KATHY SCHNITT:
This is the NCAP Discussion Group Teleconference on Wednesday the 1st of May 2019 at 21:00 UTC. Jim and Jay, I'll hand it back over to you.

JAY DALEY:
Great. Thank you very much. Welcome. As you'll see, we are now using Zoom webinar for this. You are classified now and permanently for the rest of your life in one of two things. You're either a panelist or an attendee. If you're a panelist, you can talk and engage. If you're an attendee, you can't. If you have come through as the wrong one, then please message Kathy and explain that. You would have got, if you're a panelist, you should have got an individual personal e-mail which includes within it a link, the same link as everybody else got for this meeting but a very long token at the end of it, which identifies you as the individual panelist that you are. And that would have then got you connected through to this. So, hopefully, we're good. We're seeing a number of people now move from attendee to panelist, so we've got that sorted. Good.

There will be ... We're trying to still work out how we can allow panelists to turn various things on. For now, Jim and I can see the hands raised button, so please raise hands if you have things there. Oh, and so Kathy's moved you over, which is very useful. Thank you, Kathy. Just remember, those of you who are panelists, that the link you should be using next time is the one with the very long token on the end. Okay? Great. And whoever's got their microphone on with the stuff in the background, could you please mute that?

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.

JAMES GALVIN:

And Jay, I just found an option under 'more' for 'allow panelists to start video', and I just turned it on, and it'd be interesting to see if that works.

JAY DALEY:

Great. Jim, if you could do that for the panelists, that'd be fantastic, while I kick straight into this. Okay, good. I'm going to ask those people who have already previously provided their SOIs and been panelists, so those are the people who introduced themselves last time, whether or not they have any change to their SOI? I'm going to count down from five, four, three, two, one. No hands seen, excellent, so nobody has that.

So, we're now going to go through and identify the people who've put in their SOI since the last time and just ask them to very briefly introduce themselves. So, this is like a ten, 20, maximum 30-second introduction of who you are, and why you're involved on this. So, Dmitri, I believe you were there last time. Can you quickly introduce yourself?

[DMITRI BURLOVSKI]:

Yes, my name is Dmitri [Burlovski].i, I will switch [inaudible] for some time. My primary sphere of interest is cryptography, so I think that now we when we have DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS it will significantly change their [inaudible] dangers, because of, for example, leaks from [corporate] networks, because of using resolvers which are part of browsers. So I think this aspect should be taken into account.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you Dmitri. Great. Eric? Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hello, can you hear me?

JAY DALEY: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. Sorry about that, double muted. This is Eric Osterweil. I'm
                         an assistant professor at George Mason University, and previously had a
                         lot of experience doing investigations into name collisions and whatnot.
                         I'm also currently a vice chair on the SSR2 review team, and I'm happy
                         to go on longer, but I think I just may have crossed 20 seconds.

JAY DALEY: Fantastic, thank you. Jeff? Jeff Newman, thank you, go.

JEFF NEWMAN: Hi, sorry. I had to switch to phone connection because my Internet
                         connection was unstable. I thought that was just a reference to my life,
                         but it's just a connection. Anyway, my name is Jeff Newman. I work at a
                         company called Cum Laude. We are a corporate domain name registrar
                         and brand protection company, but I'm actually in this group primarily
                         as a liaison to subsequent procedures – the GNSO subsequent
                         procedures PDP. I am one of the co-chairs of that policy development
                         process, and I want to do what I can to help us kind of coordinate

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Matthew?

MATT LARSON: Hey, can you hear me okay?

JAY DALEY: Yep.

MATT LARSON: My name's Matt. I'm the principal engineer at Verisign in the applied security group, under the security office. Done a lot of research in publications on name collisions in the past, and I'm here to help out in NCAP.

JAY DALEY: Fantastic. And Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: Looking for the unmute button, there we go. I'm Warren Kumari. I am employed by Google LLC, who is both an ICANN registry and registrar, but I do not have any day to day interaction or responsibilities with those groups. I am participating as I am part of SSAC, and I've been

involved for a long time in the name collisions research and discussions, and similar.

