
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great, thank you. So this is Eleeza. We are beginning the discussion for the group D of the application and evaluation process sub-team. This is a group that will focus on chapters six, seven, and eight of the program implementation review report. So, excuse me, we thought we could take this time to... Mute my volume here.

We are hoping to take this time with the various groups that are working on different portions of this review to talk through. [Inaudible] to talk through the conclusions of these chapters, and use this time with each group to talk through what sort of problem statements or research questions you want to apply to the chapters.

Obviously, this report is prepared primarily for this review team as sort of one key source to look back on the application and evaluation process of the new gTLD program. So I'm hoping that we can use that as a starting point for our conversation, but I'll open it up to the three of you, to see if you have any thoughts in terms of, if you have read these chapters, and if you have a better suggestion for an approach on this discussion.

Don't all speak at once.

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: This is Jonathan. That sounds right to me, as a good way to proceed. I think this will dovetail well into the conversation we're having about trying to get some outside research started on potential applicants or people that didn't apply.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Exactly. And actually, that's a perfect segue. I'm going to scroll through, and I have it synched it now, but I think I can remove the synch and let you scroll through. I'm starting from page 159 of the [inaudible] this is the conclusion of the chapter on the application support program. And I think that one key area we've talked about already, as Jonathan mentioned, is we didn't apply in all of the efforts we've talked about on outreach.

I was going to include a link here, I'm going to put it here in the chat pod, to Dennis's presentation from our last plenary call on the outreach that was done on applicant support program. I suggest that a couple of other resources for potentially interviewing those who are potential applicants, or those who reached out and were interested in the program but ultimately didn't apply. So yeah, this might be a good time to talk about how we can actually capture that data, or whether it's perhaps hiring a firm to do a sort of focus group type exercise, or if this is something the team might be interested in doing separately on their own, or doing your own types of interviews, or discussions on different calls.

So I wanted to put that out there as one idea to discuss.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

This is Jonathan again. I understand this is the call where the sub-team got formed and things, so I started a conversation with Carlos and Carlton and [inaudible] on this topic, and there is among that subset of people that it would behoove us to move forward with [inaudible] to, you know, come up with a couple of things.

One is, do the work to compile a list of people to whom we should speak, and then also organize speaking to them, and then we could choose to intervene at any of those points, or people that were local to those conversations, from the review team like in Africa or in Latin America could be a part of those focus group discussions, or to follow on after the report was completed, but there seems to be agreement in this completely informal conversation that was happening that it made sense to get a process started with a vendor to move forward.

So I am interested in hearing, since Gao and Drew weren't part of that informal discussion, I'm interested to get your feedback on if you think that's a good way to proceed.

DREW BAGLEY:

Hey Jonathan. It's Drew. To add to that, what you're talking about, so I missed out on what you just discussed, and then I think you weren't able to make the last general review team meeting, is that correct?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right. I got [inaudible]...

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. So we actually discussed this issue on that call, to an extent, because we had a terrific presentation, and I can't remember the name of the person who gave it to us, surely they can remember the name, but who is that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Dennis Chang.

DREW BAGLEY: That's right. So Dennis gave us a presentation on how the program was designed, the assistance program. And basically after that presentation, and having read through this material in the program review, what became clear is that obviously there is a lot more [inaudible] to the decision on whether or not to apply to run a registry, then just whether or not you can afford the actual application itself.

And so, you know, [CROSSTALK] discussion as to whether to just, you know, the ongoing costs to sway applicants, and then as we know from the next chapter what we have to read chapter seven. There is, of course, then the financial commitments you need in terms of long term sustainability, as far as guarantees. And so with all of that combined, something I thought of in the last call was that we should research the demand in general for new TLDs in these developing countries.

Because if you're a business person, even if you might be able to get the resources, and this is a, let's say that ICANN had the, you know, a perfect application assistance program, even with that, you might from a business standpoint, decide you don't want to spend your money on a

registry because there isn't enough demand because people in that country maybe are accessing everything through apps. It doesn't matter what URL those apps are ultimately pointing to, or there could be other considerations.

So that's where, what the research is suggesting, I think that would be great if we also ensure that whether it's done through focus groups or surveys, we looked up the actual market component. And I'm sure Stan would have, you know, a good way of framing that and designing that, that would look at whether or not there is actual demand there for registries, rather than assuming that everybody wants a registry and we just have to make the application program more accessible.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Drew. Yeah, Eleeza shared that suggestion with me, and I certainly that the questions along those lines should be incorporated into whatever sort of interaction we try to do with the list that we compile. I mean, obviously, there is a number of complicated factors there. One is that the program isn't demand driven.

I mean, there is a very open question as to whether there was some demand for any new gTLDs anywhere in the world, and not just in the developing world, and so the question of where people are coming from that are applicants is, I think, that that could still be one of the answers, but it's also, it's tricky in a way because we're looking for whether or not choice was created for folks on the one hand, right? Which could be accomplished by gTLDs being, you know, community or language

focused, or geographically focused, and all run from the global north, right?

I mean, you could still create sufficient choice for people that, if in fact, they wanted domains. And I think one of the tricky questions for us in this sub-team is to understand the application process itself, and understand you know, why more people from the more companies, potential, I don't know what to call them, but more entities, more potential registries didn't apply for strings from the global strong.

So it could be that they perceived that it wasn't sufficient demand, or that the costs were too high. There have been suggestions, for example, to move the guarantee away from the registry operator over to the registry service provider, for example, which could do a lot to mitigate some of the downstream stakes that would be faced by potential applicants, right? So, I mean, I think those are all valid questions. It's just a very interesting, there is a twist on that question from this group as opposed to the question being asked by the competition and choice team.

DREW BAGLEY:

Right. Did you see any...? When you were reading through this, and the fact that there are only three applicants, only one got through the process. I believe that did ultimately prevail. Did you come up with any other thoughts as to area we would explore through a focus group, to find out whether or not the financial assistance was sufficient or the promotion of it was sufficient, or anything else with...?

