JONATHAN ZUCK: Hello everyone and welcome to the Advisory Group meeting. I guess, Matt, is there anybody that is on the phone that isn't listed in the room that we need to report on their presence?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl is here for the record.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exciting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For me as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Is there anybody else that is on the phone but not in the room?

MATT ASHTIANI: No there is not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. Can you put up the agenda?

MATT ASHTIANI: Sure, one second.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. So, does anyone here… Christopher Wilkerson was going to be on the call this week. Did you get a regrets or anything Matt?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: I did not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. The reason I ask is because what I put on the agenda, in part for Christopher, is number two, a very brief window to add additional metrics for discussion, proposed that weren't part of the original team or issues that we weren't as aware of at the time, etc. I'm hoping there is not more than two or three that result from this, because we have a lot of work to do there, but hopefully he'll be here to represent his perspective on that, because I didn't do sufficient research on his recommendations beforehand, but I'll also try to find it.

I thought what we should do – and I want to express my appreciation for everybody banding together to get that interim recommendation to the Board. I think we did, we were models of efficiency around that document, I really appreciate the work of the staff in such short notice, and all of the people that got on to review it before we sent it, because I think it really was critical to what we were trying to accomplish in terms of not rendering some of these things mute for lack of data a year from now.

So, thanks everyone for that. And now we can be slightly more relaxed about this, given that our next deadline is a little further off, and we can get back to sort of normal discussions about this and free flow discussions. One of the things that I thought we should do at the top is, do the – a little bit of the review of our charter and what our mission is, because I want to make sure that everybody is on the same page about that, and have any kind of discussion that we need to have about that so that we're all on the same path.

Back in Buenos Aries, there was a presentation by staff, and they reduced the charter into, or the Board resolution, because there wasn't technically a chartering team, an exercise the way there often is… I'm wondering, do you guys have that handy? Can you put up the bullet points of the mission of the advisory group?

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm not sure [?] right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. That's great, thank you. So I want to say it was five three or something like that, three or four bullets under our mission.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: It's Charla. I just gave scrolling capabilities to everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Okay, so yeah. And this is basically the idea here, starting on slide five, if everyone can kind of scroll to slide five, see our mandate. So, it's my understanding that one of the principle drivers of the creation of this advisory group, was to narrow down the list of 70 metrics that ultimately were presented to the Board.

And that was due in no small measure to a cost estimate by staff that was fairly – an effort estimate, I guess, that was pretty exorbitant at the time that they went in. And so I wanted to go back over these things and open it up for discussion to make sure that we were all on the same page about that. Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Jonathan. The mandate that I'm looking at is not the one on the slide, it's actually the one on the website that was done after a significant amount of work. It's on the confluence wiki and I will read verbatim from it. The CCT has the responsibility for evaluating feasibility, utility, and cost effectiveness adopting the recommendations from the GNSO and ALAC.

Not for whether or not they were suitable to purpose, but essentially gauging the difficulty of implementing. So this group is not here to re-evaluate whether the metrics that the GNSO and ALAC did were appropriate, but simply to evaluate difficulty with data implement. That is my understanding, and it has been from day one, of why this group exists. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: …going by the documentation that's on the website, not the filtering of it into that slide.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I don't know, maybe someone at staff can react, because my impression is that updating motivation here…. I mean, again, I want to make sure that we choose words carefully, because as Evan said, I'm not sure we were tasked with being critical of any of the metrics necessarily, but that we were, as part of our task, trying to make them more manageable somehow.

I agree that was part of the legislative intent here, and the Board's resolution to form this group. What do other people think? It may amount to the same thing, in some respects, if we just decide that things are difficult to collect, but I don't know how to create a framework for that.

So I feel like our mission is to turn 70 into 30 or something like that. But, I welcome more discussion on this, including from staff. Anybody else have an opinion?

MARGIE MILAM: This is Margie, if I could get in the queue?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Please. I don't see your hand.

MARGIE MILAM: Oh yeah, sorry. I forgot to raise it. I don't… I'm not sure what the question is, the difference between Evan is saying and what, Jonathan, you're saying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Let me clarify my question then. My impression is that the Board felt that there were too many, that the 70 name was too big, and that the staff essentially told the Board that it was unmanageable in the way that it was presented, essentially. And that we were… That part of our task was to go through and do a wildling exercise on the list.

I think that it's… I think that it is Evan's impression that all of these metrics were approved by the Board, and were just looking for where the challenges might be in accomplish some of them. Maybe that's a distinction without a difference. I feel like we have an affirmative mandate to narrow the list, and I think Evan doesn't believe that, and that's why I wanted to bring that up for discussion.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm happy to go back to the Board, to the original Board mandate, Jonathan, if you can find it. Anywhere where the Board says there are too many metrics. I would love to see that.

MARGIE MILAM: This is Margie. This is my personal perspective on this. Yeah, the resolution wouldn't say that. It also does say to evaluate other input, including historical data regarding metrics used to examine earlier around the new gTLDs. So there is the ability to not be limited to the 70 list, but on the other hand, I didn't see the Board resolution implementing all of them.

And so, my thought was that this group would narrow it, but that's not explicitly say in the resolution or the rationale that I'm aware of.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In the slides, for example, it says utility is one of the things that is listed here. Honestly, I don't remember whether that word got used in the Board resolution.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, I'll have to pull up the Board resolution. It's been a while since I looked at it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Feasibility, utility. So utility is one of the things that it is in the Board resolution itself, it looks like, according to Karen.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Jonathan, I'm not disputing that. I'm just suggesting the difference between utility and appropriateness. That if there are some metrics that simply by their design are too difficult to do, or too costly to do, yes that is a reasonable consideration. But, for something, for instance, the metrics that could be purchased from third parties, isn't an issue of utility or difficulty of the [?].