JAY DALEY: Fantastic, thank you. I think we have one or two others that are stuck in the attendee thing, having not got through, so we'll just wait for them. Just a reminder for you, if you're a panelist, you would have received a direct email. In that email, lower down there is a link that has the ordinary Zoom meeting ID for this meeting on it, then it's followed by a very lengthy token, so that's the one you need to click that then gets you involved as a panelist, not as an attendee. If you add the calendar invite as told in the Zoom thing, then the link in that does not include the token. I think that's a bug in the Zoom thing. So you need to manually copy the bit with the token out of the email and add it as a URL to your calendar invite.

Moving on, then. We're onto item four now. There's a little something that I think we need to update for all of you here so that everyone's clear about how this works. This is not a GNSO consensus-based policy process. This is a joint SSAC and OCTO project, and it has a project team who will primarily be making the decisions about things. We are convening this discussion group to get as much input into those discussions as possible. Wherever possible we will be making them as consensus-based ones if we can around those things, but there are certain things that we will not be able to do that with. And because this is a project with time tables and various things, we will need to move forwards with that.

I hope that's clear to everybody. And the reason that I mention that first of all is that is because there is one thing that we are going to move forward with, just to make clear for all of you, which is the definition of name collision. That's something we're not going to reopen. That's something that we have been through significantly with SSAC and OCTO. We have consulted on in open public sessions at least three times in ICANN meetings, and we may even have published things about it as well. So, we're comfortable with that definition of it.

Now, that's not to say that if somebody doesn't come up with some tweaks to it, then we'd certainly be willing to look at those tweaks. At one of our last public sessions, [Christian] [inaudible] came up with a use case that he thought was missing from it, so that needs to be addressed. I think there are certainly some tweaks that can be made to it, but otherwise, we're not substantially revising and going back to that.

Okay, does anybody violently object, or even if a few notches down from violently, object to that about definitions at all? Right. I see no hands raised. That's excellent. Good, we've got you all in line today, that's good. The other thing in this is to remind you about ... That we're going to be using contractors to deliver this work, and the contractors will be given a statement of work, which we'll produce by OCTO. It will have inputs very directly from the project team, and it will have input indirectly from this group, as in what this group says will feed into what the project team then slides on to OCTO. But it will be OCTO's final call as to what goes into that final statement of work.

The contractor will join this list, and will join these calls, and will be able to then get involved in discussions. But just to clear, we're not going to

allow them to take instructions from anybody other than OCTO, either directly or indirectly. So, for example on the mailing list they'll be able to answer questions, they'll be able to ask questions, but if somebody says, "You should look at," or "Have you considered this?" or that type of thing – actually, maybe not the last one, but things that would then otherwise lead them to change the nature of their work are things that need to be managed by us to ensure that they are sticking to the statement of work and things as possible.

Okay. So, I'm going to move on now, unless anybody has anything they wish to talk about, onto item six, which is study one and background material. Has anybody got anything on anything I've said so far they would like to raise or anything in that related area? No? Good. Okay.

So, study one. We have had two very useful emails to the discussion group list, thank you. One from Rubens and one from Danny, which give us a list of source material, or previous source material, that could be considered by contractors in study one.

We also have, as everybody knows, the various [inaudible] report on the JAS report as well into this and various submissions and other things that were made on those reports, which probably duplicate some of the things we've been sent.

Now, having discussed this, Jim and I and those on the project, the admin group, are concerned that we need to have a relatively clear set of criteria about what needs to be included and looked at by the contractors and what should not be looked at by them. For example,

should they look at a letter where somebody is complaining that things have not been done quickly enough? My answer probably would be no.

