EN

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The recording has started, we can [inaudible] for the [leader's installment?] of the competition and choice sub-team meeting of the CCT review.

I guess I'm supposed to ask if anyone has any updates for their SOI?

Looks like no. And why don't we quickly review the agenda. I've put together from the topics, and I would think it makes sense to talk that way. We just need to do a quick run through our various data projects and get a status update. And second, one of the things that I would like to do is start to tee-up our work so that we start moving from talking about data that we would like to have, to actually do taking a look at results and putting together findings.

So in particular, I think it would make sense to look and see if we have projects that are far enough along that we can start to look at findings, and start to test out Jonathan's template and start to think about how we're going to pull together a report. And so, if you've got, and finally, just sort of look ahead, what can we do to make sure that we're as prepared as possible for our face-to-face at the end of August.

Anyone have any other things they would like to add to the agenda?

All right. Oh, Jonathan has his hand up. Go ahead Jonathan.

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.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey Jordyn, thanks. One thing that I, exercise that I kind of wanted to do with all of the groups if possible, is at some point, sort of stand back to the metrics that are, were collected as part, as a result of the work of the work group and implementation advisory group. You know, at the request of the Board.

And make sure that we just haven't forgotten about them, and that we're incorporating them into the ones that are relevant to the questions that we set as priorities in LA.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think so. [Inaudible] under the data updates topic, Eleeza wanted to talk a bit about the metrics project, so you can probably tie that in there. I think probably we're not going to have…

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see it there, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so we probably don't have time to actually do that review, but it's a good reminder that we should be making sure we don't sort of fail to take use of any of the data there, at least as it relates to our key question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Okay, thanks.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. Any other suggestions for the agenda? All right. Why don't we dive right in then? So, in terms of data updates, on our last call, we talked about two big topics. One was figuring out how we were going to fill out our ccTLD data, and I think the plan was we were going to try to reach out to [Nomin-Net], especially since we thought we might be able to do so while we were there in Helsinki, but I suspect this is a follow-up by them that, the future responsibility.

Did anyone actually talk to anyone from [Nomin-Net]?

[Inaudible] all right, so we've made no progress on ccTLD data [inaudible]. Why don't we go ahead and for real, follow-up on… Oops, [Dan] has his hand up. Go ahead [Dan]. And we don't hear you if you're trying to speak.

All right. [Dan] and Jonathan has got his hand up, so Jonathan, I'll let you go first and we'll see if [Dan] gets his mic working.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey. I was following-up on the email that I sent to you and Stan, which is I did some… I had it in my head, right or wrong, that I had it as a take-away that actually looked for reasonable data for legacy TLDs. And what I think I found is that I haven't reached out to them yet, because I wanted to make sure that we hadn't found it elsewhere, was a place called Domain Tools.

And so, I just wanted to get the go ahead to reach out to them to see what it would take to get that data for them. And it's very possible that they have ccTLD data as well, but I know that, for example, they can do

break-downs, like this is how many coms in Germany that are trying to compete with dot DE.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that sounds [inaudible]… I think the thing that will be important to understand is to what extent they are able to sort of differentiate between proxy registrations and not, because that might give you skewed interpretations of the data, but yeah, that sounds great to reach out to them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I will make this part of that ask, whether they've got the relevant ccTLD data for those regions as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, perfect. All right. [Dan] did you get your microphone working? [Inaudible] and Greg has got his hand up, so I'll pass the mic to Greg.

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, I just wanted to note to Jonathan that we in the analysis group are doing some work with the [inaudible], so to be [inaudible] that [inaudible] contact, you would like us to help in kind of the reaching out process, we'd be happy to do so. I think we are likely to have some of the data that you all are interested in, but you know, we obviously need to contact them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, are they easy to work with? Are they expensive? I mean, what's your experience been? I mean, likely, what we're looking for is being able to look at competition at reasonable level in addition to sort of this global level, and I don't know if you guys have been toying with that at all, but because there is certain…

GREG RAFERT: We actually [CROSSTALK]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: …as a whole, go ahead.

