
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome everyone to our latest plenary, plenary number 39, I had to scroll down. We are in the final stages of prioritizing our recommendations. I see that Megan is on the call, I'm excited by that, so that she can potentially help us with the discussion with the remaining recommendations that she had put forward. And Jordan is running a little bit late, but will be joining us shortly.

Megan, I don't know if you've had an opportunity to listen to any MP3s or anything like that, but we came up with a variation of the notion of a binary choice about recommendations as to whether or not they needed to happen before or after.

I guess I skipped over attendance and dove in. Are there any attendees that are on the phone but aren't on the Adobe Connect?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Jonathan, yeah, I'm just on the phone, not on the Adobe.

KAILI KAN: Yes, I am... Kaili speaking. I'm just trying to connect to Adobe. Thank you. I'll still try.

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:

Is there anybody that has an update to their statement of interest, other than them losing interest, that's an update. So, all right, so we will forge ahead here. We are down to the recommendation number 54. But I was saying, Megan, instead of just saying that a recommendation has to be implemented before or after, you know, needs to be implemented prior to subsequent procedures.

We expanded it to come up with a kind of a timeframe by which recommendations should be implemented. So, one of those was correct, that means it needs to be implemented prior to any subsequent procedures, and the other three are basically low, medium, and high priority is actually a timeframe by which we think that recommendations should be implemented.

So low is before the next CCT review, medium is in the next 36 months, and high is in the next 18 months. So, that is the timeframe thing. So, it sounds like you know about it, so that's good. So, let's jump down to number 54. And Megan, perhaps you can walk us through the intention of this and what you believe, how you believe it should fall in terms of this characterization of urgency, if you will.

Sorry, Megan, number 54. Continue GAC early warning advice as part of the public comment period, and GAC early warning advice should be provided as soon as possible. Are you on phone? Are you able to speak, Megan?

MEGAN RICHARDS:

I was speaking, can you not hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Now we can.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay, good. So, my concern about 54 was that the way that it was written before, and it's very hard for me to see it now, it was written, all the others said it should be implemented before our next round, if I'm not mistaken, and 54 said before CCT, next CCT review. Whereas it makes much more sense to have 54 implemented before our next round, any next round. That point.

So, it was a question of timing of implementation. So the GAC early warning advice, if it's not implemented before the next round doesn't make much sense. That was my point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, so that's a good point. I guess the question is, what is the actual recommendation we're making from an applicant guidebook standpoint, or a process standpoint? Is it essentially about in the advice earlier, the early warning advice [AUDIO ECHOING]...

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, but the early warning advice clearly helped applicants to improve the way in which their TLDs would work, and to make sure that prior requirements were introduced and applied. So, the point was really that that advice could be even before, if necessary, could be even earlier. It should certainly be perhaps even better organized in the

sense that it's not necessarily of the public comment, but maybe it could be a special earlier process?

I'm not [inaudible], I mean, I'm not suggesting it should be necessarily be taken out of the public comment process, but if applicants have to look at a whole series of things, including issues that come up here in the public comment, maybe it's easier to look at the GAC early warning as a separate thing. I'm not fussy about that. It's just that it clearly has a great benefit for those who have to apply certain standards and certain requirements.

So, I don't mind how the recommendation is wording or the timing specifically accept, but it should be done before any future run.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [AUDIO ECHOES] ...continue as we did before basically.

MEGAN RICHARDS: No, the recommendation is that it should be even further improved, so it worked relatively well, but there are ways that it could be improved, either by having the GAC early warning before public comment, that's one possibility. Or to have it as a separate stream of the public comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Because the reason, and I'm sorry to insist on it, but the reason the GAC early warning advice was important, useful, etc. was that there were certain public policy requirements that had to be met in certain cases. Not in all, but in most of them, and those would help the applicant to make sure that all the factors in their TLDs met public policy standards, or requirements, or whatever it might be.