So we'd like to have a conversation now about the criteria. We believe that probably, to give you an idea of some things here, one of the first criteria of things that should be looked at are any peer-reviewed research papers. We're going to throw that open. I'd like to hear from members of the discussion group on their views on criteria for what should be looked at. If you can raise your hands, then Jim and I will manage this session and call you to speak. I see no hands raised yet, so luckily I have an alternative way to play this one.

We have, as you know, multiple things that you can do on this. The advanced controls aren't shown, I don't think. I'm going to start off with suggesting that all peer-reviewed papers are included in things for people to look at. Does anybody object to that, or would anybody like to speak in support of that? Great, I see nobody ... Ah. Warren, go ahead, please.

WARREN KUMARI: Just for completeness, yeah, that seems like a great idea. Obviously, yeah.

JAY DALEY: Thank you, okay. The second one then is the previous reports, the JAS reports, [inaudible] reports, and both things there. I'm going to take that as an obvious one as well because that just has to happen. Thank you, Warren.

The next one then is we have a number of separate, independent data studies that have been produced by people. In Danny's very, very helpful email, these are described as technical reports and notes. Danny has very helpfully listed nine of these or ten of these. These are of course all Verisign ones, and so the question we need to ask ourselves is: how do we agree or not agree on these? And whether these are brought in, whether these are looked at. What criteria do we use to broaden this outwards to allow others? Warren, go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI: I read, I think, most or all of those and to me they all seemed useful, and maybe not everybody's going to agree with all the findings, but it seems like it's useful background and useful input to the process, so I don't see any reason why we wouldn't have that included.

JAY DALEY: Okay, so what would you say is the one-liner that defines those and separates those out from anything else?

WARREN KUMARI: Not sure if I can come up with a one-liner, but they seem to me to be close to peer-reviewed papers in their rigor and seem well-researched and with good data inputs, I would think. Anything that is based on data and seems well-written and provides good background information should be included. I'm not sure if that answers your question or if I—

JAY DALEY: It does. No, I think that's very useful. Let's narrow that slightly, rather than getting into the well-written because I'll spend hours criticizing people's grammar. It's basically an in-depth report that uses data. So is everybody comfortable that any report that has been written on this subject and is reasonably in depth and uses data should be included in this? Yes or no? Thank you. I have a yes from Eric. I don't see any others. Next time around I think, Kathy, if we can have the advanced [inaudible] people say yes, no and things, that would be very useful.

Okay. Now, Rubens has raised on the chat the question of the PDP report, initial report. Rubens, would you like to explain to us why you think that report should be included? Specifically, we're talking about what criteria you think you would be applying to include that report?

RUBENS KUHL: Hi, Jay. Can you hear me?

JAY DALEY: Yep.

RUBENS KUHL: This report was the product of discussions of a number of people with very different interests and backgrounds, so it's almost like a collection of a least one sector of the [inaudible], not all [inaudible], not all people on the earth. But there's a good mix of opinions that went into the initial report, which included two of the most interesting data requests I saw on this matter, which was the data requests to the ICANN organization where they responded what collisions were actually

JAY DALEY: Can I just break this down then? Those two data requests, are they separate from that PDP report?

RUBENS KUHL: Yes, they were taking into account that they are actually separate document.

JAY DALEY: Right, so the two ICANN data requests. Now the PDP report, is that actually a study based on data?

RUBENS KUHL: It's more a study based on experience than on data, so it's more a qualitative than a quantitative experience.

JAY DALEY: This is the bit where I'm wondering whether that should be included if it's not based on data. Do you have a view on that? I'd like other people to weigh in, please. Go ahead, Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL: Even though it's qualitative, it's not one person's qualitative, so there are many sciences where aggregate qualitative research is used in

research and [inaudible] advanced science, so this looks to me very similar to those scientific methods. It might be different, people from a more esteemed background usually qualifies it research, but it still [inaudible] it still recognized and used to advance many fields like economics and other fields.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you, Rubens. I'll have Warren first.