So the idea of saying that certain metrics are not appropriate, or shouldn't be moved forward, even though they're relatively easy to obtain, is something I don't think this group should be judging.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And so that could be just a difference of opinion on utility. And I definitely got the impression that there was a desire by the Board and the staff, that this list be wilted down, and so I know that part of that is just the impression of the gossip, if you will, surrounding this resolution as much as it is the language in it. Do other people have a point of view on this? Go ahead Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks. It's Steve DelBianco with Net Choice. As part of the original group, I really think the truth here is probably closer to the center of what Jonathan and Evan are saying. I would wager that not a single Board member, save Bruce Tonkin, read the metrics that the ALAC and the GNSO put in.

That they would park that for a future date, if at all. I believe that their motion really gives staff the direction to work with the community, and at examining the cost, difficulty, and utility of these measures. And I don't think the Board ever really affirmatively approved the metrics in any degree of specificity.

Having said that, all of us who have talked with staff, have seen their eyes glaze over as staff considers the daunting challenge of trying to gather all of the metrics that we've come up with. I understand that. All of us, at the meeting in Buenos Aries, pushed back a little bit on staff to say, "Please help us understand where you see the most difficult and expensive among these metrics, and we'll find ways to get them without as much difficulty and expense."

So that exercise is one way… You can't simply put a checkbox next to each and every metric saying that it does or it does not have utility. It is or it is not difficult. We anticipate all along that there would be difficulty in gathering these. Our table even had a column for relative difficulty of getting the metrics. So there lies…

I think that Jonathan is not suggesting, Evan, that some of these just disappear willy-nilly. They're supposed to be an inquiry where staff helps to real us where the difficulty and expense is, and that may, in some cases, where the difficulty and expense exceeds the utility, leave this group to recommend skipping some of our metrics. Does that sound like something you could accept Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: As you say, it's closer to the center. I guess I'll reserve judgment on whether or not the interpretation of utility is close to mine until I see the results. I'm a little concerned, especially on some of the ALAC metrics where we said that, "You know, this is stuff that you don't even need to collect yourself or do surveys. You've got market research companies that are doing this, that are collecting it, actually."

So it is a business. So the issue of difficulty of collection is really a non-issue for those. And so, I'm concerned that metrics like those might get dropped off because of judgments of some people thinking, well, the community doesn't need to see those metrics, as opposed to they're too difficult to implement. So that's my real concern here, is seeing things get dropped off, our of what I would consider to be a warped definition of utility.

Clearly there was a difference between the ALAC and the GNSO on what metrics were going to be useful going forward. What I was hoping is that this group would not be a re-fighting of that particular battle. I totally understand the issue about implement ability, and difficulty of collecting, but like I say, I did not expect that this group was going to be a re-fighting of well, the community doesn't need that metric.

That is what I did not want to see happen here again. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Anyone else want to speak to this issue? All right. Let's just move forward then, I'll be less aggressive about trying to limit this list down. That was definitely what I thought our mandate was, so I'll step more gingerly, but that's the – let's try that middle ground and try to examine this, just from a feasibility and cost standpoint and see what discussions arise from that.

Because obviously I don't want to rehash anything either. So, the second thing on the agenda, unless anyone else wants to speak to this issue. The second point of the agenda was to create a narrow window to add metrics into the discussion that either people believe that are overlooked by the first group, or that there is no emphasis or new information that suggest that they be part of our discussion, and I wanted to just open up that conversation next if I could.

So anybody that wants to bring up a metric that they think is not currently included in the 70, please do so now. Of course, the two people that I know wanted to do this, were Christopher and Mike Nelson, both of whom are not on the call [laughs]. So I've got Mike Nelson to email a suggested data source. Did everyone see Mike's email?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So what I would like to do is just quickly open up a conversation about that email, whether it looks like it should be thrown into the mix of things to be discussed. And Steve, I hope that you'll speak up on whether or not you think it is sufficiently new, based on things that are in the document today, but let's open that up for conversation. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah Jonathan, I raised my hand when you call for potential new items. I had one that I wanted to add to the list with respect…

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll come back to you then.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Evan, is your hand still up?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, that's actually about this issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. Go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, I wanted to address Michael Nelson's letter. In fact, he talks about that there is a matter of focus, or whatever. What I was going to suggest was that what he is asking for, can actually be implemented within the scope of some of the, potentially some of the ALAC metrics. If we just widen scope a bit. The broad number of ALAC metrics that were done under, let's see I'm looking under 8.1 to do with complaints, and sorry.

Like what we have in 6.1 and 6.2 and 8.1, measure number of complaints. So, these complaints can come from end users, they can come from companies that are being misrepresented or engaging in confusion. Michael is asking to take the same themes of trying to find out whether or not there is fraud or confusion happening, and turning that from the passive collection of data in the form of complaints, to actually doing a survey of CEOs.

So this could be done, perhaps by expanding slightly the scope of the survey that is already being anticipated, or perhaps we can expand the scope a little bit of some of the existing ALAC metrics, to explicitly deal with the needs of CIOs, CTOs, as Michael was asking for. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Evan. One of the things that I would be interested in exploring is getting at the complaint issue from the audience that he is talking about, but as a data exercise rather than a survey, a typical classical survey in a polling mode. Do you feel like the audience he is talking about is included in the metrics that you have Evan?

Not that methodology of a survey, but the sources of information you feel like will broadly be required to incorporate his – the CIOs, etc. that he is describing, or are they already a part of the intention of the metric that you have?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: They are part of the intention, they don't explicitly mention the audience that he is referring to, because what the ALAC metrics basically go to is the recipient of the complaint. So in other words, has ICANN received complaints on these issues? It doesn't say who they have received it from. So, anything that takes the form of an active complaint, somebody that's gone out and said, "This is confusing either to me. This is confusing to my customer. This is confusing to my website users."

The metric does not make a distinction of the source of the complaint. The collection of the metrics happens at the endpoint, where the complaints are received. To that extent Jonathan, it does not require a change because the metric that was suggested is, well, how many complaints have been received?

