JONATHAN ZUCK:	Hello, folks, and welcome to the CCT Plenary call. I don't know how this works. Is there anybody who is on the phone that isn't dialed in through GlobalMeet?
WAUDO SIGANGA:	Yes, Waudo is.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Waudo, okay. You show up in the GlobalMeet, so it's okay. Is there anybody that….
JAMIE HEDLUND:	This is Jamie.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Go ahead.
JAMIE HEDLUND:	Yeah, I'm just dialed in. I'm not on GlobalMeet. Jamie.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay, great. Yeah, you show up in GlobalMeet as well. Is there anybody with an updated statement of interest?
	Okay, the first item on the agenda is Jordyn on Recommendation 5, so I'm going to hand the microphone to Jordyn.

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.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hey, Jonathan. I don't know if you saw my e-mail this morning, but I'm sort of moving around in the first part of this call, so it would better if we could move my stuff to the end.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I read that e-mail but then somehow thought because I saw your name in there the you were available.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm available. It's just sort of noisy and I won't have access to the documents for the first half and hour or so.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Waudo, are you ready to lead a discussion on Recommendation 9?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, I am.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, well then, why don't you go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I think it's one of the shorter recommendations. It will be quite quick to go through it. The recommendation was to conduct periodic

surveys of registrants. At least this was the edit from [inaudible] I think about a month ago. I think [inaudible] didn't materialize, but I will [inaudible]. This edit I made after that last public comment on the new section. If I just read through it because it's short, "The rationale [inaudible] findings is there is a [inaudible] registrants' motivations and behavior. It hinders efforts to study competition and choice [inaudible]."

We were addressing this to the ICANN organization. The priority level was "Prerequisite" to the next round. [inaudible] within the team, I think that [inaudible] to come to [inaudible] [face-to-face]. And then the details were that the survey should be designed and continuously improved to collect registrants' [inaudible]. An initial [report] [inaudible] potential questions is [inaudible] which [inaudible] exists right now. But I think when we've finished everything, the report [inaudible] which allows some [inaudible] questions for [inaudible] registrants [inaudible]. Actually the document [inaudible] consumer [inaudible] should be [inaudible] registrant survey.

Then to expand the [inaudible], ICANN.org recommends [inaudible] and aligning the survey with the requirements of the ccTLD marketplace [inaudible]. I think that's what [inaudible] to give the recommendation that document that we made the last time we discussed it on a group.

Then finally, the success measure for this recommendation, the availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors, and the ICANN community for its work in [inaudible] competition in the DNS marketplace.

I hope that you have a copy of the recommendation and have been able to follow as I read through it. I welcome any questions or suggested changes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Waudo. Does anybody have any questions or comments for Waudo? Is there anybody that doesn't have the documents for today's meeting? Jean-Baptiste has sent them out, but they could have ended up in your [clutter folder].

WAUDO SIGANGA: I think this one was not sent out, so it will not be [inaudible]. So it was not sent out, but [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudo, if it wasn't part of the documents sent out by Jean-Baptiste, can you forward it around to the group right now?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, I'll send it by e-mail. Is that okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, I'm doing that [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. So we'll let people look at it as well, so we may circle back to you with questions or comments.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Unless anybody has any based on Waudo's description.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

[JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ]:   Hey, Waudo. The version I shared with the review team is the one from your last e-mail that you sent to me just before the call.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. I'm sending another one just now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, do we have Drew? Yeah, we do. Drew, can I hand the virtual microphone to you to handle these consolidated recommendations?

DREW BAGLEY:

Sure, Jonathan. I'll just speak briefly. Just following up from yesterday's sub team call, we agreed that we would replace Recommendations 19 and 34 calling for additional research with a modified version of Recommendation C. I've already updated Recommendation C, which calls for ongoing DNS abuse research to be published. I already updated that taking into account a conversation we had on the plenary a few weeks back. And I've updated other parts of the DNS abuse chapter.

I'll send them all out as one updated chapter, with the potential exception being that David and I are still working on Recommendation D, which will take a bit longer, where there rest of the DNS abuse chapter I'm just about done with the updates for that. Otherwise, I could send out Recommendation C on its own if people would like to go ahead and just see that on its own and approve it. It will also now include a success measure.

I apologize for the background noise. It's a snow day today in DC, so I have a little friend home with me.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You want to share with us what the success measure is, Drew? Is there anything else in broad terms that you want to share for our discussion besides just about status update?