WARREN KUMARI: Just a quick clarifying question. It's possible I missed something. What exactly does it mean for something to be included? If it's just included so that people can read it and consider it then that seems ...?

JAY DALEY: What it means is the contractors will be specifically asked to review that as part of the prior work, so it'll be on their list of the things that they must read and must include.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay, so the downside to [uplifting] staff is simply contractor time begin taken up?

JAY DALEY: Yes. Absolutely.

WARREN KUMARI: Some of that, making sure that they read as much as possible is that they have good background and a reasonable understanding of the full landscape seems important. Just a thought.

JAY DALEY: Right. Okay, thank you. I have Jeff next.

JEFF NEWMAN: Thanks, this is Jeff Newman, although totally biased as one of the co-chairs of that PDP. I do think it should be submitted and included for what it's worth. Members of the group were asked to discuss actual experiences with dealing with the ... Whether they had experiences with name collisions in their own TLDs and then what experiences they had with the mitigation methods. From the perspective of dealing with the practical as opposed to the theoretical, I think all these types of information points – I won't call it scientific data, but certainly at information points – should be at least read as background for the contractors.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Effectively, what you and Rubens are saying is that a criteria here is, as Rubens put it, qualitative research on name collision experience, which is ... I think that's reasonable. Does anybody else have any questions or comments on this, because I see some people putting things on the chat, and it would be nicer if you could raise it with your voice so that we can all hear it? No? Okay. Oh, Danny's muted. It's a conspiracy. Yes, it is a conspiracy! Dan, you've worked that

out already. Right. Well, whatever. We're agreed then that the name collision section of the PDP report will go through because it matches the criteria of qualitative research on collision experience.

The next question we need to ask is there are multiple sets of correspondence to ICANN about name collisions, which, assuming none of those come into the previous things of thorough data reports, because some of them do, or qualitative research on collision experience, do you think that we ought to include those as part of it?

The reason I'm asking this is we have a spectrum here from hard data stuff through to extensive ICANN politics, and we need to find some kind of criteria that prevents these poor contractors getting right into the ICANN politics set of things, where I don't think there's any value to this project, for them having to read and go through that. Has anyone got any other views on that? Warren again?

WARREN KUMARI: Please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that those are somewhat summarized, all of the correspondence, and so it could make sense for the contractors to look at a summary, and if they find anything interesting to go further down and research that. So if there's something that says, "This particular thing spoke about blah, blah, blah," then that should be ... And it seems relevant to them, it should be included. We are putting some faith in the contractors to be doing a reasonable job, and so [inaudible] make sure we're not limiting them. Cool.

JAY DALEY: That's useful, Warren. Thank you very much. So we'll move on then from correspondence, unless anyone wants to raise anything else. We have another 14 minutes to talk through this criteria, so no need to do things quickly.

The next thing then is about technical presentations that people have given. Again, Danny has very helpfully listed approximately I think 20 or so of those, maybe a bit fewer of those, that have been given. As I understand it, though, those presentations are probably presentations based on technical reports. I don't know if any of these presentations need to be looked at. Warren, go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI: Some of them I think are based on technical reports but not all. So, for example, there was a workshop on name collisions in London, and there were a number of people who just made presentations there that were, in a way ... The report itself is I guess is in the presentation or the data. Useful stuff is in the presentation itself. I think that those are very much in scope. They also I think should be relatively quick and easy to review, because many of them are just slide decks, or sometimes YouTube videos, or whatever other video that could be watched in the background.

JAY DALEY: Okay, great. I'm comfortable with that as well. Danny's written yes, he agrees. Anybody else have a view on this at all? Presentation?

JAMES GALVIN: We're calling up presentations, but it occurs to me don't they already fall into the category of being based on data? They would be included because they were based on data and making comments about it? Is there a reason why you're drawing a distinction between presentations and just material that uses data?