The actual applicant support itself?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, even then, applicant support is only one component of the application process, right? In other words, this is a question [CROSSTALK]...

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I just think it was applicant...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, right.

DREW BAGLEY: ...first.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But so the applicant support program, it could be that people didn't know about it. It could be that the process was too Byzantine, or as you said, it could be that people were concerned about costs beyond the initial application costs, for example. Right? So you know, I think that's... I think there is a valid questions, and so even if we bring in outside help actually come up with a list of people to talk to, and to facilitate executing those discussions, I think we're going to have to play an active role in defining the questions that get asked.

And so I don't pretend to know all of those right now. I think that that's why we have these conversations is to help, you know, whoever we engaged to... If you agree we should be engaged with somebody, as

opposed to trying to organize this ourselves, then we need to come up with what the right questions are to ask to try and ferret this out.

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah, so based on that last phone call and presentation from Dennis, something that he brought up was the way in which the awareness campaign is actually done. And so, you know, it was done through the internet. And so perhaps [inaudible] should have been done through other outlets as well, such as radio and television. So I guess maybe a way to approach it would be to break this down into headings, such as awareness, and then...

So first being made aware of the program itself, and then if we can kind of work together to pick apart different categories for the program itself to come up with questions. Perhaps if we could just do that right now, come up with at least the categories and then fill that in with questions, and then that might help us figure out how best to go about drilling further.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, that makes sense. Gao, you've been quiet. Do you have some thoughts on this?

Are you connected to us via microphone?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

...might be on mute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can't hear you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Looks like she's on a mobile device, so not sure, you're muted there Gao, or if you can type into the chat?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you hear us Gao?

[Inaudible] either.

[CROSSTALK]

All right, maybe we should proceed... Go ahead.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I was going to say, let's start with the headings you've already typed into the chat, the program awareness. And then....

JONATHAN ZUCK: So what I meant by program was the fact that there was even a new gTLD program.

DREW BAGLEY: Right, okay, yes. Actually, yeah, and so that is something where I know we're already doing research on that. So that's we're going to need that

answer to help them form the context of the application support awareness of the associated, so that will be a subset of that. So, [CROSSTALK] ...the Neilson survey, right?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Well no, because these are applicants, not registrants. I mean, I guess it might just answer public awareness or something. I think what we would need to do [CROSSTALK]...

...the idea that we have, right. The idea that we had a couple of calls ago, that actually came from Jordyn, I think, was trying to identify the cohorts in the third world to the people that did apply in the global north, and the types of firms that did. And so I've done a little bit to expand on that list, but I think the key then would be to go and find those companies.

So I feel like I have a decent list that I circulated, about how, about the types of people we should be talking to, but we need to find the actual instances of them, if that makes sense. And then so the first stage, I think, is trying to identify this sort of elusive list of people who should have applied, right?

You know, in an ideal world would have applied, as applicants, and potentially also for support. But there is also multi-million dollar companies in the global south that didn't apply, right? There is competitors, [L'Oreal] that didn't, that didn't apply for dot beauty, for example. Right? So I mean it's not just about applicant support, it's about the fact that the global south as a whole is underrepresented in the applicant pool, right?

DREW BAGLEY: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that's... So I feel like the first thing is to try and identify those folks, and that would be the first deliverable of this effort is to, you know, here is a list of people in Africa, Latin America, and maybe parts of the developing parts of southeast Asia, which I guess those three areas I would call Asia, I would call sort of the developing world, right? And then we'd take that list, discuss it, make additions or subtractions, or whatever, and then have the firm, you know, organize a way to talk to those people, either through individual calls or getting them together in a room for some kind of focus group.

DREW BAGLEY: And so with that....

JONATHAN ZUCK: We need to come up with questions, right? Go ahead, sorry.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, no, I'm sorry. If you would break that up by, we would identify, like you're suggesting, or someone who would have been interested in top beauty. So break it up by brand, and that sounds like something we could more discretely identify, and then when you look at who else

would you assume that's in the internet community would be interested in running a registry?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I can find the list that I circulated and put it back up again, but it's the same people... The idea, Jordyn's theory was, who were the people that applied, who did apply? And so that included brands, but not just applying for dot brands, but applying for generic strings that they wanted to advance via themselves. So like a dot beauty being applied for a large brand like L'Oreal or something, right?

And then there is registrars who applied for strings to the applicants, right? And so I think... So there is other community, and I'm trying to think of the other ones I have on my list. I'll go back and find it.

DREW BAGLEY:

You can bring it back to the list, because you know how our emails are these days, being bombarded [inaudible]...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. Email is just not a terrific way to maintain this information, unfortunately.

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah, and then we could... Okay, that sounds great. We can work off of that. Yeah then, especially we're thinking about the generics, in an era in which we can have IDNs, that's definitely that we need to pursue as

identifying like you said, those you know, likely entities that would have been ideal for applying for one of these TLDs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So it's, like I said, it's looking at the types of folks that applied and then just finding their analogs, basically. That's all. That's the exercise. So we can figure out what those things are, but the exercise is to say, what are the characteristics of the applicants that did apply? And then find those same people in the global south. Find those same entities.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. That sounds good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that would be part one, I think, of a study, as it's coming together in my head. And then part two, would be once that list is established, either outreach directly, or facilitating our outreach to those cohorts. Right? So it may be they do a set of call downs, and then we can follow up with additional questions, or it may be that we try to put together an in-person focus group, and then members of the review team that are in these regions could go and attend the focus group that's in that region, if possible.

Does that make sense?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, absolutely. I think either that approach, or once we identify them, maybe we would do an initial outreach, so that would information a question more...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, like take a sampling [CROSSTALK]...

