HYDERABAD – CCT Wrap-up and Debriefing Session
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:45 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

THERESA: …and he's done this in his prior job, and his prior departments. Is, really thinking about, what do you think long term trends are that will impact either ICANN the organization, the mission of the organization, the community, the multistakeholder model, any of those things?

And I know, a lot of times, have different conversations amongst each other, observations about X or Y or whatever it is. It's really intended just to try and capture that.

We're going to divide up into three groups, and we'll do the count off, and do that. The groups will go to the white boards here, with… It's very, very simple. Traditional sticky pads. And just have a conversation amongst yourselves on what you think some trends are. Now, this group in particular, given all of the focus on some of the areas of work, might have observations around things that may be other groups don't have observations around, and so I think that's one of the unique factors that Göran was also focused in on here.

You identify between five and 10, and just list them, and agree on what those are. And then each of the three groups comes and presents it to the wider, the rest of us, right? And try to come up with might be a consolidated list of 10 to 15 trends that you think are out there to look at, and we just capture that, and we put that into a compiled list. And can look at that as we look at sort of the future consolidation around different trends that come up.

The… What was I going to say? There was one other thing. Obviously, each of the three groups, there might be duplications. So, duplications, we've seen, for example, around the threats of cyber security and threats of attacks, various things. Many people have identified those.

Another one that internally amongst some of our departments, have been identified as, with the use of applications and different technology, the impact on the DNS space more broadly, and the unique identifier space. Those are just some examples of different things where we've seen different groups raise the same thing.

We're also noticing that we ran a session with our GSE team, for example, they do a lot of external engagement. So they identified some things that were different than let's say, you know, the IT team might have thought about. So, that's just

some examples of things. Very simple. We're run it for 45 minutes, I'd say, at each of the white boards. And how much time do we have? How much time have I taken from all of you?

10 after 11? Okay, so maybe 45 minutes. If people are done earlier, we can end that earlier, and then just come back to the group and present, and talk it through, and it will be captured. And then what's captured, we can just recirculate to the group and see if that sounds like, you know, things that you've identified, and then that will just be put into sort of a long term compiled list, as Göran had described.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I just had a quick question. Beyond it being part of a long-term compiled list, is there a strategic plan for doing more trend analysis, or data collection, or something that this is feeding into? In other words, does the cumulative top 10, is there some commitment to collecting data about it?

I mean, that's the part I think folks would be interested in hearing about.

THERESA: Yeah. So, definitely. As they're compiled, and you identify, let's say, a top 10 overall, or you narrow it down to a top five, ensuring that there is also the data behind all of that in the

research. So, you can say, for example, there is an increase, or a trend in increased cyberattacks, but what's the data to show that? Various sort of things.

So yes, there would be a compilation of data, compilation of research, and a tracking of the trend, over the course of the years, right? So, as one sees maybe the data shift, and indicate that that trend is in the decline, there may be another trend that is identified through exercises like these, and they're going to be run about once a year, that then identify something else that happens.

With regards to the integration of this into, obviously, the long-term, you know, our other processes, RKPIs, but also our longer term strategic planning cycles that occur, Göran and I have discussed how to capture that, and the areas that have been identified. And then as the community starts discussing the next cycle of strategic planning, also to contribute that there.

But yes, to your point, the data will be collected on the ones that have been identified as, let's say, the top 10 that have come together around alignment of everybody. So, it feeds in very nicely to a lot of your work on continuous research and data analysis of different things.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	So does anybody else have any questions? It's me again.
MEGAN RICHARDS:	It's Megan. Thanks Theresa. I just wanted to mention something. At the [foreign language] that ICANN organizes annually, well, it's actually Wolfgang [inaudible], but it's related to ICANN specifically, not this year's, but last year's, which was in Amsterdam, he had a session on the future of ICANN, and trends, and influences that would have an impact on what's going on.
	So it might be useful to ask Wolfgang if he took notes, or if there where any… What the outcome of that particular session was on. Just to add to your information.
CARLOS:	Yes. We are focused here, Theresa, on the impact of the new gTLDs. That's where I understand the mandate on the CCT review team. So now, I think it's a very nice game, where are we in terms…? Are we talking about ICANN? Are we talking about the whole DNS? Does it include the ccTLDs? Because that's an internal question we have.
	Or does it…? Are we talking that this group is going to work on our assumption that we have had for so many months [inaudible], that we are looking at the impact of the new gTLDs?