JAY DALEY: Yes, the reason I was doing it is I was just testing the assumption that I was making, which is incorrect, that they were simply presentative summaries of longer technical reports, and therefore looking at those would be duplication. But Warren has pointed out that a lot of those have original research in them, or original presentation and data in them doesn't appear anywhere else, and so that's what I was trying to tease out there.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, thanks.

JAY DALEY: Great. Just to recap then, what we are looking at then is we're looking at anything that is peer-reviewed, anything that is an in-depth database report, anything that is qualitative research on collision experience, and there are various different sources that we may go ask people to look at for that. I'm comfortable ... Sorry, Warren. Go ahead?

WARREN KUMARI: Tossing a few other things in there are a couple of RFTs which would have touched upon this, which I think would've probably also be useful, and possibly some [Internet] drafts that may fall into peer-reviewed. It may not, but I thought it might be worth calling out specifically.

JAY DALEY: Yes, that's a good point. Sorry, Danny did actually list those at the bottom of his helpful email there. We have RFCs and IDs as well. Nobody objects to any of that? That's good. So that's very useful. Now then, the only remaining thing is, Rubens, that is the current SubPro work that you posted about. Do you want that looked at as well or not, and if so, can you explain why?

RUBENS KUHL: Can you hear me okay?

JAY DALEY: Yes, I can.

RUBENS KUHL: Most of what is being discussed within SubPro, besides the reverse actions, are more linked to further studies down the road, not to study one. So, we might come back to those in discussing study two or study three, if they are done, but I don't see a strong correlation between those two proposals and study one, but I might be wrong.

JAY DALEY:

Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful. I'm going to close this section off now. Just last chance for anybody who wishes to raise anything to please say something now if they wish, raise your hand. No? Okay, thank you. Handing over to Jim for item six, part B on the list. Thank you.

BENEDICT ADDIS:

Thanks, Jay. [inaudible] about background material, that we should encourage people to continue to send stuff to the mailing list. We'll collect stuff there and do our review of it. And just as we've done here, make a case for what category it falls into so that it can be added to the list and we can make sure the contractors get a chance to look at that.

Last week we opened a discussion about the goals of study one and the tasks that are included in study one. The idea here was to recognize that what's in the project plan, as published, will become the basis for a statement of work that OCTO will be putting together when they release a bid for contractors. This is our opportunity in this group to review those goals and tasks as listed, and consider if there is any clarifications that we want to make to what's there. So, that's question one. Or question two is are there any gaps? Are there things that are missing that we should change in some way, should add for consideration here?

This really is an open opportunity for folks to do that, we had started this discussion a bit last week and we had a good discussion. Just opening it up here again for folks to suggest things that they want to have. I will take a moment, not seeing any hands, to just state out loud,

for those who do not have the email from a week or so ago, which had this in it, you can certainly go to the community Wiki page for this project and grab the project proposal from there, and find the study one section, and see the goals and tasks listed there.

But the three study goals that are listed for study one are first to examine all prior work, and we've been having a discussion about background material and collecting that and what criteria to apply there, so we'll just continue that particular task as something to pass on to them. What we're looking for, for the contractor, of course, is to provide us an analysis and assessment of all that prior work to give to us in our considerations for what to do with it.

The second goal is to create a list of data sets that were used in the past studies, with the intent of identifying gaps, if any, in that data set list, so that we know what we need to go forward with and need to go find, with respect to studies two and three. So, this is sort of preparations for what we want to be looking at in studies two and three, and what data we need in order to ask questions against studies two and three.

And then the third goal is to decide if the project should proceed based on our survey of prior work and availability of data. That's just an ordinary checkpoint that we will be doing along the way as part of managing this project. We will take a look at the work we're doing each step along the way, and just make sure that there's a clear plan and activities that are tasked for us going forward.

