ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Data
Wednesday, 30 May 2018 at 17:00 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-data-30may18-en.mp3 Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/PyIFBQ

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

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Julie Bisland: Okay thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon good evening everyone. Welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Sub Team for Data call held on Wednesday, 30 May 2018. On the call today we have Kathy Kleiman, Kristine Dorrain, Rebecca Tushnet, Lori Schulman, we have guests Stacey Chan and Greg Rafert. And I'm showing no apologies at this time. From staff I have Ariel Liang, Antonietta Mangiacotti, Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb and myself Julie Bisland. Just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this I'll turn it back over to you Julie, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So thank you all for joining and in particular for the sub team for data and also we have as noted from the Analysis Group we have Stacey Chan and Greg Rafert. And let me just take a moment to run through the agenda. And we have the introduction of the Analysis Group. And then we will move on to a presentation from the Analysis Group. And then we will – we'll discuss the guidance and the draft

questions that the data sub team has developed and then on to any other business.

And let me just ask if anybody has any other business that they would like to raise at this point? I'm not seeing any hands so let me just go ahead and move on to the first item which will be brief. So as you know we have announced that the RFP has gone to the contract has gone to Analysis Group. And we're very pleased to be able to work with them. As some of you may know they have quite a bit of experience in working with ICANN and that's certainly is extremely helpful in this case as well. And they do come with a great deal of experience in surveys and so I know that is something that was, you know, particularly important for this particular project.

So I don't know if anybody has any questions but Ariel had previously sent out, you know, the announcement of the Analysis Group and some of the background on them. So I don't want to necessarily take too much time up here but I'll just pause for a moment and see if anybody has any questions before we move on to Analysis Group's presentation.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes Julie this is Kathy.

Julie Hedlund: Hi Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi. I think it would be great if Stacey and Greg could give us a little bit of the background. I apologize I've been traveling for the last two weeks so I haven't read the background and I know they bring a lot and it might our understanding of kind of what to convey and what to share based on a better understanding of their background?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. And actually I think that, that may indeed be part of the presentation that they have for us. So perhaps then I could go ahead Greg and Stacey and switch over to you. I see we've got the presentation up now

in the room and just turn it off to you and also, you know, anything that you want to address with respect to Kathy's question?

Greg Rafert: Yes, no we'd be happy to give some background on ourselves. Do I have control of the slides or should I just ask you to advance the slide deck?

Julie Hedlund: We can…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Ariel Liang: This is Ariel. I'm sorry Greg you can just let me know and I will advance the slide deck.

Greg Rafert: Okay great. Yes I guess if you can advance to the first slide with a number, Page 1 that would be great. Yes thank you Ariel. So I'll give a brief introduction to myself and then Stacey will chime in to give a little bit of her background and then of course we're working with some other people that are listed on the slide as well. So my name is Greg Rafert. I'm a Vice President at Analysis Group in our Denver office. I've worked on a number of past reviews independent reviews with ICANN. We actually have two independent reviews that are ongoing right now both of which we fielded surveys. So we have some experience fielding surveys in the ICANN community as well.

Outside of my work for ICANN I've also been engaged on a number of projects where we've distributed surveys internationally to a really wide variety of different types of individuals based on the projects. So I come with a fair amount of survey expertise but also I think a pretty good understanding of ICANN at this point. I'm still learning little things here and there with each review but I feel much more educated about ICANN and the empowered community than I did before.

Stacey and I also worked on part of the review of the Trademark Clearinghouse. That was a little bit more data driven so we actually collected some of the data that the Trademark Clearinghouse providers themselves kind of collect over time and looked at what, you know, we could say based on kind of hard data that we were generously provided with. We did a little bit of surveying in that project but it was pretty minimal. So it doesn't surprise me that there is an interest for this kind of survey going to a number of different constituency groups within ICANN. And I'll pause – stop there and then Stacey if you want to give an introduction to yourself?

Stacey Chan: Sure. This is Stacey Chan. I'm the Manager here in the Denver office. And as Greg mentioned I've worked on a few ICANN projects as well. As Greg mentioned I helped with the review or one of the reviews of the TMCH. And that was interesting to start to learn about some of these rights protection mechanisms. And I think it'll be really nice to be able to follow-up with this project as well to be able to get a little bit more feedback from different constituency groups on their views and uses of the rights protection mechanisms. I also previously to joining Analysis Group I worked for Ernst & Young in a statistical and survey practices well in there. I helped design and implement surveys and report the survey responses back. So that's my background.