DREW BAGLEY: ...develop a couple of questions... [CROSSTALK] ...to do the research. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, they can do that too, I guess, right? That could be another milestone for them, which is to [CROSSTALK] a couple to expand on the questions. I just have a feeling a vendor might help drive us through this process better than we would on our own volunterness [sic] drive to a conclusion. So I think the key is to leave lots of opportunities for participation by the review team, and build them into any proposal, but not rely on the review team to be the impetus to drive this to conclusion.

I think that's one, that's where my head is.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, that sounds good. Okay, so then you'll bring that list back to life, and then from there, I guess we'll proceed in identifying as entities, further identifying the characteristics of the actual applicants...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And so that's the question is... So I threw out one firm that Carlton has heard of, but I ask, like I said, Carlton and Carlos, why do I ask their ideas of firms that people can do this. If you know anybody, or Gao, if you know of anybody, then let me know as well. The people I threw out is Aim Global, Andrew Max firm, that has got a lot of strong ties in Africa and Latin America, but less in Asia, I think.

But I don't know the answer to that. I haven't approached them. But at this point, we ought to just be identifying people who we think could be engaged to do this. So if you know somebody, then let me know that as well.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Will do.

MARGIE MILAM: Jonathan, it's Margie, if I could jump in for a minute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Always. The water is fine.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you, thank you. I think this is actually something Nielson could do. They're really good at focus groups. And you know, there is nothing wrong with us giving them a list of people to talk to, versus using one of their existing groups, I would think. And from a contracting perspective,

it would be really easy to just add another addendum, and we also know their style as to how they field the questions, and how they take input. You know, running us through the process would be really easy because we've already done it for this consumer survey and the registrant survey, versus starting with a totally new firm that we don't have a relationship with, [inaudible] contracting, and have to work with them, you know, with our group.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. I mean, let's definitely take that in consideration as well. I'm not sure that I trust Neilson to come up with the people we ought to be talking to. So at least that first milestone, I think, we probably want outside help on, but...

MARGIE MILAM:

Exactly. That's the part about identifying [inaudible] and the focus groups would have to be, you know, working with... We would have to generate that, you know, we'd be giving them a list and that's a separate process because I agree with you, they wouldn't be able to identify those people.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And my feeling is that we can still use help in generating that list. And so that's the, that might still require, I guess I'm not afraid of putting some of these through contracting if they're the right choice, and then once we got to that milestone, we could then decide who best to organize the, just talking to them, and it might make sense to let

Nielson back in for that. And so let's have that conversation, but I guess I also contend that it's probably still makes sense to get help in generating that list in the first place.

Because I feel like we're coming up with our characteristics, right? These are the types of entities that applied, and who are those types of entities in the developing world, is its own research project. Does that make sense?

MARGIE MILAM: So you're going beyond the names of people who actually said some interest in the, or considered applying?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so.

MARGIE MILAM: That's what you're saying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so, yeah.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, that makes sense. I'm not sure Nielson would be...

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was Jordyn's concept from the other call was trying to figure out who the analogs were to the people who did apply. So part of what we're trying to do is, by looking at the questions, you know, the queries that came in, is that, I think that will help with that list, but it's also the people...

If one of the reasons is unawareness, right? Then we need to reach out to people that didn't... That in theory should have, but didn't reach out about applying.

MARGIE MILAM: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does that make sense?

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah. It does. Is that something, Eleeza, you think a GDD could do? Someone on your, you know, the research side? Or is that not something that is intuitive, or we would have the resources on to do?

Eleeza, I think you're on mute if you're answering.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I am on mute, sorry. I started talking. So what I was saying, I think it's something we could certainly take a stab at, and I think that Jonathan, and Carlton, and Carlos will all kind of weigh the foundation of this conversation already, in terms of different categories in looking at it.

There might be value in having someone from the outside look at this, and looking at different, particularly a firm that might do different types of consumer marketing.

They might look at it in a different way, you know, if you're looking at, for example, the beauty products market, who are the companies there, that would be relevant. So I guess I can kind of see doing it in both ways. I guess it depends on how comprehensive we want to look at this, or if there, you know, are particular areas. So for example, beauty products, and I don't know, shoes, and something else, you know.

Looking at it in particular markets and trying to find those types of companies. There is a lot of different ways to do it. It seems like something, a large [inaudible] to wrap my head around now, but there was a little bit more directive in terms of what you think would be most representative that would help.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So let's put meat on the bones, and that will help drive the conversation. I just know that we're in a little bit of a time crunch to make some decisions about outside research, so I can take a first pass at this, and I'll circulate, I guess to the whole group because this group is just about applicant support and this question transcends that to some extent.

A potential outline for a research effort maybe, because obviously, there is parts of this are easy. Like one of the cohorts is registrars, right? And we can, we know who those are. And we do know who at least asked questions, I guess to some extent, Eleeza, you were able to get

some record of that. There is just a part of me that thinks that some of this happens with local, with knowledge, right? About companies in these areas, and it's not an entirely theoretical exercise, I guess.
[CROSSTALK]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: ...we might want someone with a little bit more consumer markets knowledge, which is why, I don't know, if Neilson relays that there are lots of other like consumer insight firms that do this type of research, you know, I don't know if the correlation is exactly what we're looking for here, but they would at least be familiar with, you know, certain geographic areas and certainly particular markets, such as we're looking for big brands, for example, or you know, markets for different goods or services, things like that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: ...using, you know, a firm that's exclusively primarily focused on protective work. It might be more useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe. I do know that a lot of American companies are completely stymied about... We apparently know almost nothing about consumers in Africa, for example. It's not general knowledge about that yet. There is all kinds of chatter around, in the development community, about you

know, trying to put efforts in place to spur entrepreneurship, and at the same time, gather information about consumer practices in developing world, because we don't know what they are.