I mean, I use the case of dot GMH as one example, but there are many others. So, that's the question of tweaking how the wording...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We have a question from Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, you might need to... Jordyn, go.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, I should have lowered my hand. Megan already clarified my question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks Megan. So, is there anyone that disagrees with the notion that any reforms to this process need to happen prior to subsequent procedures? I think we would probably agree with that since the function [inaudible]. So the recommendation is to look at ways to improve it by making its own process that happens, perhaps happens even earlier than the public comment period.

Does anyone disagree with the notion that it should be a prerequisite?

Okay, we'll mark it as a prerequisite then.

Number 55 is GAC advice to the Board about gTLDs should be clear, permitting the Board to determine how to [inaudible]...

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudo, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry, yeah, going back to 54, maybe I would like to ask, and maybe probably other people that way that team, the report that the writing, it looks like now we are giving some recommendations that are targeted at the GAC. So, how is the relationship, how is that [inaudible] take recommendations for [inaudible]?

I [inaudible] this one is not so much targeted to the Board, but to the GAC.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Can I come in on that one, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Please.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. It's not targeted at the GAC or to the GAC specifically. The recommendation is related to the timing and the way in which the GAC early warning advice is managed during the application process. So, it either has to be adjusted in the application guidebook, and if that goes to ICANN staff...

I mean, all of our recommendations by definition go to the Board. So the question is, who then implements them? And in this case, I think it is a question of the process that's identified in the application handbook. And also the GNSO in their PDP would want to take that into consideration. So, I'm not so worried about to whom it's addressed, because by definition [CROSSTALK] how it's implemented. Okay? Thanks.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Megan, talk to us about 55, and your intentions there.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, that one was related primarily to other GAC advice. So, we had the GAC early warning advice, which was pretty clear. I mean, in some cases, it created problems, no question, but there were political problems behind that. It wasn't, it was serious advice, not at all. But

then there were other cases of general, let's call it general GAC advice, that was directed to the Board as GAC advice by definition it is.

So, in this case, and this is perhaps been taken over a bit by the new bylaws and the change in accountability, in the sense that advice from all advisory committees, by the way, has to be sufficiently clear so that the Board can take action, or so that people to whom the advice is addressed can clearly implement it.

So, this is an observation from the other GAC advice, which sometimes wasn't perhaps as clear or as focused as perhaps it might be. But I think, quite frankly, to a certain extent, this has been overtaken by the new bylaws, which require that advice, and again, by all advisory committees, have to be sufficiently clear, sufficiently actionable, etc.

And I'm not quoting exactly correctly, but you get the gist of the idea. So that was the idea behind that recommendation.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry about that. I didn't mean to talk over you. I get what you mean, and [AUDIO ECHOES] I guess I'm inclined to agree, that particular recommendation was [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

...we're getting an echo.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You've got to mute your speaker, I guess, I think it's Megan's speaker. Sorry. I guess I would recommend that this recommendation be removed, because the need is to put it with the accountability reforms. Does anybody disagree with that notion?

Megan, are you saying you disagree with removing the recommendation?

Yeah, go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Okay, I'm suggesting that we not remove the recommendation, because it's clear, as they said in the bylaws, the advice has to be clear. But, what we could do, as a recommendation, is suggest that the GAC early warning advice would cover that. But the GAC, a slight variation of what the recommendation said before. It could be that the GAC should, and this is just a question of rewriting.

So that the GAC in providing its advice to the Board on any new gTLD round, should [inaudible] with the bylaws, ensure that its advice, its general advice is clear and appropriate. But it could be put in the context of the GAC early warning. So, the GAC early warning is used for specific cases, and the other is used for general cases.

But what we could do, and I'm thinking out loud now here, is perhaps combine it with recommendation 54, or whatever [inaudible] is supposed to be, I think the recommendation, so that in the GAC early warning advice, which is quite clear I think, we also say that consistent with the new bylaws, other GAC advice would be clearer. That's

perhaps a way of doing it. I don't want to move entirely the concept or the idea of general GAC advice, or the recommendation.