Greg Rafert: And I'm not sure is David…

((Crosstalk))

David Franklyn: I have joined. Thank you. I'm sorry I'm a little bit late everybody.

Greg Rafert: No worries David. You're actually just in time.

David Franklyn: Good. Do you want me to introduce myself?

Greg Rafert: Yes that would be great David.

David Franklyn: All right. I am David Franklyn. I'm a law professor at the University of San Francisco School of Law where I've been a professor for about 18 years and joining Golden Gate University School of Law and also School of Business and Marketing in (Among) which is in San Francisco but I also run the McCarthy Institute for Trademark and Technology Law and the Center for the Empirical Study of Trademark Law. And I've done a bunch of surveys for different clients, different types working with different consulting firms and sometimes on my own. I've also done - I've done them academically and some - published some articles about them about the use of surveys in patent law and in trademark law.

I've testified about surveys in deposition. And - see but also what relevant to what we're doing here is I'm fairly familiar with the rights protection mechanisms as I've put on a conference every year under the auspices of the McCarthy Institute for Trademark Law on trademark law with trademark lawyers from all over the world and cosponsored with INTA the International Trademark Association and have a really close relationship with them. And we usually have 300 lawyers or so - and brand owners at the conference.

And I've done a couple of surveys through INTA's 30,000 person mailing list. I've done a couple of online surveys to reach trademark lawyers, and their brand owners and their constituency. And then also at the conference every year for the last seven years we've had a one hour and 15 minute panel on ICANN. And I think for the last six years we have almost for every one of them in which we've tried to keep the audience up to date on the latest developments with the rights protection mechanisms and their interface with trademark law, and trademark lawyers, and what people should be aware of in that audience.

And so I've kept abreast of the issues mostly that way and planning that conference, and working with the panel, and then being there, and listening

and interacting so that's the experience that I think caused Greg Rafert to reach out to me and get our relationship started which is on this project will be our first project together. And I'm very happy to be here and be of service in any way I can.

Greg Rafert: Great, thank you David. This is Greg again speaking. And I will just note that the other - might've noticed on the slide that's up that we also include or note that Research Now SSI will be involved. They're a digital market research firm that Analysis Group and David have worked frequently with in the past.

And in particular -- and we can get into this in a little bit more detail later – we're going to be working with them to identify and survey potential domain name registrants which I know are kind of a harder group to get in touch with but are also of a fair amount of interest. And so they'll be helping us with that group. And I think with that yes thank you Ariel. And I'll also just note if there are any questions while we're talking please feel free to jump in we're happy to answer questions on the fly. And I'll turn it over to Stacey.

Stacey Chan: Okay. So I think our plan with this presentation is to just to walk through our current understanding of how the project will flow including a timeline which we'll look at too soon. So our current understanding of the purpose of the work that we'll be pursuing is to launch, collect and summarize survey responses from a variety of stakeholder groups that were defined in the RFP and are listed below so trademark and brand owners, new gTLD registry operators, registrars selling domain names registered in the new gTLDs, domain name registrants and then also potential domain name registrants or people who are interested in registering a domain name but have actually have not.

And we've also here listed the number of respondents that we would aim to get from each of these groups. So we are hoping to get at least 50 respondents from the first four target groups and then at least 200 respondents from the last group which is the group that Research Now SSI

will be helping with. And that's because Research Now SSI has - they've established a very large platform of potential survey respondents and they have a lot of experience and outreach to a variety of populations. So Research Now SSI is really well-positioned to be able to contact people who would be members of this group.

If there aren't any other questions I guess we can move on to the next slide. So here we're proposing the timeline. So today is March – May sorry, May 30. And we're having our project kick off meeting. Then the next milestone would be the delivery of the draft inception report which we would aim to deliver early in June which we're right on the cusp of June, so that would be soon. We'll talk in the next slide about exactly what would be involved in the draft inception report.

Following that so in about two weeks we would hope to finalize the survey questions and meet again with the full working group to discuss that plan. And from there we would move forward in the next week to ten days to program and finalize the survey instruments. So on a rolling basis as we complete the surveys they would launch and we would be hoping ideally of course to launch the surveys as early as possible. We think that we would probably be able to begin launching on June 20 and have them all launched by the end of that week on the 22nd.