GREG RAFERT: I didn't mean to interrupt, I just wanted to say that, excuse me, we are planning to solicit some of these more regional cuts, and we actually have requested some data from them already, that they've provided, to your first set of questions, they are very easy to work with. They're quite responsive, and at least from our perspective, they aren't very expensive, I forget the exact cost for the regional data cut back, and take a look at [inaudible] and get back to you, and Stan, and others.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. I mean, are you down to the country level?

GREG RAFERT: We are, in some cases even at the city level. For example, in Berlin. [CROSSTALK]

Yeah, so I think what might make sense for us to do is for me to reach out to you and Stan, and anyone else that makes sense. And I can give you a sense of the data that we've already obtained, and then you can see as it might make sense to go back and look for more.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, that sounds good.

GREG RAFERT: Great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, thanks Greg. That's really helpful. And I see [Dan] back in the queue, so hopefully that means we've solved his audio problems. [Dan], go ahead.

[DAN]: Yeah, hope it's working now. I'm working on [inaudible] table [inaudible] data and I'm almost done with comparing with the data from [MET?], and there is definitely a difference between data [inaudible] table and data in the [MET]. And I checked only briefly first, some ccTLD, their website, and there is also difference with all of that data between, let's say, [looking] table and [MET], but I checked only for a few of them, and that's all [inaudible] dot MK.

And there is a very big difference in looking table, there was around 7,000 domain names, but they have, they have three times more than that, so I hope that there is no such difference for other ccTLDs, but I will check for a few more.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's really helpful analysis. Unfortunately, we can't just blindly rely on the data sources that we have already. So, I think it's going to make sense for us to reach out to [Nomin-Net], so [Dan] maybe I coordinate with you after the call, and we sort of figure out how we're going to reach out to [Nomin-Net] and see if we can figure out where they got their data from for the map. And see if we trust more.

[DAN]:   Okay, I will say my colleagues from registry, they have some [inaudible] [inaudible]…

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, perfect. [CROSSTALK]

[DAN]:   …. [inaudible] who knows more.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thank you.

All right, so I think that's it for ccTLD there. We've had somewhat better progress on the next topic, which is parching data from NTLD staff. We had a call with NTLD staff last week, and they indicated that it will be challenging to get a complete set of working data for the legacy TLDs, largely because the legacy TLDs are so much larger than the new gTLDs, and because they've been collecting the information on new gTLDs over a period of time.

They don't really have the system capacity or the available IP addresses that they need in order to collect the data, that with some additional resources, they might be able to do some data collection, accelerate it, and/or what we… I think we mostly landed on was the idea of performing a sample of the legacy gTLDs as they tend to be quite a bit larger than the new gTLDs, and we're trying to do some comparisons.

So I think we've got a quote from them yesterday, possibly. And Eleeza, maybe you want to quickly summarize the proposal from them?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, happy to. So [inaudible]. They basically offered up two options, both essentially the same thing. One is what they called an automatic parking check of 1% of comment [inaudible] using a current algorithm that they used to [inaudible] and new gTLDs, which they said they can turn around in one to two weeks for 2800 Euro.

And then the second option would be to do the same with what he said was an additional manual check of the results to determine the margin of error, which they'll do in more like two to three weeks, at a little bit of a higher price, 4400 Euros.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thank you. I think we need some… [Inaudible] comment and not the other legacy gTLDs, that's right Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's correct, and the other thing I'm not sure about is, which parking numbers, in other words, how they're calculating this.   Which algorithms they're using?   They present parking, they described it in different ways on our calls [in the last case?].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I guess that this means they would do the full sweep analysis that they do on the new gTLDs, but we should clarify that. That would be the most helpful, I would imagine, so we can do apples to apples comparison. I think it would be helpful to get someone, who is better at math than me, to get a sense of like, what do you think the 1% sample is sufficient in order to draw, physically correct, statistically powerful inferences from them.