But if you like, I could squeeze it into 54, make 54 and 55 one single recommendation. If someone can forward it to me in writing, whatever we have. I don't know where... I can't work on the Google Documents from here. I'm sorry. I'm not in exact hospital bed, but I'm immobilized, so I can't get to my office.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay Megan. We'll make the [inaudible] to you for rewording. It sounds as though the nature of this advice is aimed at the Board, has more to do with how the Board reacts. Since we can't make recommendations in itself, it's more about Board's acceptance of that advice being based on it being, you know, clear and actionable, right?

Can't hear you, Megan.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

That's because my microphone was off. Every time I turn it on, you hear an echo. No, I was just responding to Jordyn. The early warning advice was quite clear and quite actionable. And all I'm saying is that in 54, I think, and I think Eleeza, or someone, yes, Eleeza has written in saying, this was one recommendation divided into three parts.

So, I don't know, I was just proposing to put those two parts back into one recommendation. That's all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, what do you think [AUDIO ECHO]... Sorry, mute your speakers. What do you think about Carlton's recommendation about asking the subsequent procedures team to develop some sort of template for advice related to the program from the GAC? Does that [inaudible]?

MEGAN RICHARDS: I said okay in the chat, because every time I turn on my microphone you get an echo.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that's fine then, thanks. I think it's just when other people are speaking and your microphone is on, maybe is when this happens. Okay. I think we all agree then, that this is something that would require implementation prior to a new round, so it's a... Is there anybody that disagrees with that categorization?

And then I think that incorporates number 56 as well. So, the next is related to community applications, number 57, review of procedures and objectives for the continued based applications, and improvements to address incorrect concerns that were raised. Megan, do you want to talk us through that?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, that was related to primarily to the ombudsman's report, and a number of issues that were raised in the GAC [AUDIO INTERFERANCE] community based applications. And as you know, there was a lot of, I'm going to call it [foreign language], about the community based

applications, because something like 75 or 80% of them were not successful.

And so the ombudsman has clearly recommended that the process be reconsider the next period. So, what we're really doing here is not going through and identifying specific issues that need to be redone, although I think in paper, I've identified a few. What we're suggesting is that in the applicant guidebook and the PDP, look at this case in quite some detail and determine how to address this issue at any future round.

So, it has to be done before any future rounds. And that's really the essence of the recommendation.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, go ahead and mute your microphone for a second. Are there any questions for Megan about that, and do you agree that it should be a prerequisite? I'm inclined to agree.

Eleeza's question is, who should carry it out? And I can see that we're passing this to the public and procedures working group. Unless somebody disagrees.

I see Eleeza, yes, thank you for the question. I think it's subsequent procedures PDP, not an ICANN org. Any other questions?

Okay. Moving right along then. We are on number 58, which was about [inaudible] of dispute resolution. And number 58 is a thorough review of the results of the dispute resolution on all string confusion objections. So Megan, walk us through.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Yes, that one is the problem that in some dispute resolution cases, different panels came to different conclusions on issues that were very similar in fact. Obviously, they were not exactly the same. But they were very similar. So, just as an example, on singular versus plural, the dispute resolution panels came to different conclusions. Not in every case, but in some cases.

So, the point is, and this is not absolutely urgent, although I think it would be very useful if it could be done before the end of the next round, so it would have to be done before the round starts, is to have an even better... Well, first a full analysis of the dispute resolution process, and if I'm not mistaken, I think someone is doing this. I'm not sure.

Second, to make sure that any improvements can be made in that dispute resolution process, so that for example, one single panel looks at all similar cases, let's say singulars versus plurals, or geographic names, or whatever it might be so that you get consistency in the results of the dispute resolution. That was the point there.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Megan. This maybe a case where one recommendation got divided up again, because that's currently, recommendation 60 is similar cases for dispute resolution should be reviewed by the same expert panels, or determine in advance... I mean, it talks about the plural, but that sounds like what you're recommending. Is it similar types of dispute resolution to be handled by the same panel, then there

is this notion of a thorough review of dispute resolution, and then also consider introducing a post-dispute resolution panel review mechanism.

