

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call to discuss the GeoNames Survey for today, Monday the 19th of August 2019, at 1600 UTC. On the call today we have Jonathan Zuck, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Gordon Chillcott, Harold Arcos, Herb Wayne, Jose Lebron, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vrikson Acosta, Yrjö Länsipuro, and Kaili Kan. We have received apologies from Christopher Wilkinson. From Staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Sebastien Bachollet, Maria Korniets, Evin Erdogdu, Yesim Nazlar, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you, and with this, I turn it over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks a lot. Thanks everyone for joining the call. I'll keep introductory remarks short. The genesis of the survey was that we had a kind of a roundabout discussion in Marrakech where everybody had ideas about what policies were significant, but very little sense of what the implications of those policies were in terms of outcomes. So there were some folks that were proposing policies that were more government oriented, sovereignty oriented, and there were people that were also concerned about government and wanted the community to be more in control. And so this is just an attempt to take an approach to looking at this in the form of a survey, and then if we get a sense of some shared

---

*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.*

---

consensus on what kind of outcomes we would like in different areas, then we might policy recommendations.

And so the questions of the survey are all structured identically, which is a scenario and an outcome, and then there are some questions about each scenario which answer believes that scenario is likely and what the outcome would be. That's essentially the structure of the survey. We're having this call because we want to go over this question by question and for the questions that we think are confusing, I will go back in with Evin or something like that and we'll be clearer for the things we think are confusing. I'm happy to take any questions before we get started. Okay, I suggest we just launch in.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Okay, sorry Jonathan, I didn't hear that, what do you want me to display right now, the actual survey?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

The actual survey, yeah, the questions themselves, and let's get people's reactions. The question, if they think it's stupid, or they think it's not easy to understand. So the top questions are just sort of demographic questions, you know, where are people from and whether or not they have a technical background, whether they own a domain name, plan to own a domain name, et cetera.

So, I don't think that I need to talk a lot, thankfully, I think if we just show the questions one by one and let folks raise questions they have about them, that would be the way to proceed. I'm not sure they even

---

need to be read aloud. People should just read them when it's up on the screen and then raise their hand if they think the question is unclear or illogical, or whatever else you might find about it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Jonathan, I have difficulties to understand you because your voice is not clear. I don't know if I am the only one who has this problem.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Claudia, can you, and we could use the document if he wants to, but you can scroll up past the demographic questions.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Jonathan, can you hear me okay? Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're not hearing me?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Jonathan, can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Jonathan, can you hear me? Hello Jonathan, do you hear me?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Tijani, can you hear me? I can hear you okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I hear you very clear, but I don't understand what Jonathan is saying, because his voice is very corrupted.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yeah, likely he's on his cell phone. I'm going to have the operator dial out to him.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, right now we cannot hear you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: In the meantime, everyone, I put a link in the chat to the survey, so you're welcome to look at it while we reconnect Jonathan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: With that survey, you're not going to be able to go on to the next page unless you actually complete the answers, so you probably want to use the link I sent, which is a page with just all the questions on it where you don't have to complete it.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, let me get that, one second.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I may be wrong, this survey may be structured so you can go on to the next page, but normally you can't. It looks like I'm wrong, it looks like you can hit 'next.' Bad survey design, but nevertheless.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can folks hear me now?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, now we can hear you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're just switching drivers. Can you hear me now?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, I can hear you, Jonathan. Can you hear us?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I'm on the phone now.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, so the survey is up and also we have two people with their hands up in the queue, Marita Moll first, and then Tijani is next. I don't know if you want to take questions now or not?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, I'm happy to take questions, if you could handle the queue that would be helpful because I'm not always going to be able to see, I think.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, I did make you a co-host so you can see it as well, but yes, Marita, if you can speak now, please?

MARITA MOLL: Okay, hi, Marita Moll speaking for the record. First of all, Jonathan, I'd like to know what has been your response to this so far? What kind of feedback have you got. Because, you know, sometimes we'll all get different kinds of feedback, so I'd just like to know where are we starting from? Are there other people who this doesn't work for them?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi Marita. The response I've gotten has completely run the gamut of these are great scenarios, to I couldn't understand anything, to some of them were confusing. And not a single thing has been specific thus far. That's where I am. So that's I'm suggesting that we simply go through them one by one and find out if people find them confusing or illogical, or whatever else might bother people, and try to rewrite them in such a way that it doesn't change the answers that we've already received, I mean, that would be my objective. Does that answer your question?

MARITA MOLL: Yes, to make it conform with the questions, but let's try it.

