ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) PDP Working Group
Wednesday, 30 May 2018 at 12:00 UTC
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-30may18-en.mp3

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/ER0FBQ

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms RPMs in all gTLDs PDP Working Group call held on Wednesday, the 30th of May, 2018 at 1200 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the WebEx room. If you are only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you, Jeff. I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to Phil Corwin. Please begin.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you. Phil here. Welcome back everyone. We've been away for two weeks - well, we skipped two meetings because of other events going on. Now we're back with our APAC time call. And any change in statement of

interest from anyone? All right. And our agenda is to discuss quantitative data from Professor Tushnet's research that can be used to address Document Sub Team questions about the 250 responses received and 58 respondent prevailed cases and there's a link to a Dropbox document and then after that we're going to discuss some planning for ICANN 62 in Panama where we have three sessions scheduled at the meeting.

So anyone wish to kick off the discussion about the professor's research? Is the professor with us today? I don't…

Julie Hedlund: Hello, Phil. It's Julie Hedlund from staff.

Phil Corwin: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: She was expected to join. We did confirm with her previously that she was available at this time although I don't think I see her on the call, just checking again. No, I don't see her at this moment.

Phil Corwin: Yes, can someone email - my understanding was that she was going to take the lead on this call. Is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that was the staff understanding and that is what we had confirmed with her. So I will go ahead and try to get in touch with her.

Phil Corwin: All right, let's see what we can do here. I apologize to all for the delay but…

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: …the professor would lead the discussion here.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Phil. This is Julie Hedlund again. I do see that she had responded to a message on the list just late yesterday so she's certainly active in the discussion. Let me go ahead and get in touch right now.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Would it be helpful in the meantime if staff provided a little bit of an
                 introduction?

Phil Corwin: Yes, why don't we go ahead and do that, that would be very helpful, get some
                 background in anticipation of professor joining.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great. Thank you. Then let me - I think that Mary had wanted to give a
                 little bit of an intro but I don't know if she has joined quite yet. Let me get this
                 message off to Rebecca and then we can talk through the intro. While we're
                 waiting for Mary I think Berry might be able to give us a little bit of an intro.
                 Berry, please go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. Berry Cobb for the record. So the intent for today's agenda was
                 basically to understand what the working group's and/or the sub team's next
                 steps are going to be as it related to Professor Tushnet's data set. As you will
                 recall we had divided into our three sub teams a few months ago, one of
                 them being the Document Sub Team, the second being the Providers Sub
                 Team and the third being the Practitioner's.

                 Within the Document Sub Team, which was basically began with the
                 foundation document that was identifying different aspects or charter
                 questions, that sub team had also created an additional column on that
                 document trying to identify what quantitative types of datasets might be
                 available to help answer some of those charter questions. In addition to some
                 prior analysis that staff had done as it related to the 780 or so URS cases up
                 to 2017, which I think equated to about 1850 or so domain names across
                 those cases.

                 More specifically, when the Document Sub Team was wrapping up its effort,
                 it was about the time that Professor Tushnet had sent her coding exercise

which was reviewed briefly over the last call and so today's kind of discussion is to understand what those next steps should be and whether - how that coding exercise can help complete or help better inform some of the charter questions. And id o have some - a little bit more information as it relates to the sub team from the Document Sub Team but that the working group should also make a decision as to how this data can be used and should we split apart back into our sub teams to complete the exercise or continue forward as the full working group.

And I'll note that Rebecca's coding dataset, there were also several - I can't remember how many, I'm going to say four or five potential areas from the Providers Sub Team where this data might help them in completing the questions that have been submitted to them. I'm not as intimate with those as I was with the Document Sub Team but those are possible areas as well.

You know, and the last thing I'll state before I turn it back over to Julie is, you know, as it relates to the agenda item, in terms of the 250 responses received and then the 58 cases where the respondent prevailed, I have already done some of this analysis so using Rebecca's - unfortunately it's not in a position to share, I'm still confirming the data that or the summary results of that data, and hopefully we can send that out early next week for the - you know, the full working group or if the working group decides to go sub team first and chew on that data first before taking it back to the working group.

But the responses we were able to look at those a little bit more in depth based on that coding exercise. They had decided - or they had coded that, you know, was there a response received? If yes, was it with 14 days? If not within 14 days was there a response within six months? And were there any requests for extensions?