So that sounds separate. So you see there are these three recommendations, or we should do a review of all of the dispute resolutions post-panel review and recommend that the same panel handle the specific types of that dispute resolutions?

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Well, that's how it was written initially, if I'm not mistaken, because you have to do the review first, to make sure that nothing has been dropped out, or there has been no mistake, because the review I did was pretty superficial. I didn't have any external analysis of this. I had [inaudible] do it myself.

But I could see that there were inconsistencies in certain cases, as I used the cases plural versus singular as an example. So, therefore, you have to have a full review first. Then you can suggest that in cases that are similar, you have a single panel, and there was also a suggestion that a post-dispute resolution review be instituted. And I think that was in the also, I mean, that's something that I think is important, but I also think it was in the ICANN program implementation review [inaudible].

So again, this was more or less one recommendation, but it's divided up into three. So, I don't know how you want to [inaudible] that. For me, they go together.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Jordyn, do you want to speak up on this? I see you've written this up in the chat, as probably a single recommendation that says maybe such as a couple of these examples, but then that just leaves the details for the subsequent procedures PDP. Do you want to speak?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Sorry, yeah. And you've roughly captured it. I think that we probably don't want to be overly prescriptive about solutions when we haven't had time to fully flesh out the problem space. Let's just say, we've identified this issue, here are some possible solutions, we recommend that the subsequent procedures PDP results takes us to address this issue prior to the next round.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I think we all agree that it's a prerequisite. Is there anybody that objects to its designation as a prerequisite?

[Inaudible] has volunteered to work with Megan on language for this one, so thank you very much. And then the, I guess now that you're onboard, the other paper you've worked on, as well as Megan, is up there with the recommendations 42, 43, and 44. Is that right, Jordyn, you worked on that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Inaudible] work on that paper yet, although I changed the recommendations, so we need to make sure Megan's [inaudible] for that, but there is only one now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You have to surface the recommended recommendations that you have? So we can hash this out?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, I think it was, let me look on the chart. [Inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jordyn, why don't you read out the recommendations? Because I didn't see the changes. I'm sure you made significant improvements, which is always good, but if you could just go through them, then probably everyone else can have a look, or hear, at least what the post changes are and then we can go through that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Inaudible] just looking for the [inaudible], okay. So, roughly what I did was just to, I think this is another one where there are multiple recommendations sort of pummeled together, and [inaudible] a couple of these, just try and simplify by making clear, making the recommendation for the part actionable.

So, I think we end up really just with number 42, from this list, which is that future consumer surveys should have more questions related to both the benefits and the hostilities, confusion, from the introduction of a program, and [inaudible] has already identified a number of specific types of improvements that could be made, but roughly to be say are

there, here is a list of possible things that could be approved, that could be [inaudible] from the introduction of new gTLDs.

For example, it might be easier to find a new domain, or that it might be, as a result of it being something more TLDs or that it might be easier for an end user to navigate to something that's specific to their interest, because there is more targeted domains on the other side, sort of trying to get confusion of whether there is a possibility for a risk of confusion as a result of so many TLDs being introduced.

So that, just to expand the scope of future consumer and registrar surveys, that [inaudible] specifically. And the latter two recommendations seem a little less actionable. I know that Margie, for example, added her comments one, that made it hard to tell, that [inaudible] and I agreed that it was hard to tell exactly how it might be consumed.

So basically, turns into a data collection item that's due to be delivered prior to the next CCT, so that a future CCT will have more information, be able to address the topic.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So, we've reduced it down to a single recommendation then, Jordyn, is that the...?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

That's right. So roughly, adjust the, this is just the 42, 43, and 44, to some [inaudible] consolidated, but mostly go away.