And similarly, to see what it would take to expand this to the other legacy gTLDs as well. And maybe we just do a small sample of those too, but we set a minimum of, you know, a minimum of [inaudible] size or something like that, to make sure that in the cases of like dot cat, we don't only sample a couple of hundred domain names.

But maybe we can get some thoughts from either Stan or staff from the analysis group, someone who would be better, who has actually had some statistical background to figure out whether we think the samples,

what we think the samples would necessarily would look like in order to get the results right.

The cost of the proposal seems to me to be pretty reasonable. Eleeza, is that in the range of something we can do in the existing budget?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: At this point, yeah, it just depends on what other things we decide to pursue, but it's certainly reasonable, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, okay. So [inaudible] to expand the scope. I presume it's not going to… [Inaudible] to that number is not going to go like crazy higher.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Probably not.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Like to 50,000 Euros, or something like that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: One would hope not.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: With regard to the map, I wonder if we could tap Sam to do that. I think, because he's particularly interested in this, and he can look at the size of the, you know, we have registration numbers for those TLDs. We can figure that out, but I'd be happy to… I can take a crack at it, but I am about to go on vacation, so I won't be able to follow-up on this.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, is Stan on the call today? It's hard to volunteer him for things, but why don't you talk to him and see if that works or not. I agree, that's probably a great solution.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right, I'll do that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. And I see [Dan's] hand is up. Is that an old hand [Dan]?

Okay, it is an old hand. So I'm going to, I think we should try, hopefully we'll get a quick response from Stan, I'd like to try to [inaudible] we could commission, we could confirm the number, I think we agreed that we were going to try to like get budgets on the additional projects by the end of this week, so if we can finalize what we want from NTLD staff, that would be great.

And that there really is like a two to three-week timeframe, which is in time for our face to face as well. All right. Third topic is updates on the Neilson and analysis group work. So, Eleeza, I'll let you sort of choose how we want to dive into that discussion.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. In terms of the Neilson work, I don't have much to report other than that they are nearly done fielding the registrant survey, and the whole thing to have results for you before you meet later in August. So that is where that stands for now [inaudible] Greg and Stacy to join you on the call, on the call going forward, to keep you posted on their progress. So I'll let them chime in.

GREG RAFERT: All right. So this is Greg. So we have begun work on the various projects that I think all have Stan's name next to them in the Google document that, I think, is showing on the screen. Our plan is to get those projects kind of to you on a rolling basis as we complete them. We started on one of the projects and are hoping to have it complete either later this week or early next week, and then I guess the question that we have is, should we be sending the results of these analysis to the full group, to kind of a subset of the group that's on the phone today, or I guess a subset of the entire CCT review team?

And yeah, so I think that's an open question that we have, but our plan is to hopefully get these analysis done in relatively short order, and then we're happy to either kind of talk about them in more depth on previously scheduled calls, or if it makes sense to have shorter calls with the subset of a group, where we can go through the results. We're happy to do that as well.

And then I think the end goal is to have everything, all of the analysis done, that we've been tasked with by August 16th, but hopefully before that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. That's helpful Greg. You said you started on one of the projects already. Can you let us know which one that is?

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, it's… Let me actually go back to my screen. I stepped outside. I'm calling from home today and there is an energetic toddler hanging around, and so I'm trying to minimize the external volume. So the moment, we're working on calculating a number of the HHIs, at least in the Google document that I have, it's kind of defined as the basic registry market share calculations, where we have kind of the four [inaudible] concentration rations in HHIs.

And that's the one that we're currently working on. And the Excel file looks like it's 1.4.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great. Okay. That's helpful. That will be helpful around a major topic, which part [inaudible] findings for. In terms of where to send the results, I'll let Jonathan chime in as well if he has a different opinion, but my take would be for now, sending them to this sub-team is probably the right thing to do. And then as we start to digest them, we can share them with the broader team. Agrees, so that's probably the right thing to do.

