
LAUREEN KAPIN:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. This is Lauren Kapin. You're not hearing the mellifluous tones of Jonathan Zuck because he has some other obligations that arose, so I'll be stepping into his shoes.

We have a pretty full agenda this morning. It's up on the screen. We'll be hearing from Dennis Chang on Outreach to Underserved Regions.

We'll be talking about Studies and Surveys, getting an update on that.

We'll be getting some I think rather limited updates from the Competition and Consumer Choice sub team on market definitions because my impression is that communications may not have been as clear as they were intended regarding folks reporting on this area today. So if folks can give brief remarks, that would be great. If it's not a full-blown presentation, we totally understand because, as I said, I don't know that the expectations were set as clearly for that as they were intended.

We'll get a brief update regarding the work of my sub team on Safeguards and Trust.

Then I think we'll be spending a bigger chunk of time on the Application and Evaluation Process, brainstorming and talking about our work plan.

We'll talk about the coordination regarding Subsequent Procedures PDP process going on. I think we're going to hear from Carlos regarding that topic.

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

We're going to talk about our upcoming face-to-face meeting and then have it open for Any Other Business.

So with that overview, I will hand the discussion over to Dennis to talk about Outreach to Underserved Regions. A special thank you for Dennis for joining us with what I suspect is a very early time. So take it away, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. If you could bring up the slide for me. My name is Dennis Chang. I'm ICANN staff, currently serving as GDD Services and Engagement Program Director at ICANN. At the time of this period, I was the program manager for the Applicant Support Program (ASP).

While we're loading the slides, I'll just give you a quick background on myself. I was brought into ICANN specifically for the ASP, to build and launch the program. So this program is very close to me, of course. It's what brought me to ICANN.

I'm not seeing anything yet. Am I supposed to?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Hi, Dennis. Your slides are up in the Adobe room, yes. Would you like us to [inaudible]?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. For some reason, I'm not seeing it. That's really bad. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. We will [inaudible] for you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so let me bring up my own slides then. So we'll have to [think] manually here. The first slide was just a cover slide. Let's go to the next slide then, which has the Applicant Support Program. Just a quick, one-page slide for everyone to get on the same page for what an Applicant Support Program (ASP) is. ICANN has created a program to seek specifically to serve the global public interest and ensuring the worldwide accessibility to, and competition within, the gTLD program. So it's a program within the gTLD program.

It had a component of financial assistance in a way of fees reduction. Also, we set up an ASP directory which we called pro bono third-party services where the seekers of the service and offerers of the service can help each other for the application.

The ASP program details can be found on our website. It basically has everything that we created, all the programs from the beginning to the end.

Next, slide number three is a timeline slide. We want to take you back to March 2010, when the Board requested a Joint Applicant Support Working Group to be composed of representatives from SOs and ACs. The JAS, as we [inaudible] called them, had to work together to bring a final report which is the basis for the program.

In December 2011, the Board resolved and authorized the creation of the ASP, and then we went into work to create and launch the program.

On 12 January 2012, the date that we'll all never forget, is the date when the ASP and the New gTLD Program officially opened window to take in the applications.

The deadline for the applications was 12 April, and then after that we established a review panel, the Support Applicant Review Panel (SARP), which was composed of independent volunteers representing the regions and the different expertise. We wanted to make sure that it was composed of people who are familiar with things like grants and awarding and reviewing proposals like [inaudible] because of the financial component.

The SARP completed their work, and the results of the SARP have been published on March 2013. That's when I consider the program to be [over]. Next page.

I've heard that you were interested in the outreach effort within the ASP. The outreach that we were doing that we're going to talk about right now is in the context of the Applicant Support Program. Several channels we will talk about. We used social media, global press, ICANN website of course, live events, and other activities. I'll take you through each one of these in some detail. Page five, please, next page.

Promotion of ASP Through Social Media. Basically, Twitter, Facebook, online advertising campaign. What we did is we measured what happened within the six or seven weeks from the start of the ASP program. We had Google ads on the new gTLDs in 145 countries. Now this included 35 countries defined by the World Bank as lowest income. It was geographically targeted in the Facebook page. We intentionally

did not run any campaign in North America to conserve funds so that we can use more for the deserving regions.

We did our online banner targeting for chief marketing officers (CMO) in developing economies. Those CMO-targeted campaign and Google ad campaign had these visitors from 136 countries and over five million impressions.

Some of the Twitter examples that we used prominently displayed Applicant Support Program and promoted financial assistance components so that people are aware that this is available. During this time, it's remarkable how the Twitter followers had grown. Predominantly, we had about 8,000 followers in North America. But within just a few weeks, it just mushroomed to 45,000 from all parts of the world. The biggest was actually seen from these cities that you see here: Jakarta, Nairobi, Istanbul, Lima, and Cairo. It was a remarkable thing to watch. Next page, page seven.

From the Global Press. This is very difficult to measures, but we attempted in any case. About 2,500 articles we could track in the World Bank's five designated regions of the developing countries. Journalism conference we had in African continent. At the time, it was called Highway Africa. We saw it result in a direct media coverage from Dot Com to Dot Anything. Then of course, based on that type of conference, the other journalists gained understanding and wrote about the ASP. You see some numbers there in Number of Earned Media Articles in these regions totaling about 2,487. That's the Global Press. The next page.

Promotion of ASP on the ICANN Website. The ICANN website was, at that time, a lot about gTLDs. We also did some promotion for the Applicant Support Program, such as the banner that you see on top. At the time, we were defining the program in three components: the pro bono services, reduced evaluation fees, and then we actually thought about creating an applicant support fund which is in addition to the amount that the Board had allocated. I'll talk more about that a little later.

We had our Applicant Support pages on our New gTLDs micro-site. We created a New gTLDs micro-site specifically to gather and organize and present everything about the new gTLDs, and the applicant support page and subpages are part of that.

We created handbooks. We created things like, I guess the other things that I was thinking about is when we were doing our public support for the program for our public comment for the program that Applicant Support was prominently displayed on our ICANN website.

The other thing that we did on the website is, of course, when we were trying to build the Support Applicant Review Panel (SARP), we did press releases and we published in various places. Announcing the need for the SARP and the recruiting effort that went on was in a way promoting the ASP at the same time because you can't be asking for the volunteers for SARP without first talking about what the program is. Next page.

The Live Events. These numbers and these live events, it's hard for me to tell when these happened, [when these are measured], but it's not within seven weeks obviously. It was from some time, maybe a couple

of years. But these things happen around the world. Basically, that's the message here. It's not any one person or one group. The ASP was an integral part of various presentations by many different people. About 59 live events, and many of these events – and we were basically focused on the World Bank classified as a lower-middle-income – the developing countries: Egypt, India, Pakistan, Senegal, Ukraine, Kenya, Nepal – places like that. So 59 live events, about 25,000 total attendees we counted. These are events that we used to promote the ASP. Page number nine.