JONATHAN PRICE: Okay. So, are you...? Do you want to put your language out there? Or, are you going to work on language provided by Megan and the group? Or what's the next step [CROSSTALK]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Inaudible]... Yeah, so I sent it out [inaudible] last night, hopefully people got it. [Inaudible] at least got it, because she responded. But it's out there for folks to take a look at.

JONATHAN PRICE: Okay. All right. We don't this as a [inaudible] because it's more of a reporting thing after the fact, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Inaudible] actually because it was mostly the input to a future CCT, so it needs to be done before then. Now, it's not particular clear who would take action on that other than a future CCT.

JONATHAN PRICE: Okay. Does anybody object to it being a low priority?

Okay. So, that's designated. So now my question to staff is, do we have any other recommendations we haven't clarified?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Jonathan. Yes [CROSSTALK]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: ...document. Okay Eleeza, thanks. Which one?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry. These go up to number seven, correction of secondary market data, I think we missed this the first time around when we started working on this list about a week ago. This is one of yours that was initially included in the data analysis chapter, and which was [inaudible] chapter.

So, if you want to address that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, thanks Eleeza, thanks for pointing that out. Just to remind people, I mean one of the different challenges that we had in doing the competition analysis is that prices are somewhat distorted potentially by the price caps, and so the primary market prices are restrained by the caps, but the secondary prices are not.

And so, we had an absolutely abysmal time of getting ahold of secondary market data for the analysis. In fact, we didn't get any. And had we had data prior to the round and after the round, then we would may have been able to make an assessment or done a shift in pricing.

We're talking about buying out pricing in the secondary market before and after the start of a new round. And so, I'm inclined to say that we need to find a way to get secondary market data on prices prior to the

start of a group procedure, so that we can, a future CCT team can look at the data. So, I welcome discussion at that.

And I know Eleeza, that part of your perspective on that is if we fail this time, how are we going to succeed in the future? And I don't have a good answer to that, but I guess we can still make a recommendation to do our best to get base line secondary market data prior to a new round.

Any questions about that? Any disagreements about that? Does that make sense to everyone?

I see people typing furiously.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So Jonathan, it's Jordyn. [Inaudible] what's the proposed priority for this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I proposed it as a prerequisite because I think we need baseline secondary market data to compare to post-subsequent procedures data for our future reviews, so that the collection of a baseline, of buying out pricing for secondary market would be a prerequisite.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I guess [inaudible] because I don't understand, you know, we tried, I don't know, I don't want to say pretty hard, but we tried to do this and totally failed. It's not clear ICANN has leavers to change that going

forward, and I would hate to see additional gTLDs not be delegated just because CO refuses to hand over anything that there is, ICANN has [inaudible] change the contracts, because ICANN doesn't have contracts with any of these parties.

So, it seems challenging to put it as a prerequisite given that there is no actual leavers to make it happen, other than just by asking nicely.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Can that be...? And I completely get that. That's why I mentioned... Does it make sense to just word in it such a way that allows for failure, best efforts, prior to or something like that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, I mean, what I would recommend is leaving to that high priority to indicate in the text of the recommendation that even though it's not a prerequisite, but it would be most useful and ICANN should endeavor to do it prior to the next round, because it would be more useful for the baseline.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, yeah, I mean, ironically, a high priority is probably 18 months sooner than a prerequisite. But so we can do that. Carlton, I'm not sure I understand your comment in the chat about commercial transaction. You mean about paying [inaudible] for the data?

Eleeza, it's a low priority except the need for a baseline on the data is what would make it a higher priority. Just answering your question in

the chat. In other words, if it was possible to get both sets of, both snapshots after the fact, I just don't know the answer to that, then it could be a low priority if we need to somehow get baseline data out of the secondary market beforehand, that makes it a higher priority. Does that make sense?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, it does. I'm just not sure what's possible and what's not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, all right. I will take Jordyn's recommendation to make it a high priority with the a note that says it would be most useful if a baseline was gathered by the subsequent procedures. So, we won't make it a [inaudible] that's given the difficulty we had getting that data.