THERESEA: So this particular exercise is actually not constrained to only the remit of the CCT review team. Because you are exposed, and focusing in, and have expertise on that space, that you're focusing in on here, you might be seeing different trends that other groups may not see. But the remit of this exercise is not limited solely to the scope of the CCT review team. It could be that you have observations from other areas of experience that you think are relevant to contribute and could be compiled.

So, I appreciate it's an unique kind of situation. I think it's to utilize the talent and expertise to see whether there is areas that could be identified that are relevant for this. Does that help, Carlos?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, in other words, Carlos, for the next 45 minutes you are free from the constraints that I have place on you for the last 10 months. This freedom will only last 45 minutes.

THERESA: And with that, we're going to do the count off now. So we're just going to go around and do one, two, three, one, two, three. I would suggest that maybe the ICANN team supporting the group, maybe not participate. I know that we're running the

exercise with the departments themselves, and also this will be offered to the SOs and ACs as well, in the future.

So, this is not limited to this group. So, with that…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jamie is not staff. He's, in fact, a team member. So, we need to keep that in mind.

THERESA: So, starting out with Jamie.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey folks, let's reconvene.

THERESA: Okay, so what we're going to do now is, each group hopefully has identified a spokesperson, and we're going to list, and the spokesperson is going to describe the ones, the trends, that you've identified. And we're going to try to write them up, or if you have posted stick its, just put them, and then we'll go to the second group, have the spokesperson there talk to those, see where we had some overlap, match those up a little bit.

Third group, same thing. And then all we're going to do is take that list. I've asked Pamela to help compile that, send that out

to you. See if there is any adjustments to be made, and then that will contribute to the overall database and accumulation of different things that we're starting to notice.

Sound good? Okay, great. So, why don't we start with group three? We're going to go backwards. Did I throw that off?

[CROSSTALK]

I know, I'm just shaking it up a little bit here. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so we have group three, recently completed our brainstorming exercise. And, I think started with some obvious ones, and then sort of ended up spending most of our time discussing one that we were having trouble sort of putting words to, and so, the it's tough to come up with a bulleted version.

So, at the top of our list was cybersecurity, it's in the news right now, denial of service attacks. IP spoofing. Other things, the role of digital certificates are going to play, that's certainly, I think, is probably going to be on everybody's list.

The other issue has to do with alternative identities on the web. And so we've talked about this briefly in our group. There is a little bit of validation that came out of the Neilson research, and so this is about folks choosing Facebook, or Yelp, or Square

Space, etc., in lieu of registering their own domain name, right? That they're using sort of these alternative identities, apps fall into this category as well.

Then the third that's somewhat related, has to do with the increasing role of search engines. And there are a lot of components to this. One is that with having a massive growth, if you will, in the number of domains that the actual typing in, the guessing, is going to go down, and that we're relying more and more on search engines to get the information that we need from the web, and that the importance of individual identifiers is going to decrease.

So that you are, you know, the actual domain name that you get is going to be less important, because you're going to, most people are going to be getting to you, whatever presence that is that you have, via a search engine. And this is also true where there is instances where the search engine itself is not just providing links anymore, but data.

So, when I say to Alexa, or Google, what's the weather like in Hyderabad? They're often giving me the answer to that question, rather than a set of links to go find the answer. And so, there is implications. And obviously, you know, there has been, present company excluded, there have been disputes about that

with Yelp and things like that, that are concerned that people aren't finding their way back to the service.

And so that's going to be an interesting thing, and we don't know where the data actually comes from, that search engines are providing for us. When you say to Alexa on your kitchen counter, you know, what are the, what's a good place for Indian food in DC? You don't know if that's going to a review based site, or if it's choosing it based on people who have paid Amazon to promote themselves, right?

So, you're just getting answers now instead of links. So, search engines, I think, have a very big important role in the future of the DNS. And then, privacy versus, you know, and we always try not to use the versus term, but the balance, I guess, between privacy and consumer protection, you know, infringement, issues like that.

And so one of our observers, he's now left, you know, was concerned about the fact that I'm going to trust… Oh, I didn't realize, I thought you left. But okay, you told us you were leaving. Okay, so, you know, that if I look, you know, if I'm protected by a proxy service, then I should know who I'm doing business with.