So I'm happy to start that process with an outline, and then maybe we can go, we just need to proceed quickly, I guess, to identify somebody that might be able to help us come up with that list. And maybe those are two separate efforts, and we can address the best vendor for each of the efforts then. [CROSSTALK] list, and talking to them.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry. I was just going to say, in the interest of time, it would be helpful for us to at least reach out to Neilson to see what their capabilities are in this regard and see if they can come up with any type of...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: ...that they can assist you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, I can take that as an action.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And if you think about what you're talking about, it's not just identifying the companies that would be, like potentially could have been the applicants, but even like who within the company you would speak to. You know, is it the product person? The marketing person? The legal person? That's probably a harder question to figure out who inside your organization, versus, you know, what kind of company it is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: For sure. I think that's exactly right. And that's the, that's the tricky part. I mean, some of this is driven through IP interests, and brand awareness, and things like that. So there would be different types of people in different types I think. I think you're absolutely right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And Eleeza, do we have any insight from running the program as to, like the point of contact for the applicant. Is, you know, I think the role, are they the, you know, trademark lawyer? Are they the marketing person? Are they some engineer? You know, because that might help identify, you know... It may very well be that if we do find, you know, in the millions of companies, you might reach out to all three roles.

You know, the lawyers, the marketing person, whatever, head of product development.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, but I can ask around and see if that's something that we can, you know, sort through in our [inaudible] database to see who the point of contact is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And then, there is a lot of different answers there, but we might get [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, well that's... Wow. That's one piece of the puzzle.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just a second. This is from Florida, hang on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I guess in moving forward, in terms of any other work, or research, or how we actually may want to structure this discussion on the applicant support program. Is there anything else that we're mistaking here that we should add to the equation before we move on to the next chapter?

DREW BAGLEY: I think that's a decision, because we already have established this notion of looking at whether or not there was a market for these things in the developing world, and whether that might be one of the applicants, and that's going to be, whether or not that could be, the issue could be tied to part and parcel to the discussions that will go on

after we identify potential applicants, or would have been applicants, against entities that look similar to theirs who ultimately, from the developed world, who ultimately did apply.

I think a lot of questions will hopefully be answered by what we just talked about that plan, so I think we can move on to chapter seven. [CROSSTALK] ...thoughts about where you wanted us to kind of focus on with chapter seven?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

So one thing I was going to point to, excuse me, on the issue of [inaudible] versions, is, let me pull up the link here. And so in September, there is the link, ICANN announced this amendment service for the COI, which basically allows registry operators to change the level of funding in their COI, and this is partially in response to what the findings were here in this chapter, which is, you know, for many applicants, this was kind of burdensome requirements with late interest.

Kind of gets back to some of the questions that we're just talking about in terms of who all applied and why they didn't apply. So, this is one area where there has been at least some movement. I didn't really have anything else to point to in that regard, but wanted to make sure that was part of the conversation.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. And part of this is the issue of moving this away from the applicant to service provider, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I believe so.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's my understanding, that at least a portion of the proposal for reform is to... I mean, there has just been general talk, and we know that [Jeff and Avri's?] team are looking into this as well. There is some talk about trying to create a preapproved list of registry service providers so they don't have to keep giving reevaluated, which is much of a convenience thing on their side, but I know that Akrim talks about this as a way to lower the stress of the people that had to put these guarantees in place by just taking on a RSP that had already made the guarantee.

DREW BAGLEY: Can you remind me? What are we...? We did mention backend providers and how we were going to identify backend providers, and I think try to see how many different backend providers are actually being used because didn't somebody say it was only around six? So I guess this would...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's more than that, but yeah. I sent out [CROSSTALK]...

DREW BAGLEY: ...there was some number that low for, maybe it was six or X percent, for some really large percentage of actual new TLD registries. Does that sound right from a previous discussion? Unless that was something where we... Maybe somebody said, we don't know how many there is for 90% of them? Maybe 90% of them are, you know, providing a small number, and maybe that's where I'm getting that six number from.

Maybe some hypothetical from there. But nonetheless, is this something that where it would be a tie in to whatever other research we're doing about backend providers in terms of...? In case we are going to make... In case we think that that could be a solution, is shifting this to the service providers, then I guess we would want to know a bit more about those service providers.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So in terms of the research I did in terms of the backend providers, this was the large zip file I sent you all a link to, what I did was map each string to [CROSSTALK]...

DREW BAGLEY: I remember that, yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah. So you can... So that's for 942, 941 strings, I guess. So you can look at that and see exactly how many are listed. Actually...

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, let me pull that up. Yeah, the call I'm seeing about is something we have about two months ago. So I think we're talking about a hypothetical situation. Yeah, but it did have tie into this, because it was when we were alluding this, I just remember this topic in general, that if that we were wondering about, I think, access to backend providers.

And this may even have been in the sub-team call, I can't recall, but we were wondering about that. That could have tied into applications from the developing world, if for example, in the developed world, for whatever reason, there is much more awareness or much more access, actual service providers, and perhaps that was some sort of impediment that we would want to look into. [CROSSTALK]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's what this [inaudible] file that I put together...

DREW BAGLEY: Now I remember that. [CROSSTALK] ...extensively that night, I forgot to do it again last night.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So there is more than six, it looks like. Maybe about 20 or so.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, do we know anything about...? So there has been this discussion about shifting to a service provider, but do we know anything about the counter argument or if there is a counter argument?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Not that I know of, but... Scrolling through here. I'm afraid this isn't an area where I'm particularly well versed. I'm trying to remember what I've read about it here.

So I wonder if what might be helpful for this topic area is to think about a little bit more about the question we're trying to ask? And what the findings of this particular chapter were, and see what else we can dig up, if anything, to get you, you know, to the point where you think you can, findings or recommendations.

I think we might need a bit more time to read this a bit more carefully because I don't have any better suggestions at this point. [Inaudible] ask the question, I guess that's the question for you guys. What is the question you ask of this topic area?