Other Activities. The other activities that we were thinking about on how we had promoted the ASP. When the New gTLD Program was available and the Board had decided to go and approve the New gTLD Program, we sent letters to the governments. Not only to the governments within the GAC but also to non-GAC governments. Within this letter, we wanted to make sure that the New gTLDs were made aware of by the other governments in the developing countries, so that's probably the earliest time when they were there. The earliest possibility.

The thing that I was looking at for measuring how successful our outreach program had been is this Applicant Support Directory that we have on our website. The Applicant Support Directory, we call it the pro bono services by the third party, is basically a voluntary program. If you are a new candidate and if you are considering an application for a new gTLD through Applicant Support, then you could come here and list your name as someone who is seeking the services.

Now these services are all pro bono, and they're provided by other companies who have either experience in or knowledge of and voluntarily offer their services to help these new candidates. You see that we have 50 organizations who have posted their information seeking the pro bono services. So I see that as 50 potential candidates for the Applicant Support Program and the New gTLDs.

In particular note here about the funds. We have \$2 million funded by the Board to support this program. That would be enough to support about 14 qualified applicants. So at one time, we were concerned that we didn't have enough money. That's why you see in some of the materials, the ASP funding concerns or maybe efforts to raise more funds. It turns out that the \$2 million was plenty.

You can find more about the Applicant Support Directory on that link that I provided you. The last page here.

Again, everything about the program is already on the website, so you can go ahead and take a look at the factsheet which will give you probably the quickest one-page overview of what the program is.

There's my 15- to 20-minute presentation on the outreach efforts that ICANN has done for the ASP program.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you so much, Dennis. We really appreciate that overview. I want to open up the floor to questions. I also have a couple of questions myself, but I see that Waudo has his hand up. So why don't we start with Waudo.

Waudu, we're not hearing you. I'm not sure if you're on mute. I just wanted to let you know that we can't hear your question. Okay, Waudu is typing. Okay, "problem connecting mic." Okay. Do you want to type your question into the chat box, Waudu? Okay, so Waudu is typing.

While he's doing that, I have a quick question. I'm not sure I caught whether you said this or not, Dennis, but was there a tally of the actual amount of funds that ended up being provided to applicants seeking support?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. It was an easy tally because if you look at the result of the program, and it's published, there were three applications for ASP and only one qualified. So to give you a number, I think that number was – let me just see – oh, if you recall the normal fee for the program was like \$185,000 I think and the reduced fee was about \$47,000. So about \$135,000 was the amount of money that we spent out of the \$2 million allocated.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Gotcha. Just based on this overview, it sounds like there was a considerable amount of press, social media, in-person events, but then at the end of the day, what you've just told me is you only get three applications. So looking back on it, do you have any thoughts about why there were so few applicants seeking assistance? After all the outreach and efforts, why it resulted in such a small number of people actually seeking this assistance?

DENNIS CHANG: Now you are asking me to offer my opinion on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, exactly.

DENNIS CHANG: Keeping in mind that this is just one person's opinion then and it's from the perspective of the ICANN staff, and of course looking back at the whole thing, and we had some conversations about this too, when I first engaged with ICANN, I was brought in because of my expertise in program management. So from December to January, [inaudible] think about 30 months, we had to go through building the program, launching the program, creating the materials, and we actually go in a public comment period within that too. Just [inaudible] different times.

So very focused on executing the program, and I really didn't understand what registry was at the time or how to raise a registry, how to stand up a new business. Over time, I got to appreciate just how complex of a task that is and perhaps very costly. When I thought about developing nations and someone who is trying to stand up a new registry business, the application fee is but only one component of the whole thing. If you look at the people who actually got qualified for the [inaudible], it's someone who is very familiar with the registry, very, very, qualified.

My opinion is that while there was a lot of interest, and as you saw about 50 organizations had looked at the program but eventually they did not put forward their applications, I believe it's because when they

did their homework and realized the complexity it was probably too big of a challenge and maybe not enough time at the time because it takes a long time to build that sort of a business plan. And the people who have submitted the application have been around for a long time too. That's my opinion.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Right. I understand that it's an opinion and it doesn't necessarily represent the views of ICANN. I understand that. I think your opinion is important because you were running this program and you were there at the time, and I think you're very well situated to provide insights into thoughts about what worked and maybe what could be done differently in the future. It sounds to me from your answer one of the issues was perhaps a lack of sufficient time to provide the non-financial support to potential applicants that they might have needed given the complexity of what's required to actually run a new domain. Is that a fair description of your comment?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, I would say time is a component. But also if you're looking at, and I've been doing business for a long time and I did three startup companies myself, the amount of money that it would take is something that you really have to consider. I don't know whether the \$135,000 benefit in the fee was an adequate of a financial assistance for someone who was trying to create a new business in a developing nation. Whether for a profit motive or for public service motives, these are decisions that have to be made very early on.

Of course, the evaluation criteria for the ASP was not easy to pass either, example by three candidates and two of them were disqualified by our SARP. So they had to prove not only their understanding of what a registry does but also show a very strong financial position to carry on the business.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I don't know if you can see the chat where you are, Dennis. Do you have access to the Adobe Connect chat? Because if not, I will read the questions that Waudu has posed.

DENNIS CHANG: I see Waudu is typing. Let me see.

LAUREEN KAPIN: He had some earlier questions.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. Let's see. I'm looking at the chat now. Question 2? Oh, he's asking several questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Maybe start with "invited to the live events."

DENNIS CHANG:

“So far it looks like it’s only [inaudible] metric for success of both ASP and outreach program. How useful is this given that we may not know the business quality of those who have registered [there]?”

That is correct. We do not know. We made no efforts to find out exactly who these all were and whether they would have qualified or not, anything like that. It was an attempt for ICANN not to get directly involved but try to facilitate sort of a matchmaking between a company who is seeking assistance and a company who is offering assistance. It was great to see 23 entities offering free services too, so it was something that was very interesting. But also, I think people knew the intent of the program and they were trying to be helpful.

So the measure of success I would say if we had \$2 million set aside, it would have been nice if we could have gotten more applications and actually spent the \$2 million, but that didn’t happen. So you could look at it that way too. If you look at the number of qualified applicants and whether it was successful or not. At one time, we were afraid that we were going to have too many applicants. If that was the case, would that have been a success? But it’s up to you to look at the success of the program.