And so that definitely was very useful in understanding how the responses occurred and more importantly what the - it turned out is in terms of the 58 cases, where the respondent prevailed, just about half of them there was no

response so that even creates that small subset just a little bit smaller in terms of the cases that we would review which is really around the area of, what is it, let me pull it up on the document, which as it relates to the standard of proof and defenses around URS procedures 5.7 and 5.8 which is where some of that analysis will occur.

And then lastly, I'll also point out as it relates to Rebecca's research, and I had mentioned this when it was being introduced on the call, there was one particular part of that analysis which talks about the domain's disposition, trying to understand what its current state is and what happened to it after the case had - after the determination had been made, did in fact the domain get suspended? And then more importantly, what happened to the domain after the suspension?

Unfortunately, the original Whois data that I had provided to them was not a current query but a last known record which threw off the actual results. In the meantime, I've done a fresh query against Whois, I was able to acquire about 1400 of them from an automated perspective, and then I had to manually go fetch the other 400 but this new dataset will first tell us whether the name is registered or not and then after that I've gone through in the details to figure out is the name under suspension, which is kind of the biggest group of the domains, but then to understand of those that aren't suspended, basically trying to tag them or categorize them into queues whether the domain is protected under brand protection, DPML, or whether the original registrant is using the name. And I'm still working on cleaning out that data.

And then finally, having done that exercise, there were two things to note. One was that so far, and again this is preliminary results, and we'll share this soon, but as one example I only found one instance where the domain that the complainant prevailed, went through suspension, eventually became available or was deleted and available for registration and the original registrant re-registered the name.

But in understanding that exercise, I stared to notice that there were also duplicate domains that had been - that had two URS cases filed against it, some of which were the domain is - or the case that was first filed it was either withdrawn or the claim was denied for whatever reason and that the trademark owner then resubmitted the claim. And then another primary use case is that the trademark owner prevailed in the original case but the domain was deleted and then it was re-registered by a different registrant and another URS case was filed against the same name.

There were about 20 domains where that happened, so that's something that I don't think any of us originally had planned to use or look at but it does look like it might be another useful dataset for us to look at. So sorry for rambling so long. Like I said, I'm just trying to confirm and validate some of the summary charts that - or summary pivot tables that are being presented. I'm hopeful that we can share that with the working group early next week. And again, kind of the decision on the table is how shall we proceed with the use of this dataset either at the working group level or at the sub team level and go from there. So I hope that was helpful. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Phil. This is Kathy. May I join the queue?

Phil Corwin: Yes, sure Kathy. Before you speak I just wanted to ask a follow up question on Berry, you available, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, sir.

Phil Corwin: Yes, so there were about - my recollection is there are about 900 total URS cases filed to date, correct?

Berry Cobb: I believe it's 827…

Phil Corwin: Oh 827…

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: …at the close of 2017.

Phil Corwin: Okay. So out of those 820 cases, there were responses in about 250, correct? Which would be about 30% of all the cases filed.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Phil Corwin: Okay. And in all of the 826 cases, the respondent prevailed in 58 and from what you just said half of those respondent-prevailed cases came in cases where there was no response?

Berry Cobb: That is correct.

Phil Corwin: So the 58 is not just a subset of the 250 but of all the cases. So then the question before us would be what conclusions from that high level data and additional data from the research could be used to draw on any conclusions about the operation of the URS, the I guess the sufficiency of the response time, the neutrality of the - or objectiveness of the determinations, all of that, but without the professor here to get further into the weeds it's hard to know what to do with that.

So far as whether conclusions to be drawn from the research should be discussed within the full group or by a sub team, we've only got 20 people on this call; I'm not sure that we can make that decision for the full working group, we may have to take it to the email list. And just checking to see - all right so we still don't have the professor with us. Go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks. And Berry, thanks for the introduction. At the very beginning of your introduction you said something that sounded really interesting and I kind of missed it in passing. I think you said that there was - that in the long questions created - the questions created by either the Providers or

Practitioners sub teams, that there might be answers in the data that Rebecca provided. I'm not sure we want to go through it now but if that's the case, would you have the time to kind of go through and help both you know, because those questions are now kind of up at the working group level, help the working group see where those answers might like or at least the data might like to some of those questions that we've been asking and that would be great. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Kathy. That is what staff has done in - it wasn't the Practitioners at all, I don't believe there was any potential datasets at least from my perspective in our cursory review where any of Professor Tushnet's data might be useful for them. But there were four or five, again, I can't remember what they were exactly how many for the providers because there were some pretty detailed questions to the providers and I believe their general response was that they would need to review through all of the cases to accurately respond to that.