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Also, we have Alan Greenberg with his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, it's Alan Greenberg. I'm not quite sure I understand the merit of the questions that ask, "Do you think this scenario is likely?" Whether we think it's likely or not is moot, the relevant question I think is do you think this outcome would be good or bad? So, we can answer is this scenario likely, but I'm not really sure of the relevance of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan, I guess there might be differences of opinion about whether that scenario is worth focusing on or solving, or something like that, right? In other words, if we have a bunch of negative outcomes, but they are associated with scenarios that people don't believe are likely, then maybe they aren't things that we need to be developing policy for. That was my thinking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless our opinion does not match the others, and it becomes likely, even though we think it's unlikely. Anyway, it's not worth wasting a lot of time on. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, is there anybody else?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, Olivier has his hand up also.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I've answered the survey and so I think maybe rather than asking do you feel this type of scenario is likely, it's more like to you think this type of scenario is likely to happen? Because the first question always is, the way I understood it, here's a case scenario, do you think this type of scenario might be happening, and you answer yes or no or maybe. Then, would you say this is a good thing or would you say this is a bad thing? Which is the second question for each one of the scenarios.

So I'm not quite sure where the difficulty comes to misunderstanding this, because what I understand from this is you're going to end up with the whole thing saying we're going to focus on the scenarios that are likely to happen, we're not going to look at all the thousands of different scenarios that are out there, and we're also going to look at the scenarios where a majority of the people in our community believe that it's a negative outcome that's going to take place...



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or even a positive outcome.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: ...because there's no use in focusing on the other stuff. Is that correct?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right, Olivier, but even positive outcomes I think are good. In other words, if there's an outcome we like, then we might want to recommend policies that lead to that outcome, right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, alright, thanks. So that's it. I'm not sure what the problem is, then. It might just be a difficulty I guess with maybe the wording of it. But I was hoping perhaps that if people are confused by the questions, maybe you could take us through the different scenarios and just explain a few things and answer any questions about the scenarios themselves. I don't know if we have enough time. But thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so if people already know of ones, if people have read these and already know of ones that they think are confusing, we can do that. I was literally going to start sooner and go straight through and just read the questions and have people stop if they found it was difficult to understand. Is that alright? Sorry, I'm on a phone and so I don't have a good chance of getting a sense of anything like that. So, maybe, Claudia, if you would just bring up the substantive questions one by one, give people a chance to quickly read it, and see if there is a

---

question about it, and then manage that queue, that would be really helpful.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, sorry, I didn't really understand. So the survey questions are up, you just want me to read if they have a question in the chat?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, forget the chat. The substantive questions, so skip the demographic questions, bring up each of the substantive questions, give people a few seconds to look at it and to raise their hand if they have a question about it, and then manage that queue. Is that alright?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, sounds good. The questions are up and Marita has her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go ahead.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: It looks like it was an old hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So are there any questions about the first question? Are there any hands up?

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I see Marita has her hand up again. Marita, are you able to speak?

MARITA MOLL: Okay, sorry. I got an amusing problem here, can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes we can, thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Alright, I was going to address that first question, let's get started on this, let's just try to do a couple. Yes, all 11 million names in the geonames.org database. First of all, are you expecting the person who is going to answer this, if they're just like general end users, they have to go to the geonames.org database, are you expecting them to do that? And then you're bringing up something about .PARIS, well, .PARIS is already reserved, so I wouldn't use that particular, this is confusing if you use that as an example. What do we really want to know here? Do we want to know if 20 jurisdictions share the name, who should have the first claim on it? Is that what we want to know?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. So we can use something other than .PARIS, so that's a different question, isn't it?

MARITA MOLL: Well, it's just this question is complicated, I'm not sure, I mean, do we need to have such a detailed scenario to answer the question that we're

---

trying to get at? We're just trying to get at if there are 20 places that have the same name, how are we going to sort them out? Are we going to do it by the oldest place, the biggest place, the smallest place, the first come first serve? Is that the real question here?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, it's the real question, but that's not an answerable questions. Because that gets to everybody's policies. So, the point is to choose something as an outcome and see whether or not people are happy with that outcome.