The one thing that we can say undoubtedly is that from the time that we were authorized to proceed with the program, we did get out all the program materials, we set up the program process and procedures and executed the program, including recruiting the SARP and giving them process and criteria and went through the whole evaluation without a hitch. SARP just did a very, very good job. I was so impressed with these

people. Some of the members had no experience with ICANN at all when they started.

Okay, next question: “Who was invited to the live events? [inaudible]” Yes, Waudo is making an excellent point. These events by nature are Internet events. The typical attendee tended to be people who are already connected somehow with ICANN or interested in the Internet. A lot of these events were not our own ICANN events, but it was other forums that ICANN attended to participate. So whether or not we had targeted some business executives who attended these events, those kind of things were done more or less individually by the people who were in the area at the time and we asked for their help.

Now keep in mind that ICANN in 2011 was very different than ICANN now. There was no Remote Hub at the time, and we did not have the GSE department that are spread out from the work with engagement duties. So it was the staff can do with their limited resources.

“What are the weaknesses that were noticed or improved on?” These are things that I wanted to hear from maybe you and maybe Carlton. He’s not making it today here. I’m just maybe going to repeat back some of the things that I’ve heard in the past, anecdotal more or less.

The one particular comment that I was hearing and it meant a lot to me is that if we are trying to help raise Internet business in the developing nations where there are not a lot of Internet businesses to start with, then perhaps the social media was not the right forum or is not the most effective forum and we should have gone more with the radios and press. So these are things that we kind of knew about already but,

again due to the limited resources and time at the time, we did what we could there.

Waudu, I don't know if I am providing satisfactory answers to your questions, but that's what I know.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's a good insight, Dennis. I also see that two other people have their hands up. David, I think you have a question. And then it looks like Carlos would be next in the queue.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks, Laureen. Can you hear me okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: Good. Super. Thanks so much, Dennis. Very insightful presentation, and it certainly highlights that there's a financial barrier that was there, which we all looked at. And considering the time, it wasn't just the financial barrier, so that certainly comes across. I think Waudu has kind of asked the same question as me because I was really going to ask you if there's one thing you would change, what would it be. You've obviously mentioned that it was limited resources and time. So I suppose arguably you would say more resources and more time. I think the social media not being the best medium is perhaps certainly one of

the things. But if there was one other thing which you would change, what would it be? I'd just be intrigued to know.

DENNIS CHANG:

You put me in an awkward position. However, I have to tell you that personally, the Applicant Support Program meant a lot to me. Like I said, this was the reason why I started engagement with ICANN because I was keenly interested in doing something to help the developing nations and doing some part of it.

Now that I'm doing a lot more work with registries, I realize just how much work and how difficult that is. I think if I'm putting myself in the shoes where I'm a business person and I'm trying to decide whether or not I'm going to go into the registry business, the typical questions that you would ask as I said before, application fee is just a one-time expense. So getting that out of the way, then you have to question what about the ongoing. How much does it take to really run a registry, and how much knowledge and experience do I need to have?

Thinking about all of that, I think the assistance that was offered – and I think we're going to have a lot more of the resources now with associations like [DNA] that is up and running right now – probably partner with people like that so that we can provide assistance to fewer but more a beginning to the end assistance.

Whether or not ICANN does or ICANN supports that activity as a partner, take them through the beginning to the end. Not just: "Here's how you do an application" and that's the end of that but: "Here's how you set up a registry, and here's how you set up your staff, how many

people you need, what kind of equipment you need,” the whole thing setting up a whole new business.

If that sort of an assistance right up front could be provided a year before at least, that window gets [opened] and then a business investor could really make a decision. Like I said, whether it’s a profit motive – and I really believe there are people out there who are not running a registry for the profit but for public interest – so for those people maybe there’s some other financial assistance that is outside of ICANN that we can broker or connect them to. There’s plenty of money out there for nonprofit organizations.

One of the components of the program we had considered, it never happened and we didn’t need to, was fundraising and setting up a third entity as a charitable organization. Whether that is something we do or not is another question.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Dennis. I’m going to move on to Carlos, but first I just wanted to let you know that you mentioned you feel like you’re being put in an awkward situation. I just wanted to reassure you that these questions are not asked with any bad intent or Monday morning quarterbacking intent. We really ask these questions because we want the benefit of your insights and observations, and we want to be able to think about this in a constructive way so that we have insights that we can base our recommendations on going forward. So these questions are not asked in a critical way. They’re really asked to get the benefit of your perspective having gone through it.

DENNIS CHANG: I appreciate that. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Because there's not any of us who having been through an experience for the first time are unable to look back and say, "I did I perfectly." We all will say, "Well, some things worked. Some things didn't." That's just the nature of we flawed human beings. Carlos, you have a hand up.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much and thank you, Dennis, for your excellent presentation. I can only agree with Laureen. Carlton Samuels had expressed before to us the big disappointment he had, and he knew the business pretty well so I can only agree with Laureen.

But back to your thoughts on the whole, let's call it, the whole business model or the full value-added model for offering TLDs. I have two very specific questions. The first one is that after the fact, ICANN has then developed some studies (which I have not been able to read) for the Middle East, the first one I think, and then one for Latin America. I think they also are trying to do one for Africa on the DNS market, trying to analyze the market in a better way. My first question is: are you a participant of this effort that ICANN outreach staff is continuing to do?

My second question is related to the ccTLDs. Do you think that the ccTLDs would be an important multiplier in these underserved areas? Or maybe the gTLDs didn't want competition from new [inaudible]. In these afterwards discussions, have you analyzed a little

bit better the role of the ccTLDs? Or do you think this study – the Middle East study, I believe, I noticed that they relied a lot on information by the ccTLDs. Do you think the ccTLDs might be an important participant in the process? Either positively or negatively, you don't have to say it right now. But excellent presentation. Thank you, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. Personally, I'm not involved in those forums. My efforts these days are more focused on policy implementation projects and some of the infrastructure building at ICANN, like ICANN Portal.

And of course the DNS forums and all those forums around the world are specifically targeted to grow the knowledge and experience base of the ICANN-related business in those regions, so they are specifically doing that and, hopefully, with years of these sort of forums and the networking and drawing people who haven't been involved into the knowledge base of our community, maybe next round they're already familiar with registries and what those things are and things like that.