If we want to slice and dice that into which came from end users, and which came to major company website operators. I mean, we can do that as a matter of the analysis, but the collection of that would not seem to change, and would already be covered by the existing metrics. That's my take on it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I wish Mike was on the call to validate this, but it's my impression that he's not talking about complaints received by ICANN, but instead going out to companies and ISPs and others to talk about what complaints they've received, because they're closer to the ground kind of. As opposed to looking for whatever sanitized bold up complaints ICANN receives from those people, I think he wants to get at the data that they have about the complaints that they have received.

So that maybe the one distinction there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's active rather than passive, rather than how many complaints are going out into them, whether they have complained or not, and say, "What have you encountered?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And so what I asked to do was explore that as a data gathering exercise, as opposed to getting people on the phone and saying, "Do you feel like there has been more complaints or not?" But actually making it a data gathering exercise so those organizations, you know, at the time of the review. Does anybody else have anything, ideas on that? Or objections to adding that concept into the mix of the metrics that we'll be discussing?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I have a point on that Jonathan. It's Steve.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Evan said, if you look at the metrics in the design already, 1.13 through 1.19 are all metrics about the kind of complaints that Nelson is speaking of, other than collisions, which we haven't even anticipated. Things like 1.16, the relative incidents of fraud transactions caused by phishing. And in them, we think the data source is going to be the anti-phishing working group and perhaps law enforcement agencies.

This is a great opportunity to slot Mike Nelson's point into those eight metrics. So there is an outbound communication, that would ask corporate data sources to contribute to that metric, would be very helpful. It can't necessarily be self-selected. You don't really know which one of them would respond when asked, but the data that a particular ISP in say, the United Kingdom, that actually had data on excessive amounts of spam or phishing, they could contribute to it, metrics 1.16, 1.17.

And we could consider that in our review, as you said, at the time we do the review. When it comes to the surveys, if the survey method we end up picking tries to achieve a good geographic and demographic spread around the world, there won't be any way for those CIOs to self-select into a survey that is being structured to generate the appropriate distributions.

I don't think the survey is the answer to attract answers to Mike Nelson's question. Instead, with the [?] communication, identifying the metrics regarding [?] upon which would ask them to contribute their own findings at the appropriate time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Can I ask you to take a shot at nudging the metrics as they currently stand, to incorporate that outbound communication to the audience that he suggests? And we'll circle that back?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sure, I'll do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Are there any other objections to that? It makes sense to me that if people have an objection to add in the mix, then speak up now. Okay. So, Steve, you had one that you wanted to recommend as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, thank you. In the same series of 1.13 to 1.20, I think that we have subsequently learned that there is a high potential that collisions might still occur with some of the new gTLDs, and the only place it fits in is probably under consumer trust, and it would end up adding a metric either to one we already have, or adding a whole new one, suggesting the cost to severity of disruptions caused by collisions, between new gTLDs and internal domain names.

It maybe that this will be a non-issue, I certainly hope that it's a non-issue given that ICANN, at the very last minute, did pay attention this issue, and has worked hard to identify and park gTLDs that won't even be allowed to be delegated, things like dot home and dot corp, which would have generated a tremendous number of collisions. So I hope that this one doesn't require a lot of work, but I do think we should have a place for it, or we'll look like we really missed something a year from today. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Does anybody else want to discuss that further? Or adding that amount of finding, existing to incorporate the collisions? Raise your hand if you do. Okay. So Buckingham is typing, I don't know if that's in yet. Cheryl says, "It's important to add collisions." Okay. So it sounds like people are being supportive of this, some I'm just looking for objections, having none, then I guess I will ask you to find a place for that as well, Steve, that you can circulate in the next – on the list later on.

So the last one that I wanted to raise, in addition to Mike's, was Christopher's. Where he wanted to try and capture something about registrar discrimination by registrars owned by registries. And I don't have it in front of me, but I wanted to at least bring it up for discussion. People have seen the stuff that he has written, and I didn't find it before the call because I was hoping he was going to represent this himself.

But, I don't know, Steve, do you have a sense of whether or not that concept of shelf space, etc., is captured in the metrics that we have? Or is this something that we should try to make a place holder for future discussion as well?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. I believe that the pricing of wholesale and retail is fully anticipated by the group, but Christopher does bring up this notion about availability. If there are some registrars who choose only to offer domains in certain TLDs, then that doesn't show up in price data, right? It would not be priced at… If Go Daddy decides not to offer dot bike domains, it wouldn't show up as a pricing issue.

And what Christopher gets at does have some merit in that, as we're assessing on what we call the retail pricing, it would be an opportunity to note that of the new TLDs that are open for purchase by the general public, that some may not be offered by certain registrars. We have no idea why. The registrar may decide that the wholesale prices are too high, they may decide that they would like to focus on different areas, they may not have come to an agreement with the registry on pricing and distribution.

They may not like the registries policies for registrant pre-qualification. Are you with me? There are so many different reasons, so I don't think that Christopher is going to learn as much as he thinks he would learn from this exercise, but he has a valid point in that we ought to note the mere presence or absence of new TLDs as we survey registrars for retail pricing. So I think it's in addition to the exercise on retail price and retail price data gathering. I hope that helps.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It does. Does anybody else want to comment on that? All right. Seeing no one's hand up, I will assume that we will incorporate that into our conversations as well. And Cheryl has expressed agreement, thank you. Okay. So are there any others that fall into this category of things that might have been overlooked, or things that we should think about before we start down the path of looking through the utility and feasibility of all, the cost effectiveness of all of these?

Okay. So, now on to the meat of things, which is let's open up for discussion how we want to go about going through the exercise that we've been chartered to do. Does anybody have a recommendation about how we should approach this? Do we want to divide up into groups on trust, competition, and choice? Or do we want to just divide that up across the schedule and discuss them based on Karen's analysis of cost and feasibility?