And we understand of course at that point we're kind of coming up against the ICANN meetings so we're hoping that we could be able to have that launch. Greg will be present at the ICANN meetings and so he can, you know, raise awareness of the surveys during the meetings and then we can follow-up with participants after the meetings just to remind them of the surveys out there and hopefully, you know, than elicit more response while the survey is still in the field. And then following that once the survey closes after about a month of being in the field we'll work on summarizing the responses. And again as we go through the rest of the presentation we'll talk

about the details of what we're planning to have in the final report. So that's the timeline.

Greg Rafert: Yes I'll just briefly jump in. I think it's important to note that this is a pretty aggressive timeline for getting all five surveys out. So that's why we put approximately June 13 and approximately June 22. We're certainly going to move with all due haste to, you know, work with everyone on the phone today to get the survey questions finalized as quickly as possible and then decode the surveys up quickly. But yes this is a tight timeline so I think we'll just want to keep that in mind as we're moving forward.

Stacey Chan: Thanks Greg. Okay so I think we can move on to the next slide.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. This is Kristine. May I ask a question? I cannot figure out how to raise my hand.

Greg Rafert: Yes of course.

Stacey Chan: Sure.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you Kristine Amazon Registry Services. Thanks so much for presenting this. And maybe I'm jumping the gun a little bit but maybe this is a question for you or maybe a question for staff but I noticed that you did mention the launch of the surveys time to kind of coincide with Panama so that we can do some marketing. Is there some sort of discussion yet with staff about how we can actually have a marketing campaign and get the word out? I mean I don't think grassroots is really the right effort here. I mean we know that one of the things that the INTA survey struggled from was a lack of full participation. So is there an actual plan in place to get the various people in categories one through four engaged and involved? Thanks.

Greg Rafert: No that's a great question. I think it's a really important one. I can begin it and then if staff would like to jump in as well. So we've begun discussions with

staff. We have not yet come up with a formalized plan but I think it will be put together relatively quickly. Yes I agree with you that kind of this grassroots approach probably is not going to cut it for getting the surveys sufficiently distributed. And so like I said I think we'll work with staff to put a plan together quickly but it hasn't really been developed yet.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you.

Greg Rafert: I offer on an earlier - yes so go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Oh thank you. This is Kristine again. Yes that's very helpful. Thank you. I had actually a question from the previous slide that I've been mulling over so if you don't mind me reverting back to that. You mentioned seeking responses from 50 new gTLD registry operators. As a new gTLD registry operator I'm wondering are there actually 50 unique new gTLD registry operators? I mean when you break down sort of how many new gTLDs, you know, sort of bulk registry operators own are – were you thinking of that more by 50 different TLDs will respond or 50 different unique registry operators? That's part A to my question.

And then part B to my question is you had mentioned that you might get 200 respondents for potential domain name registrants. And I believe the answer you gave for why is because Research Now has a large pool so there might be 200 available. But was there any other reason besides we can get that number or was there some thought that went into why 200 why not less why not more? Thank you.

Greg Rafert: Yes both very good questions. This is Greg speaking again. So I'll take the last question first regarding the potential domain name registrants. So there's kind of a general rule of thumb in survey design that getting around let's say 200 kind of respondents it gives you enough what's called like statistical power to be able to draw kind of meaningful conclusions from the data. And so that's why we've targeted approximately 200 respondents from the

potential domain name registrants. Your question regarding the new gTLD registry operators is also a good one. I think I was thinking more along the lines of distinct TLDs but I would be open to discussion on that point if we just want to restrict it to one response per gTLD operator.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks so much Greg. This is Kristine again if I can just follow-up and then I'll stop. So I know from Amazon's perspective we have 52. So if we actually take the time to respond for all of ours you will get all 52 of your responses simply from Amazon. And I can probably also tell you you're going to get the same response for all 52 of our TLDs unless we separate out our brand TLDs or something differently.

So you might want to just consider that Donuts has 200 I think. You probably don't want 200 different responses from Donuts unless they have some different things something different to say about various TLDs not that we have to hash that out at this moment but I just invite you to consider that as you're looking for registry operator feedback. Thank you.

Greg Rafert: No that's very helpful thank you.

Mary Wong: And this is Mary from staff Greg.

Greg Rafert: Yes sorry go ahead Mary.