So we do have a separate email distribution for the sub-team, which I think is CCT dash competition, but then again, staff can provide you with that.

GREG RAFERT: Okay, that sounds good. That will be helpful.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great.

GREG RAFERT: But assuming, I mean, I guess, data analysis can often go a little bit forward than one would expect, but assuming that everything goes smoothly, and I think that our hope is that it will, I would imagine that, you know, something like every four or seven days, we're sending you a batch of results.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, that sounds fantastic. We still need to figure out how to start digesting that, and putting that into both the template that Jonathan put together, and eventually the text with our report, which we'll get to in just a minute. Thanks for the update Greg.

GREG RAFERT: Of course.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. And now, the next topic is on the metrics project, which is also from [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks Jordyn. So I just put into the chat a link to the metrics page, which is now functional again. We've been having some problems with them, with the page before, but now it seems to be working. I just wanted to, as Jonathan mentioned at the beginning of the call, I wanted to bring this to your attention again, because there is quite a lot of data that we're capturing on the page, that these all came from metrics that were recommended by the implementation advisory group that proceeded the CCT review team.

So, if you look through the metrics on the page, and if you click on any of them, you'll see at the bottom, each one has listed a CCT review category of trust, change, or competition. Someone might come across different categories, but this is how they were categorized by the IAG. So, hopefully that you, hope you will find this relevant to you.

I think most of the ones that are under the registries category, which includes a lot of different registration numbers and shared calculation, will be of particular interest, sorry, I said registries. Under domain name registrations, the categories under registries might help with the interesting, because that includes a lot of geographic breakdowns and a number of service providers and things like that.

So I just wanted to flag this to your attention, and hope that as you look at the data you're receiving now, and start working on some of your discussion papers, you can refer back to this and see if there are any

additional data sets that may help enlighten the questions you're trying to answer. In the chart in front of you, I've noted in a few places where I think certain metrics might be relevant, so those numbers correspond to that page.

[Inaudible] answer any questions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, that's very helpful. Thanks Eleeza. Just glancing through this myself. It does seem like it should be helpful and provides a good breakdown of the number of the things that we're interested in taking a look at. So I appreciate that. Does anyone have any questions for Eleeza?

All right, I don't see any. Jonathan, this, one of the metrics… Jonathan's hand is up. So why don't we just jump to Jonathan?

Jonathan…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, sorry about that. I was muted. I guess the question I was going to ask Eleeza, and then I'll take up the question you have, Jordyn, was… And maybe this is a question for all of us, but the information is resolved a data point, or a metric, on the website that you pointed us to, I mean, maybe this is a question for Jordyn.

I mean, do you think we're, the team will be okay just grabbing this number off of this webpage? Or are people going to feel the need to somehow calculate the number and get data sets out of ICANN to do

that? Because I mean, the idea was to come up with kind of public metrics that could have, you know, three year targets and things like that, so that you're sort of creating an environment of continuous reform, like we want to get this number down to this, and we want to make, show continuous improvement of this number.

I mean, that was the original concept behind the work group and the IAG, and so recalculating it from scratch all of the time feels like make work, but I was just wondering what your thoughts were on that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So I think we'll have to take a look at the individual numbers. We'll see how they can be [inaudible]… take it as if ICANN has produced a number that we think is the number that we, is available and we want to include in our report. Then it would make sense, from my perspective, for us just to use that number, and then in the spirit of span, to include a footnote that ICANN staff can flesh out with a description of the methodology for continuing it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And then, that should give some… That way, people can look in the future, and you know, understand how it was calculated, and for future reference will do it. I assume that these, that the things that are included here, Eleeza has got her hand up so I don't know if this is a good transition to her, but I think that the things that are included in the

metrics dashboard, you guys are going to continue to keep this data updated periodically. Is that a good assumption, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That is our plan. I mean, in creating this, we were, you know, this is obviously primarily to serve the review team, but it's really a longer term, we sort of granted plans for having this interactive page, and ways we can calculate charts and things like that. Fortunately, we haven't had the resources to create that. It's a little bit more stagnant than I would like to see at this point, but we've been updating this on a regular basis, since the Board adopted the IAG's recommendations to collect these particular metrics.