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah, I mean, I guess the question I'm most interested in this is, I guess we really want to find out, is this an actual deterrent to other would be applicants? So would there have been more applicants from the developing world, but for this requirement? And so that would actually tie into the research we just talked about for the previous chapter, because it would be the same people we're targeting, and to me, that's [inaudible] the most with this.

And then what we could do, we could then do further analysis after we answer that basic question, and that's where we can figure out if our suggestion is to do this suggestion that's been already discussed about

shifting this burden to the service providers. But in terms of relevance, that's the thing that's most relevant to me.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So but then, one thing I would suggest, I mean this goes beyond a developing [inaudible] question, I think the conclusion somewhere...

DREW BAGLEY: The conclusion talks about how it effects everyone.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Every applicant has to make [CROSSTALK] and more than 20% had three or more amendments. So this is obviously something that was problematic across the board. [CROSSTALK]

DREW BAGLEY: ...context of, this in the context of [CROSSTALK] ...the previous topic. That is what's relevant to me, is this the impediment where they say oh the applicants are not perfect but we can never overcome this, and then that would obviously tie into the trend that many people are facing anyway. So then yes, so that should be one thing, just pertaining to application, or applicant support. And then separately, we should be looking at this topic holistically, and the way we should look at that.

We already know that there are issues that the applicants had to make amendments. And so, I guess we should just focus on the question at hand here, whether there are other ways to fund in the event of a TLD

failure. And so that we know that there are other ways, but I guess that is something that we should come up with is that we should, I guess come up with a list of other ways that could be funded. [Inaudible] would be shifting it. Sorry, what was that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I was going to say, so that kind of falls into the category if what your recommendation might be, right? Would be in the category of, it would be the alternative of COI.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. And so then we would have to come up with some criteria to analyze that, what the alternatives would be. Yeah, so there is the application support part, and then you go to the alternatives in general.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So, I guess, working backwards here. Just... What other data points that you'd think you require to answer this question?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Kind of worried if this is a priority or not in the chat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I don't know if I should be typing or talking, so... It's such a small group [CROSSTALK]... No, no, so part of what we did in our exercise with Jeff, and Steve, and Avri was to lay out what our priorities were within the question of the application and evaluation process. And

there was a heavy emphasis on confusion, GAC advice, and the developing world as the sort of prisms through which we were going to be trying to ask these questions.

And so, taking a step back and asking this in a general form about whether it was the best way to approach this, would seem to fall outside the emphasis that we had [inaudible], and I wonder if it's something that we should try to address the more general question, or if it's something that we should try to talk to the PDP folks about whether or not they're trying to address it.

Because it sort of falls, as a general question, it falls into the category of things that we let go. Unless I'm missing something.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

DREW BAGLEY: Gao, are you there by chance, audio wise? Because I just wanted to hear your perspective since you have a lot more perspective on the companies in the developing world.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess it's my point. I think Eleeza was trying to pull you out of just considering this as a developing world question, right? Or am I misunderstanding the exercise that you're trying to outline?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, because it did effect everybody. And I think Eleeza is right, absolutely with that...

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I agree. The question, [inaudible] that agreed, is that it effected everyone, is that our question for our review team or not? And that's the broader question. I completely agree that it effects everyone.

DREW BAGLEY: So I would say, yes, that is a question for the review team. Because that still could have effected competition, and I think it's still [inaudible] our mandate, even if it effected everybody.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

DREW BAGLEY: Although, I guess, [inaudible] and prioritize that in looking at the developing world.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So I guess we can then frame this to make sure that these questions are captured in whatever type of focus group exercise that we try to take on, but still wanted to tackle this or maybe produce some

findings on the effectiveness of this component of the application process. Would that be the right way of looking at it?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess, it's largely a financial issue, right? And one of the things that we did raise in our brainstorming session was just about whether or not the process was, it isn't so much about the developing world, but whether there was an economic divide that may exist even in the developed world between the haves and the have nots in the application process.

And so that was raised as an issue as well, and maybe that part of what we would be looking at here is this notion to, you know, access via a wider variety of entities even in the developed world. And then we get at the same type of question that we're trying to ask about the developing world, is you know, did this act as a kind of barrier to entry for companies anywhere? And not just the developing world.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So, is there...? Taking a step back then, are there other data points that would help you to reach those to reach reasonable findings on that topic that go beyond what you see here? In terms of the amendments that were required and so forth.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, again it feels like it ought to be discussion based. We need to try and talk to folks that... I mean, these people might be easier to identify to look at the people that fell out of the process, perhaps and try to understand whether or not this had an effect.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I mean certainly there are...

JONATHAN ZUCK: What do folks think? Go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I was going to say, obviously, we can look to the drawn application, and speak to those folks as a group. I'm looking here at the paragraph just about the conclusion paragraph, and there is 965 [inaudible], I'm sorry I'm looking at [inaudible]. But in any case, I think there is a good pool to ask some questions there. In addition to potential applicants, those who withdrew and where the [inaudible] along the way.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So let's make it an action item to... I think we want them anyway. Let's develop a list of applicants, and explore [CROSSTALK]... No, exactly, exactly right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I think you would probably want to speak to, speak to that group about a number of different topics. So, maybe what we need to do is start coming up with a way of capturing the questions and the topics you would want to propose to these people. Again, if it's interviews, a survey, focus groups or what not.

But because of the [inaudible] we might have an easier time engaging someone to help with this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think Drew's suggestion, it might make sense to reach out to them as a whole and see what subset of them, just say we sign, that we're willing to be talked to, and then try to put together an informal discussion, which might help us... I mean, I think we should obviously start with questions, but I think it might help us a lot to refine them before doing a survey or anything like that, all of them, is to see who is willing to get on the phone and have an informal discussion about you know, what led to their withdrawal or whatever.