I'm still not seeing any hands. I think that the observation here is if we don't have any updates or changes to make to this ... And we still have

time, you can always bring stuff to the mailing list if you don't have anything that you want to add here right now. And of course, we'll have another meeting next week. Our deadline is May 15th, so two weeks from tonight, when we will close off this discussion and all of these goals and tasks as stated here will then be handed over to OCTO to then begin their process of the statement of work and bidding it out and going through procurement so that we can then proceed with our tasks here. If we pause for a moment, I'll see if anybody wants to just speak. I think there's a few people who don't have hands available to them if you want to jump in and speak?

JAY DALEY: Jim, I'll jump in there. I think it would be useful to just try to visualize what the output of the report would be so that people can ... So that we have a common shared vision of this. Some things that I am not expecting to come in the report: I'm not expecting them to go back and look at the source data that any of these peer-reviewed papers, or technical reports or other things looked at. I'm personally not expecting them to check was that particular with the conclusions, or were the outcomes of that report written, done correctly. All I'm expecting them to look at is what those people have said as their conclusions and assess against those. I'd be curious to see what other people think about that. Over to you, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, thanks for that. In fact, that's a nice extra clarity detail on what we mean by reporting on past work. We're expecting as a study deliverable

in study one from the contractor is a review of past work, not to re-do the work, but to review the conclusions that were made there, and to provide a summary of all that to us. I see a couple of hands. Let's go to hands. Rubens, you were first. Go ahead, please.

RUBENS KUHL: Thanks, Jim. Data source is one of the things we looked at doing the subsequent procedure discussion was whether those data sources were accessible to researchers or not. So, one of the questions we need to ask now is whether we want the contractor to [inaudible] data sources that will be accessible to any researcher or not.

I will make to examples of one thing that isn't and one that's not. DNS OARC data, the [detailed] data, is accessible to researchers, even though you have to either become an OARC member, or do some vow of secrecy, but there is a way for researchers to access that data. So that fits that criteria.

But, for instance, the L-root data held by ICANN, even though ICANN uses it constantly for their studies and an ICANN contractor could possibly have access to it, is not a data set that is available for even researchers [inaudible] to look at. For instance, in the PDP criteria, the L-root would fall out, except for the L-root data that ICANN gives to OARC during the [inaudible]. So, these two types of data we might want to see if we want to include both or not in what we ask the contractor to look at. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks for that, Rubens. I can tell you that this issue is covered in the project proposal. We were very careful to be aware of this distinction between data that might be available generally and might not be. Very quickly, in summary, it is our goal for whatever work that we do and whatever conclusions that we draw for that to be reproducible by researchers and the public at large.

But this proposal and this project is very careful to not promise that, because we recognize that there may very well be data sources that we will obtain the opportunity to interact with and ask questions of, and then perhaps be able to use that as input in our deliberations and recommendations, that it may not be possible for others to do, and we consider that an ordinary part of what we're doing. We will try as much as we can to make sure that everything is reproducible, but it's not a guarantee. But there are details about all of that in the project proposal already as written. Warren, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

WARREN KUMARI: I largely agree with what Jay said and Ruben, but I think we should also be careful that we don't artificially constrain the contractors. So, if while they're reading a report, the conclusions or something, and disagree with the interpretation of data, or just want to go and look at the data themselves, if it's available, to get a better understanding, and potentially call it out. In this particular report, all the numbers were multiplied by ten, but that looks like a mistake. We should be careful not to artificially constrain them.

