhere and creates a different environment. Even if that happens it seems to me that the

work that we are doing on the DNS is extremely useful from the consumer's point of view but also from ICANN's point of view.

Okay, yes. The more the discussion goes on in the chat the more I'm thinking we really do need to take a couple of paragraphs and explain this to the community. It's an important point.

Anyway I'm not sure that we can do anymore on this particular point this morning. Should - well my time it's morning. Should we move now to the point that Chuck Gomes was making on metrics?

So just looking at Berry's summary my recollection was that Chuck was suggesting that we be a little more bullish than we were being.

Steve DelBianco: A little more lenient with respect to breach notices.

Rosemary Sinclair: Lenient.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. And then the Registries Constituency submitted the same thing in writing on Monday. So they're suggesting that given that the breach notices - I mean, other than dot Jobs there may not be any - I don't know how many there are. But he felt like it would be unfair to hold hundreds of new gTLDs to...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...a standard that was quite low in the gTLD space, the legacy space. We did say the word relative incidents and relative implies relative to a denominator so the number...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...of breach notices divided by - in most cases we said relative was by the number of registrations. So if there's one breach notice for every hundred million registrations then that would be the relative incidents. But I'm not positive we had thought that through very carefully. Was it 1 out of 20 gTLDs? There's a 5% incidents in the legacy.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And that would say that in the new space if we had more than 5% of the new TLD operators that we would fail to meet the target. Interested to know what the team thinks. Relative is a function of TLD operators or of registrations?

Rosemary Sinclair: Interesting. Rosemary here. I quite like the construction that Chuck was suggesting that we think about. Particularly I suppose in the first - in the first three years where you're looking for a variation around the legacy gTLDs. I thought that checked people in the ballpark, so to speak, but gave us a range that we could work with. Any other thoughts on that? No? Okay...

Steve DelBianco: Yes, I mean, I don't really think that plus or minus 5% achieves the...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...leniency that Chuck wants or that Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: It might be that we should...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...clarify that it's - clarify how we get the measure, how you do the math.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Yes I suppose when I'm thinking about all of the measures it seems to me that ICANN is taking a great leap forward in being specific in its approach to measure. So in general I'm okay if the measures themselves are a bit flexible or a bit lenient not to the point of being useless in terms of monitoring real bad behavior.

But actually I suppose I see this whole thing as a change management process where you're bringing forward transparency and accountability and compliance. So the first little while for me is getting everybody used to the process and then some of the numbers might be too tough, some of the numbers might be too lenient.

I wouldn't really be expecting, you know, savage action to be taken on the results until we've experienced the absolute measures to understand whether we've really got this right or whether we're too tough or too lenient.

So I'm open to these sorts of suggestions because I think the process is the most important thing at the moment - the discussion and then the process. Anybody else want to comment on this one?

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry. Based on what you just said...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...I'm reminded of what Jonathan had also mentioned later on in the feedback portion of our session. And, you know, we can talk to death the definitions and the specifics of the metrics until we're all blue in the face but it's all about just starting to - start capturing the data first.

And perhaps, you know, maybe that there's more, you know, while we're chartered to create these three-year targets certainly we're kind of flying IFR

right now. We don't have any visual as to what these - what a lot of these metrics are going to really look like.

But perhaps the future review team when they get formed 12 months after the first delegation they will have tangible metrics to look at to better formulate those types of targets. But it's really all about measuring it now or capturing it now.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's a very good point, Berry. And I suppose one of my own concerns is that you can sometimes with these sorts of changes of process - if you're pretty tough at the beginning of a process that you don't really understand that can sometimes give people the ammunition that they need to get rid of the whole process.

So we're having such discussions in Australia about water measurement, management and allocation at the moment. And it's a great example where everyone agrees what the problem is, everybody agrees on the process but some of the metrics are so specific that they've actually led to rejection of the process.

So I - for me at any rate am taking a longer term view of this and a bit of flexibility at the beginning. As you say, Berry, what we're really trying to do is select data so that we understand this system much more than we do - is important.