MARITA MOLL: Why can't people just choose the largest, we should choose the largest, the smallest, the first come, the oldest, why can't people just choose those instead of the yes, maybe, no. Why can't there be other kinds of responses? Sorry, that's just kind of what I thought about the first one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I guess we could. We could try to think of all the possible answers to that situation and list them as multiple choice. I guess there are other hands up?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yeah, Alan Greenberg?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, I would strongly suggest that we for this question not use a delegated name, or one that is already delegated, and not use one that's also a capital city, because it confuses the issue, you know, pick some city, pick Montreal, where there are a bunch of Montreals around probably not 53, but I don't care what we pick, but pick one that isn't already a capital city and isn't already delegated, because otherwise people are going to answer the wrong question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, let's pretend it's another city and it's not a capital city, and let's answer the questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. So if the city is different, do people still find the question to be too complex?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Alan said what I wanted to say, but also from Marita, I don't know if we are understanding the same thing, because she thinks about other things. Here you said that all 11 million geographic names are put in a reserve database, so those names are reserved and everyone who wants to apply for one of them has to go to get the permission from applicable authorities. So it's different, and

---

perhaps the confusion came from the .PARIS because it's already delegated, so, Alan said what I wanted to say. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, so the real question here, you think 11 million names should be put on a reserve list and require permission from people if they want to apply for one of those cities. That's the question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which in this case included 53 jurisdictions for one string. So, I'll find another one that isn't .PARIS. But that's the question, is that question confusing, if it's not an already delegated string? Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I'm going answer the question instead of debating what the question is. The question, as I read it is, we're going to have a database with every bloody known geographic name in it, and if you try to pick one of those, you have to get permission from everyone who is known to use it. I'd like to think we're not stupid enough to do this, and if we do it, it would be very bad. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that's the kind of answer that I'm after from people. Is there anything that needs to change other than the name of the domain

---

about the question? Alright, let's move on to the next question. And then just take the queue if it's confusing. If there's no hands then we can just keep moving on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan, just one comment. All of these, say you have to get permission. The current discussions I thought were you have to get permission but if you're silent for more than three months, you are deemed to have given permission. I don't know if you're assuming that here or you actually need positive acknowledgement permission. I'm not sure what your intent was in the question. I'm assuming the former and not the latter.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alright, I guess I wasn't trying to tie it too tightly to the discussion, but to actually what we wanted the outcome to be. Because I know there has already been discussion in the At-Large, for example, about you don't have to, the current document doesn't require you to get permission if you don't intend to use the string for geographic purposes, and so that was raised as a loophole. So I'm just trying to get to this abstraction that says what kind of scenario do we want to have happen. There were two people in the meeting that wanted 11 million names on a reserve list. That's why that question is there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Given that reserve list probably changes every day, that would be an interesting implementation.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Agreed, I guess I'm not trying to debate the merits, though, right now, because we can go on, that's the meeting we already had. Is the question clear, is I guess what I'm trying to get at.

MAUREEN HILYARD:               Hi Jonathan, Maureen Hilyard. I did the survey quite early and granted I haven't been to all the meetings, I probably missed out, but I did the survey and found that if I really went into this sort of like the potential complexities of the questions, for some of them I knew a bit about, and had a view. If I had gone into the complexities, as some people did, I think I would have found it more confusing.

But I think I just responded to the answers based on my interpretation of what the question was asking, and I think I'm not quite sure whether it was exactly what you were asking, but that's just sort of like just a general feel of it. I enjoyed the survey, it brought up a lot of the different scenarios that there are and what we're particularly looking at. I just thought I'd add that, anyway. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Thanks, Maureen. I guess I want to get to the questions to that people find complicated or difficult to answer, and see if there is a way to simplify the question. I guess that's my objective for this call.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:                    Marita has her hand up.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Okay, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL:                   Hi, Marita for the record. It's a great survey Jonathan, for the people who know what this is all about. But changing .PARIS to something else is not going to be meaningful to most end users because they don't even know that .PARIS is already reserved. They don't know any of this stuff. I'd like to take this survey to a university class in international politics and ask them how they would answer these questions without anymore background information than they already have on these questions.

I think it would take an entire hour-and-a-half to get through these questions, explaining what this is about. I think it's a great example, we have so many different audiences. This is really great for audiences that already know what this is about. A lot of people don't even know what tech level strings are without someone telling them. If you're trying to reach end user, individual internet end users, they don't know this stuff, so this particular survey , so let's just put it straight, this is not a survey for the uninitiated. It's a great survey, but if we want a survey for people who really want to know what Joe Whoever out there thinks about this, they have gut feeling about this, this isn't it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Thanks, Marita. I don't know that I'm trying to get to that person, right? I was really just trying to get RALOs to send things out to ALSes and get