So it's hopeful that in those four or five instances where this data may be helpful that the providers could potentially use the data to try to get to the answer that particular sub team was looking for. And yes, I don't think we're prepared to walk through those on today's call but we can certainly make it a part of the next agenda item to highlight those potential areas that the providers could use the data for.

Kathy Kleiman: Maybe we can use the data for directly, I'm not sure the providers have access to this material or want to go through it. I mean, it may be something we can answer this directly by accessing the data.

Berry Cobb: Well I believe that the Dropbox link is available to everyone so they would have access to it. And again, I'm not intimate with the exact questions being asked. What I will note that it still will take time for some analysis and maybe to find the appropriate coding columns whereby we can create a pivot table to find some relationship among the data to help answer that question. You

know, there are several summary tabs in Professor Tushnet's dataset that may be able to answer some of those but I suspect that there will be some manual analysis and again, pivot tables, I love pivot tables, that may need to be built to help inform the providers to answer those or the working group whichever direction.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Did you have anything further, Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Coming off mute. No, I appreciate Berry's response.

Phil Corwin: All right, I see a hand up from George Kirikos. Go ahead please.

George Kirikos: Yes, George Kirikos for the transcript. And I noticed on the - there are other questions that we can answer with this data if it's properly collated, for example in the cases by respondent country tab, we can see that the top 15 countries of the URS respondents is listed with China being 252 cases, the United States of America, 159. But then we see a whole bunch of non-English speaking countries, some that are English speaking, for example, Canada and Australia, etcetera.

                 But if we look at, for example, the default rate for non-English speaking countries and see how that varies against English speaking countries, that can help answer some of these language related questions and also even just the success rate, where they do respond because if you're in a race but you're starting 20 meters behind because your native language isn't English, then that puts you at a disadvantage. Thank you. Just a matter of collating the data appropriately to answer some of these other questions. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Okay, I just lost my computer. Something just happened to my desktop and it's restarting, which has never happened before. There was a power outage or what. But I'm flying blind at the moment. I can't see a thing.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Phil. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. We do not currently have any hands up at the moment.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: I can wander off somewhere else and maybe get - this is going to take me a moment I'm afraid.

Jeff Neuman: So this is Jeff Neuman can I just get in the queue real quick and I could…

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Yes, Jeff, go ahead. Because I've got a situation here.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks.

Phil Corwin: I'll try to get online on a different machine. I'm putting myself on speaker and listening right now. And, Kathy, maybe I can hand off to you for a moment while I get back online. And go ahead, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. I'm just trying to like - so while this data is interesting for data purposes, I'm still trying to figure out why or how we're trying to use it. I think George went over a theory on the non-English speakers which, again, the first thing that comes to my mind is well, are the strings themselves English words being applied for non-English speaker?

So I just want to make sure that we don't just jump to conclusions based on raw data that we, you know, we don't even have a working theories or things that we're trying to prove or disprove; we just have a whole bunch of data in

front of us and I'm just worried about, you know, taking months to look at data without kind of any just context or background of what we're trying to look for why this data.

You know, it's great that someone's got the data but I mean, without discussions beforehand as to why we think the data is useful or what it's useful for, what we're trying to prove or disprove or theories or anything like that, I'm just not sure what we're going to do with a whole bunch of data dropped in our lap. But that's just a general concern. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan, can I get in the queue please? I'm on audio only.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. Can everybody hear me? This is Kathy. And I think - I'm driving so but I think Phil just handed this over to me. I just wanted to respond to Jeff briefly that, you know, this is, you know, these are the questions that we are considering; we have been given - we have had a lot of data dropped in our lap, very comprehensive data. It involves every case up to a certain point. And I just wanted to add there's certain number of withdrawals as well, about 7% of the cases have been withdrawn and to me that's very interesting as well.

So, you know, we have a lot of questions, we have a lot of data, how can we - my thought would be how can we merge it? Greg, go ahead please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. Partially to respond to Jeff, I think there are - I don't know that the working group has theories but it seems to me that there are individual members have theories that they would like to try to prove using this data so it'll be interesting to see how that plays out. I think we need to be careful with the inferences that we draw from the data and extrapolating for instance - whether the default rate for non-English speakers has anything to do with their language capacity is not something that can be drawn from this data.

We'd need to know why they defaulted. There's no - there are a number of alternate theories one could provide including the fact that the people from non-English speaking countries have a higher rate of cybersquatting and therefore their cases are dead losers and they decided not to try to defend themselves. That is at least as viable a theory as the idea that they were just poor schmucks who were handicapped by the inability to deal with English which, you know, may or may not have been an issue, we just don't know.