Now back to the chat. Olivier has to go. And Steve is reminding us that we want to leave time for discussing how we analyze the comments which is a very good point. And maybe we should jump into that. Perhaps we could quickly scroll down. Consumer. Just see what was in there and talk about analyzing the process - the comments from here.

Okay so consumer - trust, yes, okay. Different types of trust, gosh. I think we'll be doing well just not - okay so we'll talk process because Olivier is staying to do this and then we can come back to these definitions.

Now I have to declare that I have absolutely no experience in this next stage so is there anyone on the call who can take us through an outline of our process from here on?

Berry Cobb: Rosemary, this is Berry. So our comment period closes today. And then the reply period will be open for another 21 days to respond to the abundance of comments that we have right now.

As soon as the reply period closes ICANN staff will compile all of the public comments and we'll create a summary for the working group to review through. Through those deliberations of the working group until we have collectively agreed that we've addressed all of the comments placed in the public forum and made changes accordingly to the draft advice letter. That pretty much concludes the process in terms of the public comment areas.

And to answer Steve's question, will staff - will the staff summary include the Costa Rica comments? I'm not sure of the exact protocol but I wouldn't see it being an issue that we append this working document of the Costa Rica comments to the tail end of that to make it official for the record.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Great. This is Steve. One other question. If in fact we get comments tomorrow or the day after or even up to May the 7th which are initial comments for whoever filed them I, for one, believe we should consider all the comments received even if an initial comment showed up during the reply half of the comment period.

I only base that on the experience I've seen of trying to get comments in with a 21 plus 21 day window sometimes your initial comment...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...is not really ready until you get into the second half of that. What are the feelings on the call? Do we - are we going to try to be strict and not address initial comments that show up in the second half of the comment period?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Given the fact that we only have three comments right now I would overwhelmingly support including any comments that come through even through the end of the reply period. This new process is new for us at ICANN as well and I would imagine that, you know, that kind of threshold question may come into play in areas when we have hundreds of comments on a particular session versus something like the - what we have in a very limited scope.

The other thing that I don't know for sure is at the official close of the comment period will it even allow users to submit initial comments or not? And so that'll be interesting to see as well.

Rosemary Sinclair: Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Rosemary. It's Olivier for the transcript. If I was absolutely selfish I would say no we have to stick to the exact timings as they are defined with only acceptance of replies later on. And in fact, by the way, just for the process the comment and public forum actually remains open during the whole time.

And it's only the date at which the comment is submitted that defines whether this should be an initial comment or a reply. But they all actually get recorded in the same way under the same forum. So there is no technical limitation to show that the - what is being filed is a reply or an initial comment.

As Chair of the At Large Advisory Committee I have been battling with time recently to be able to obtain input in 21 days; it's been an absolute nightmare and a struggle. And I know that several other committees in ICANN have also been really struggling especially since many of these comment periods started during the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica. So our attention was focused elsewhere.

So I would be branded an absolute hypocrite if I was to say no, no we need to remain within the 21 days. I think we should allow for initial comments all the way down to the end - to the time when we actually close the whole comment period, reply included. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well I think in that case we are all agreed that we would be happy to take comments right until the very end of the comment period. I think in particular with this piece of work it's important to be very, very inclusive and give people the maximum opportunity to contribute even though it does make for a difficult administration at the end trying to bring it together.

So if we could just record that, Berry, that we're all agreed about giving people the maximum time available. Not encouraging them of course but giving that time.

John Berard: This is John. Berry, you can do that as long as you don't say it's because we've gotten too few comments so no need to ignore any.

Rosemary Sinclair: No we don't have to be that transparent, John.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...stay sharp. I bet we'll see several more before the end of today.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes. Having made various submissions in various forms I was always right on the death knell or even a day or two late so I think that's going to be (unintelligible), I agree.

So now what - Berry, what are you explaining to us about getting more attention whilst everybody else is just thinking whether there are any final comments or questions about the process before we go back into a quick scan of those matters that we haven't had time to touch on.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I just received an email a little bit earlier. They're repositioning or redoing some of the banner areas on ICANN.org. And it was suggested that the consumer metrics comment period would be a good candidate to go up on the homepage basically...

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh good.

