
LAUREEN KAPIN:

Good morning, everyone. Thanks to everyone for joining. I'll remind everyone to say their names before they speak for the clarity of the recording. I'll also start by asking if folks have any additional topics that they would like to discuss during this phone call. Anyone? Okey-dokey, then, let's just dive right in.

Our last document, our brainstorming document, is on the screen and also is available at the wiki, which our great ICANN staff folks have put the link for, and it also is in my prior e-mail. I think when we spoke last, we had made some progress prioritizing our topic. We also had thought about prioritizing within the topic. I thought we could take a look at the consumer/end user category, which I think is one of our biggest categories, and think about whether that is in the order that we want it to be in.

Do folks have thoughts about that? In terms of our consumer/end user behavior, does that reflect our priorities for our inquiry? If folks have questions about this, they should just shout out.

Just for clarity, since I'm hoping that this call is not a monologue and that we're going to have a dialogue having just seen Tennessee Williams' "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof" last night, which opens with an extended monologue and then unfolds into dialogue in the second and third acts which are much more engaging, I'm hoping that our call can reflect that progress too.

The second category, Consumer/End User Behavior, starts off with Consumer Literacy and Public Awareness of New gTLDs, distinguishing

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.

between legacy and similarly-named new gTLDs. How the new gTLD impacts user expectations, whether consumers know where to report problems.

Then we have another separate category if DNS Abuse, the prevalence of abuse, new gTLDs versus legacy gTLDs, enforcement mechanisms to curb abuse, abuse policies in new gTLD registries and registrars, and compliance issues comparing new gTLDs with legacy gTLDs.

Then we have Consumer/End User Behavior, which is a more technical issue, whether consumers actually reach their intended destination; whether they're victims of malware, phishing, botnet, etc.; and homographic attacks, which I'll confess I don't recall the meaning of that.

Then we had Privacy Policy issues. Are there privacy policies? Are they easy to find? What do they cover? Etc.

That's the issue that's on the table, and my question to folks is whether that reflects our priority, that order.

I see your extra question here, so we'll talk about the meeting in Finland. We will certainly get to that, and I'll add that as a note for our agenda.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Laureen, if I may?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Carlos, yes.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Yes, thank you, Lauren. I'm sorry I couldn't make it to the last call. I just want to have the framework clear. What you just read is what we expect Nielsen to go deeper into in the second round of their surveys, is that right?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No. The Nielsen issue actually has been discussed [recently] in the context, Carlos, of a separate phone call with the Nielsen sub team members primarily. And then I think the issues also percolated somewhat during some of our plenary calls. But my sense is, and maybe Alice and Pam or – I guess we don't have Eleeza on the call today – but Alice or Pam, you can correct me if I'm wrong. My sense is that the Nielsen survey is pretty much closed now, so to speak. They have made the changes we had requested, the adjustments we had requested, and I think they're starting to engage in trying to get that second survey out. Is that accurate, Pam and Alice.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Actually, I am on the call.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, you are on the phone. I don't know why I'm not seeing your name listed.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's up top, but I am on the call. I might have to drop out of the room at some point, but I'll be on audio until the hour is up.

I can answer that question. The Nielsen study, the consumer study [inaudible] the end users, that questionnaire is now closed, you're right. Nielsen is programming it into their software platform, and in fact have already started fielding in several countries. They've already gotten several hundred responses, so that one is underway. We can't make any more changes to that questionnaire.

The registrants survey, that's the one I sent in the e-mail around about last week to gather any of the feedback we talked about so far of what we could add to that survey. So Nielsen is now working on incorporating those changes and other appropriate changes to the survey that we fielded for registrants last year. If I'm not mistaken, I think you should see a draft of that probably within the next four to five weeks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I'm sorry. Say that last part one more time for me?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I was saying that you should see a draft of the registrant questionnaire so we could start [inaudible] the questionnaire within probably four to five weeks.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, great. So what we are talking about then, Carlos, is really the work of our subgroup in terms of the issues we want to tackle as part of the safeguard-focused review. During our last conversation, we had reprioritized our brainstorming document to start with the Impact of the Public Interest Commitments and Other Safeguards, which was a rather short category. But then we followed it up with a rather long category, Consumer/End User Behavior, with a lot of subtopics within that. That's what I just read, Carlos. My question to the group is, within that topic, does that order reflect our priorities, or do we want to reassess that? That's really my question.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:

Thank you very much, Laureen. I think it looks good. It's just the Consumer/End User Behavior, when you say Navigation and Use, it's pretty light. I would hope that we will discuss more there. Does not resolve is one possibility, but it resolves but brings me somewhere else or it brings a fake page and asks me to push a button to go to another one and things like that. This is an area where this step from addressing to reaching the page which I would like to have better developed on the Consumer/End User Behavior. There are [three] pages there, but it is pretty general compared to the sections one and two before. That's my comment. Thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Carlos. I think that those are very good points. What I'm going to ask you to do is perhaps circulate your suggestions to the group because that way we can share our views on it with everyone else in the

group, and then I'm thinking export it into the document because I think you raise a good point. In fact, very recently there have been a lot of articles about typo domain squatting, trying to use a domain that deliberately takes advantage of people mistyping, which is slightly different from what you identified but I think goes to the general topic of are consumers reaching their intended destination or are they landing somewhere else where they then are subject to increased risk for abusive behavior. Is that alright with you, Carlos, to circulate something for us?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Yes, sure. I will do it. Thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Anyone else with either comments on those sub categories or thoughts about whether that order reflects our priorities? Hi, Calvin.

CALVIN BROWNE: I think as we proceed, the order may change as we get into more depth on these various topics.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's right. This isn't hard and fast. It's just a starting point.

CALVIN BROWNE: Exactly. So as a starting point, it's probably adequate.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Although I'm losing connectivity on my screen, I believe I see Drew's hand up.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. I just wanted to add to what Carlos had mentioned and just say to Carlos to suggest maybe he looks at what we have listed under Use. We have Navigate, then we have Use. Maybe, Carlos, as you're working on your proposal, maybe you can figure out if Use should be tweaked in any way or if any of those components should also be repeated in the Navigate sub category.

Also, I just wanted to add that with the first topic, with Consumer Literacy and Public Awareness of New gTLDs, based on some of the readings we've done the past week, I think that first question – or whatever it is, it's a partial question, I guess, we have "Public awareness of New gTLDs?" – I think we should have that say something about "public awareness of new gTLDs, including their IDNs."

Because I'm trying to remember which study, I think it was one of only U.S. and U.K. participants, but I think it illustrates a problem potentially with any consumer seeing something that's not in their own native language is that perhaps IDNs are going to be inherently untrustworthy to someone if it's in a language that's unknown to them, even if it truly is a bank site at .bank and it's ".bank" in Chinese. So that's just some other component maybe of Consumer Literacy.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I think that's a fair point too, and I'm going to make the same request for you to just capture that in an e-mail because I think the next time we chat we can have a document that then reflects these comments.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Sounds good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Unless folks have other comments...okay, I see Brian's hand up.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi, Laureen, everyone. Can you hear me okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Great. I just have a comment on the substance, not necessarily the order of the questions under DNS Abuse. The questions are great as a starting point, and this is something to think about just as the months progress. The questions lead to binary yes or no type answers, and that's great as a starting point. But the way I approach that or go beyond that is once I have that binary answer, is I ask myself a "why" question. I think the why questions are very important, and also what explains the variation in something.

For example, take the first point: Is DNS abuse more prevalent in new versus legacy? There's going to be some yes or no answer there, more prevalent in new gTLDs. So what explains that variation between new and legacy? Then you hypothesize it's going to be maybe safeguards or something like that or ineffective safeguards.

So I think that's something. The way I try to think about these things going forward is asking why questions, and I think that leads in the long run to more productive conclusions. But I understand at the outset you have to pose these initial research questions. That's just my two cents for going forward. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Brian. I appreciate that. I think that makes a lot of sense to me. This is our starting point, but then of course I absolutely agree with you. It's very productive to then figure out what's behind the answer to our question, so that makes a lot of sense to me.