DREW BAGLEY:

Sure. I have not drafted the exact language, but the success measure will be consistent with what we're now saying in the body of the recommendation about this research needing to be something

published regularly and that can actually inform ongoing policy decisions as well as compliance gaps so that the community is able to see if, in fact, there are areas in which DNS abuse is flourishing and existing measures are not working. So I need to actually craft the language for that. I have not crafted that yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Drew. Does anybody have questions or comments for Drew? I just received Waudo's e-mail, so everyone check your inbox and take a look as we're going through at Waudo's text. See if it generates any more questions or comments.

Then next in the queue this morning is David, but I don't think I see him. Jean-Baptiste, did you tell me David sent apologies? Or he's supposed to be on, right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I did not receive apologies from David, and he's not on the call as [you] mentioned, unfortunately.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hey, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hey, I've got [stuck] for a couple minutes, so I probably have a couple minutes to talk through at least the parking updates if you want to do that right now if you want to jump around on the agenda.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, let's do it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Okay, so I just sent around last night an update to the parking paper. It's not materially different in terms of recommendation or substance from the previous version that we reviewed on the last plenary call. [inaudible] updated with [inaudible] feedback based on the last call, as well as Laureen had sent around a bunch of comments in the [doc] that I had tried to address in the last [inaudible].

So hopefully everyone has had a chance to look at that, and I don't have a lot to say other to react to any questions or comments at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Did everyone get a chance to look at the parking document, and did it generate any questions or comments?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, Jordyn. I haven't had a chance to look at it yet. But I will look at it today shortly after the call and if I still have questions, I'll send them around. [inaudible] very late.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, no worries.

KAILI KAN: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Kaili, go ahead.

KAILI KAN: Just the explanations that "overall however we do not believe defensive registrations by trademark holders constitute a large enough fraction of overall registrations in new gTLDs to significantly alter our approach [inaudible] effects on competition. For a complete [inaudible] of this topic, see Section 4.3." Jordyn, can you briefly remind me about what is in Section 4.3?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Section 4.3 I guess makes two points. One is that generally speaking, trademark holders are reluctant registrants, that there's pretty good evidence that they're not registering in order to gain a competitive advantage or innovate but rather in many cases they feel obliged to. But then we do a numerical analysis to try to understand

how big a fraction of the total registration base was trademark registrations, the defensive trademark registrations represent and come up a number of 0.3% of the total. So that's why we conclude, while it's [inaudible] cost to trademark holders, it's not material to the overall numbers of registrations within the new gTLD program.

KAILI KAN: Okay, so the second point was that the defensive registrations is only 0.3% of the total registrations, so that's a very small percentage. Okay?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. And the first point is just we do want to acknowledge that trademark holders that do tend to register defensively and that those defensive registrations don't deliver a lot of value to the trademark holders.

I think the other thing in addition to the 0.3%, we did note that most trademark holders and not registering very many defensive registrations. I think there are some IP trademark holders would argue any is too many, but we find there's a median of three registrations per mark that's actually registered within the new gTLD program. Most trademarks that are registered in .com aren't at all in the new gTLD. So some statement of while acknowledging that this is a deadweight cost of the program, it doesn't seem to be particularly large in terms of overall effect on the program.

KAILI KAN: Okay, so I see. So the first point was basically saying that we acknowledge they exist, defensive registrations, but mostly our reasoning is based off the second point because of only 0.3% which is a very small percentage. Is that correct?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that's right. I guess I would say viewed from the lens of a trademark holder that the program doesn't look very good.

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] just 0.3%, can we just briefly cite [inaudible] 0.3% which is a very small percentage, and then for details please look at Section 4.3? That will make it easier to read.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Yeah, happy to add that number.

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] would be better [inaudible] just looking back, flipping through the document and there, "Oh, that's a very simple fact." Okay?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's an easy change. If Jean-Baptiste can take a note of that, because I'm not at my computer, then I'll [inaudible] do that. Although Jean-Baptiste may be who left. I don't know. In any case, if someone can take a note of that, I will do it when I get back to my computer.

KAILI KAN: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Jordyn. Thanks.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello? I have a question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, Waudo, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Jordyn, unfortunately I haven't had a good chance to go through the document thoroughly, but I do want to ask: you may recall that I think it was the last meeting when we [inaudible] something that the parking may [inaudible] after the [inaudible] competition within the gTLD marketplace. This was because one of the reasons for parking which I think came also from the study was that the practice how the registries offer discounts and promotions. During those discounts and promotions, there are more registrations and also the increased registrations are more [inaudible]. So through that feature….