And it will inform the questions they want to ask, I think.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe we should...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. So I mean, just quickly, there is a very easily accessible list of all of the withdrawn applications online, all with email contact information. So I certainly think we could reach out to all of them and say you're listed as a contact for an application on a string that was withdrawn, we would like to speak to you about, you know, maybe providing them with three or four topics, and provide some background on the review team and see what kind of responses you get.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm happy to do that initial outreach.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you think it would carry more whatever.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll use my low radio voice so that it has more gravitas. [LAUGHTER]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Excellent. Well let's, since we have you on the phone now. What other topics do you think we could, would be worth posing to those who withdrew?

DREW BAGLEY: Sorry, I just said, um.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Obviously the big question is why, why did you withdraw? Right? I think we might want to ask that question in the general sense because it will help prioritize....

DREW BAGLEY: ...things as possible.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And it will help us prioritize the things that might afterward get identified as inconvenience or contributing to the withdraw, is maybe asking an open ended question, because maybe there may be something in the back of their mind that this is the straw that broke the camel's back or whatever.

And then come up with a list of other questions that are, you know, about... I mean, I think we could come up with a list of questions from this report, that asks like did you feel like you got sufficient help with your application? Were there sufficient resources available to process

the application? Was cost a consideration? Did you consider applying for applicant support?

And each one of those things, if not, then why not? And did...? Was the conflict resolution process seem intimidating? Was it another applicant that applied for the same string that, or something sufficiently similar that you thought you wouldn't have a chance of getting it?

Was it changing business objectives, where you just changed your mind and put in an application because everybody was doing it and it was around? And you didn't even really know that when you applied that you really wanted, whether you wanted it or not?

So I mean, I can think of a number of questions like that to kind of ferret them out, but it might be, makes sense to go through the recommendations in this document and just turn them all into separate style questions and put them out there. But again, I think in conversation form is much as anything.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I don't know. I mean, I could be wrong. It could be that maybe we want a very small [inaudible], just a few of them to develop the questions, because it could be that people don't want to speak [CROSSTALK] larger issues.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I would prefer that to begin with, open ended questions, then it would help with identify things that aren't in the report. And then from there, we could actually have some methodology applied and draft up a list of consistent questions we would ask all the other people we've identified.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So I'm just looking through this list. I think some of these are related to applicants who did successfully apply, and you know, the [inaudible] of these registries.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So they just withdraw particular applications.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Exactly, yeah, like [inaudible] is on here, [inaudible] registry is on here, Google is on here. Minds and Machines. You know, all of these ones are here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So can we control for them and just grab the ones that didn't end up getting strings?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't know if there is a way to do that in here. You know, if we had a database of the existing strings, I could write a query very easily that

came up with that list. Maybe you and I should have a talk after this about databases.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Maybe we should.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Access?] is wetting the bed as I'm trying to split the thing up into normalized tables.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah. What I have in that table is actual strings, and what I'm pulling up in front of me right now is from the [inaudible] and I'll just... So you can click on withdrawn, the application status, and you'll come up with 469 applications that were withdrawn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Application status, withdrawn. And can I export from these results?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's the problem. I don't think you can. [Inaudible] this page. [Inaudible]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so I don't blame you then Eleeza, it's not your fault.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's what I tell everyone, every day.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not my fault. I guess that's the... I guess if I had these, I could do, I mean, I could do a comparison query.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And there isn't a... Is this database a database someplace? Is there some place that we could just ask them to do an export to access for us?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Let me find out. I don't know who... I have a guess as to who owns it, but I have to find out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Because my guess is that there is a database that's supporting this webpage, that's on some SQL Server or something like that, and we could just do an export from that, and we could play with it more.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. I will work on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know your list is long.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Something to do every day.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We appreciate all that you do.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So let me work on that, and I think we'll all discuss internally maybe what's the best way to reach out to a large group of people, maybe you all can think about, [inaudible] talking to a few, or maybe perhaps, you know, pushing out a mass email and if we get a few responses, inviting them to a call with this group, or perhaps with the whole review team for an interview or a discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Because we can get a few people, and obviously the people that we would want would be people that withdraw, not people like Google. And if we had a few people, it would help us to refine our questions, and then we can put together a Survey Monkey survey, and we could put it out to all of them and see what kind of answers we get back. And then ask from the respondents, who will be willing.

And then in the survey, ask who would be willing to participate in a discussion about it. Something like that. That's like a three part process, if possible.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I think that... I'm looking through these applicants [inaudible] withdrew, Microsoft withdrew for dot doc. So, we are going to see tons of variation, and some of it is going to be, like you suggested Jonathan, a business decision after the fact where maybe they rushed for it, because everyone was doing it, and then they realized it doesn't make sense.

But yeah, I think this is a really good approach. There is a small phone call, and then develop, yeah, a Survey Monkey type of survey from that, span that out, and then who is, see who would be willing to be talked to in a more formal way.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or even less formal. Who is willing to just gab about it?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. So I mean, I guess I can try to codify my list of questions, a straw man list of questions, for that group. I mean, it's just the stuff that I was spit balling, I can try to write down if that's helpful.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. That would be great. Gao, I see your hand raised, hopefully you have mic now.

GAO MOSWEU: Yes, I just wanted to say like, I think Eleeza you mentioned that maybe when we speak to these applicants, we can get them to the larger review team or to this team. I'm just thinking like, if we do the review team, it might be a little bit too intimidating. It seems like an interrogation. So, a call with this team, rather than a bigger...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think that's a fair point, actually because [it's kind of tough to] moderate a large discussion like that.

GAO MOSWEU: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: There are some intimidating people on the review team, that's for sure.
[LAUGHTER]

So we'll nominate a subset of people to talk to them and ask those questions, I guess. I think that makes sense. Thank you Gao, good idea.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, so kind of stray from the COI discussion, but I guess this is all related. Anything else on this topic?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Eleeza, is it your sense that there is anybody other than people that fell out of the process that we should be concerned about with respect to COI?