Mary Wong: I was actually just going to jump in on the question of reaching out that Kristine asked earlier and to confirm that we have begun talking with you and Stacey and the team about how to do that. And where we are is that it may be different depending on each of the five target groups. And as Greg has already explained Research Now SSI are the ones that are going to be working with the group that's potential registrants. With the others for example one way that we will most likely reach the registry operators and the registrars is to use the ICANN staff who already have those contacts with the registries and registrars.

And I believe they quite recently we actually did another survey through a professional firm but ICANN staff were the ones that contacted the ROs and the registrars. So those discussions are taking place. And we obviously welcome more suggestions but hopefully we will through collaboration be able to reach as many as possible who can respond to the surveys.

David Franklyn: Can I jump in here for a minute? It's David Franklyn. One concern that I have and I've bounced it around a little bit with Greg is in terms of yield rate, and reaching people, and getting them to complete the survey we should all be very mindful of the length of the survey that the longer it is the harder it is going to be to capture attention - keep attention and deliver even on what I consider to be fairly modest numerical goals. And I just throw that out there because we have to - these are really great questions. And outreach is important to define but survey taker fatigue is a very real thing and we have to think about that too because we think about numbers.

Michael Graham: This is Michael Graham. I've got a quick question.

Greg Rafert: Yes go ahead Michael.

Michael Graham: Okay yes I'm trying to work my hand here who knows if it worked. I had a question too sort of jumping off of what Mary was saying just to ask if there was a plan for example for how we were going to reach the trademark and brand owners? I mean was there a particular way that was going to be handled or not? And I'm sensitive to that as a member of INTA and having directed the survey that we issued two years ago where we ran into exactly the problem that David was just discussing the length of the survey and the complexity of it kept a number of - well actually kept 2/3 of the possible respondents who had started the survey from completing it and probably others as well. And I was just wondering what you had at this point planned in terms of identifying those possible respondents and with the knowledge that

you're probably going to have to send out two at least two to three times as many surveys to get the number of responses that you'd like?

David Franklyn: Michael can I jump in on that? Michael by the way where are you from? Are you a trademark lawyer?

Michael Graham: All of - sorry yes I'm with Expedia Inc. here in Seattle.

David Franklyn: Oh nice to meet you.

Michael Graham: Nice to meet you.

David Franklyn: I've been up your way many times.

Michael Graham: And I saw you two years ago at the Franklyn or at the McCarthy Institute I believe.

David Franklyn: Great yes. Well, you know, I've done a survey of different type through INTA with (Sherry Diamond) where we tried to figure out how many - why people do surveys and don't bring them forward in litigation sometimes. And even then we get pretty good yield but our survey was only maybe 18 minutes long and we got about 300 respondents through INTA. We did and INTA blast ATN and INTA was kind enough to let us - they blasted it out for us around the world to 30,000 people. And I guess we got 100 I mean 1% of the total blast who completed.

I don't remember how many started more than that but we didn't have huge drop-off rate because we tried to keep it short. Do you recall how long the survey was in terms of like average time to take it the one that you're speaking of that you did through INTA on rights protection mechanisms a couple of years ago?

Michael Graham: Yes it actually was on the cost impact of the new gTLD program. And this is Michael by the way for the record. And so it was seeking metrics of costs numbers, actions types of actions generally addressing specific questions that were being asked by the Consumer Trust Choice and Competition Review Team. And really questions that demanded a look at specific expenditures over the past two years which was in a form and for information that's not normally kept by trademark owners. So the time to prepare - I mean on my behalf I probably put it eight hours of preparation that includes having - getting information from outside counsel and then probably four dedicated hours to completing the survey itself, so it was quite extensive.

David Franklyn: That's a lot to ask of people. And how many people actually completed that survey?

Michael Graham: Well Lori Shulman can confirm this if I'm wrong I believe we had 93 who actually touched and began taking the survey and 31 who completed it. And that was out of a base of 1700. We only sent - it was only sent out to regular members of INTA that is members who actually are trademark owners. So it did not go to any law firms or such.

David Franklyn: Because of the nature…

Ariel Liang: Sorry.

David Franklyn: …of the questions you were asking, yes.

Michael Graham: Yes exactly.

Ariel Liang: Excuse me sorry this is Ariel from staff. We do have a few people in the queue. And it's (Susan) first and then Phil, and then Lori. And I just want to have a quick reminder that we do have limited time and have a lot to go through and please keep your questions or comments brief. Thank you.