I'm open now at this point to get people's impressions about how we should approach the larger exercise that we have in front of us. Christa says groups seem to make sense. Does anybody else have a perspective on how we might want to approach this? Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Jonathan. Since we are going to be meeting face to face in Singapore, can we not sort of task everybody in this group to essentially take away the metrics, do an analysis of the metrics that matter especially from the particular expertise that everyone brings to this group? And then to essentially but heads in Singapore? Bring back all of our combined analysis and try to deal with it reasonable, definitively, at that time when we're face to face in a room?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I admire your optimism Evan, but we can certainly try to do that. Maybe it's a good time to hear from Karen on where staff are on their side of the analysis associated with feasibility and cost associated with these as well. And whether or not that could be part of our funnel of discussion. Let's see how just had their hand up. I thought Steve had his hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, this is the actual meat of the work of what we need to do, and staff did a good job laying out an outline of this in Buenos Aries, where they had already constructed several questions that would be asked by each and every metric, in terms of data gathering. That's the real work we need to get to. I believe it's premature to divide into groups, since we should as a whole, as a body, we should do several metrics and run them through the staff's recommended analytical questions.

I think there are eight questions in each metric. If we all do it together for several metrics, a few from trust, a few from choice, a few from competition, we'll all discover whether those are the appropriate questions to ask, we'll get a sense for how staff is addressing it, because they're going to be probably more unanswered questions than answered questions, and maybe that would suggest itself, at that point, once we've learned how we're going to do it, to maybe divide it up into subgroups.

But so much of what has to happen relies upon staff to answer our critical question on each of the metrics. I do think the face to face is a good place to do it. The question would be how, between now and Singapore, how do we give us an incentive to revisit that list of questions that staff has, and maybe examine any questions staff has already answered?

Because I have not returned to the staff wiki to see if you guys have been updating the answers to those certain questions. So, it would be great to hear from Karen and staff about the current status of the analysis that you've been doing on the existing metrics. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What I can do is bring chocolate to Singapore and hand out prizes for people that come prepared, something like that. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. As much as I like chocolate, I'll probably just bring my own. I'm not sure [?]… I just wanted to raise [?] and it's a point I was going to make. If the Adobe room will stay long enough so I can raise my hand, thankfully it has. Clearly Singapore is going to be an important touch point, because a face to face opportunity is very important, but of course, many of is not the majority of this particular team, will not be, or a work group at this stage, will not necessarily be in attendance in Singapore.

Or, of course, it may very well, as often happens with me, have competing meetings at the same time. So I wouldn't want to have a go, no go, or a huge amount of investment in Singapore other than an aggregation point. And probably an ideal opportunity to do what Steve has suggested, and that is go through with a tasting plate's worth of analysis as a group activity on a couple of things for each of those eight matters raised.

I think it's, I also agree it is too early to split into sub-teams yet, and I do however, agree with the sub-team in principle, there [?] in the first place. But we haven't even established methodologies for operation within the group, let alone how we could split those sub-teams to go off and do the work and then come back to the committee as a whole.

The reason I'm concerned about that Jonathan is, how we would slice that team. We can find vastly different methodologies between choice and trust, or consumer and non, and that's, you know, bothers me a great deal. I'd like to see an established framework that is agreed upon by us all, before we opt into [?] to do the [?], and then come back obviously, the group as a whole. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Cheryl. Karen, go ahead.

KAREN LENTZI: Thanks Jonathan. So, I've been listening to the comments and thinking about a couple of different ways that we could go about this. So the second part of the spreadsheet that we provided in February was kind of a transition into the next phase after all of the fact finding in terms of availability and whether certain data can be collected, and how it relied on a third party.

There are a few of the metrics that we flagged as wanting some clarification from the group. That's one set of item. Another is we had collected all, or sorted by all of the ones that were indicated as needing a baseline. And so we've pulled out the ones that required a Board recommendation, and sort of pulled out the survey and the economic questions.

But there are the remaining baseline items which range from easy to hard, and I think haven't been discussed in terms of priority or support or not for those. So that's one potential next phase to look at that group of baseline items. Or, there are also the ones, broadly speaking we've identified the ones as green, meaning easy, can begin collecting, and we've started on some of those.

And they can kind of take those out and minus the survey ones as well, and then look at everything that is left. I'm kind of in agreement with Steve that the – it would be useful to go through, in detail, some of the items by category, by competition, by choice and by trust. And look at sort of the broad set of questions and bucket them in terms of feasibility and so forth.

As far as the wiki, most of our work and consultations have been, in updating the spreadsheet and moving forward on the survey items, so the wiki is not – hasn't been completely up to date probably from all of the discussions that we've had in the past week, or week or so. But we can certainly do that in support of Singapore and support of the group's further configuration, if that's the framework we want to use. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Karen. So, are there other people with…? One thing that occurs to me is that some of these are just clarification questions. Are those worth doing clarifying via the calls? Or is that something that can be done via a small group that includes Steve, and Evan, and a couple of others to simply just answer those questions for staff about what the intention was behind things, rather than having a full committee, if you will, discussion of how that…?

KAREN LENTZI: Yes, that's fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What do people think about that? The ones that are sort of labeled clarification? So the things that are sort of defined as debate, we make that number as small as possible. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Jonathan. Cheryl for the record again. Yeah, look, that makes perfect sense to me. It's actually, I thought, a conflict that was early on and perhaps didn't… By earlier on, as I recall, and perhaps didn't get followed through. But yeah, the clarification matters can be ongoing between now and whenever we stop needing to clarify them, because more important clarity may come up as well.

So I'm perfectly happy with that, and it does go back to Tony's point about not leaving some of these things to Singapore. I think that would be an example of one that, leaving clarification points discussion in Singapore, just wouldn't be a good use of resources. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I think, Cheryl, the exercise that Steve and Evan specifically went through was to do their own analysis of things that they thought would be difficult to capture, and so it didn't have the benefit of staff's analysis at that time. And so, it's sort of adhering now to…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes… Cheryl back at you Jonathan. Yeah, I understand that, but that would make that same group, Evan and Steve, the natural respondents to the points that staff need clarification of.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so, yeah, my only hesitation there is if we keep assigning things to them, so maybe is there – can someone volunteer to work with Steve on answering some of these questions? And someone volunteer to work with Evan on answering some of these questions that just fall into the clarification heading?