And so that's potentially has trust aspects associated with it. So, those were sort of the easy ones. And then the last thing that we

talked about is, an evolving expectation of users for a kind of taxonomy on the web. And some of this is confirmed by our Neilson survey results, which, you know, say things like people like the idea of domain names that say, you know, help them guide their expectations.

That if I go to photography, I'm going to get a photographer. If I go to doctor, I'm going to get a doctor. If I go to bank, I'm getting a bank. And there is even some indication that a desire that these should somehow be enforced, but obviously the reality is that some of the cases, there is some expectation being created there, and in some subset of those, there is enforcement that's taking place.

But in many instances, they're not. So dot pharmacy is, you know, trying to do some kind of validation, but doctor isn't. And so, what is the long-term implication for that? And so David brought up sort of what went down with dot travel, for example, when they weren't getting enough travel related registrations, they started registering non-travel related domains, and a lot of them were link sites and things like that.

And so, are we setting up link sites? Like, kind of like ad pages that people drop to, that didn't have anything to do with travel. Right? And so the question then becomes, are we setting ourselves up through this massive expansion? Are we delivering

a message to the world that we are going to create a taxonomy for the web, and then not deliver on that expectation? Right?

So I guess that was our one that's tough to make into a bullet, but that was our last one which is, you know, end user expectations for a taxonomy of the web. This is the best summary that we came up with. So those are our five.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We did, we did.

So, we also had identified the security issues and the alternative identity issues. I don't think you used exactly that phrase, but it was the same thing. I'm sorry, yeah. We didn't use, alternatives to DNS identities. So, we have the same two issues as well. Although we didn't mention it in our group, I think the privacy, the tension between privacy and access to information for the public and consumer protection, law enforcement, is also very important.

But in addition to those things, we had some other issues. The long-term viability of gTLDs, which I think is related to this alternative identity issues. So, tracking how the new entrance to the gTLD space are doing. Those who are currently in, might enter into the market in the future.

Also tracking the incidents of DNS abuse, and that can be divided between legacy or new gTLDs, and it may be capable of being divided in other ways as well. And I think a related issue to that is how prevalent registration restrictions are becoming.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

It would be a separate category, but I think it nevertheless has some relationship to DNS abuse, at least in some cases, it's intended to. And we see that in registration restrictions, particularly for highly regulated gTLDs, but there are unregulated gTLDs that have registration restrictions too, and tracking that to see whether there is any impact between restrictions and DNS abuse would be an interesting exercise also.

So there is the general issue of DNS abuse, and then there is another issue about registration restrictions, their prevalence and their impact. Growing usage of INDs, tracking that.

Also, looking at how domain names are used, whether they're used in a way to promote some sort of actual website that the public uses, versus domain names being used in a way where it's a defensive registration, or part. This has been an issue that's been a topic, discussed in our group and in our subgroup for this exercise.

And also, is there a trend to universal acceptance of new gTLDs?

I think I hit all the issues that we identified, but if I missed any, now is the time for group one folks to speak up.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

[LAUGHTER]

You can beef them up Kaili.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I was just going to briefly comment on some of the cybercrime trends that are going to effect this whole world, the marketplace, and yet, are currently outside of ICANN's control. And so at the bottom of the vertical line on the chart, where Carlos pointed out the resellers. The resellers, are of course, contractually, one step removed from ICANN, and yet that's where many of the bad guys are going, and using resellers that permit the use of Bitcoin to register domain names, for which they use privacy and proxy services that are also currently outside of ICANN contractually.

And then they use those domain names for ransomware and all sorts of other things, and even the new IOT botnet command and control that we've seen recently. And so that's something that is absolutely a growing trend. And so that kind of Wild West

is going to be expanding and something that, I think, should definitely be on ICANN's radar.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I say something here though about the ICANN contract, the compliance, ICANN compliance itself. It is my view, and since I've been around 2006, that if you didn't know that all of these vehicles will require some downstream work, you would know by now. And when you add more to it, you have to expect the same results, or you intend failure.

I'm going to say it now, the weight is configured, I do not believe ICANN contracts compliance is intended to succeed. That's how I feel about it. You cannot tell me that you know you have a set of contracts, and you had trouble enforcing them anyway, trouble tracking them anyway, and you add other layers to it, and you don't make the expansion, you don't make the investment that you need, you don't infuse different processes in it, what is the expectation?