Does that make sense to everyone? Does anyone object to that categorization? So we can even call it a medium priority I would say.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't know if mine is muted.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you, Carlton, just speak up.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. So, we know that there is at least one source for the secondary data. And we know that they're in the business to collect secondary

data. I think while we didn't get a chance to do it, I believe that you can make [inaudible] arrangements to get the data. I see the baseline for that data requirement, baseline requirement for that data is important.

I don't see how you can submit it a solid analysis of what is the market of that data. So, while I would agree for it to have a prerequisite to have higher priority, I think the data could be had, a commercial transaction.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Is there as Jean-Baptiste has noted in the notes, the latest version of the executive summary is available. There have been some comments from Megan and some comments from a few others, and some edits from Stan that we'll incorporate. But take a look at that and just make sure that you're kind of in line with what is stated there.

And there was some factoid that you feel from the paper that should have made it into the executive summary and didn't, and please raise that alarm sooner rather than later. Obviously, the actual conclusion to the executive summary are just based on the paper and should be non-controversial to the group, but if something important worth mentioning that didn't get mentioned, please take a look and bring it up.

Is Carlton the only one who can't hear me or can no one hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Sorry, say that again?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're so funny.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, so it's just Carlton. All right, any other business for this call?
Short call because we just have a few of these recommendations left.
Anything that staff wants to remind me that I'm forgetting?

Don't worry, Jamie, I won't forget you. All right folks. Thank you so
much for your work on this and for being on the call. Oh, Fabro.

We can't hear you.

All right, your mic is not working. Are you going to type something in
the chat? Okay.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jonathan, while you're waiting for...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, what did [inaudible]?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Are you going to close the call? I just wanted to ask one thing about Copenhagen before you close.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, if we can get, at some point, the timing and information about the 10th and the 11th, because those are the days now that I understand that you're planning CCT discussion. I moved my arrival from the 11th to the 10th, but I'm only arriving around noon-ish, I would say.

So, if someone can send us, at some point, obviously it's not [inaudible], as we say, but it would be useful for planning purposes, just so we know where the meeting is taking place and our proposed agenda. Thanks.

PAMELA SMITH: Hi Megan, it's Pamela. We're just waiting for the final schedule from the meeting planners, and as soon as we have it, then all of that, then we believe we know where everything is, but I just want to hear [inaudible] say okay, it's done. And as soon as I have it, you will have it. I promise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great Pam. I guess we should start working on an agenda as well, and make sure that the morning of the 10th is when we need Megan the most, or something like that as well. So that's why it's a logistics

question, more of a substantive one, I guess. So, let's start noodling with the agenda for Copenhagen.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And so when we get that information, Pam, that's going to include whatever presentations we have to the community, and the Board, etc.?

PAMELA SMITH: Absolutely. What I will do is I'll put together what I have, I'll send it to Jean-Baptiste and he can add whatever else that he's got. And I'm sure his intention is probably to send you a combined version, to speak for him, Jean-Baptiste.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry Pamela, you [inaudible] combined what?

PAMELA SMITH: [Inaudible]

[CROSSTALK]

A combined [inaudible] will be coming, as soon as we can comfortably issue it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thanks folks. I'll follow up with these items about the agenda.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, Jonathan, if I can comment on one other thing?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, just to go back to the draft reports. So, I think everyone is expecting that we will be publishing a draft report next Monday on February 20th, but as it looks, we are still expecting for a few edits on some papers. So, this is unfortunately delaying the publication. So, it's really important that in the next days, if possible, before the end of this week, we get the latest version of the data paper, and the papers from the agenda that Jordyn is currently revising.

So that we can already send that to the editor, and have a better idea of when it will be the earliest publication date now. Just a heads up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jean-Baptiste. Yeah, I guess I've got to go back and look at this data analysis paper. I think it's nearly done. I think there is just a couple of outstanding from Eleeza, so I'll take a look at those today.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And we'll hear back from Jordyn and then make it on the other papers.
Okay, great everyone. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]