Okay. I'm just checking for hands. I'm checking the chat. This is for people who can divide their attention. Okay, so moving on. Let's talk about our reading list. I had circulated and Pam and Alice and perhaps others had populated our wiki with some studies that contain elements that I thought would be of interest. I'm hoping that folks had a chance to read or at least peruse these. I know at least one of them was rather lengthy, but the others were shorter and more digestible.

I wanted to open up the discussion of thoughts about these studies and what we think might be worthy of really something that we want to focus on for the purpose of our review, if we think it has information or

data that is really pertinent to the questions we're grappling with. I want to open that up for discussion with an eye, I think, toward next time perhaps dividing and conquering where I'll ask for volunteers to do a deep dive into some of these documents for presentation to the group. But for now, I wanted to get people's preliminary thoughts on what information on that reading list, which of those studies they think are things that we're going to really want to include in our [inquiry]. That's the question I'm opening up to the group.

Thank you, Pam, for posting in the chat the link to the reading list. Folks, was everyone able to find the reading list? I know everyone is busy, but I want to make sure – and I'm not going to be the scolding professor here – what I want to make sure is people are able to find this list. Did anyone have trouble finding this list?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Laureen. I think Drew wanted to speak before me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I'm having trouble seeing [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: You can go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Okay. Yes, I'm very sorry. I have a lot of work over the last two days, and today we have the monthly call of the GNSO Council and we have such a

backlog that I haven't paid attention. But I think your idea is great, and you should assign randomly the papers. I hope I get a short one.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think we're [inaudible], Carlos.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Look, Pam was so nice and gave us the link again. Now I know where it is. It is in the same place a little bit down the page, but I'm ready to take anyone you suggest and try to make a presentation. I think this is the best idea [inaudible], but I think it's a great idea. I volunteer alone or with somebody to work, make a presentation on one of the papers – or two, I don't know – for the next time. Count on me. You are the chair. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, that's fine. Maybe that's the best way to approach this. Here's what I'll do. And, Drew, I know you want to speak and you probably have thoughts on some of these things, so I'm going to get to you in a second. Here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to give folks a couple of hours today. I'll send out a new e-mail with this plan for the benefit of those who aren't on the call. I'll give folks a couple of hours to express a preference for what reading they would like to present on. Then if I don't hear from enough people to cover the [readings] we have, then I will – as Carlos so graciously said – I'll randomly assign with an eye toward having many presentations on the studies for our next phone call. That way it will be a little more manageable for folks, I think. I know

we're all busy, but I want to also get us all taking a little bit of a dive into the many resources we already have, which I've tried to [inaudible].

Okay, Drew, you've been very patient. You have the floor.

DREW BAGLEY:

Thank you. I think adding to the assignment, you're giving us all of our homework, I think we should all, whoever is assigned to whichever paper, should try to come up with in addition to the merit of the study and presenting the study to try to come up with research questions about the new gTLDs based on that topic, the topic discussed in the study.

For example, if there are questions that come out of the takedowns study versus the DNS abuse study, I think that would be helpful as well as any proposed methodology. I think the most helpful report on the reading list is the one Brian did because it does propose research methodologies. So I think for that report, that might be helpful to have maybe two people go through that one and look at all the research suggestions and see whether or not this is something we want to take on for each one of the research questions, the hypotheses, and the proposed means of achieving an answer.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That sounds like a great idea. While you have the floor, I actually had a question for you. When I was looking at the Secure Domain Foundation report that I linked to, I think I didn't link to quite the right thing

because I didn't see the underlying data. Does that live somewhere else, so to speak?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. The underlying data itself since it's based on anonymous surveys are not published.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I see.

DREW BAGLEY: But I might be able to get those. I'm thinking I won't be able to because that research was done with the understanding that everything would be kept anonymous and whatnot, and some of the answers can be revealing because of the numbers. But I might be able to get more data if you have specific questions about numbers in any way whatsoever. I could probably get those and make those public. Otherwise, the footnotes include numbers [for some of that stuff].