Because I feel like, to degree to which it generated inconvenience or stress, is something that the PDP folks are very focused on. And we are less so in a way, right? I think our group is a little less concerned about the people that in fact made it through the process than the people that didn't make it, just generally speaking, that seems to be the case.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. I mean, the review's task is looking at whether or not this portion of evaluation [inaudible], this is actually effective. So yes, something certainly made it through, obviously, with some headaches to come along with it. But I wonder if there... You're right, is there much more there for this group to draw conclusions on? Or is it enough to pass that off to the PDP group and allow them to make their recommendations for future program.

Is that what you're suggesting?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think, kind of. I mean, I'm doing my best to soften my stance on that PDP, right? And adopt a cooperative perspective. And I guess the basis for that is basically our brainstorming in Los Angeles, where we set our own priorities, and the things that we thought that we would review about each of these components.

And so, that generated a finite list that we then used to kind of raise the stakes and lower the stakes accordingly, vis a vis the PDP folks, that's all.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's up to you guys how you want to approach it. I can't think of anything further to bring to your attention on this topic, beyond what we've already discussed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. All right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Maybe that's your answer.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then I guess we're done with that topic, for now.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: For now, all right. Excellent. Then with the time remaining, should we talk about chapter eight on program management. I admit, I'm roughly on this [inaudible], so I'm going to scroll down to the conclusion to refresh my memory.

The conclusion is on page 174, right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

DREW BAGLEY: ...did this last week.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So this chapter was really getting at, kind of more program management, more of the oversight of everything, timelines, systems that were used, and for allowing for more time, or building more time and more historical knowledge into the program, as it continued, repeat the mistakes of the past, I guess. I'm getting a little bit philosophical, but...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I feel like a lot of this chapter touches a lot of the other topics that we're talking about. I don't really have a good suggestion for how best to approach this area.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I mean, it certainly will provide further material for questions as I go through this. I see additional, you know, one of the things that came up in our brainstorming process was the objection process, for example. And so I mean, I think each of these are worthy of discussion. I know that the PDP folks are planning to do a series of discussions with applicants. And so I mean, I think what this may, and what we told

them, is that we would try to supplement their questions with our own. And so my guess as I'm going through this chapter, that this is a wealth spring of possible questions for applicants to get their feedback on these different mechanisms.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And again, I think we'll find ourselves looking for the people that were sort of dramatically affected by these things, as opposed to inconvenienced by them. I think that's kind of where our group seems to be placing its emphasis.

DREW BAGLEY: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Do you, sort of an aside, do you have a sense of timing on this PDP group is going to start to see [inaudible]....?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nope, not yet. They do have a... I mean, Steve Chan put together a timeline for them, but I don't know if they are approved yet by their group. Those have some preliminary indications in them. And so I haven't internalized that document yet, but...

But I will...

I guess he doesn't go by Steve in his emails. Is it Stephen?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Steven with a "V" I think. He goes by Steve, it's with a "V." Steve dot Chan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, Steve dot Chan?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yup.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Let's see.

Okay, my goodness. It's very small print. Okay.

I'm just reading through their work plan, that's all, if you're wondering why I'm quiet.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: As you do that, Drew, any further thoughts on this chapter? Other means of evaluating this portion of the program for effectiveness?

While you're thinking, Margie has her hand raised.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, as I was scrolling through the chapter, it's been a while since I looked at it, I don't think it's necessary, I mean, obviously, this is your story, this review team, to have to go into every aspect of every chapter, but really focus on perhaps the issues that relates to enhancing competition or protecting [inaudible]...

You know, things that are truly the focus of the review team, because you know the PDP is also underway, looking at other things. And so, as you look at issues you want to focus on for this chapter. You might look at it from that perspective.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I think that's a great point. To just reiterate what [inaudible], versus getting off the lead to some of this stuff, some of the suggestions over, given that actual software itself, and technical difficulties.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so that's what I was saying about looking for those that were dramatically affected as opposed to inconvenienced by them, and using that as a bar, a filter for going through these things. I'm trying to read Steve's document, and it looks like he's got about a 90 day deadline on some of these, that was on the accreditation program.

Sort of like a 40, 50 days is around the times. So it looks like August, September is what they were looking at to have some preliminary thoughts on this clarity of application process. Number 55 with systems accreditation programs, applicant guidebook. So those are some of the things that they got going in track one, which is this procedural stuff,

and that appears to be, you know, between 40 and 90 days, it seems like. So they have a request for constituency comment, input from SOs, ACs, integrate input.

I don't actually see their survey in here, so maybe we need to reach back out to them to find out if that suggestion came to fruition. Because I don't see it in here, but I could be missing it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not sure either... I don't recall seeing any talk about it recently. I can tell what Steve said on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I mean, we can bring it up on the next call and things like that, but I remember that coming up when we were in, wherever we were, Marrakech.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. I did too.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But it looks like they've got a fairly tight turn around on evaluating overall progress in track one. I mean, it's about a 90 day. So the entirety of it appears to be about 90 days.

From what I can tell.

Well, the entirety is 126 days, I guess, for the overall progress. For all of track one, 128, 126 days. And I think that's, start dates... Okay. Yeah, so I mean, so they're trying to get a... I think they're trying to put a request for information in front of people in August.

And that's when they would start [inaudible], so some of these, so actually going through some of these things starting in August, now that I'm reading this more carefully. So that's a little bit late for us, I guess, on some of this. Which only underscores Margie's point, I think, about really figuring out what portions of this we want to tackle.

And focusing in on that, because if we need to put together our own discussion with applicants, I guess we want to try to drive it sooner than the fall.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, definitely.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But again, I, my sense is that we are most interested for those that, for whom these ended up representing barriers to entry, for one reason or another. That does seem to be the tenor of our group. We can bring that back up on the plenary to confirm that, I don't want to misrepresent anything, but that feels like where the discussions went on these procedural issues.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Are we focusing on those who draft out of the process? That for example, just go back to the questions for the withdrawn applicants?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're definitely focused on them. The question is, is there anybody outside of them that, I can't, I don't know if there is a, is there a category of applicants that stayed in for, you know, some stuff but dropped out for others? And were participate less? I mean, I guess that gets to be a difficult assessment to make. Right?