So trying to pretend that we know things we don't know because there's data that has certain numbers is something that we need to avoid otherwise we're just going to be merrily kind of abusing the data and that's something we need to watch out for. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes, this is Phil. Kathy, I appreciate your briefly taking over while I switch machines due to my technical issue. I'm back on. Thank you, Jeff and Greg for those comments. Yes, I think you know, we need to be very careful about only drawing conclusions that flow naturally from the data, not trying to pull things out of it that aren't clearly supported. And I see something in the chat on this. But again, without the - we're half an hour into the call. The professor is not with us, we were expecting her to lead the discussion and tell us what she thought might - what conclusions might credibly be drawn or at least looked at, what questions could be looked at based upon this data. And she's not with us.

And rather than go too far with speculation based on very little information here…

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: Phil, this is Scott. I have my hand up.

Phil Corwin: Who's that?

Scott Austin: This is Scott. I do have my hand up.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Okay, yes, I'll get to you in a second, Scott.

Scott Austin: Okay.

Phil Corwin: I don't know how long we want to go with this discussion today. Maybe we can talk about what's the best way to deal with this. Certainly we don't want to be spending months on this. I think we - my own view, strictly personal view out there for discussion is that we - and we'll be having another Data Sub Team call, a long one, later today where we may get into this a lot more, I don't want to preempt that call, but perhaps that's the group that should be looking at this and reporting back to the full working group in a rather short period of time the next few weeks, as to what conclusions relevant to the questions we have regarding providers can be credibly drawn from the professor's data.

                  So with that I'll stop and recognize Scott. Scott, go ahead. Scott Austin, if you're on mute, unmute yourself.

Scott Austin: Yes, I'm sorry, I just had to get through the various…

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Scott Austin: …on my phone back to it. Anyway, my questions and perhaps Berry could address that just because I know he's been working with the professor to a certain extent and looking at this a lot, I noted there are a series of language cases and as much as George has offered his theory apparently some folks either requested that the analysis be done or the decision be done in their

language, but I wasn't sure exactly what the list of language cases meant, if the string was in a particular language or affected by a particular language or if those were cases where either the complainant or respondent had asked for the decision to be put into a language other than English. And that's one question.

Second question is, in the summary tables, there are references to default - this is in the count case number lower right hand corner, default and default final - slash final and then final. And I just wondered how those distinctions were made, if there were really only 15 cases where there was a final decision in the instance of a default or there were 566 default cases where no final decision was rendered, I just wanted to determine what that distinction was. And if Berry can speak to that great, otherwise I guess I'll wait until the professor breaks it down. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Berry, did you have a response on that?

Berry Cobb: Yes, sir. Thank you, Scott. So you know, I can't speak 100% for Rebecca's coding exercise so but I'll offer up at least what I've observed thus far. So the one tab as it related to the country is only from the registrant's location. And I don't think that has any much more detailed data as to beyond just the location of the registrant. You know, I've combed through a lot of cases and the only two providers that I see where cases were in a language other than English were from MFSD - or MFSD and ADNDRC.

I don't think I've come across one case from Forum that had - that wasn't in English. That said, you know, that, you know, I don't - I'd hate to go any further as to make any other kind of observations about how the providers and/or the examiners were dealing with the - with the respondents in that regard.

As it relates to the second part of your question, and I'm not sure exactly what you were looking at, but the same premise or I guess the same columns

of data are similar from the original dataset that I have scraped off the providers and that we did some of our initial analysis and review of the charts back several ICANN meetings ago, and that's essentially how they're displayed on the provider's site.

In essence, they will provide two kinds of status as it relates to the particular cases. And a, you know, what's the ultimate outcome or the result? And that's either the claim was denied or the domain was suspended or basically the case was withdrawn. And then you basically then had the determination and anywhere where it lists default essentially there was no response, there was no request for an extension and it was a default outcome or determination that ultimately resulted in the domain being suspended and/or the claim denied.

In cases where there is a final it typically meant that there was a response to that particular case and that could have happened within the 14 days or even within the six month period. And that was - that determination code. But again in essence, and then I think there's a few that are default final and then there's an additional column that also highlights appeals. But the - at the end of the day those types of codes really came from the providers' site themselves and not - and in essence when you're looking at Professor Tushnet's spreadsheet the basic case information was the data that I had originally - that staff had originally scraped off of the provider websites.