---

as many responses as we could from the people that we will in fact have involved in this discussion. That's really the issue at this point. This is an end user survey, I'm not trying to write a survey for my grandmother, I am literally trying to write a survey for somebody that's probably in a RALO, in an ALS, et cetera, that has some basic understanding, and I think they can skip a question if it doesn't make sense. I don't know how it's confusing to say that there is 11 million names on a list and you have to get permission from the countries if you want to apply for one of those names. I mean, that's the question. So, I'm anxious to know how I can clarify that for people that are in fact going to be part of our conversation on this.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Olivier has his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm a little surprised here about Marita's point. This is indeed, the whole point of this is to ask people within the Consolidated Policy Working Group, but also our ALS representative and individual members about positions here. Because one of the problems that we're faced with, this is a very, very complex set of issues, there are a lot of them. And as you see from the different scenarios, I think Jonathan has been trying to put the scenarios together, trying to make a complex issues. Each one of

---

these questions is actually treating one small complex issue in the overall set of complex issues out there. And so the answers that are given there should really be from people who know what a second level domain is, that's a basic thing.

I myself don't see where the confusion can come into that. Because some of those questions might seem confusing, but they actually are dealing with a specific point, which if one uses the correct term for describing it, makes it even more complicated, when you look at, for example, trademark law, and all of these things. We're trying to use layman's language for this.

So, at the end of the day, and this is something which is also time controlled. We need to have these answers as quickly as possible and proceed forward with at least having a sense of a view as to what our community thinks about these issues. Because if we don't, then any statement that the ALAC comes up with is a case of well, that's the statement of the three people or five people that held the pen, nobody else really knows what it's about. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. I guess it's also an issue of we're trying to cooperate with the GAC on any of this, as well. So we have to figure out which positions we can reach some consensus on. Are there any other hands up?

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Yes, Alan has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, my comment is not dissimilar from Olivier's. If you believe you're going to be sending this out to people who haven't participated in any of these discussions and get answers you can trust, I think you're wrong. Words, expressions like reserved list, registry. If you ask a typical user what a registry is, they won't know, they'll probably confuse it with a registrar.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't mean to cut you off, but that's not what we're trying to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, you just said you're going to have the RALOs send it out to ALSes, and that is what you're doing if you're saying that. If we're talking about people who are participating in the CPWG, that's fine. If you're talking about a wider audience, then this thing is loaded with terms that people will not necessarily understand. I'm just making that statement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so if we wanted to get to an ALS level, is that the same as a typical end user?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's much closer. To be honest, I don't think we can sanitize this enough to make it palatable and understandable to a typical person without a

---

lot of handholding and explanation. So, I think we should be targeting the people who have some knowledge of what we're talking about at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We have Tijani with his hand up also.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I don't agree a lot with Alan that our ALSes wouldn't understand anything or wouldn't know what it is about. Of course, some of them are like this, and I think it is the role of the RALO to perhaps have a webinar or something like this, or a call, a special call for this survey, and try to explain for people who don't understand who had confusion, try to explain to them. But we need to go through the ALSes if we want to have the image of our base. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are there any other hands up?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: No, that's it.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not sure how to proceed.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I'm still scrolling down the questions right now, I'm at Question 7. Okay, Marita has her hand up now. Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Hi, Marita speaking. I think, Jonathan, that we should proceed, realizing who is really answering this questionnaire and for the people who are engaged and involved, a webinar would be a great idea that are sort of on the edge of that, because only those who are really involved are going to be going on to that webinar. Forget about trying to get too far close to the base. We need a different kind of survey to get close to the base. I think it's worth exploring, but not in this timeframe. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Are there additional questions that anybody on this call, given that this is the crème de le crème of the people that know the vocabulary, et cetera, that people still find confusing. Because that would still be a concern if there is a question that folks on this call find confusing. So, I'm not asking you to think like a non-registrant end user, but just as yourself, is there anything that you find unclear that we should try to clarify?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Nadira has her hand up.

NADIRA ALARAJ: Yeah, thank you. This is a great initiative to reach out. One question I think Marita mentioned, if you add for the demographic to know how deep they know, the respondent knows the issue. Because then you can just filter the answers and take that statement, it's a start. So just one question, a demographic question to ask the depth of knowledge on GeoNames.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We have Alan with his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have a question, not about the questions, but what we're going to do with them when we get the answers. Can one assume that if you say it is not likely to happen, and therefore you don't answer the second question, you're implying you think the outcome would be bad if it did happen? Because otherwise we're going to have a smattering of answers, and I'm not quite sure how we summarize them and process them to find out what the composite answer is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe I should just change the wording for the second thing about, instead of saying if it's likely, but instead say if it happened.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: That would make our processing a lot easier, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I'll make that change.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Next, we have Tijani with his hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Jonathan. Question #10, it is about .SANTAMARIA applied to before by Italy and the Philippines, and you said that it was delegated to the Philippines because it is an “underserved” region. And you said it is likely. This kind of question made me say on one of the previous calls that these scenarios will not perhaps lead us to have the right position. Because here if you answer this question I will say no, because it is not because it an underserved region. The Philippines has more rights on .SANTAMARIA. And if I say no, you will conclude that, underserved region, we have to forget about, and this is not right at all. In this case, yes. So the scenario is a particular case and we don't have to build on a particular case to draw a conclusion at the end. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. It was certainly not my expectation that we would forget about underserved regions, but that we would get to the criteria that we would use to deal with dispute this way. So, that doesn't mean