I think that it would be very helpful for ccTLDs – obviously some ccTLDs have been very involved, others haven't – but there's no doubt that ccTLDs can offer assistance. Somehow if we can connect them to a mutual benefit model where they can stand up side-by-side and coexist to everyone's benefit, that would just be lovely.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:

Thank you very much, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: You're quite welcome.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I'm looking to see if there are any more hands up. Carlos, that's an old hand. I don't see any more, though I think we have a big thank you to give to Dennis for an excellent overview and also really good insights and some very useful and candid information. Thank you so much, Dennis. I hope as we continue to grapple with this project that we can continue to call upon you as a resource from time to time.

DENNIS CHANG: Of course, you may. As I said, it's near and dear to my heart, and I am here and my job here is to support all of you guys. Thank you, all of you, for volunteering on this team and devoting to the review. I really appreciate it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I'm going to sign off now then. Is that okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, bye. Good luck [to you guys].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Have a good morning.

I think that, unfortunately, Carlton was not able to join us, so we'll have to push off hearing from Carlton on this topic. Perhaps we can revisit it at the next plenary call, and maybe either Alice or Brenda – whoever is in charge of the notes – can make a note that we want to hear back from Carlton on this topic.

That takes us to an update on Studies and Surveys from our great staff. Also, I want to reinforce one particular point here, which is that there is money, but certain money will disappear June 30. For us, that means that we really want to be thinking about our requests now so that we can take advantage of the funds that are presently available. With that, I will turn it over to staff to give us an update on this topic.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Lauren. Thank you. I think I can pick up on this thread. I really wanted to give you an update on the Nielsen and Analysis Group work. I was also going to mention the research funding that Lauren just brought up. There's a budget for research for the Review Team for this fiscal year, which ICANN's fiscal year ends June 30. There's also funding in the next fiscal year for research, so I don't want it to seem that there won't be any funding moving forward. But there is a chunk of money that it would be great to get some use out of, so we wanted to emphasize that and bring that to your attention today so that as you

work in your sub teams and think about any external data requests you may have, that would be things that ICANN, we can't compile internally from our data source but rather may have to come from outside data purchases or research services that we purchase from another firm. So it would be great to start thinking about some of those requests.

With that in mind, just quick updates on the Nielsen and Analysis Group work. On the Nielsen side, the Draft Registrant Questionnaire went out to the Nielsen sub team last week. We made a few changes, including adding a branch for those who don't qualify for the survey. These are people who when they were initially asked, "Have you ever registered a domain name?" say no but then they're presented with three additional questions that ask if they use any other forms of online identity to either promote, for example, a business or a personal interest or something of that nature whether it's through, for example, Facebook, Instagram, using a website builder like Squarespace or Wix.

So Nielsen has added a few questions, and that revised questionnaire is now with that sub team. So hopefully, those of you who are on that team are taking a look and providing your feedback, and we'll have another call with the Nielsen team tomorrow morning Pacific Time. I think it's at 14:00 UTC. That is underway. We're hoping to finish all of the edits on the survey and then get it out to field by, I think it's, late July or August.

On the consumer survey, Nielsen is working on their analysis now and putting together a draft report which, of course, we'll be discussing with Dave Dickinson in Washington in June. That's where things stand on that.

On Analysis Group, we've talked a bit about some of the struggles we've had in getting retail price data. So at Jonathan's suggestion, there are two sites where the Analysis Group folks may be able to more easily scrape retail price data for different registrars across different TLDs: DNPrice.es and [NameStat.org]. The Analysis Group folks are in touch with those two site owners to see about either purchasing data or better using their site to access some of that data for their study. That conversation is happening and, hopefully, will provide them with access to a more robust set of data.

On the registry side, we've had more responses from the registries who are included in the sample, and the team there is beginning their analytical work on the data that they've received to date.

I think that's about all. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Eleeza. I'm looking to see if we have any questions. I don't see any hands up. Okay, Carlos. I can always count on you, Carlos, for a question, which I appreciate. Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: I'm sorry. I don't want to be a pain in the neck.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, I meant it sincerely.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Eleeza, every time I hear the story that we have such a generous budget for data I feel bad because the rest of ICANN is always complaining about the lack of funds. But I have a question. We have a long list of raw data that we want to collect as opposed to [indices] like the proposal of [abuse] which is a very sophisticated one. We have this very long list of 66 or 67 or 70 data points or data issues that we want to collect someday, these recommendations of this group.

Question: who is going to collect this data? Can you, the ICANN staff, take the money and make a proposal how we are going to collect this data, or can we use these funds for getting these 77, 67 data points or something like that? I don't know if this is possibly out of scope, this question, but I really want to react. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you, Carlos. No, that's a great question. Actually, we're already collecting the data on most all of those 66 metrics which I've presented to you before. In fact, most of them are published on our CCT Metric site which right now, unfortunately, has hit a bit of a bug and we're working our IT team to get it worked out. But a lot of the data was already up on the site, and I will put the link into the chat pod here.

Apologies for my daughter who is crying in the background. She just woke up.

What was on that site – you're not seeing it now because we've had some problems with updating it – was I think at least 30 to 40 of the

metrics from that 66 that we're already capturing, so most of that is being captured. Some of the other ones that were in the 66 are being captured by the surveys, and three of them are being captured by the economic study.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: That's great, but if you have money, keep pouring money into this data collection. This is my only comment. I hope it gets as good as possible. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Carlos. Okay, I think we're going to move on now to our Competition and Consumer Choice Sub Team Progress update. Now I know we don't have Jordan with us. But I'm hoping that we can hear from some folks from the Competition and Consumer Choice sub team on these issues of how we're defining market definition.

So again, this isn't going to be a formal presentation with bells and whistles and slides. But I'm hoping just a few helpful comments on how these market definitions are being defined. And I think there are folks who are actually assigned to these subtopics of the market definition for topic area, the market definition for language, and the market definition for geography.

So perhaps we can start with the person who is most familiar with the market definition for topic area. And I'm not certain who that is. I think, perhaps, the staff knows but if that person has joined us today, maybe he or she could speak to that topic.

STANLEY BESEN: Actually, I will speak to all three topics.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, good. Stan, thank you.

STANLEY BESEN: But very briefly.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's fine.

STANLEY BESEN: I learned at 5:56 this morning, I got an e-mail from Jordan asking me to do this.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sorry for the late notice.

STANLEY BESEN: It explains the absence of slides. But I think there's a single, the same report, I believe, applies to all of these three topics. But there are the market definition by topic, by language and by geography. So I believe this is accurate characterization for each of them.

There is, in each case, a tentative list of markets that has been generated by one of the members of the sub sub team. In each case, those tentative lists have been circulated to the other members of the sub sub teams. And in each case, we're waiting for the responses from those other members.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So this basically is where we're working on it and waiting for further information summary.