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Hi, it's Christa. I'm happy to volunteer on anything I can help.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Christa.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Jonathan, this is Evan. We don't need to split these up at this point. I think it was a good exercise to have us both give feedback to each other before coming forward. So, if it's a matter of simply expanding the work that Steve and I were doing to add a few more bodies to it and share the load a bit, I think that's probably the best benefit of this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Steve, are you okay with that? Are you still on? He had told me he needed to leave in an hour so…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, Cheryl here. Sorry, I've just typed a whole lot into the room, and it hasn't turned up. But then it's probably the fact that my room is breaking yet again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see, not before Singapore, kind of busy, and agree to add Steve and Evan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There you go. That's a long way between Australia and where the rest of you guys are, it did take a while. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. It all got through. Okay. So I'm going to ask Steve, and I'll send an email to Steve as well, for you guys to work on the clarification side of things. Nathalie asked a question about the deadline after which some data will no longer be available. And so I guess that gets to the notion of, data that does in fact require a baseline but doesn't require Board approval, that Karen mentioned, and those are certainly things that should be discussed sooner rather than later.

Karen, is that a fairly finite list of data sources that you think will – that will not be available at the time of the review team is convened? That we should try to address now whether to turn those on?

KAREN LENTZI: Yes. Yeah, it's a finite list. It's maybe, I don't know, 10 or 12.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I mean, I guess I would suggest that's probably where the group itself should start. Its next discussion is on that list, certainly the ones that would require a baseline, or that we think we couldn't get the deltas for after the fact. And is that a list that you have wilted down now?

KAREN LENTZI: Yeah. It is. We had done all of the, in preparation for the interim Board recommendation. We had isolated all of the things that had already been identified as baseline items. And so, if you take out the ones that have been covered by the survey, or by the two other recommendations that are a few left.

That are, I can run through them briefly here. There are one 13, one 17, and one 18, those are all around compliance concerns regarding data security breaches, phishing sites, botnets, malware. So that set of things. Matt has put the baseline list up on the screen. Thanks Matt. One 19 is on identity theft, which from our discussions with the law enforcement liaison, those that work with them. That's really not something that is going to be feasible to tie to a domain.

Intelligence from them anyway is that identities aren't distributed via websites. It's more of an underground chat room kind of activity, so they didn't seem too optimistic about finding anything there. Then there is one 22 which is the qualitative comparison of mission and purpose in question 18. We had… That's something that requires a baseline, we didn't think it was urgent in terms of timing because the data won't go away.

The application data will always be there. It will continue to be retained by ICANN. So there is no time concern there. [CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: …didn't feel like a baseline thing.

KAREN LENTZI: I'm sorry?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That didn't feel like a baseline type of issue.

KAREN LENTZI: Yeah. It was identified as such in the table, but – I mean, it's a baseline in terms of taking a point and looking at it again later. But, yeah, not in the sense that the data might disappear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

KAREN LENTZI: 2.8 relates to sunrise registrations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, I mean, why don't we just continue through… Why don't we actually just start some of this conversation? Since we have this list up, why don't we just start at 1.13 and have a kind of a sample conversation about this in terms of what the – what staff's belief is about the relative complexity and cost is of capturing that data? And then we'll try to have a conversation about how they compare as to the, I want to avoid using the wrong term here, as the utility or the value, etc. of that metric?

I guess that's kind of the exercise that we're going to try to experiment our way through which is to compare column four to – column five to column three basically. If that makes sense to folks. So can you start with 1.13 and give us a sense of what you believe are the challenges will be associated with collecting that data?

KAREN LENTZI: Sure. So there are a few things in here, compliance concerns relating to applicable national laws, including data security breaches. So, with regards to data security breaches, I think, there is a range of who are being intended there. There are a whole set of metrics relating to security breaches at the registry, and relating to botnet, and phishing, and malware, where the registry agreement provides that the registry does need to maintain data on that.

And so from the TLD standpoint, that's available. In the compliance related to national law, so we do have our compliance system. The compliance complaints that are received by ICANN are easily tracked. Regarding law enforcement, just sort of broadly speaking, there are two broad types of metrics that were mentioned in the context of working with law enforcement.

One was the same set of activities like spam, malware, phishing, etc. where there are a lot of grouped forms, especially where law enforcement maybe part of them, but who do target and research and study those particular things. So, that I think is more fruitful then just going to law enforcement specifically. So that's one area.

The other area is more on the consume complaint side, and that we think so far seems to be more challenging because the consumer complaint agencies, there is some coordination, and there is some data out there and some willingness to contribute and be helpful. It's not, though, very standardized in terms of being able to bucket things and target what relates to a domain name and what doesn't, and how the types of data that they collect are consistent across what one country or jurisdiction is collecting, is willing to share in another.

So, in terms of that set of data relating to consumer complaints, the data is likely to be more spotty. So that's the comment on the first one there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I guess that the… I'm trying to figure out how to summarize that in a way that is actionable in the group. Is that really an effort of an instance of best efforts, and there is just maybe some things that may not be available that may modify our ability to get to that data? And we need to modify the description to accommodate those best efforts? Or is it that there is 80% solution in place and the other 20% would just be an extreme amount of effort to try track down data that may not be particularly thorough or statistically significant to begin with? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl for the record again. I think this is an important distinction to make, but if I understand the exercise we are currently doing correctly, this would be an example where we take 1.13 now, assuming that that is 1.13 on my screen size is so small, I can barely read it. That yes we recognize that there is some data in house, therefore it may not perhaps be time critical to start now, but on that 20, on that issue particularly which Karen was outlining from consumer complaints, that's going to take reaching out to those organizations, be they coordinated or not.