So that's definitely the plan. I also wanted to touch on the methodology. We do have, I thought it was [inaudible], but I'm not seeing it, I think it's on your Wiki, I'm going to stick that up right now. A memo that outlines the methodology collection for each of these metrics. So you can see exactly the steps we go through to construct all of the numbers that we come up with.

And not in every case, but in several cases, we do provide downloadable Excel files so that you can see the data set in full, like in some instances where it asks for, you know, gTLD registrations, we can't put up a table with every single gTLD on here. We have samples instead, but we have the full tables available for download too.

So it's quite deep, deeper than it looks from this simple page.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks Eleeza. So, if the intent is that staff will keep this up, and certainly we include metrics in the report, that we think are going to be relevant to future reviews, or that we think the community is going to want to continue to track, then I think we can flag those as ones that we would hope and expect to continue to be updated by staff.

I think the question will be what happens when we come up with our analysis that is a synthesis of, not minutes produced by the staff analysis plus some other data sources? Those will presumably be a little harder to keep up to date, but maybe we'll have to get that into the dashboard, or something along those lines.

But I think we'll probably [CROSSTALK]… Yeah, for each of these metrics, we'll have to take a look and sort of see, this is a key metric we expect to track over time, in terms of you know, maybe they should be added to the dashboard or something like that for each of those.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, I mean some we're going to be, that aren't pure staff data collection, it will be tougher to just have in the ongoing dashboard. So it will be something that category, and some that are more in the category they were recommended this day to be purchased again, you know, every year or something, and updated, or something like that. That's probably how [CROSSTALK], I would imagine.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Inaudible] going back to my previous suggestion, if we sort of footnote our methodology, or have an appendix with our methodology

[inaudible], and we use that will make it, hopefully, a lot more straightforward for future efforts to continue to, you know, reproduce consistent numbers.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I mean, I know it's their intention to keep doing it because they're going to use it as part of the help index as well, since we've gone through the effort of getting those things collected, I think they're trying to make it an ongoing statistic also. So. How do you want to go through the exercise of figuring out which things are…?

I mean, guess Eleeza has already done it by going, putting it into this project chart. So, Eleeza, are you confident that everybody can just use their assignments on this chart to go back and look at the metrics that are relevant to it? Or do we need an exercise of going through the recommended metrics from the IAG?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So, I think that what I've noted in the chat, are those that I think, those metrics that I think are most relevant to the project you've outlined here. There are other metrics that maybe don't fall so neatly into the projects might, I don't know, help enhance some of the writing that you're planning to do.

I can take another pass at looking at the projects, and again noting which metrics those might be. But I think, you know…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well it's not the project, maybe the high level questions.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. That's also true. Yeah, I could certainly do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And then, I don't know, Jordyn, I don't know that we haven't… Some of our high level questions or so high level that there is not going to be any individual responsible for them, but I guess once they have those, you know, those that apply directly to the questions, maybe we can just assign, for each question, somebody to do that review of the metric to see if it's relevant to our report, something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that probably makes sense. We don't have any high level questions, so it's probably pretty easy to have an owner for each one.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Would it be helpful if I added maybe to our Google sheet, at the bottom of each question here, you know, recommended CCT metrics, and I can list which ones are the most relevant.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that would be helpful.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Thanks Eleeza].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure thing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right.   Anything else on the metrics project?   Is there more information or any questions from the rest of the team?   All right, I don't see any. Let's go to item number two in our agenda, which is, do we have projects that are [inaudible] that [inaudible] findings? It seems like that in the very near future, we're going to start to get completed projects from our chart, from our analysis groups, so that's great news that I didn't realize when I wrote this agenda item.