STANLEY BESEN: Yeah. There exists tentative lists, but they're sort of, I think it's inappropriate to circulate them until the other members of each group have signed off on them, at which point, they will be sent to the Competition sub team and presumably in turn to the larger team. But these are all works in progress.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So basically, you're coming up with lists to populate what these market definitions are going to be in these specific subareas.

STANLEY BESEN: Yeah. I can actually be a bit more specific regarding topics. What we've done there because we had the advantage of table 12 in the announcement report which had a bunch of about ten groups of TLDs. And the effort there is to see whether that list should be expanded, add more groups or add more members to those groups. So that process is

underway. I'm less familiar with the details of the other two because I only learned about that at 8:15 and 8:45 this morning.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So I think we're going to have to punt this then, maybe for our next plenary call so this will be more ripe for discussion. Does that sound likely, Stan?

STANLEY BESEN: Actually, you people have probably figured out that I'm not the most patient person on this committee so this is going a bit slower than I would prefer.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No. Okay. Noted. So we will have to resume this discussion during the next plenary call then. And I'm hoping by that time, Stan, your impatience will fuel efforts in this area and we'll have some more information to update the broader group.

STANLEY BESEN: Before we move on to the next topic, number five, I can say one more thing about the efforts of the Competition and Consumer Choice sub team, if I may.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Absolutely.

STANLEY BESEN:

In a previous call, I'm not sure whether it's the plenary call or just our sub team, I point out that our work plan was not detailed enough to identify the specific projects that we'd be undertaking. Of course, in response to that, Jordan tasked me with coming up with a project list. No good deed goes unpunished. I circulated a list. I sent a list to Jordan the other day. He circulated it to the Competition and Consumer Choice sub team.

These are projects that are fairly detailed with fairly specific questions including identifying the data requirements to implement all of them. That just went out to the sub team yesterday. My hope is that other members of the sub team will look at the list, refine it, add other topics, and then we'll be in a position to implement those.

It does address the question or deal with the question that Carlos raised earlier which is, exactly who is going to do the calculations? And I think that still remains an open question.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. Thanks for that update. I'm glad to hear that you have given a lot of thought to the data request notwithstanding who is actually going to be completing that request because no matter who's completing it, it's going to involve funds. And it'll be good for us to be getting those requests in early. And it's great that you've started that process. So thank you for that, Stan.

I will give a very brief update on our work on the Safeguards and Consumer Trust sub team. We have been continuing to discuss different studies and papers. The focus of our last call was on the ICANN DNS abuse report. Brian was able to join us and give us a very helpful overview of that report and Carlos also presented certain questions and comments based on that report.

We also heard from Drew completing his discussion of the DNS abuse report, which I would headline as there is a good business case for registrars that take a proactive approach to dealing with DNS abuse. And I think moving back to the ICANN DNS abuse report that Brian discussed and Carlos discussed, I think – and Carlos you can jump in if I’m mischaracterizing – but I think Carlos was particularly interested in figuring out a way for us to have a realistic way to gather data on the metrics that are discussed in the ICANN report. Given that there may not be an abundance of data and information out there, what then would be the best approach to gather information on these metrics? Those were the primary topics of discussion during our last call.

Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Laureen, may I take your [word]? No, and I want to remind everybody that we are expecting the public comment on Brian’s report on abuse that should be out very soon. I think the deadline is the end of this week, so I ask everybody to follow this discussion, to follow the public comments that we might expect to have ready, I hope, by Washington. I don’t know what Brian thinks about that. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And Brian, did you want to give any comments on what went on during our last call?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: His phone looks off here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, it does look off. Well, Brian, if you do want to give comments, you can indicate that in the chat.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi. Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, now we can.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. Great. No, just really would echo what Carlos is saying. We're waiting until Friday to see what all of the public comments say. We're expecting some more. We haven't received too much in the way of suggestions in terms of data sources. A lot of the public comments are gravitating towards already making recommendations for new safeguards. But I guess that's also to be expected. And right now, I'm currently working with Visa to compile a list of all our metrics, potential data sources, and if we don't have anything existing, ways we can sort

of construct our own data, potentially. So I will have that. I believe you and Drew and Elise and I will have a discussion. Lauren and then that will probably circulate around after that. So that's forthcoming within the next couple days.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's correct.

BRIAN AITCHISON: So that's my update. Yeah. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Brian. And the other topic we discussed during our last call was led by Karen Lentz regarding measuring the impact of the public interest commitments. And as you may recall, this has been a topic that's been flagged for us by several different sources.

And we talked about how to assess the impact and actual experience of how the public interest commitments have been used in the domain world. And we also discussed various ways we might be able to look at that. For example, websites for registrars, promotional materials, complaints, GAC Early Warnings, missions stated in the applications versus the actual experience once the domains are live. So we did have an interesting discussion about that and we're going to have further discussion trying to narrow our approach there. So those were the basic three topics we discussed.

Moving forward, we're going to continue our presentations delving into the papers that are on our reading list, which are a variety of studies and articles dealing with safeguards and domain abuse issues. And we have lengthened the time of our sub team call so we can try and get these discussions and presentations in before our June face-to-face meeting. Does anyone have any questions on what our safeguards and trust sub team is up to?

Brian, I don't know if that's an old hand or if you have a question. But if you have a question, now is a good time.

BRIAN AITCHISON:

Yeah. I just wanted to make a quick comment regarding the PIC study. I sat down with Karen and Antoinetta who's on our team as well and we've kind of started playing around with different approaches to sort of testing PICs and it's, at least in this very early stage, proving to be quite difficult because just in terms of method, we're trying to assess what was said in the application and then test their sort of commitment to those PICs which is a very difficult thing to test just by sort of looking, comparing what was stated in the application and what was sort of put on their website. And then that's a different sort of animal from what they actually practiced in terms of testing.

But I just wanted to let you know that we are looking at it and we'll have updates on that as well, so thanks very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Brian. I appreciate that and even just those three things: what's in the application, what's on the website and what's actually practiced is a huge issue. Of course, that's separate and apart from and is what's actually practiced having an impact on consumer trust. I mean, that would be the fourth question that links up to what we're looking at in general. So yeah, it's a big challenge.

Okay. So now we can move on to the application and evaluation process. And I know that staff has prepared some slides here. And also, I will let everyone, not let everyone know because you probably already know this, but I'll emphasize that if you're like me, you would have received a scheduler for a time to have a discussion with your subgroup for the application and evaluation process. And as you may recall, let me bring you all back to our first face-to-face meeting where we divided into smaller sub teams to talk about different aspects of the Application Guidebook. And we haven't really focused on that for quite some time. But the plan always was to try and get at these issues sooner rather than later, and divide and conquer, and have some discussions and brainstorming about the Application Guidebook.