To me, there are not intended to succeed. That's the way I feel about it.

JORDYN BUCHANNAN: So, yeah I think, so there was that [inaudible] notion, I think too, Carlos touched on two other trends that we pointed to. First

was, just the general use of DNS mobile, or lack thereof, potentially, right? Like, what is the influence on the fact that mobile is becoming the predominant mechanism by which people interact with the internet on the use of DNS going forward.

I mean, everywhere, right? Just people, you don't interact with your URL bar mobile devices in the same way that you do on desktop machines, right? And so, it is the case that the global south, like in the global south, you see this trend much more strongly because there are people who only interact with the internet on mobile devices.

And so, there is the next billion internet users are going to have very different expectations about interactivity with the internet then people sitting in this room, by and large. So, you know, that has a profound effect on how we think about, how users interact with the DNS. So that's one.

And then, so that has like a potentially very limiting effect on the DNS. The flip side of that, that Carlos alluded to is, you know, we now see TLDs in the hands of… Many more participants than in the past, and we talked specifically about Google's open source platform for TLD operators. But you know, just this general trend towards the [inaudible] of the ability to operate a TLD.

And, you know, the quote we put up there is, TLDs for everyone, right? TLDs for all. What does the future look like in which the cost to ICANN is much lower? Because ICANN is better at fixing this process, and the cost to operate a TLD is much lower. Does that have implications for how the DNS will be used.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

So, there are two there, right? So there is the mobile one…

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Yes, the DNS and mobile. The second one is just like…

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Democratization of…

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

…TLD operations.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Yeah.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Sure, go ahead Megan.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I just had a corollary to what Jordyn had mentioned. Whoops. And that relates to what you call democratization, but also one of the issues that was just raised at the GAC meeting that I was at, is the issue of the SSAC, who said the number of new gTLDs has not caused a security issue.

And the issue really is of an infinite number that's possible, or are there security elements relating to eventual larger number? So that's perhaps something to add as a corollary to what you've said. I'm not sure if you addressed…

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I mean, I think that would be what in this trend, if there was a trend towards infinity TLDs, certainly one of the things that ICANN would want to pay attention to in the process of that trend is like, does that increase or decrease the potential for user confusion? Does that increase or decrease the potential for root scaling problems?

You know, there is a bunch of issues around that, but the general trend would be towards, like I think you said it, what's the epsilon that we're approaching with regards to…? Exactly, what is the limits to growth on that? On TLDs, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I only just thought of this now, so this is an out of group response, so I apologize. But the, exactly. Group 3.5. I guess the other issue is the straight up alternatives of DNS, like block chain and things like that, and we haven't talked about it, but I dong think they've really taken hold either, and so I don't know whether to call them trends, you know, but there is also content based identifiers instead of hierarchal identifiers. There is a lot of experimentation going on, in terms of alternatives to the DNS as we know it, and my sense is that none of it has really caught on to date, but if some of these other scenarios come to fruition, then we might have more an inclination to take a harder look at some of these other forms of identifiers.

I know like [inaudible] for example, is a giant fan of block chain.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And that's particularly true, I think. I think this mobile trend makes… Because if humans are not the ones interacting with the identifiers, and it's really just machines talking to each other, like Drew and I were talking about, you know like, the things behind your native app on your phone, those servers are still talking DNS you know, because there is a bunch of different IP addresses that change all of the time, and so having the identifier as a DNS sort of like, make it so servers have this

abstraction away from the individual IP addresses is still useful, but you don't need like…

The DNS is also designed to be human readable, and like that element of it, like isn't necessary anymore. So that could make, if possible, for emergent alternatives to take effect, where that hasn't been the case in the past, because we had to make the machines work and the humans work, and now maybe we only care about the machines.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The search engine point, I think, feeds into that as well. The more that I'm relying on search engines, the less the human readability of an identifier becomes less important as well.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I mean, I think the real question is, does Sky Net care about DNS?

Sky Net.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just while it's taking over, it will care about it. It has a nice list to walk through. Sky Net loves the root.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There are two other trends which I think are important. I just understand that they've not been raised by any of the groups related. The trend of [inaudible] and the trend of [inaudible].