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm sorry. [inaudible] specific discussion of discounting behaviors and [inaudible].

WAUDO SIGANGA: Pardon?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] one of the changes that was made, it was not made this round but that was made prior to the last call, was in response to some public comments. There is now a specific mention of discounting behavior driving parking.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, [inaudible] discounts and promotions really is driving parking, yes. So what I was suggesting is that we can now make a conclusion that parking in itself is [inaudible] measure or is an indicator of increased competition within gTLD marketplace. I don't know if [inaudible] maybe mention something like that in [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, you're right, Waudo. I remember you making that point, and I didn't capture it in the notes. So that didn't get transcribed. So I'll add that statement that discounting behavior itself is evidence of competition. It's a good point.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions or comments for Jordyn? All right, thank you, Jordyn. So we still don't have David, so I guess that just leaves me.

GAO MOSWEU: Hi, Jonathan. Gao here. I've just joined the meeting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see that. Welcome.

GAO MOSWEU: Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jonathan, I think we also have Jordyn's consolidation of 13, 15, and 33, which I actually have some views on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Jordyn, are you ready to discuss?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. Now I'm moving around again, so it would be good to do yours first.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Sorry, Laureen. Soon.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm on the edge of my seat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I believe it. Also circulated yesterday, sorry for the lateness but we went over it in the sub team call, was an attempt on my part to address some of the concerns raised by the U.S. government not so much on the recommendations of which they were pretty much in agreement but in the findings themselves, particularly those on competition. I think the USG was probably the most skeptical of our findings on competition and were not entirely convinced that the new gTLDs represented an economic substitute for the legacy TLDs, the way that Pepsi is for Coke.

Normally, when we talk about economic substitution, it's done in a fairly straightforward way which is that if you raise the price of one, the demand for the other increases. It's amazing how much does just come down to price in a lot of economic theory.

What I attempted to do was to give a little bit of a common sense overview of how this particular marketplace worked and was unique and to talk about how these products did represent a kind of economic substitute but potentially more in the macro than in the micro.

In other words, one of the byproducts of the new gTLD program was to create this more expanded semantic framework for the web. So a .photography is a good substitute for any legacy site that had to do with photography but not an idea substitute for an existing .com that dealt with plumbing, for example.

So when looking at the new gTLDs as substitutes, you have to look at the new gTLDs as a whole and not individually. When you do that, you are reminded that we looked at some analysis that said that people when they had the option to pursue the concatenated version of a new gTLD in legacy TLDs – we always use the example of bigshots.photography versus bigshotsphotography.com – that there was a tendency to use the new gTLD.

The government pushed back on this and said some of the most popular TLDs were nonsensical as concatenations like .xyz, etc. So Jordyn and I are talking to staff and Brian in particular about delving into that, finding which of these TLDs are nonsensical as concatenations and trying to remove them from the analysis to see if the analysis on substitutions still holds.

The other challenge in looking at this as a straight substitution problem is that my association with a TLD is longer term than my association is with a soft drink. If [you] raise the price of Coke, I start buying Pepsi. But each individual Coke or Pepsi doesn't last very long, whereas TLDs tend to linger because they're out there in e-mails, brochures, web links, blog posts, reviews, etc. Given their low cost overall, you don't have an incentive to drop your old TLD even if you have migrated to a new one.

An example that I often use when talking about this is a friend mine, Scott Stanfield, ran a company called Vertigo Software. They had VertigoSoftware.com and then on their 10th anniversary invested in getting in the aftermarket and getting Vertigo.com. But they kept VertigoSoftware.com for a number of years. After making the transition, after updating their website and their business cards and brochures,

they still hung on to the old URL until traffic on it had really diminished to almost nothing.

That's one of the things that makes straight substitution analysis complicated because the real indicator of whether or not somebody has made a substitution is not dropping their old TLD but reprinting their business cards or repainting their vans and things, and that's a very difficult thing for this team to study.

The extent to which we see some price sensitivity, we keep coming back to this, is difficult in the primary market because of the price caps. The caps frustrate an analysis of if you raise the price, it will lead somebody elsewhere because there's such limitations in the price raising that can happen and they're infinitesimal as a percentage. So I went through and talked about some of that analysis as well.

There's some literature that says that in this situation the best place to look is not the extent to which the new entrants cannibalize existing market share but what their market share is going forward. I cited some of that literature and then reminded folks of our finding that the purchase of TLDs since the introduction of the new gTLD program is pretty even between new gTLDs and legacy TLDs, which is a better benchmark for potential for competition than the cannibalization of the existing market share of the legacy. They need to look forward instead of backward is the premise of that literature.