So you all probably got an e-mail scheduling a time to talk about that. And if you're like me, when you saw that AEPP header, you may not have known what it meant. But I think the real intent here it to have us all turn back to actually looking at the sections of the Application Guidebook. We volunteer to take a close look at and be ready to discuss and brainstorm about that in time for next week's call.

So this is basically a homework update. It should be on everyone's radar screen as some homework and preparation to take a look at those

sections of the Application Guidebook if you haven't already and be prepared to discuss those sections so that we can move forward with this work.

So with that said, I'm going to turn it over to staff to start discussion of these slides and our brainstorming effort here.

And if I've misunderstood who should be leading this discussion and, in fact, it should be me, I will let someone tell me that because if I misunderstood, I'm happy to take over.

ALICE JANSEN:

Hi, Laureen. Yes, actually, it's your name for this.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, I'm on. You all are going to be really sick of hearing my voice. Okay. So my slides are a little cut off, Alice. I'm not sure if it's the slide itself is cut off. Ah, that's much better. Great. Thank you. Okay.

So this is going to be, I think, a little bit of a reminder for us about what's going to be going on here. So as a reminder for us, the questions that we generated in our brainstorming session were focused on these big topic areas that are in the topic sentences here.

So one, addressing the needs of underserved areas and markets, providing an equal opportunity for participation in the program, collecting and implementing GAC public policy advice, preventing delegations of TLDs that would be confusing or harmful, and allowing

specific communities to be served by a relevant TLD. And then we have subtopics here.

And then we also discussed two separate topics, the string contention process, was that ultimately too expensive for registrants and can we simplify the process by eliminating rounds? I'm going to confess I don't recall the discussion regarding that last topic. But I think these slides, basically, are reminding us of what we originally had brainstormed about in terms of the application and evaluation process.

So in terms of discussion, what we would like to really think about, and this ties into our funds that are going to be expiring at the end of June, are potential research projects.

So that's what I really would like to open up discussion. If folks have thoughts on potential research projects which might get at some of these topics that are identified in the slides, the underserved communities, equal opportunities for participation, preventing the delegation of harmful gTLDs, allowing specific communities to be served by a relevant TLD, and collecting and implementing GAC public policy advice. So do folks have thoughts, if folks have thoughts on that.

Okay. And I see, okay, thank you, Megan, for that clarification. Megan is weighing in that perhaps there was a discussion about allowing brands to go forward without a separate round. And that might very well be. That might very well have been the discussion that took place in our brainstorming session.

Carlos, I see your hand is up. Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. I want to mention that this point is not only very important, but it is the first major overlap area that we have with the PDP on subsequent rounds which is the next in the agenda. So I don't want to jump ahead, but these calls we're preparing for next week are really important. This homework that you mentioned is very timely to jump into the study, into the homework on the Applicant's Guidebook with these questions in the back, you know? Not that we're going to rewrite the Applicant's Guidebook. That's the job that the other group has to do. But this is a direct overlap and I will report later on how we are going to coordinate this area. I just want to bring your forth your messages. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Carlos. I appreciate that. Drew, go ahead.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. I just have some thoughts based on the discussion, or based on the presentation we heard today, about thinking about all of the different factors that went into developing countries choosing to apply for, to run new gTLDs or not choosing to. And I was particularly interested in the idea that was brought up that there was all these other business [inaudible] of course associated with running a registry and that it's not just the application process itself.

And so I think for us to evaluate whether ICANN's roles and responsibilities in this program were done well and whether this program was effective with creating equal opportunity, maybe we need

a better sense of what the markets actually look like and what Internet users and Internet use actually looks like in many of these developing countries. So that way, we're not assuming that there's going to be just as much interest in, I can't think of a good country [inaudible] right now because I can't recall where those applicants, those three applicants, came from and the one that actually got the [inaudible] came from, but for us to not assume that all developing countries have the same level of interest in new gTLDs.

And so maybe if the outreach was good, maybe the Internet's used in a different way. Maybe everything's done primarily through mobile phones and through apps, and therefore, there's, a new gTLD wouldn't be a great commercial success there even if there's all the funding in the world available. So that's something where perhaps there are some studies that already exist. But if not, then maybe we could use some of those funds to better understand that so that we're understanding those markets. And that might be something maybe Stan or another economist could jump in on and better define as far as our methodology would go.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That's, you raise an interesting point there, Drew. But to me, it almost sounds like that is a point that would almost be a recommendation rather than a study for us because what I hear you saying is that perhaps the support given to potential applicants wasn't as effective as it could be because there wasn't sufficient understanding of, I'll say, the baseline development of what the Internet usage, what modes are used.

And you gave that great example of it's all mobile, then new gTLDs aren't going to be that alluring. But to me, that goes to a recommendation for ICANN to understand it rather than us to do a study and say, "Here's this information." To me, that's a recommendation for a more effective support has to be founded on a basis of understanding and maybe that understanding should have been more in-depth. But tell me your reaction to my statement. That's just how it strikes me listening to it.

DREW BAGLEY:

Well, I think for us to understand whether the program was effective or not, we need to have a better understanding of whether or not there's a demand to begin with for running a registry in some of these countries because ICANN's program could have been the most effective program, the most perfectly crafted program, but there wasn't an interest because business leaders in different countries knew it wouldn't be a fruitful venture based on the way Internet users were there and what they were interested in, what they were drawn to in terms of just how a brand for a new gTLD might work or not work. Then it doesn't matter how effective ICANN's program was if there was no market there, I guess.

So that's my thought is that if we're going to, otherwise, when we evaluate the program, we just need to be careful not assume because there were fewer applicants, that implies that the program, that alone implies that the program was not successful. I guess that's my thought. It may have been a very poorly crafted program. It may have been a terrific program. But if there wasn't that demand there for it, that kind

of alters what we can, how much weight we can give to the fact that there were few applicants.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So then what I'm hearing is a request for data on the demand for new gTLDs in the underserved areas and markets to assess whether there's a demand for it in the first instance so that we can inform our assessment of how the new gTLD program worked in terms of addressing the needs of underserved areas and markets.

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah. I think that would be helpful because yeah, that would at least tell us if there was, there were, we assumed, so I think the assistance was set up with the assumption that there was going to be a demand for it, and therefore, a business opportunity for it, and therefore, ICANN was assisting to ensure that there would be equality in pursuing those business opportunities. So that would help us at least see whether or not there was such a demand for the new gTLDs because maybe, for whatever reason, there wasn't. So some data that speaks to that, I think, could be helpful for us.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Got it. Okay, I think that's very helpful. Stan, you have a hand up.