That's going to take getting started to try and capture the data points, spotty or not. Just recognizing that they are spotty. It's okay for data points not to be there, but you've got to recognize and report that they're not there and why. And so that's work that I would think is going to be put into the, and needs to start now category, rather than, you know, we can get back to it in 19 and a half months' time. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Karen?

KAREN LENTZI: Thank you Jonathan. I was just going to suggest that maybe with this metric that it would be useful to break it down. I think it could actually be three, two or three things. The answer in terms of total availability and feasibility is going to be different in the stop items. So [?] we can piece that out a little bit, and be more focused in the areas that we still want to think we want to discuss.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Definitely. I guess that the two questions that we need to really assess is whether or not work needs to begin now and the barriers are to that work beginning now. And where there are barriers, making a decision about the relative importance of overcoming them. That's the exercise as I understand it. So the more specific those conversations can be, the better obviously. So where do you, in that one, see if you were to break it out.

I don't mean this as a formal exercise now. If you were to break out the portion of that that you consider the barriers to be high, what would that be?

KAREN LENTZI: Well, I think it would be in the compliance concerns regarding applicable national laws, if that's meant to be complaints related to – complaints received by law enforcement, applicable nationals laws, we're not [?] every law, right? There is more specificity there, but I think that area, the kind of update that you can only get from law enforcement in terms of numbers and types of complaints. That's the hard part.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Because they don't keep it, aren't interested in sharing it? What is it that makes that hard?

KAREN LENTZI: Some of these, yeah. Not all of it is collected or tracked in terms of what's related to a domain name. The national laws are different, the complaints are different. So it's both, not everybody has this type of data readily at hand, and obviously not everyone is prepared to share it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, right. Okay. So, I guess it is worth the exercise of parsing these out, and I don't know. Steve held the pen on creating the GNSO side of this, and Evan, I guess, did on the ALAC side of this. But I don't know what the best way will be to sync up that parsing, whether it's a 1.13.1.2 or dot three, or something like that. If you see that. So, I guess, in the case of this particular one, and the idea of getting information out of law enforcement, your questioning whether that's even possible.

So it may not even be a decision for this group to make a cost benefit analysis if you believe that the data may not be there to get in the first place. Is that what you're saying, Karen? Cheryl, just give me a second. Is that what you're saying Karen? Is that there is certain parts of that metric that it doesn't matter what we decide? And it may be Cheryl's point that we want to ask you to try even though you formed a belief that it's not possible. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Jonathan. We've obviously work too long together. It's kind of scary. That's pretty much exactly what I was going to ask, I was going to say to Karen. Are these assumptions or are they proven matters yet? And in some cases, if a snapshot has been taken or a look has been taken, and there is data not available, or is not currently being captured by the third parties that we want to work with on this.

It may be a matter of, if we ask them to, or if they know there is a relevance in it being collected, then it can be. And if that's the case, so the answer on that they know is, oh, okay, well we can, then that then makes the sort of end time critical. So thank you. [CROSSTALK]

Ask people to get, if they can collect it well in advance, of needing it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Karen, did you want to react to that?

KAREN LENTZI: Yes, sure. So just to clarify. I'm not at all trying to suggest that this is impossible, or that we shouldn't try to do it, or trying to discourage anybody from considering it. The question is, which aspects of it are most difficult. That this is one of them, not because we can't reach out and ask people to cooperate and we will get some…

The conversations have been, some people will provide what they can and it may not be exactly what we're seeking, but in terms of a comprehensive data set where you can look across globally and get consistent numbers of complaints relating to national laws that have to do with domain names, the answer is I think we'll get some of that, but we won't have a metric that is complete in terms of accounting for all of the jurisdictions of the world.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I guess I get back to what I was saying originally is that it sort of amounts to a best efforts thing and we don't know what we'll get as a result. So, as we're – maybe this isn't the best test case, right? But if we're using it to evaluate the metric and its utility, I guess I'm – is our outcome from this that barring some sort unsurmountable or extremely costly in terms or money barrier, that the group create the expectation that given these best efforts type of objections from staff, that you guys can make those efforts?

Or are there areas where you really want to put your hand up, and that you think there is sufficient barriers and sufficient questions of value that the group needs to seriously consider refining the description of the metric? Is my question make any sense? I'm guess I'm trying to get to what our core task is, which is to make some decisions about these metrics and help you with a go, no go decision on beginning to try and collect this data.

And so, my sense is that the natural inclination of this group would be to say, "Yes, go start collecting all the data that requires a baseline." So part of this has got to be, if it's not a clarification, the impetuous has got to come from staff to say, "Wait, we either can't get this. We need help in understanding where I get it. Or, it would really take an enormous amount of resources for us to get it. Is it really worth it?"

I feel like those questions coming back from staff that we would then need to grapple with. Our default position is going to be, hey, if you're up for taking a shot at the beginning of the collection of some of these things, or suggesting that others begin to collect it, that we would like you to do that. I mean, does that make sense Karen?

KAREN LENTZI: Sure, yes, yes, it does. That's actually the… I think if you go line by line like this, not all of them are this complex. But yes, our sort of assumption going in is that we do the utmost we can to reach the goal of why the metric is in there. In terms of any that staff would sort of question whether it needs to be there at all, the only one that I would put in that category right now is one 19 on identity theft, which I mentioned, we can come back to this.

It just doesn't seem that it would be particularly fruitful to try to gather that. But everything else, I think it's for the group to decide. And sort of what I would expect is if you take – this one is aiming for – to tell us something about consumer trust. If you take all of the metrics relating to consumer trust and look at them, sort of as a whole, knowing what we now about some of this is going to be partial data, and it's going to take some more effort than some other ones.