That's a quick overview, and then I'm happy to take some discussion.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I ask a question, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I read the USG's response, especially with respect to the evidence of competition, that portion where they were doubling down on price movement as the largest or probably the singular measure. They never acknowledge [inaudible] to me in any kind of robust way that the price caps actually put a finger on the movement of prices. I'm wondering whether or not we should not start by pointing out that with respect to competition and substitution for legacy gTLDs with price as the main measure you couldn't get a measure that was reliable because of the finger on the legacy [gTLD] [inaudible] prices. I wonder whether or not we shouldn't just start by pointing that out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlton. I think that's a good point, and I invite you to take a look at the document that was circulated because we do make that argument and, in fact, suggest I guess in what I like to call a soft recommendation – I mean, we could all get together and turn it into a harder recommendation, but it will probably stir up a hornet's nest – of experimenting with relieving those price caps to see what the price and demand behavior is going forward. So there is that, like I said, a recommendation in the text about ICANN looking not that more seriously.

So the price point is made there and also in the pricing analysis that was circulated and approved earlier. Both of those were new documents that will be making it into this paper. I encourage you to look at the document. I know it just went around yesterday. If you think it's insufficient or insufficiently emphasized or something like that, then please do get back to me. Folks are making comments on this paper, so please do get back to me in the next week and I will make updates to the substitution analysis section.

It felt like the substitution analysis was a good enough categorization of the USG comments that we could just make it a section rather than editing the existing competition paper and making it a lot easier on our translators and our process of trying to integrate new stuff into the old stuff. So it's just a brand new standalone section in the competition paper. Feel free to look at it and make comments on it and get them back to me if you think that I don't cover it well enough, Carlton.

But I certainly agree and do specify that we have lack of data on pricing which the USG concedes and that the caps frustrate this analysis but there are other things that do as well. Even if there was a rapid increase in price, I still wouldn't necessarily dump the TLD right away because of how important it is to capture old e-mails and blog posts and things like that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I quite agree with that too. That's an operational piece that they need to accept. That is very much a big part of it too.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Thanks for your comment, Carlton.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, ma'am.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That was a helpful explanation about where this lives in the document because I was a little confused about that. So there is no recommendation that relates to this? This is just an additional part of the analysis to respond to the USG comment about trying to measure market rivalry more specifically. Is that fair?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exactly right. This is just bolstering our findings because the USG actually agreed with all of our recommendations.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Okay, I just wanted to make sure I understood the context.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But everyone do take a look. Like I said, you probably haven't had a chance, but take a look and get back to me with any comments you might have.

Any other questions just based on my overall discussion? I was doing my best to channel Stan in this analysis, so there was some rigor involved.

Okay, Jordyn, how are you doing on your drive?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I am walking, not driving, but I am about five minutes away from being in a place where it's not snowy and loud.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Maybe we can back over Recommendation 9 in the five minutes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I e-mailed this. I don't know whether [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah so, folks, has everyone received Waudo's Recommendation 9 e-mail? If you would, let's just take a moment right now to read through it and see if you have any questions or comments.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Is it possible to send around the text where this lives? Because right now, this is very standalone and although I can understand what the recommendation says, it would be very helpful to have what it relates to.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	I think it's possible to send that right now. Maybe after the call, I can send that out.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	That would be fine. Or Jean-Baptiste could also take care of that. It's just very hard to really, for me anyway, understand [these things] unless I see what it relates to.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	Understood.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Waudo, this recommendation is building on the survey that was done by the – what's the name of the organization? That registry.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	[inaudible]
CARLTON SAMUELS:	I'm sorry?

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible]

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, this is coming on that original survey where we looked at registrant responses.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: And [the survey] was about the size of the pool was an issue, right?

WAUDO SIGANGA: The size of the pool?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, as well as the fact that there might be differences in responses from the same registrant over time, right? That was one issue as well?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, okay the sequence of events, Carlton, we had the original recommendation that came [out] from that original survey and we have had some alterations to it. So this current alteration is after the public comments on the new sections.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, okay, I'm up to speed now. I have it in context.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: We're waiting on Jordyn?