---

forget about underserved regions, but it's interesting to know that you don't believe that we should use that as a criteria for string contention, because some people might build that it should be.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Marita, you're next.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, Marita speaking. Looking at Question #9, applicants from Oregon and Michigan are in contention for .DETROIT. I think that's a really North American based question and I was wondering myself how people from other parts of the world were going to read that question, probably not knowing that Oregon and Michigan are states in the US, necessarily.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, I'll expand that to explain that they're states in the United States.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Next, with have Heidi with her hand up. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: First, please Jonathan, do look at the chat when you have a chance, there's a lot of information there. I've noticed that these questions don't have an option of 'don't know' which might be useful, given that a lot of this information does presume a lot of knowledge that people just might not have. They're probably not following all these contention

---

issues, so just some thoughts there. And then on the webinar, that might something, given the short timeframe that you have, is to hold this webinar and perhaps just get some responses there, if that's what you're looking for. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Heidi. I'm not treating this as if we have a short time at this point. I'm treating this as something we should have done much sooner than we did, but that we need to figure out what our positions on things are. So, I'm just going back to brass tacks on this a little bit. But good point on "don't know," I'll add that, as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, it's Alan, an alternative to 'don't know' is telling people to skip questions they don't understand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, I can do that. Other specifics?

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, it's Alan. You may want to look at the copy of the chat when it's published afterwards, because there are comments being made that may alter what you do.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I will do that. I'm sorry I can't watch everything at once because I'm on the phone. But I will look at the chat afterward, and I'm going to go back over this recording too, because I'm not taking notes, either.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Marita has her hand up, Marita, go ahead please.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, just we don't have a blank space here, I find #13 to be really confusing. First a jewelry company and then a tourism company. I'm not sure what the goal of this particular question is. And I don't have any suggestions on how to change it, I just find it confusing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But you don't have a sense of why you're confused by it?

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the reasons is it's not clear to everyone in the world that Blue.Nile is a jewelry company, or the name of a jewelry company.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Doesn't the question say that that's Blue.Nile jewelry company?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it says They license Blue.Nile to the jewelry company.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see, okay, alright, well I'll clarify that as well, then.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, Gordon, you're next in the queue, go ahead please.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Gordon Chillcott for the record. Thanks Marita for pointing this one out. I passed this survey on to some members of my ALS and this was one that prompted a rather interesting question. This outcome would be bad, very bad, or whatever, for whom? I should mention the person who asked me that question is an old cynic, but still. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Gordon. I guess I meant that in an absolute sense. I'm not asking anybody to put themselves in the shoes of anyone, but to say an outcome that you would be pleased with as the respondent. That's the idea. I can try to clarify that, as well.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Marita you have your hand up, go ahead please.

MARITA MOLL: Marita speaking, just in response to that Jonathan, I don't know how you cannot be asking people, you don't know who these people are who are answering the questions, so you don't know who's shoes they're in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, I think that's a really good question, the result is good or bad for whom? It's very complex, sorry. I'm not sure that I'm going to trust the results entirely, the results of this survey, because there are too many things going on here that are unresolved.

MARITA MOLL: Alan has his hand up. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question says how would you characterize this outcome? Maybe we need to capitalize you and maybe we need a preamble saying you're looking at this from the general public interest or individual user perspective, obviously not from one of the proponents of a particular commercial solution. Other than that, I think you're going to have to rely on, any survey has a certain amount of vagueness and uncertainty, and I don't think you can make that perfect. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Other questions?

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Jonathan, I'm not seeing any other people with their hand up and I've already scrolled down to the last question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Thanks everyone for participating. I will go back to the chat and the transcripts. If you've got other thoughts, please email them to me, but I will try to turn around an improved version of the survey fairly quickly. So, I appreciate you all taking the time. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, that concludes this call. Thank you everyone for joining, and please remember to disconnect your lines. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**