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's helpful. Carlos asked, "Which one was done by Brian?" That actually was the ICANN study, which I think had a prior dead link but has now risen again like the Phoenix, thanks to Pam and Alice who put a new link. But it's called the New gTLD Program Safeguards Against DNS Abuse. That is the right one, Brian, yes? Brian and Drew, am I identifying that correctly?

[BRIAN AITCHISON]: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Okay, so that's the one. That you can now link to, and you'll see that on the reading list. Which raises the question, if folks have any other – and I am not totally off the chat. I can't see anything because I have a wholly blank screen now. I don't know why that is. I have voice-to-voice contact only.

That brings me to the question of whether folks want to identify any other sources that we should be taking a look at. I had tried to collect sources that had already been identified or things I was already aware of. Other folks have suggested things to me. Are there any other studies or sources or articles, things we should be taking a look at that might inspire questions or analysis on our consumer trust and safeguard issues? Any other sources?

DREW BAGLEY: Quickly, I'm just going to paste a link to some APWG resources I think we should look at.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's the Anti-Phishing Working Group, yes?

DREW BAGLEY: Correct.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, that's great.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hi, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Good morning. I think it's great that we're compiling this reading list. I hope that we can add additional materials after this call.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, absolutely.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. My question is, is the reading list for our own background, or do you foresee using them in some other way?

LAUREEN KAPIN: The reading list, at least at this point, is for our background. I think ultimately, it may form part of the working group's analysis, but I think that's going to be subject to looking if over and discussing it among the group. This is more a preliminary dive to see what's going to be useful, what's going to inspire other analysis requests for data, and perhaps

what's going to be a source of data ultimately for us. Does that answer your question?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, it does. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm still having problems connecting, so if folks have put information in the chat, I can't see it so I'm going to have to rely on folks to actually speak up if they're able to if there are any other sources. You can identify a source after the phone call, but if there's anything you want to chime in about now, let me know.

DREW BAGLEY: What Brian said in the chat was that we could look at a lot of the references in the DNS abuse report itself as resources that should. We should read the primary content to be inspired for our own research questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, and this reinforces the need I think for more than one person to take a look at that because you then can also start looking at some of the underlying materials as well. Brian, if you think there's something especially juicy and useful, maybe you can highlight that to us also.

Pam and Alice – and I know I just interrupted someone, and I'll cede in a minute – Pam and Alice, if you can add Drew's link to the Anti-Phishing

Working Group resources to our reading list, that would be super. Great. Someone else wanted to talk.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, Laureen, can you hear me now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. I just wanted to expand upon what Jamie was referring to and also add to what Drew was saying. Yes, there are going to be some juicy references, so to speak, in that DNS abuse report, so I think you will find a lot of them interesting. Some of them are just little tidbits.

Also, in response to Jamie and how we use this, I think it will be important to create sort of a literature review, something like that, as we go forward to establish something like a state of affairs for an introduction to any potential report you guys produce. Having all that background I think is going to be really useful, and I think it will eventually result in a tangible output. So I think that's a useful exercise to have an understanding of that state of affairs. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Brian. I appreciate your perspective here because this strikes me as something that when we are putting together whatever interim and final products we have, I think it will have a lot more credibility if

we actually have a lot of information about the resources we've consulted in forming our conclusion, which probably will go beyond just data and also include these other sources of information.

Good. Brian, your hand is still up, but I'm thinking that's your old hand. But if it's not, speak up. Drew, your hand is still up. Okay, hands are down. Margie, your hand is up.

MARGIE MILAM:

Thanks. Good morning, everyone. As you think about how you want to analyze each of these articles, I'm wondering if it would be helpful to have a template of areas. If you're going to assign various committee members different articles either to summarize or bring back materials for, I'm wondering if we want to standardize that so everyone is looking for the same thing and presenting it back in the same way so that as we think about building out a report later on, it will be easy to feed into some of that. Just a suggestion for you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Let me give that some thought. My initial inclination is I think a template will be useful at some point. I'm not sure I want to have a template for the first time because I'm actually interested in an unfiltered take on what people think of the articles right now and what people find useful, and I fear if I impose a template at the onset, I may actually miss something which I don't want to do.