So, we're really looking for direction from the group if we want to start collecting this now, then certainly we'll do that. But I think it's also useful to look at sort of the overall objective of the metrics which are prioritized in terms of essential must have, nice to have, and so forth. That would help us a little bit in directing where to send the most resources.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, and I guess that's – I mean, not to open a can of worms, I guess that's where I was coming from with the first agenda item, is that that requires a relative value analysis by the group of the different metrics. And so that would suggest that there is some kind of a zero sum analysis that needs to take place here which we can't just say, "Yes, please start collecting data on everything that you can."

Because you're asking for prioritization, or must have, nice to have, etc. So the question embedded in that is an assumption that we can't have everything. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl for the record. I was kind of with you up until you put that last line in there, mate. [Laughs] I usually don't go along with that, we can't have it all. My question is usually then, why not? But, back to where you were earlier in that last sentence. If we take the, what is on page one of the document that's being shared, and going line by line, particularly with 1.13 was probably – I mean, it's a good idea in principle going line by line, but I suspect there is a little bit more complexity in the first one then might have been predicted.

But this is how I would like at this page for the exercise that I think is at hand right now. In Singapore, we can obviously chew this over again. I would be saying that there is time critical information, or information which requires the beginning of interaction with third parties to happen as soon as possible, which effect 1.13 and 1.18.

1.17 is data that is obtainable by ICANN and therefore I don't – I wouldn't see that as a prioritized, needs to start now. And 1.19, based on what Karen has told us, can probably be deleted. I think that's [?] the filter we can start putting through on some of these. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Cheryl, I'm not sure that your assumption about 1.17 is correct. I think that staff are indicating that they think they have a way to get this data, but are also indicating that a baseline is necessary, and that's why we're looking at it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see that, that's where we would prioritize… We're only looking at baseline necessary, I only [?] baseline necessary, didn't I?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the only thing that's in front of us right now is baseline necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [CROSSTALK] …Yeah, we have to prioritize within that group. And if it's obtainable from ICANN context, contract, than that's not as important as what to do earliest, as some other things is what I'm saying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, maybe. We may be making a distinction without a difference, but if the data is not going to be there when the review team convenes, than that's what we need as a baseline, so therefore it would need to happen now. That's all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, understood. I thought we were working in an almost… I was putting a fairly… Cheryl again for the record. I was putting a fairly cost filter through this at this stage. And then, we would be putting a finer filter through it in Singapore.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess… Yes, I'm sorry. I don't mean to be floundering here a little bit. I'm trying to figure out what… If our goal is simply to prioritize these things based on…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Degree of difficulty.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Based on staff's degree of difficulty, then our work is already done for us, in a sense, right? So if we start with the assumption that there is nothing that staff is saying is too much work or too expensive to get, but is either, in the case of 1.19 there is a belief that it can't be gotten, and maybe that's where we have some discussion, but otherwise, we're – that prioritization maybe, as you say Cheryl, just based on the difficulty of getting started and doing that first.

But that we're still saying that we want all of them basically to get started, that require a baseline. And we're not suggesting that one is more important than the other, we're simply saying that, starting on the ones that are harder to get, that seems to be what you're suggesting Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, that's very valid analysis of what I said Jonathan. Cheryl for the record. But, it's also some – well, 1.19 is the example. We've been presented with something that obviously, as you say, we still need to discuss and agree on. But, that would be a candidate for culling based on the information at hand. That type of decision being made by the group now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. And Evan, I agree with you that the definition of too expensive, is a judgment call. So I'm… I guess that's a question I'm asking is that, we need to determine what the decisions the Board slash staff would like us to discuss and make. That's really what's at issue here, because as I said, our natural inclination would be to say, "Okay, go ahead. And start getting whatever it is you're capable of getting."

And, if in the case of 1.19, you believe you're not capable of getting it, than the group can discuss whether or not we agree or want to recommend way to get it. But otherwise, I think we're asking you to go ahead and start all of these things, and if that answer is not acceptable to you as staff, that's where I'm looking for some clarity.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Jonathan, this is Evan. I'm totally okay with what you just said. The point I was making about too expensive, essentially goes back to the fact that, look, we recommended a survey going forward knowing that that was going to entail a significant amount of expense, that it was justified in the execution of what we're here to do.

So, that's what I meant about the too expensive, to a certain extent, is in the eye of the beholder.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I agree completely. So, like the survey, it would be a, if the staff said, "Hey, this is really expensive." The burden would be on us to say, "Yes, but we think it's worth it." I think that that's the conversation that we're prepared to have when facing a talk to the hand from the staff on any of these individual metrics.

But barring that, our inclination is to say, "We would like you to start on everything." And if that is not a good enough response, then I think we're looking for clarity from you Karen. So, good thing you have your hand up. Go ahead.

KAREN LENTZI: Thank you Jonathan. So that actually is helpful. If the direction is to take the subset of baseline items and start on them. Some of them are covered by the survey and the existing Board resolution. And so, I mentioned one, 19, as an issue, but the only other thing that I would like to point out and make sure that we're clear on…

There was another subset of metrics that we talked about on the last call in terms of whether to include in the Board recommendation and did not, and that was 5.2, three and four, related to hosted pages, QR posts, and URL shortening services. So, are investigation around that was that there wasn't readily, publically available data on that. That most of that data was held by companies or who were offering those types of products, or who did their own studies and so forth.

And so our sense was that if the group didn't want to pursue those, that that would potentially be a cost item that would go into the Board recommendation and did not. So in terms of where those items fit, I guess maybe we should be clear about whether and how we're going forward on those. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And so I want to give Evan a chance to talk about those particularly metrics, since he wasn't on the call when we made that decision. So we need to determine whether or not… Because Evan had suggested that there are sources that are readily available for them, and what we need to clarify is whether or not they're part of the baseline discussion, or whether or not those sources are persistent and therefore can be part of an analysis that takes place at the time the review team is convened.