Obviously, I mean the Googles and the Affilias aren't the people that we're worried about, but are there people that, you know, made three applications but dropped two of them, or something like that, might still be interesting? Right? But I feel as a general rule, working from the withdrawals is a good place to start, for sure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So then perhaps we [inaudible] this conversation on that group for now and see where that takes us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Maybe gear up to talk to those who are successful. I mean, obviously we can, depending on how you want to invite those people, we can do

our own types of focus group or interviews with those existing registries, and how we [inaudible] contacts with them as it is. So that's where we can, I think, make an effort to do at any time the group sees fit.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I don't know the best way to have a conversation now about this, since all of us appear to be reading it as we go, on this particular chapter. Drew, how would you like to take the assignment of reading through the chapter and from it, generating a series of questions that we might want to ask those...?

DREW BAGLEY: I was just waiting for you to ask me. I'd love to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I carry a ring around at all times for just this purpose, Drew.

DREW BAGLEY: All right. That sounds like a good plan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. [CROSSTALK] ...as well.

GAO MOSWEU: Actually, I don't know [inaudible]...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Gao, you're very faint.

GAO MOSWEU: ...to then shed on the level of our [inaudible] or the communications [inaudible] that were done in advance of the new gTLD [inaudible]... But I did find, it was this chapter, I actually read this chapter, annotated it, and [inaudible] all over it, and it doesn't really have the [inaudible] by region. The [inaudible] number of countries in how many went, and then actually how many applicants from the region.

So I think it's kind of [inaudible] an idea of the level of communication or outreach and the number of applicants from the particular region. [Inaudible] yeah. So for instance, in Africa, we had three countries, and that was one of the least visited countries in the outreach program, and we had [inaudible] in the application and revealed the [inaudible].

And then we have like Asia, Australia, face to face [inaudible] there was 11 countries visited and there were 303 [inaudible]... The train, I don't know how [inaudible]... I think it's sort of telling that in some areas, maybe the outreach could have been, could have reached, maybe it had more [inaudible] Africa [inaudible]...

We could have had, if we had more outreach, we could maybe [inaudible] or Latin America [inaudible] and also [inaudible]... The outreach had [inaudible]... And so you can see the correlation [inaudible]... So [inaudible]... Jonathan, you can help [inaudible]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Gao. Definitely. I think that... After Dennis's report, and as we start to try and do the interviews with the people that withdrew, with the people.... When we identify the people that didn't apply, I guess it's more so, and we reach out to them, I think part of the questions that we'll be trying to ask is exactly what you're suggesting, which is were you, did someone reach out to you? And did you feel supported?

And things like that, and ask these questions of businesses and entities in Africa and Latin America and Asia, that have the same characteristics of the people that applied in the global north, and tried to get an understanding if there is some correlation, you know, between outreach and application. I think that's exactly one of the things that we would be trying to ask.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, so...

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I think we've got an assignment to Drew to go through this chapter and turn it into some questions, based on the prism that we are trying to put on these process recommendations.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And the question we would pose to the successful applicants? Is that what you were thinking?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, to the unsuccessful ones, to the withdrawn ones.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: To the withdrawn ones. Right, right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. All right. Anything else on this chapter?

DREW BAGLEY: For now...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can't think of anything.

DREW BAGLEY: ...read through it. I have to run, because I have to go pick up my son from daycare before this rain starts here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Yeah, we're getting crazy Biblical rain here too.

DREW BAGLEY: Are you in Florida or are you in DC?

JONATHAN ZUCK: DC.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, you're in DC, okay. Me too. I'm getting ready to head for Florida tomorrow.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is there anything else we need to cover on this call, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, this was, that was it, just to go through those three chapters. And we'll follow up with each other on our different action items before next call, and we'll go from there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, that sounds good. And Eleeza, let's stay in communication on databases. It feels like we're really circling in on the need for something that we can really run some queries against. How are your efforts coming?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: They're coming. I've been watching some tutorials and that seems to help me. So, that's been sort of helping me to build something, but I'm a novice with access. So it's kind of slow going for me. So yeah, maybe we should kind of take some time to talk about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Let me know if you'd like. I was trying to use the wizard and the wizard crashed. Because I'm very familiar with SQL databases, right, and with Access 18 years ago, but it's, when it just crashes and says something inscrutable, it's tough to figure out what was wrong, because ideally, we should be able to separate that large spreadsheet into several tables that are related to each other. [CROSSTALK] ...constrained elements, more unique elements.

So there is a manual way to do it through distinct queries, so I don't know what you're trying to do, but the wizard is supposed to take care of it. I don't know if you've tried the wizard.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, I haven't. I mean, I'm still working on building the tables. So I'm still kind of early into it. Let me play with it a bit [CROSSTALK]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: ...because maybe the wizard will work for you and it didn't for me, because sometimes it's idiosyncrasies about the virus software that affect database [inaudible] and string stuff like that, but we can... Because right now, I get a little bit stymied. So I was about to start a manual process, but it would be great if we don't have to do that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't disagree with you. Let me see if I can play with that, and if I come up with anything.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Under data tools, there is something called the table analyzer. And what I can do is, I can send you what I believe the structure, the database structure should be. If you'd like, and then you can... Because it only takes like five minutes to go through the...

So let me know. If you want to do it on the call, or I can send an email, but let's communicate on that. I guess we don't have to take everybody's time here on this call to have this conversation. Let's work that out. I feel like querying is something that we're both itching to do.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, very much. Okay, why don't you send me what you have and give me a little bit of time to play with this, and then we can talk about it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, sounds good.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right, thank you very much. Thank you Gao for sticking it out, I know it's late for you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]