I think what I'd rather do is use our first reporting session to come up with a template that we decide to apply thereafter, but I certainly

welcome any ideas for a template now. It's just that a first reporting session, I think I'd rather just hear what folks are thinking is the most important thing about the study, what's the most interesting, what's the most surprising, what could be useful, and whatever else strikes people as they're reading the study. I think as we move forward, we can then create a template that we think is going to be most useful for our purposes.

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure, that actually makes a lot of sense. When we get to that next call, we'll as staff just listen to the comments to see whether it helps identify what kind of issues are for a template. I think that might be helpful for you too so that we can see the kinds of things that people are focusing on.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Perfect. That will be very useful.

Good. Okay, we've talked about our priorities. We've talked a little bit about the studies. I think the issue of additional data is going to be assisted when we have our discussion of these resources, but if folks have thoughts now about any additional data needs, now is the time to discuss them. Any thoughts about additional data needs at this point that you see already? Okay, so let's park that one then since I'm not seeing hands. Let's park that for our next phone call.

This then will bring us to Fabro's question, which I believe referred to a question about our face-to-face meeting in Finland, which I think

confused me a little bit, Fabro, because I think our next face-to-face is going to be in Washington, DC, and I'm not certain that there even is a planned face-to-face in Finland at all. But I will ask that question to Alice and Margie and Pam on the phone if there's additional insight about a face-to-face meeting in Finland. I do know that on the GAC draft schedule – and here I'm checking off an item that I promised to do that I didn't do last time at the GAC meeting – there is a place for an update on the CCT Review Team activities.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

That's true, Lauren. I'll jump in. That is correct. After the last meeting in Marrakech, the group decided that they did not want to meet during an ICANN meeting. So we essentially decided to explore other options, and that's how we came up with the June date in Washington, DC. So there will be no formal Review Team meetings in Finland.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Does that answer your question, Fabro? Okay, I think it does. Yes. Good. I will just give again a heads up to staff that there is going to be some sort of briefing in Helsinki to the GAC, and that's something we need to plan for that's different from the face-to-face meeting.

Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Lauren? [inaudible] Sorry, I'm only on the phone, so I can't raise my hand. Are you and Megan planning on doing that update?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I haven't spoken with Megan. I think that's the likely scenario, and I'm not sure. Again, this has just come up because I've just looked at the draft schedule only recently. It is also something I wanted to chat with Jonathan about and see what his thoughts are as well. I think at the very least Megan and I would be involved and perhaps Jonathan as well as a question mark there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Are there any other items that folks want to discuss? Any other items? While I have people on the phone, who is planning to join us in June? I'm hoping we can get as many folks as possible. From the folks that are on the phone, who is planning on joining us in DC in June? We have Drew, Carlos, Fabro, Gao, Calvin, Jamie. Yay! It looks like we're getting a nice level of participation. That's terrific. Hopefully, the people who haven't been able to join us on this call can also attend.

"We have no travel arrangements though." So, Carlos, what does that mean? That you haven't received communications from ICANN about the travel arrangements yet? Oh, okay, I'm seeing in the chat that that's the case. Okay, so hopefully that will be taken care of by the ICANN travel folks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Laureen, can I raise another issue if we have a little more time?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We do, and you can.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. I wanted to quickly discuss the name collision topic. I know that you've been communicating with Francisco, our director of technical services about this. Just for the benefit of the group, last week on your plenary call, I mentioned that if the team was interested in learning more about name collisions, Francisco could do a presentation for you. Laureen, I think perhaps you and Francisco were going to discuss this more, but I thought maybe this would be a chance to hear from the group what in particular you'd like to learn from the topic to give Francisco a [status] of how to organize his presentation and his thoughts for you.