Scott Austin: Great. Thank you, Berry.

Phil Corwin: Okay. All right, and Scott, I assume that's an old hand up there? So…

Scott Austin: Just one follow up question to what Berry mentioned…

Phil Corwin: Sure, okay.

Scott Austin: …because I was on the Practitioner group and I know one of the things we asked in our survey questions was regarding the use of an appeal within the six month period and I just wondered in the spreadsheet itself, Berry, is there a place and, forgive me if it's obvious, but is there a place where that particular type of case has been highlighted where there was an appeal within the six month period? And that's my last question.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Scott. I guess I had missed that that was a specific question within the Practitioner's one. It was also listed on the Document Sub Team and we did do an analysis so there were 14 appeals and that was sent basically it was a part of the summary report that the Document Sub Team and the - Brian Beckham was our sub team chair for that, but there were basically 14 appeals, seven were, you know, were related to the dotEmail gTLD and there's other details that I don't have right in front of me about those 14 appeals.

But we analyzed those 14 cases and tried to basically compare the original case to the appeal, understand what the responses were like but we didn't dive into the aspects about any of the - of the three prongs or the three elements of - to prove within those cases other than highlighting what it was and then the ultimate determination. So this already a summary of those appeals completed. What I can't answer for you is whether that will address the question that your sub team had created.

Scott Austin: Well, my question was simpler, it was just whether or not any of those appeals are singled out and reflected in Professor Tushnet's coding exercise as you've referenced it here?

Berry Cobb: They are highlighted and that is Column Alpha Poppa, AP. And it'll basically either be coded as not applicable or successful or unsuccessful. And then Colum Alpha Quebec, AQ, will have a link to that particular appeal.

Scott Austin: Great, thank you.

Phil Corwin: Okay thank you, Scott. Thank you, Berry. I'm going to go through some of the comments put in the chat and then maybe wrap up this discussion where we're limited. From Georges N, he agreed with Jeff. He thinks just looking at the data by itself doesn't help without a broader context, in particular the data has some assumptions and codings built into it that may or may not be accurate so if we're going to look at the data we need to consider the professor's underlying assumptions.

And of course we need the professor to do that. I'm editorializing a bit as I read this. And then Mary Wong stated as Berry noted, it's up to the working group to decide which parts of the data and how is relevant to the scope of our work. Rebecca's research assistant has done a lot of work but it's entirely her research and she has kindly provided it to us in full. Doesn't mean it's all directly relevant to our work is why some may be very useful but perhaps not all of it.

And then Mary continues, some of it seems very relevant to the Document Sub Team and then she goes on, the other two sub teams may wish to see if any of the data can supplement as quantitative measures, responses received from providers or practitioners. And I'll editorialize here, of course we're waiting for those responses.

So I'm going to suggest we have very extensive research done by Professor Tushnet that is not a working group document, it's something that working group member has developed on her own and submitted to the working group to consider whether all or part of it can be useful to our work and drawing any conclusions and helping to answer our revised charter questions regarding the URS. It's definitely relevant to the Document Sub Team. Some parts of the research may have some relevance to the work of the Providers and Practitioner Sub Teams.

So given that we don't have the professor available to answer questions and give us her personal view as to what - what portions of this research may be relevant to answering our questions, I'm going to suggest unless there's a lot of people who want to continue talking about this at a high level, that I will discuss this with my two cochairs, one of whom is on the call but not very able to talk about the best way to proceed.

I'm thinking the best way to proceed may be to invite members of the three URS Sub Teams who wish to be involved to engage with the professor and report back to the full working group by a designated deadline, and I'm thinking that deadline should be no later than the Panama meeting, what useful conclusions they think may be drawn from the research; that would give us, three, four weeks to - for that small group to consult with the professor an bring something back to the full working group for consideration because we do expect to have answers to all the practitioner's questions back before the Panama meeting and hopefully all but if not almost all of the answers back from the providers and so we want this to be fed in at the same time; we can't be waiting months later on views as to what conclusions can be drawn from the research.

Any comments on that? I think we'll probably take this first to the cochairs and then come back to the full list with a proposal of how to proceed on dealing with the Professor Tushnet's research and deciding its relevance if any to answering our questions. Any comments on procedure for dealing with the research?