So that will be one obvious area that we can start to use. I think that we've done some amount of analysis on two areas. Stan started to write up some text around the trademark project, which he sent around. Although I don't think we have all the data we need there yet, and then also, I think there is a very basic analysis that Stan has done already, and I think we probably already have all of the data for, which is just to look at the gTLD versus legacy gTLD… The new gTLD versus legacy gTLD market share numbers, and [inaudible] numbers, which I think the analysis group is already including in their report, but which I think we can compute relatively easily as well.

Pardon? [Inaudible], maybe not. Okay. In any case, I would say, you know, Jonathan in our last call, in the plenary call, introduced the

template for findings that he would like to use. And [inaudible] something, some experience using that template. And so, I made the proposal that we pick one of these, and try to use the template to summarize the data and the findings.

Does anyone else has ideas other than those two as to possible candidates for an early use of the template? [Inaudible], all right, so [inaudible] I think the easiest one will be just take a look at gTLD versus, new versus legacy gTLD market share numbers. This will be a very simplistic, based on analysis. But I'll go ahead and take that on myself to do a first pass of using the template, hopefully by our next plenary call.

And once I do that, when we get the analysis group right above the HII and concentration data, you know, later this week or next week, we should also use, put that into the template as well. And Stan can take a crack at that once he's back from his travel.

So, that may be it for this agenda item.

Okay, and then, moving on to item number three then, which is looking forward to the face to face meeting at the end of August. So [inaudible] data that we're expecting to see will be landing relatively near to the end of August, but it sounds like we'll be getting some of it in the pipeline, including some of the analysis group data. You said the, are we expecting the Neilson registrant data to come relatively close to the August meeting?

Or do you have any expectation of when we'll see that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. I think it will come just… I think we'll see a draft report that will be reviewed with you just before the meeting.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Okay, so there [inaudible] registrant survey data, we'll get very close to the end of August, and then there will be some that we get in advance. So, I think in general, our goal, by the time we get to the face to face in August, we want to consider, essentially, the data collection process of this effort to be complete, although there may be refinements that we do, as we go on, and as we start to write this up, but we certainly, the first pass of data collection and data analysis ought to be complete, and we ought to, should be focusing on determining findings, maybe even having findings in advance, and then start writing the text of the draft report.

So, I think, I won't try to work through it on this call, but maybe, Eleeza maybe early next week, when Stan is back, the three of us could spend a little time going through the projects, and roughly putting together plans of action and sort of expected timelines for each of those projects. We can map that to something…

I know Alice has been putting together a work plan, but we can start to map that to specific projects and sort of timelines, and sort of make sure we expect everything to land prior to the face to face meeting.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Happy to work with you on that, but I'm on vacation next week. I'll be back in the office on the 26th.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. [Inaudible] the way we do it… Let's see, let me look at the calendar.

The 26th. All right, why don't we try to have a call on the 26th prior to our next meeting, we'll have that worked out.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So you and Stan.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think so.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I see Jonathan typing in the chat. Oh, he's making fun of the fact that you're going on vacation. [Inaudible] vacation two weeks ago, or three weeks going. Sorry about that. I guess either Jonathan or staff, are there other things that you guys expect that we're going to need to have wrapped up leading into that August face to face meeting. I want to make sure sub-teams are going to be landing on the same schedule as the rest of the work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn, it's Jonathan. I'm going to… I got the email from you from, about the after market people, and so it feels like that should be enough time to both get the data and analyze it, because the analysis itself should be straightforward.   So provided that that process of getting is frictionless, I should have something there.

And I confess that I have another assignment that I've forgotten what it is. I'll have to look through the table to find it. There was some data that I feel like Eleeza already shared with me, that I was going to perform some analysis on as well. So I will, I will look for that, and maybe in an email, she remembers what it was that I was going to do, because I may be able to finish as well, just data that I've already gotten in my hands, apparently.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks Jonathan. Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [Inaudible] sorry. But one other thing that I wanted to point out, and this went to your list, but I don't think it did. So we had this project that we worked on to compare registry policy, which our new research analysist, Michael [inaudible] has worked on, and I share that with, I think it was, we had a speaker last, I can't remember.