I think I had mentioned on the call that we do have one of the recommended metrics on this topic was to collect the number of reports of name collisions that ICANN has received. One suggestion I had was to have Francisco talk about how we collect those reports, what we do with them, and if there's any other way of looking at those reports that might be helpful for the review. There's lot of other literature and studies and work that has been done to address this issue in the new gTLD program, so [I don't know] if there's a particular area or some suggestions. I think it might help Francisco to focus his thoughts for you all on your next sub team call. He couldn't join today, so in two weeks he'll be joining you to address the topic.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's a great topic. I have been e-mailing back and forth with Francisco, and I'm hopeful he's going to be able to join us for our next phone call in two weeks. What are folks' ideas more specifically about name collisions? What would be most useful to hear? I'm thinking about maybe 10 or 15 minutes for Francisco to chat with us since we'll also have some of our study presentations. Okay, Fabro has typed in some topics here.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, great. I'm sure my colleagues will capture that and forward it to me when I'm online again. We could also discuss this on the safeguards sub team list if that might be a useful forum for you guys as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, that would be fine. Fabro, I'm a little confused about your comment. Does that refer to that name collision, or is this a general comment about a draft safeguard? Okay, Fabro is typing, so I'm going to let him finish typing so I can get the answer. While Fabro is finishing typing, does anyone else have any other comments about the name collision? What would be most useful? Okay, so I'll ask folks to look in the chat because Fabro has some useful suggestions about linking at our topic to some of the studies [inaudible] ultimately would be a good idea.

I'm also, and I would perhaps ask folks to do likewise, is I'm intending to take a look at the competition group's list of topics and how they've

approached this preliminary step to see if there are things we can learn from them, things that are useful in their approach. So if folks want to take a mosey on to the competition part of our Review Team wiki and take a look at the last version of their brainstorming document, if there's something useful about their approach that you think would be good for us to copy since that is the sincerest form of flattery, let's talk about it next time we chat together as a sub group.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, Carlos?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Now that you talk about the other sub group, I strongly recommend to watch a very short presentation that Stan Besen did yesterday or the day before on the basics of competition from the point of view of allowing mergers and acquisitions. It was very straightforward, very easy. You can read it yourself, and it's very good stuff. That's where my initiative for reading the papers came from. I really recommend everybody who couldn't follow the presentation by Stan to take a look at that one. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Carlos, is that available? Where are we finding that? Is that going to be on the competition sub team's wiki? By listening to the recording? Or is that a presentation that's actually posted?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: I hope it's posted. It's a very short PowerPoint presentation, less than ten pages, almost self-explanatory, very useful. I haven't checked if they put it up on the page, but it should be there. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. If it's not there, I'll touch base with our supporting folks who help troubleshoot for us and see if we can get that. And, of course, Stan always has it too. I'm sure he'll be delighted to share. I think that's a great suggestion. As I understand it, Stan was talking about the definition of markets. Am I right about the topic here, Carlos?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Yes, right, but from the point of view of allowing or not allowing mergers or acquisitions. The heading is the market definition, but it applied to the analysis if there is market power or not. So it goes beyond the other definition of market. It was like an impulse to start discussing the definition of market, and from there, there is already an [inaudible] discussion what should be part of the market or the markets that we're going to analyze and what should be outside, so defined boundaries of the competition side. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. If folks are interested in that, and I think it would be useful even though it's a competition-related issue, it's good for us to have a general understanding of those concepts, so I would recommend that folks take a look at that. It looks like Pam has already posted a link for us in the chat, so that's terrific.

Any other topics before we close out a smidgen early? I'm not seeing any other hands raised. Anyone else want to jump in with any other topics? I see Brian. Carlton, to answer your question, the Francisco Arias presentation is going to be about name collision. The earlier question about how prevalent that is actually is a question that I have also. I think that's one of the things that Francisco is going to discuss.

Okay, so we're adjourning five minutes early. What that means is that if I ever go five minutes over, no one gets to complain because we'll be Even Steven. If anyone has any questions or comments in the interim, please feel free to circulate it to the group. Or if you have something you want to discuss with me, as always, please feel free to reach out to me directly.

Thanks, everyone, for participating. I'm going to send out an e-mail with your "homework" for presentations on these studies inviting you to give me a preference of what you'd like to present. If I don't get a preference, then I'll just divvy them out. Okey-dokey.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]