All right, I don't see any hands up. I want to correct - I made a misstatement a little while ago, the Data Sub Team call today will not be dealing with this research, that's a call for members of the Data Sub Team to interact with the Analysis Group which has been selected to conduct the data survey on the Clearinghouse, claims notices and sunrise and assist Analysis Group in teeing up those questions and getting that survey out as soon as possible

now that they've been contracted to get that work back to us we're hoping by midsummer so that's the purpose of that call today.

So unless there's other comments now on the Harvard Law School research, I'm going to going once, going twice, we're going to switch to a quick discussion of ICANN 62 planning. Look to staff to bring us up to date as to where things stand, briefly discuss it and end this call early in view of the fact that the person we had hoped to engage with for most of this call is not on the call. So let's proceed to ICANN 62 discussion.

Who wants to speak to that from staff? Bring us an update.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Phil. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I can speak to that. We will have - sorry, I should have brought this up beforehand but we will have several sessions at ICANN 62. And although that full schedule is not up yet, staff can tell you when those will be occurring. So they are three different sessions, and sorry momentarily, let me just get to those. We have on Wednesday, that's the 27th of June, we have the first of three sessions, that will be from 10:30 to noon on that day.

And then moving to Thursday, the 28th, we have two sessions that follow each one, one from 9:00 to 10:15 and one from 10:30 to noon. And staff will go ahead and send out with notes from this call those - that information as well. And staff are working with the cochairs on the agenda for a program for each of those sessions.

Phil Corwin: Okay, Julie, I thought we had picked up a Monday afternoon slot? Have we been bumped from that?

Julie Hedlund: Let me check that again. I do not think there's a Monday afternoon slot. And I'm looking at that. No, I think the final determination was that what I had just mentioned to you. I think the Monday afternoon ended up clashing - it would

have clashed with a cross community session on geographic names. I see that that is in an afternoon slot.

Phil Corwin: All right so we're very back loaded, we're at the tail end of the Panama meeting which is unfortunate but there's nothing we can do about it.

Julie Hedlund: Right, unfortunately the schedule is set. As usual, there were you know, several different conflicts and, you know, sort of trading back and forth and this is what we ended up with.

Phil Corwin: Okay. And we haven't decided what we're going to use the three sessions for yet; we have committed that one of them is going to be talking about procedural issues going forward in our final - for the second half of the year leading up to publication of our initial report. We'll decide what the substance of the other two will be as we approach it. Did anyone want to weigh in now on the Panama schedule or ideas for what we should be focusing on Panama given that we think we're going to have all the practitioner questions answers back by then and hopefully all or if not all almost all of the providers responses, so that's the likely focus of our substantive sessions in Panama to review those responses and discuss what if any conclusions can be drawn from them.

John McElwaine: Hey, Phil. John McElwaine. I'll get in the queue.

Phil Corwin: Hi, John. Yes, go ahead, John, you're number one.

John McElwaine: So as we've discussed on this call, previously, do we still have planned a session to talk about process and scoping and going forward, you know, how we're going to produce the interim and final report? Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes, John, I just said that, we plan to devote one of the three sessions in Panama to discussing how to operate procedurally to be productive and

constructive as possible in the second half of this year when we're moving toward developing an initial report.

John McElwaine: Okay thanks.

Phil Corwin: So the answer is yes. All right well I have - that's the schedule for Panama so if you're going to Panama please don't schedule leaving too early on Thursday because we're going to be in meetings up to noon on Thursday of the final day in Panama right up to checkout time, maybe we can get late departures those of us on the working group.

And the only other thing I'd say I'd like staff to review the attendance list of this new call time versus the previous call time we were using for APAC calls. I have to say having only - I thought this time was fairly - certainly very friendly for European members of the working group, and, you know, reasonable for East Coast and Midwest US members, not so great for Pacific Coast members.

But we have - I'd like to know what the attendance of prior calls at this time have been compared to the prior APAC time because it seems to me we have very particularly low attendance on this call, I'm not sure if that's because it's a holiday week or coming off a holiday weekend in the US or what but we had hoped to get greater attendance using this time and that doesn't seem to be happening so this cochair would like some feedback on how that's working out.

Does anyone else have anything they want to bring up before we adjourn the call and give you back 36 minutes of your life? Well thank you. I'm sorry we couldn't get people into this today but the speaker we were expecting on the call is not with us. We're going to take the discussion of how to proceed procedurally with analyzing the professor's research. We'll bring it back to the full working group list after the cochairs have some discussion among themselves in regard to that. And thank you all for attending. Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Thanks for joining. Thanks so much, Phil, for chairing, appreciate it.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. That concludes…

((Crosstalk))

Andrea Glandon: …today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END