STANLEY BESEN:

Yeah, I just sort of pointed out that Brian's question [inaudible] really has a much, potentially a much broader focus. I was struck by looking at

data on the current registration levels of the new gTLDs, how many of them have very, very few registrants. And looking at those data, my reaction was, “Are these guys going to really survive in the long run?” Not limited to the gTLDs that Dennis discussed earlier. And I think that’s a valid question. I think there was kind of a land rush. Lots of people got in, but the registration numbers are highly skewed and a relatively small number of gTLDs have most of the new registrations.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So connect that then, Stan, to the application and evaluation process.

STANLEY BESEN: Well, I’m not sure. I thought that Brian was talking about the outreach program. Did I misunderstand?

LAUREEN KAPIN: First of all, I’m not sure. When you say “Brian”, are you talking about Drew’s last comment or are you talking –

STANLEY BESEN: Oh, I’m sorry. Drew’s, yes, the [inaudible] that said that maybe we shouldn’t have expected these to be successful given the changing the way which the Internet is being used.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right. That’s Drew’s last comment.

STANLEY BESEN: Okay. And the point, that's very general if that's the case. Looking at the registration data now, someone looking at an industry like that might say, "Gee, there's going to be a lot of eggs in it in the not too distant future." And I think that's a question whether we categorize. It's maybe not directly addressed to the application process. But it is relevant to our broader mandate.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. I agree. I definitely agree that it's relevant to our broader mandate. So thanks for that. Carlos, do you have a question?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you, Laureen, and thank you, Drew, for your question. It's not that I feel I'm a qualified economist but I think it's very important also what Stan mentioned. And the overall question is around what's successful. I think we have to keep it in mind because you can also argue, Stan, that it was utterly successful. And it collected tons of money and some of the streams were auctioned for millions of dollars. I mean, what couldn't be more successful from the point of view of the applications? So in terms of applications, we can show some success.

In the case of sustainability of some of the models, this is a totally different question. This is not the application process per se. This is the market. This is for the market to decide. And the market, of course, has changed as Drew said. The market has sent the domain names back behind applications and behind mobile operation, mobile access, and

behind many other ways to access them. But in the end, there is always a domain page.

So I think we have to keep this discussion very alive and analyze not success per se, but some of the trends behind the results. And one of the trends we have already noticed, this is the segmentation or categorization of the new domain names. For example, trademarks, they will never die even if they don't get registrants. I mean, as long as the company exists and they will have the trademarks, they will [inaudible]. So analyzing the number of domain names under a trademark is no solution.

And then the trademark to the first level was a success. There was a lot of demand and there were some brands that are pissed off that they didn't apply. In the PDP, we have somebody from [Printer] complaining every day, "Oh, [Twitter] missed it and we want to apply double trademark." And he is one of the co-chairs so you can imagine how it goes.

And the other point of success is what Dennis Chang told us just an hour ago, that it is a whole value chain. There is a whole cost chain. It is not only the application. You have to have an operation. You have to have a marketing operation. Then you have to offer a whole thing, and e-mail, and value-added services, etc., etc.

So we have these two trends that I want to keep in mind. One is the capitalization or segmentation of the different types of the new domain names, some more successful than others in the application, some with better prospects of sustainability in the long-term. And the second one

is that at some point, if not this group, somebody else will have to analyze the whole value chain, not only the cost of the application. Thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Carlos. So I think what might be helpful to divide this into smaller pieces a bit is to at least start a discussion about how we might go about studying these different areas, the first one being addressing the needs of the underserved areas and markets. And we already had a comment from Drew that it might be helpful to basically study whether there is a need or a demand, for new gTLDs in underserved areas. But are there any other surveys or studies we might want to identify to get at the topics that we have already identified as is important to us for addressing the needs of underserved areas and markets?

Folks have questions or input on that. Carlos, I don't know if that's a new hand or an old hand. Old, okay. Other thoughts?

It might be interesting. I'm just looking at examining barriers to entry for prospective participants for emerging economies. It might be interesting to give some thought to who we might want to survey for that. Would it be business owners? Would it be some other groups? Would it be some other groups to try and survey to see what are the barriers for entry? Because we certainly have some observations from Dennis and others about actual barriers to entry being both financial. It may have been the ecosystem that actually exists in the country. If it's all mobile, that's going to be different from people getting to the Internet via a computer. It might be technical expertise.

So it seems to me that we might want to consider how we can best develop a survey to identify barriers to entry and maybe that's something we can flag as a potential research project.

For whosoever is doing the typing for the application and evaluation process, can we flag, please, Drew's question on surveying the demand for new gTLDs in developing economies? And my topic of trying to identify what individuals and entities we can survey to examine barriers for entry.

Other thoughts on this topic for addressing the needs of the underserved community?

Okay. Thank you, Waudu. A mixture of different groups, businesses, NGOs, etc.

Other thoughts on addressing the needs of the underserved areas?

So let's turn our attention, then, to providing equal opportunity for participation in the program. Thoughts about how we might actually gather data in this area? And the sub points we identified here are the risk of unfair advantage for those with more resources or disadvantage of those with fewer resources, linguistic barriers, outreach and awareness, which we've actually talked a good deal about this morning with Dennis, and infrastructure access. Thoughts here?

Okay. I think what this points to is that maybe we need I think a little more lead time for folks to think about these issues before we just launch into a brainstorming discussion. That's kind of my observation here. So maybe this also points to something that we can spend some

time on in our face-to-face discussion in Washington D.C. I don't recall at this point if it's on the draft agenda, but I do know that preparing for the Washington D.C. meeting is one of the points we're going to cover.

So I'm going to propose, for now, to table this topic because it strikes me that folks aren't quite ready to discuss it in-depth. And that perhaps this should be part of folks' homework for the calls next week, that as we're looking at our assigned Application Guidebook sections, we should also be going back to these slides to consider what studies might be available, what studies we can formulate to guide our discussion on these topics and guide our inquiry on these topics.

So if I can ask ICANN staff to post these slides on our Wiki page, which probably they were going to do anyway. But if I can make an explicit request, that would be, I think, useful as folks prepare for their calls next week on the application and evaluation process.

Okay. So let's move on then. Carlos, this is going to be your topic. What's happening with our coordination with the gTLD on subsequent procedures?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: [inaudible] on new gTLD subsequent procedures? Go ahead, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh, sorry. I thought I had seen David's hand raised. But he's put it down. I'm not sure if he has something [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see that. David, my apologies if I missed you.