JAMES GALVIN:	Thank you for that, Warren. What I would say is that, yes, the contractors should call out questions and issues like that, but study one is expressly about reporting on prior work. That kind of analysis, and maybe reanalyzing the data and doing things with it is actually part of the second study, in study two. We'll have to be careful to manage that. We don't want to have an open-ended requirement on the part of the contractors for study one, so we'll have to see. But we certainly do want to make a notice about that and have them as part of the report, identify those kinds of questions, so that we can carry that forward if we choose not to be able to let them do it right now.
JAY DALEY:	Jim, can I just jump in there? A couple of things. Can I just go back to what Rubens said? I actually think Rubens said some very good points, that we should ask the contractor for study one to specifically address the accessibility of each of the data sets that is used in the prior work, to record that. Otherwise, we're going to have to do that again for study two. So, that's a separate point there, Jim, that Rubens is making. Just that the contractor, as they go through this prior work, just notes whether that data set is available or not.
	Secondly, on Warren's point, I think that we should be asking them to make an assessment of the methodology used. Brief assessment or a non-assessment, sorry ... Up to them quite how in-depth, without having to actually reproduce the results. So, if they are saying, "Hold on, this is a data study that somebody's done, but they're claiming it's a data study but the methodologies are silly," then that's a no-no, and I think that's important, because we need them to be able to assign a

degree of credibility to the results, and the only way they're going to do that without going back to the original thing is if they're looking at the methodology there.

And then the third point is, Danny's put in about anonymized data for TLDs. Just so that you're aware of this for later on, one of the things that we are looking at in study two is having a contractor produce an anonymization mechanism, so that third parties who have data that they would share if they were happy that it could be sufficiently anonymized have a means by which the data can be anonymized so that it still suits our purposes, and yet everything else is removed from it. And so that would be useful for us to consider later on. Sorry to be lengthy, but just three points there. Jim, over to you.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you. I do want to call out ... We can certainly put some additional clarity on the tasks that are listed here. Task number four already asks for, as part of the written report, any important points that should be brought forward for this project, and all we're suggesting here – and you very clearly articulated Jay, is we should ... And back to Warren's point, about make sure we can add clarity here. We'll propose some new words that they should certainly speak to assessing methodology is one part of that, and any open questions as a result of that that they might have, so we can clarify exactly what we mean by important points in that particular item.

The other thing is tasks six and eight both speak about data sets. Task six already talks about identifying data sets used in past studies. We'll

add as clarity there that they should, in addition to identifying the data sets used, also give us a notation on the existing availability of that data, just in case … See if it's still there, or if it's not, and so we can add some clarity to that item.

Item 8 already clearly states assessing the potential availability of these additional data sets, but we'll be very clear about both the source and accessibility of it in what a potential availability needs. So we'll add that clarity to that task that's already there, so thanks for all of that.

Looking for any additional hands from folks about additional things here? I will take as a task here to make sure that we provide an update to this list of study tasks, as we've just talked about here. We can add to the list so that folks can continue to review this material and provide additional discussion on the list and in future meetings. Steve, you don't have a hand up, but it looks like you want to say something. No? Okay. You're not? Thank you. Anyone else? I'm not hearing any other discussions at the moment and that's fine.

As we've said, this is still an open topic. You can add discussion on the mailing list. There will be two more meetings next week and the week after, so I think we'll just move to item seven on our agenda. We'll close it out for today and ask for any other business. Anyone? I'm hearing some background noise from somebody who's not muted. One more chance, last chance. No any other business from anyone?

JAY DALEY: There's one in the chat, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: "The rest of the SOIs need to be posted." It should be the case that you're not a panelist, and not subscribed in a way to post if your SOI is not published, so that's just a tweak in the process which might have gotten a little confused here.

JAY DALEY: No, I think they're saying that the full SOIs aren't up yet. That's the question list. I'm sure that's just an admin thing that we'll ... It's the wrong link. Kathy is just going to correct that by providing the right link so we can get that sorted.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah, okay. I thought they actually were ... At one time I thought I had seen that go. There we go, Kathy's got the link up, so that's good. I thought ... Our staff is quite efficient about all this and on the job here. There is a little bit of a nuance because the Wiki page is being reshaped a little bit, so there might be some confusion about a few links, but everything should be there. It should be the case that you can't be a panelist and can't post to the list without having your SOI actually published, and that's the way the staff is exercising that process. Okay.

Again, we'll be meeting next week, same time and the week after also at this same time. And if there's no any other business then thanks everyone for joining us today. And we are adjourned.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Jim and Jay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]