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm just waiting for people to read this and see if there are any questions or comments. And then, yes, we're waiting on Jordyn.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm ready whenever you're ready.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Jordyn, just before that, Jean-Baptiste, I request in addition to the request by Laureen for the [inaudible] background [inaudible] on this so that they can discuss later on probably by e-mail, I also request that

maybe you resend that internal worksheet that you have that was summarizing what was [inaudible] in the public comments with regard to specific recommendations. So for this particular recommendation if you can also [inaudible] that so that they have a good context to comment.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Waudo, I can re-share this Excel sheet together with the text from your recommendation.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks, Waudo. Jordyn, let me pass the microphone back to you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Just as a reminder, I think we're talking about a further consolidation of Recommendation 11 into a set of consolidated recommendations that Laureen had already put together. These recommendations have somewhat different goals. The focus of the consolidation that Laureen had previously completed was focused on understanding safeguards, whereas the recommendation that I consolidated in is focused on understanding the benefits and costs of additional choice from a consumer choice perspective.

However, all of the recommendations use the mechanism of the registrant survey. So my goal in consolidating them was to basically just reiterate we need to [keep to the] registrant surveys and those should encompass both the questions that relate to safeguards and trust as well as understanding the effects on consumer choice.

I think you'd actually [basically] an identical target audience and even some overlap in questions because some of them questions related to choice are essentially, "Why did you choose this one? Why do you like this TLD?" and that could potentially be related to trust as well.

So I've made an attempt to consolidate them. I just sent that out right before the meeting last time, and so I guess Laureen at least now has some feedback but happy to entertain any other discussion around the proposed consolidation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn. I agree with you that I think this all could be done in a single instrument, and it absolutely makes sense to do that. However, I don't think it makes sense to consolidate this recommendation because it's apples and oranges and frankly to me it is incomprehensible to read. It goes from focusing on consumer trust to focusing on entirely different issues of consumer choice.

I think I would recommend instead of consolidating we just add a note in both to say we believe a single registrant survey should be done. Part of it should focus on consumer trust per this recommendation. And then have the same note in the other recommendation focusing on consumer choice cross-referencing. That way you still have your single

instrument, which makes perfect sense, but you have these recommendations separate and living with the text that discusses the reasoning. To me, this is consolidation, but it makes no sense to consolidate it. It does make sense, however, to do this in a single instrument, and I absolutely agree with that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah so, Laureen, I'm just a little worried that we're [shipping our org chart] here in that we're really just saying one thing, right? Which is we should keep doing registrant surveys, and the goals of those registrant surveys are multifaceted. They're designed to help us understand those issues related to choice as well as safeguards and trust. It's only because we have shaped our findings the way we have that there's any question of separating the recommendations. If we had started with recommendations and gone backwards to findings – which would be a little backwards of a thing to do – you could easily imagine talking about the issues related to both choice and trust and why a registrant survey would be helpful for that.

I guess I'm hesitant to have people parse through the list of recommendations, even if they cross-reference each other, have it look like we're recommending two things when we're really recommending one thing, which is to do a survey, and we want to make sure we gather at least two particular sets of data from that particular survey. [inaudible] is we're not actually recommending two things. We're recommending one things, just it's trying to do at least two different [jobs].

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Right, and I appreciate that. Again, we're in agreement on that point, but the fact is we have organized the report this way and the recommendations flow from the analysis. One part of the analysis is on safeguards, one part is on choice. So I think we're going to have to agree to disagree on this one.
	I do think we can clearly label these, and I think separating them actually reflects the organization we have. We don't have the organization you posited, which started with recommendations. What we have is a report that talks about competition, consumer choice, and safeguards, and to consolidate a recommendation that deals with safeguards and consumer choice to me is very confusing.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Anyone else have views on the question. I agree this is largely a subjective matter of opinion of how you like the recommendations structured relative to the findings. If no one else has an opinion, does that mean Laureen and I just rock-paper-scissors it?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I don't know. I guess my question is whether or not there's a way to – the problem is we don't have too many other examples of this – but the recommendations themselves are in a recommendations section. We talked about but we also reference the recommendations in the findings section as well proximate to the findings. So the question, is there just a way to better sanitize the recommendations so that they stand on their

own and you make reference to two different findings for the recommendation? I guess it's sort of what you were attempting to do, Jordyn, in your draft.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I agree with Laureen, I maybe tried too hard to keep the text really simple. It could be. One approach I think may be worth considering as you pointed out is [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] findings lead to this recommendation and make them more separate but proximate to each other. And say this is a recommendation, this is [inaudible] recommendation and there are a number of reasons we're making this recommendation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right. So what I was thinking was I could take another stab at this and make a recommendation that more clearly breaks out the two different objectives of data collection. What I would imagine we could do is just, like you say, the recommendations live in the recommendations. And then we could just in both sections of the findings, we could refer back to that same recommendation and we could just mention that this is – it's Laureen's [inaudible] we can cross-reference – but just have it be one recommendation with one number and just in each section make it clear why we're trying to gather that particular set of data.