Berry Cobb: ...or wherever the banners are at. And so if that happens in the next day or two hopefully that'll give us a little bit more advertising out there on the front of ICANN.org.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Yes, I mean, whenever we explain what we do people say oh my gosh, I can't believe I wasn't aware. This sounds really important. And I don't know how we could advertise it anymore than we do but I'd welcome being a guinea pig for the front page display, Berry. Make it happen.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's right. You feel like saying, you know, you'll say this is really important when you read what we're doing. I had the same reaction in Peter Nettlefold. He said oh my goodness I had no idea you folks were doing this so.

Now we've got just a few minutes, do we just want to have a look at these last matters from the workshop? I...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Rosemary, I thought you asked the critical question earlier on process which is what would be the method we would use to analyze comments and digest them? And I know we started by saying that staff would summarize. We then went on to say that staff's summary would include the work Berry had already done on the Costa Rica conversation. We went on to say...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...that as new comments come in we'd consider them whether they were reply or initial. But once all of them are done at the end of May 7 what do we envision is the process that the working group would use to revise our draft into a final advice letter?

Do you think it will be point by point going through the comments or go through our document and as we get to every line of our document refer back to the comments that came in that are on point there?

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I thought it was very useful, Berry's structure of the workshop around our document. And if it's possible to do the analysis of the comments that come in using the structure of our document that will mean that at least we've got - if you like - the right dot points in the right place.

Otherwise we'll be going backwards and forwards between the two documents. And it's easy when we're doing it that way to lose something. Even if we decide that a particular dot point is not so relevant to definition but is rather more relevant to metrics. That's, I've found, a more organized process of making that sort of change.

So I feel it should be sort of like a track changes approach where we use our document as the core and attach the comments to that document. That would be my suggested way forward. Are there any other views that people have had with this kind of complex task?

If not the other thing that I am used to - I'm not sure if it's an ICANN process. But I'm used - in submissions and summaries where there are particularly contentious points of view that those points of view are actually summarized very, very succinctly and then the working group in this case indicates why it has come out in a particular way.

That, I've found, enables people to understand even if they don't agree with the particular outcome. But I'm not sure if that's an ICANN kind of process. Acknowledge - oh maybe Berry's last points, acknowledged, no action required, goes to that approach.

Berry Cobb: Yes, Rosemary. This is Berry. In my previous life on the other side of the fence I've worked in the PDNR working group. And...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...that working group received over 200 comments. I mean, it was pretty impressive. And there was a template that was used that would take the summaries of those comments and as the working group reviewed line by line of those summaries then we could tag that particular comment as, you know, we the working group acknowledge this and we feel that it's already addressed in the current version of the work product.

Or we acknowledge the comment and it requires a deliberation within the working group. Sometimes the deliberation could be accomplished right then and there or it would be tabled to a future meeting to debate both sides of the issue.

Or thirdly the working group acknowledges the comment and agrees that an edit is required for the work product. And then by the time we've gone, you know, completed through all of the comments then we can go back and just take action on those that require either further deliberation or direct edits to the work product.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. I think that sounds like a really good approach. And certainly that PDNR working group did some (hard tasks) in terms of process as well as in terms of content. So to be able to learn from their experience is great. Any other thoughts on that?

Okay well let's agree that that's how we'll go forward. If it doesn't work for whatever reason we can review. But I think that's a good approach at this stage.

Now we just have a couple more minutes on this call. Is there anything that anyone feels we need to discuss before we finish?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Just to confirm that our next session will be scheduled for the 1st of May at the same time.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's fine.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Rosemary Sinclair: And we had a couple of action items, Berry, didn't we, from this meeting. One on me to talk to Peter Nettlefold and one on Steve to touch base with Bruce Tonkin I think. Got those?

Steve DelBianco: That's what I have.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Sure.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right, everyone well thanks for - gosh I think we've really worked hard today. The workshop gave us some really tough ideas and we started pushing them around. So it's hard but worthwhile I think. So...

Steve DelBianco: Agreed.

Rosemary Sinclair: Sorry?

Steve DelBianco: I said agreed.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So we'll get back together again on the 1st of May.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you everybody.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks everyone. Thanks, Berry.

Rosemary Sinclair: Take care.

END