So let's definitely have that conversation. But as part of our template conversation, if we're saying go ahead and do your best on 13, 17, and 18, is there anyone that has a belief that there is a way to get at the baseline data associated with distributing identities and account information used in identity fraud? Is that something that the collective intelligence of the group can suggest a way forward?

Or are we all in agreement that, as Cheryl called it, that that 1.19 might be called, given the staff analysis, that data would be difficult if not impossible to obtain? So that's something I would like to open up for discussion right now is your feeling on 1.19. Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I don't have any comment on the item myself, because I don't claim to have an expertise in it. Do we have any access to members of the law enforcement community, to be able to ask them about this? Or has that already been done, in which case, might, but I just want to make sure that we have exhausted that before giving up on it.

And after that Jonathan, I want to go back to the original point that was made a second ago. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course, it's still on my mind, Evan, I just want to make sure that we got through this little subset. So, my understanding is that staff did in fact, reach out to law enforcement to ask that question. And Karen, correct me if I'm wrong, they got back to you and said that that type of data would be difficult if not impossible to provide for you for a number of reasons about the way that IDs are circulated, etc. Is that right Karen? You've already check with law enforcement about that?

KAREN LENTZI: Yeah. So to be clear, we discussed with staff who works with law enforcement on a daily basis, who has those contacts. And so the feedback was really – the assumption in the metric is not really correct. I mean, there is an assumption that you can attract how many websites or domains are out there that are distributing account information or identity of fraud, which is a pretty strong response back that that wasn't likely to lead you anywhere.

The problems that occur with identity theft aren't really supported or officially located by the actual registered domain names. So, from those who work in identity theft, they didn't see it as relevant to the TLDs necessarily.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And then, Rudi asked the question about whether or not that was just a US perspective, or are there in fact, domain names as opposed to IP addresses, etc. that might be in Russia or something like that, that are associated with these things? Or do you feel like that was pretty much a global perspective on that question?

KAREN LENTZI; It was pretty… I didn't ask specifically, whose response are you basing this on? We can certainly go back in terms of the question about IP addresses and make sure that we're clear about the avenue of data there. But yeah, my sense was – coming from their perspective, it was a strange way to ask the question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Rudi? Go ahead.

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you Jonathan. Rudi Vansnick speaking. Well, I'm asking them because I'm almost sure that most of the cyber criminality is coming from other regions than the US region, and it would be good if we had a clear view on what the impact is from the other regions on the abuse of domain names and IP addresses. I'm almost convinced that there are big issues when I see how many attacks from the Chinese region or done on the European service at the moment.

So I think that it's important that we have a clear view before dropping out of this metric.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I guess we're putting this out there, Karen, as a conditional calling, subject to you maybe circulating back and asking Rudi's question about US versus the world, and whether or not there is some kind of a measure about, there is a relevance of TLDs that are in fact associated with these types of activities around the globe or they were just thinking of the US.

KAREN LENTZI: Okay. We'll follow up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. And then based on the answer there, we'll make a decision about pressing forward on this or dropping it from the list.

KAREN LENTZI: Okay. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you. So we've reached the end of our call. Evan, I think what I've been trying to do is ask Matt to put those metrics in question that came up about – put it at the top of the agenda for the next call…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: What I have is just very short.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So go ahead and say your peace, I just want to make sure that it gets enough discussion, it might not right now, that's all.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Understood. We're talking about basically the items under number five, which has to do with a lot of market research based things. I was comfortable with the way the letter was sent out to the Board because these market research bodies collect a lot of historical data, so there wasn't a timeliness issue of having to go to the Board and purchase that stuff right away.

Having said that, I continue to be baffled by staff coming back and saying that this is going to be difficult to get. The ALAC metrics even gave names of places to find this. So the difficulty is not the issue. This becomes clearly a matter of cost. So I guess I continue to be baffled by the amount of pushback that comes. Yes, do we want to debate the cost effectiveness, or whether or not it's too expensive?

Okay, that's a conversation to have. But can we stop, please, coming back and saying this stuff is difficult to obtain? Not only is it easy to obtain from third parties, but the ALAC metrics even identifies sources. So let's focus this conversation on whether or not it's too expensive, or justified in that way, and stop dealing with this as it is too hard to get, because that is absolutely provable otherwise. That's all I wanted to say at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you Evan. So, what you have done though is suggested that they are not… Because they believe the data sources are not eroding, you don't believe that it's a baseline issue, so all we need to discuss, decide at this juncture is that if they're not culled from the list, that they're still part of the ongoing conversation, but they don't have the time urgency that some of these baseline things have. [CROSSTALK]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: …in fact, help us identify trends, because they will have – they're collecting the baseline data now. They even how historical stuff from some time back. So we'll be able to go to them, and say we need ranges from here to here. They'll be able to give us the baseline data at some future point, which is why I don't think there is a panic need to go – to have had that part of the Board's [?] at this point.

So you're absolutely right Jonathan. We can go back to them at a future time and collect the trend data. I just want to make sure that it's not off the list. I just don't think it's urgent…

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's not. It's not off the list, because we're just going to deal with the ones that are urgent now. So, Karen, we're towards the end of the call, but there are other things where there is a cost or complexity, so that cost could be staff time versus money, etc. concern over the collection of the baseline data, if we can call down to the few of those that fall into that category of, you really want us to do the work of justifying it, maybe we can start the next call that way. Does that make sense?

KAREN LENTZI: I think so. So if there is anything else that, in the baseline list that staff has a question about in terms of level of effort in pursing it then we should raise that for the next call?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. So then that forces us to grapple with the cost benefit analysis of that particular metric, or prioritize it vis a vis the other ones within the group. But if there are things that require baseline, but that are – have a high barrier to execution, that's what we should prioritize to our next call.

KAREN LENTZI: Okay. Understood. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you. If there aren't any other questions, I thank you all for participating. I know this was a lot to get our heads around how we're going to approach this. So thanks for sticking it out, and we'll get more efficient as we go. But thanks everyone for being on the call, I appreciate it.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]