Walled gardens, walled gardens is where providers give you part of the internet, just a little bit, that's related to the…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Theresa.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Yeah, so maybe we'll dive back into our wrap-up. So, we need to… We have a number of parallel tracks going, I guess, in a way, right? We have a DNS abuse survey that we're just about to put into the field, I don't know… The vendor is still not public, right? [Inaudible] asked me who was doing it and I don't know the answer, so I'm hoping that either you or Drew could get in touch with [inaudible] and share what you can share in terms of the questions we're asking and things like that.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay. And we've got the applicant survey that we actually expect to see by the end of this month. We lost Eleeza, but I think we expect to see a final version of the applicant survey by the end of the month. By the end of November.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: She mentioned yesterday that it will depend on the number of replies she has received.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, because it's still open.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Until the end of this month, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And so, there are some things happening in parallel, and so, I see that as an advantage and disadvantage in a way, because I think we've also identified some, as a result of some feedback we've gotten here, and additional discussions we've gotten here, that there are some other data sets that we want to go after.

And so Stan has mentioned, the appearance of the Latin American report sort of highlights the fact that this team hasn't done much on its original intentions to look at things regionally, right? Which is one of the areas where ccTLDs play, you know, a major role, when you start to do regional competition analysis.

And so one of the questions that we're going to try to ask, I guess… I'm going to try to put through Eleeza, right? She'll go get the answers. Can we reach out to the researchers doing the Latin American study and the Middle East study, and actually either get them to run concentration figures based on formulas we give them?

Or somehow give us access, or give the analysis group access, to the underlying data in those reports? So that's one of the questions that we want to look at. Another issue that's come up has to do with looking at the growth, growth curves from the past. Looking at things like dot biz and seeing what the curve of registrations was to see how that applies to new gTLDs by way of comparison.

So, these are things that are ongoing. And so… But at the same time, we've promised something in written form to the community by the end of the year, which happens to be in about six weeks. Right? For most of the world. And so, we have a number of…

I will circulate the email, you know, a plenary schedule to hammer out what's in and what's out of that document. We accomplished a lot of that here in the face to face, but we need to just literally say, yea or nay on things. Then we're going to identify a subset of the team to produce a draft by the, basically by the first of December, to circulate with the team, to do reviews so that we can then have some back and forth.

So, we're going to try to have this drafting team work rather intensely the last week of November, and that last three days of November, to produce something that looks like a report that we would put out for public comment, and then start socializing that with the group, and going back and forth from a draft.

So, what we need to do between now and the last week of November, is really nail down yeas or nays on any additional templates, finish the templates that weren't done, so that the actual positions we're taking are set, so that the drafters are not trying to make too many of those decisions.

Okay. Are there other questions? [CROSSTALK] in an email.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We have a comment from the chat. Calvin Browne, ICANN then becomes a registry. That's the comment. So I think that was probably from a little bit before.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, from the brainstorming discussion. Okay, thanks. Are there other questions or comments? So the actual schedule, I'll put out in an email, to work from, but that's the broad strokes of the schedule is that we're going to try to, the last week of November, get a draft done to begin to circulate to the group.

So anyways, what I said about the upside is that there is also going to be some down times. So for example, the month of January, will be something where we don't need to spend a lot of time on plenary calls and things like that, because we'll be waiting for user feedback, and we'll be waiting for the [inta?] survey, and some other things to get done.

And so that will be a little bit of a respite, but at the same time, it may offer up some opportunities to look at some of these things like regional divisions, etc. that we may not have time to incorporate in this initial draft. Megan and then Stan.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, it's Megan for the record. Just a question, and I don't want to throw a spanner in the works, as the Brits say. We were going to do more work also on the application evaluation process, which I have the feeling we haven't done as much as, certainly

as I would have liked to have done, and it's not a criticism, not at all.

Are we going to try to do that at a later point to add to the July version? Or how are you looking at that? [CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: …agree. We have some work done on that, and I think what we're going try to do is determine what we have and don't have, and incorporate some of it, the stuff from [inaudible] Global, the stuff that we get out of the applicant survey, some of the work that you did on string confusion, and things of that sort, and the GAC early warnings, etc.

So, we have some material there. And I think we're going to figure out what we have and begin putting that into this initial draft, and then we'll look at what else we want to do and schedule that again for that interim period.

STAN BESEN: I guess I just don't see January as that leisurely. I think at least two projects that I think we will probably not have done by the time this first draft goes out. One of them is the geographic market stuff, that's probably is going to be still, I don't know where we'll be then, but maybe somebody will be doing calculations.