I think we could add some more words to the recommendation to make it less confusing and basically say we want to keep doing a registrant survey, and there are two distinct sets of data that we're trying to collect. Or we want to make sure that the data supports two different types of analysis after the survey is complete, and here they are.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I think if things are clearly labeled and separated out a little more, that would make it far less confusing. And then, as you point out, Jonathan, if in the text with the findings basically the recommendations the safeguards request the safeguards and then says and by the way prior in the report we talked about part of this recommendation relating to consumer choice. See pages XXX. I'd have to see it, but conceptually I think that could work.

It's just right now, I think as Jordyn already said, his quest to be concise actually blended these so much as to make it confusing for me. But that doesn't mean it couldn't be separated out more to make it more clear. So I will happily look at the next [inaudible] version.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that's fine. Let me make another pass at that recommendation and see if we can make that a little clearer what we're trying to do there.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	I think the other thing would be you could look at how it would look in the text with the findings because that's the other place I'm concerned about.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Right.
GAO MOSWEU:	My hand is up.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay, we have a queue, so we'll go to Carlton and then Gao.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Okay, I'm [inaudible] and I'm going back to what Jonathan is suggesting because it seems to make sense. We have two issues. We have findings from the survey that deal with both consumer choice as well as with safeguards. We are recommending another round of the surveys to substantiate the findings and the recommendations that we make from what we now have. Is that correct?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Okay, so all we need do is to redraft the findings to point out the objectives that we were looking for in the registrants. So the

recommendations would follow [out of] that immediately in two places, no?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Perhaps the analogy is actually Recommendation 1. It's about formalization of analyzing the need for data collection. Because it's a recommendation that stands on its own but is actually [inaudible] by a lack of data in a lot of different places within the document. So that's the analogous recommendation to have multiple findings that lead to the recommendation. I think the key is just to make sure that they are discretely described in the justification and success measures for the recommendations and then referenced in the findings so that things are clear. But it is an example where, as Jordyn puts it, it's one recommendation for which we have many justifications similar to Recommendation 1.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah. Thank you, Jonathan. So we have a model. That's all I wanted to ensure that we know we have a model there somewhere.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so. Gao, you're next.

GAO MOSWEU: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Jordyn. I think like Laureen, I had difficulty. I'm in the sub-team that's working on the these recommendations, and I had great difficulty in consolidating them into

one recommendation because I felt that they dealt with separate issues that needed to stand out on their own. So I was like Laureen. I'm looking forward to a clearer text with regard to the consolidations. And thanks, Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks, Gao.

GAO MOSWEU: And then just to add what I will be dropping off the call in the next five minutes because I have [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Any other questions or comments? So, Jordyn, you have the pen back again to make this dream a reality.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, will do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Other comments, suggestions? Jean-Baptiste, do we have other things on the agenda?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Jonathan. No, I don't believe so. We have the recommendations from David, but I see he is still not on the call so, unfortunately, no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so David was primarily going to give a status update because he and Drew are still refining the language for those recommendations. So keep your eyes peeled in the e-mail for updated language on that. Then the same with the competition paper, if you get a chance to take a look at that, if you have questions or comments on that, please get back to me on the refinements and clarifications, prioritizations, etc., that you would like to see in that paper. Otherwise, unless there's objection, we'll consider that section approved in principle, but you can have a week to make refinements. Okay?

All right, does anybody have Any Other Business?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we have any sense of when the Adobe Connect is going to be back in business? It's so much easier with it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I don't have any information on that at this stage, unfortunately.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste, and thanks for the question, Laureen. The other question is there are other packages like Zoom that allow for screen and document sharing that would be better than GlobalMeet and they're free.

CARLTON SAMUELS:	To answer that, Jonathan, because I was wondering why is it that we don't even in an emergency look at one of [inaudible]. Those are in [good] use all over the place. We don't have to be so orthodox that we can't use something else in the meantime.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Well, we are using something. I just think it's an inferior something.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Well, yeah. Well, the GlobalMeet, I can't see. I dial in and that's it.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah so, I don't know, Jean-Baptiste, there's a lot going on. I don't want to cause trouble. But if there was a way we could use Zoom or something, then we could back to that core functionality. It's just a possibility, but we could take it offline.
	Any other business? All right, folks, thanks for being on the call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]