DAVID TAYLOR: That's okay, Laureen. Can you hear me now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: You were tabling this. So I got a comment, but then you were talking about tabling it so I was putting my hand down. But it was just on that, the slide and providing equal opportunity for participation in the program and that risk of unfair advantage for those with more money. I thought we should probably add an insider advantage or the potential insider advantage because we don't bring that out in the slide and I think when we look at where all of the applicants have come from, there's obviously a clear, to my mind at least, a clear correlation between those who have been part of ICANN for a number of years and those who haven't. So I think that's where we start seeing inequalities. So to capture that, I just thought add in another bullet point or add it in to the first bullet point there, just, you know, the insider advantage just so we've got it flagged.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. I think that's an excellent point. Alice, can we add that to the slides that are going to be saved on our part, on our wiki page?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Laureen. Yes, we can make that change.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect. Okay. So let's move on then, Carlos, to our coordination with the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you, Laureen. The coordination call took place yesterday morning. Alice, of course, did an excellent job writing down everything that was discussed. I'm going to give you a more general overview, the way we see it.

Both teams are worrying less about the content right now and worrying more about how to compare the work plan, the timeline and the research that each side is doing. The PDP on the subsequent round did a rework of their five or six chapters. They reduced it to five only or four only. I don't know. It was a streamlining and they started putting a timeline on their discussions, a very aggressive timeline, to come up with a deadline, let's say.

They also put in a separate list, the issues that are related to our review, which is also very interesting and worthwhile to go through it. You should do it, for sure no later than during the Washington meeting.

On our side, Jonathan also explained a little bit our timeline that we're waiting for the research of the [extent of] consultants, the subgroups that we have and what's coming up in our agenda. As I mentioned before, we are heading towards the first big overlap, which is number one on the side of the PDP issues, the Applicant Guidebook, and very much related to the last point we discussed.

So Jonathan told them it is on our agenda for the Washington meeting, the second day. So we should expect to have participants. I don't know if they will show up or if they will just follow our discussion for that segment. And that means, of course, that we have between now and Washington to get our new subgroup up to speed. As Laureen already mentioned, we will have a call very soon for those groups. I hope we will have it by Monday [inaudible] has some trouble with Friday to make it for the call.

But in general terms, I would say that we have developed a common language that is very valuable. We don't necessarily have to talk very long with them, but we have to talk regularly so that the group is moving ahead, I think, very well and there is less discussion of the beginning who is doing what or this jealousy. I think it's working very well.

The reason I wanted to mention that is because I don't know if some of you are also involved in the discussion of the new bylaws and the

inclusion of their reviews into the bylaws. It's very important that we keep an eye on that and we are aware that, in the future, reviews and policy development will be happening simultaneously every time. At least, there will be a review every year for the next four years going on, and of course, there is a lot of policy development going on. So we, it's very important to have your input, your thoughts, and your reactions to this coordination because we're heading to a new way of developing policy and doing reviews simultaneously. And it's not only about the content, but also about the way we work together that we have to keep an eye and be responsive and be ready to give our opinion of what's happening.

And I think, in fact, Alice just put up the excellent notes so you can read it at leisure. I hope that's enough. Laureen, if there are any questions, I'm happy to [come back].

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Carlos. Does anyone have any questions for Carlos?

Okay. Let's move on, then, to preparing for our Washington D.C. meeting, the draft agenda.

ALICE JANSEN:

Hi, Laureen. The agenda should be up on your screen now. So as you will see, the agenda we're suggesting for Washington has a lot of time dedicated to subgroup meetings.

LAUREEN KAPIN: My screen is blank. I don't know about other people's screens.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay. It's appearing on mine. Do others have the same problem?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, maybe it's just me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have it. I can see it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's just my screen, so please go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay. So I was just saying a lot of the time available in D.C. will be dedicated to making progress in your respective sub teams. You will also notice there is an agenda item for Lars Drake to come and have a chat with you on the first day in the morning. A significant portion of the time as well is dedicated to getting the update from Nielsen and the questionnaire.

And on day two, you'll notice all morning is focused on the application and evaluation discussion that you've just had. So some time will be carved out for that s well.

So this agenda, obviously, is still a draft and may change based on the progress that's made in-between, between now and Washington. But if

you have any edits or comments you'd like to share, we're more than happy to have some factor into this. Thank you so much.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Alice. And forgive me. I know that I have received this draft agenda before. Oh, now. There it is. It just appeared like magic. Is this something that also – will this be on our wiki page? Because if people want to comment on it, I just want to make sure they have access to the document.

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, absolutely. It's already available on this plenary call page.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, got it.

ALICE JANSEN: But we'll make sure it's also available on the dedicated page for Washington. Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Okay, that sounds good. And you know, my question's about what's available where makes me wonder if during the face-to-face meeting in D.C., if maybe we can spend, even if it's just five minutes on jus a little tour where all our information is living, just for those of us who are finding where, locating where everything is a little more challenging. Maybe if we can just get a little walkthrough as a reminder

and guide during the D.C. meeting about where everything is. I think that might be helpful.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Laureen again. Yes, we can actually compile that in an e-mail if that helps.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That would be great.

ALICE JANSEN: Yeah. Will do.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. So do folks have questions or feedback on the draft agenda for the face-to-face meeting?

Okay. I'm not seeing any. So dinner on Sunday for people out of town. So I think that's a great idea and maybe we can circulate something via e-mail that people can respond to for folks who are wishing to join for a Sunday dinner. I think that's an excellent idea.

Okay. Any other business that people want to bring up in our remaining few minutes, including if there's any topics that I unintentionally cut off discussion on?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Laureen. Just real quick, I just wanted to flag that in the near future, probably today or tomorrow, you will be receiving a doodle poll for the next face-to-face meeting, so not this Washington meeting, but the next one in September, so that you will be asked to provide your availability and preference for this meeting. So we'll be sending a set of dates to you shortly.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. And do we have, will that doodle poll include thoughts on where the next meeting might take place?

ALICE JANSEN: No. That will be to be determined.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Any other questions, comments? Any other business?

Okay. I'm not seeing... Alice, you have a hand up.

ALICE JANSEN: Old hand. Sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Old hand. Okay. No worries. Great. I'm not seeing any other questions, so I want to thank everyone, particularly – well, Dennis isn't on the phone, but it was great for Dennis to have joined us. Thanks, as always, to the wonderful staff we have supporting us and being infinitely

patient with our questions and problems. And thank everyone for being patient with me for handling this call. I appreciate everyone's support.

Okay, so it's 10:59. You all have an extra minute in your lives. Think fondly of me during that minute. Take care.

STANLEY BESEN: Thanks, Laureen. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, Laureen. Bye, everyone.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]