It's hard for me to think we'll be able to report results of that in that report. Second, I just don't know where the parking data collection is ongoing. The one that would permit us to present an alternative set of market share calculations adjusted for parking. That also is, the pacing item there is the availability of the data.

It's not available tomorrow. If it's available, like in mid-December, I don't think it will get into our report then, and so we… I think we're going to have placeholders in our report for things that we're still awaiting on data. I think the same thing may be true of the abuse study. And so, it doesn't impress me as that leisurely in January and February as you suggest.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I didn't include February. I guess we'll be waiting on those results quite a bit during January, that's what I was saying, on those analysis. So I don't know that we'll have that data. If we do, we'll be working on it. But I don't know if we'll be doing the same set of calls and things that we're doing, that you love so much, Stan.

So I mean, I know you'll miss them, so we can schedule them if you're feeling…

STAN BESEN: I'll miss them terribly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Other questions or comments? But obviously, we'll jump on any data that is made available in that timeframe for sure. Megan?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Sorry to come back again. It's just a minor question. So, what I can see, aside from the drafting group, our work is more or less finished in terms of face to face meetings for this year. And are you planning to meet again at the next ICANN meeting face to face? Or can you give us a little estimate of what you're planning?

                      You told us January was going to be cool, February may be not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, that's right. I think that we… I think we should think about having a face to face in February, because we will have both new data in hand, and community feedback to grapple with. And it won't be a slow time for staff, because they will be coding community feedback as it comes in.

                      So I mean so, I think we should think in terms of having a face to face in February.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I suggest also, for the next face to face, because there are some many things there to bring up, that you look at blocking a little longer time. It's a lot more efficient for those who travel, to travel and stay three days and focus, then come in one day, and spend two days, or one and a half, and then go back. Just think about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, we brought this up before, and the reaction was mixed. And certainly the three day meeting was not purely effective for the ATRT. So we would just need to… People would need to commit to spending three days working, and not being… I guess people were, you know, flitting off during the three day meeting, because of its length and things.

So, I put that up for the group. I'm open for that, for sure, because I do feel that at the end of every one of these two day things, in addition to being exhausted, that we feel like we haven't gotten everything covered that we wanted to.

So, if folks, if there is some consensus that we should attempt a three day meeting, then we can make that happen. So, how do other people feel? What's your thought there?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I would agree with a three day meeting, if it's coupled with a clear agenda, because of those concerns that you voiced. Because, even if you look back at our year together, there have been meetings where, I think, we've had so much momentum, and for the most part, everyone is in the room and not running off doing their day jobs.

And there has been other meetings where there has been certain days, just because we all do have our day jobs, people are stepping out. So I think with a clear agenda that everyone can commit to, and where they could, in advance, make their work obligations work around it, I think three days could be highly productive at that stage.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, just with a show of hands, how many people would be supportive of a three day meeting?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay. I appreciate that. I will be sure to confer with you on the organization of the two day meeting, Megan. Yes, Stan.

STAN BESEN: I actually think it's... I don't object to a three day meeting, but I think it's important to have written documents before we meet.

I'd like to read… This goes back to the agenda point. If we're going to talk about something and use the time productively, I'd rather have a document that is, in fact, the focus of the discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. So, and I've heard that from you before Stan, of course. And I will say that the majority of what we were looking at during these two days, were in fact, written documents. So they weren't prose, right? Ready for redlines. And so we've made that distinction between trying to get consensus around the positions we're trying to take, and redlining prose.

And so, that's going to be dependent on people getting the stuff written that they commit to writing in time for, you know, it to be circulated in advance.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

So, we ended up sort of split down the middle on the three day meeting though, it seems like. That there isn't big support for it. Jordyn, you were one of the people that didn't raise his hand.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I didn't raise my hand, but it's because I… It's not because I hate the idea, it's because I don't have enough

information about the agenda… Like, I don't want to be sold on the agenda before I raise my hand for it.

And so, you know, I don't object, but I'm not saying what's definitely planted either. So, I think we want to firm that up before we jump to… Let's know what we're doing before we know how many days we're doing it for.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Point taken. So, we'll continue that. So there is going to be… I'll send out an email. We're about to lose the room here for the next meeting. Thanks for your participation in the brainstorming session, and we will check your inboxes for next steps.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]