So in addition to what he compiled on the picks and those registries which is [inaudible] registration, [inaudible] from my team also recently did a similar exercise, though a little bit more in depth on voluntary

picks for all of the GAC category one strings, and all of the top level registries that have picks. So this is something that the safeguard team is looking at in more detail, but I thought this might, this chart could also be helpful for you on, in reference to that project.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that sounds helpful, and hopefully Dan get a chance to take a look at the chart to see if it's helpful.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And that, in fact, that may be a project that is nearly ready to actually have some findings or some of the writing done. We've done a lot of the compiling, and I was going to ask Michael when he returns, he's out for all of July, to work on maybe doing a short paper comparing these different policies.

But it may just be in good enough shape that we can start actually writing a paper on it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So maybe I would ask [inaudible] if you can look at that table, and see if you think it's ready to translate into a template form that Jonathan had put together as well for our findings.

Hopefully he's going to say yes, that's amazing.

I think the long version is yes. He said, okay, I'll do that. All right, so that's great. So we'll have a couple of different things that hopefully,

over the next couple of weeks, we'll start to get some red miles on Jonathan's template. And see if we need to adapt it at all.

Is that a new hand Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, an old.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. All right, and so, you know, if we go into the face to face with several of the sort of write up of our findings, and maybe some of the, you know, some hypothesis and sort of where we stand on those, I feel like the goal should be to come out of the meeting in August with a pretty, hopefully a point of view that all of our hypothesis, have hypothesis for each of the key questions, a point of view on what the data is telling us about those hypothesis.

That can help us give a general structure, I think, to the report, which we can then spend the time between the end of August and… Are planning to have a draft report out in December, is that right Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's right. [Inaudible] to put up some kind of a draft that people can start to look at and comment on. I think fully realizing that it will have holes that says, data pending, or this is what it looks like in our final, you know, it will probably be a draft in that form, as opposed that's ready but for comments. I think that it will be a draft that includes additional work on our part.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Inaudible] to start actually drafting that text, which it feels to me like it should be enough time. I guess we'll see when we get to the face to face. That's an optimistic assumption is that we're going to start to see the data, and we'll all just agree what it means, and it will just be a matter of writing text to connect that.

I think other people are more skeptical, and that that's when we'll start to have arguments about what things mean. It will take a while to sort of has through that. [Inaudible] we should be no problems to get the draft report put together by December, and otherwise we'll have calls that are more exciting and maybe on a more regular [inaudible] once we get [inaudible] data [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. We'll be casting aspirations at each other. Jordyn, I thought you were smart.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, we'll see. I think, I'm not going to [inaudible] since we are doing this in a [inaudible] that it will be relatively [CROSSTALK]… to understand what it means. All right, so I think with that, oh. Go ahead Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was going to say, I think a lot of it is going to be a question of degree. You know? I mean, the end user survey is a perfect example, right? If

you are willing to be generous, there is some notion that there was some increase of trust over the period of time, but the numbers are not statistically significant, right? Then I think given the short amount of time, we'll probably find a lot of data like that, that the trend appears to be going in the right direction, but that we can't sort of definitively say, wow, about a lot of it, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I'm inclined to do the same. I think we all recognize that this review process is happening relatively early in the program. And so, I think a lot of our [inaudible] will probably be of the… It seems like this might be happening, but it's early days, and the data is not really strong yet. But let's check back on it in a couple of years and we'll probably have a better signal.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. So with that, I think we've exhausted our agenda for the day. Unless anyone else has any last minute topics that would like to get to. Let's have a pause, a couple of seconds, to look for a hand or suggestion.

Nope. Don't see any, we'll wrap up the call. Thanks to everyone for participating today. And we have a bunch of action items that we'll hopefully be able to make some progress on over the next couple of weeks.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jordyn.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]