Greg Rafert: Okay.

(Susan):   Hi thanks, it's (Susan). It was just a really quick one. One was I just wanted to support what Kristine had been saying about the registry operators the 50. And I think as far as (unintelligible) it would be preferable to get sort of registry operators, you know, only catch them once not catch them multiple times if they own different TLDs.

                 And I think we probably also need to be for the purposes of this study we need to be ruling out the brand TLD operators or registry operators who are only a brand TLD operator. I mean there are some who have a mix of - in their portfolio but, you know, they won't have been administering the rights protection mechanisms if in the context of being a registry operator if they're a .brand. And so we need to keep those excluded from the survey I think. And I just wondered if you could say a bit more about the potential domain name registrants sort of who are these people that Research Now have on their data base? Can you give us a bit more about their background?

Greg Rafert: Yes so Research Now SSI relies on panels of individuals. So these are people who have basically signed up to take the occasional survey from Research Now SSI. In this case we're going to be targeting English speaking potential domain name registrants. And they basically receive kind of a very a relatively small renumeration for each survey that they complete.

                 And they'll use - or we'll work with Research Now SSI to kind of come up with what we think are a reasonable set of screening questions to make sure that we're really identifying potential domain name registrants. I don't know if that's - if there's - if you have additional questions on kind of these types of individuals but that's at least at a high level who they are and why they sign up for being in the panel.

Ariel Liang: Next is Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks. Phil for the record. My question again relates to what page is this? On Page 3 the 50 of each group someone just switched me to Page 4, now back to three. Yes my question how do we - want to make sure when we get the results back this summer that we have statistically significant results from a diversity of types of respondents. So my question is what is statistically significant, you know, among 50 separate registry operators may be more than the actual universe of registry operators when you - if you regard each portfolio operator as one but 50 people who registered domain names in new TLDs is a very small subset of total registrants and new TLDs.

How do we determine what's statistically significant and so how do we - when the registry operators are not concerned about diversity but trademark and brand owners what efforts will be made to not just give Fortune 500 companies but small and medium enterprises? Same with registrars we want of course GoDaddy had Tocows but we've got small ones out there who may face different challenges. And so how do we make sure that these results are something we can base decisions on in terms of statistical reliability and diversity of respondents, thank you?

Greg Rafert: Great question Phil. I can begin but then David you should of course feel free to jump in as well. I mean just taking registrars as an example I think in terms of the outreach we'll, you know, be working with ICANN staff closely to make sure that we are getting into contact with all of, you know, as large of the universe of registrars as possible ideally the entire universe are close to it. We'll then follow-up somewhat frequently with registrars that haven't had a chance to respond or haven't responded to kind of further encourage their response.

And then what we'll do once we've collected all of the data from once again for example registrars we'll be looking at the data carefully to see, you know, whether or not it is representative of the universe of registrars. And if it isn't, you know, what groups might we be missing and how might that affect kind of our analysis and discussion of the results?

David Franklyn: I would -- this is David -- I would just say very briefly because we're trying to keep people on the queue these are excellent questions. We've begun to talk about and we do not have full answers to in my opinion at this point in time. The goals that have been set for data collection I think are preliminary and they're based on past experience that ICANN has had and some sense of the size of development universe and what we can expect to get.

But you're right there is the issue of statistical significance. And that is, you know, for everybody else's benefit on the call what we're looking at generally when we talk about that is a 95% confidence interval rate. That the sample we have we want it to be within a relatively small margin of error, that it's a representative example of the actual universe that we're trying to test and the way that's calculated is using a formula that's accepted amongst people who can do this a mathematical formula. And it can vary from a pretty small size to a larger size. But as you probably know from doing other types of surveys like when I do a trademark confusion survey I usually can't claim there's statistical significance unless I have at least 300 people responding.

And I usually try to get 700 people responding. But I often don't need that many I just go overboard. And then the other part of the answer to that is it depends of the structure of the question, the range of answers that are possible and that affects statistical significance and sometimes therefore one can't begin to come up with really what one needs until one starts seeing the answers and how much they vary amongst each other. And then that's why we often do pilots to in part figure out how many respondents we ultimately need with a 95% confidence interval.

So what I would suggest we do here so that would be this guidepost we're already hearing questions of challenge whether we're going to get them. We're going to also have questions in the instruments that make people describe who they are so that we can do cross tabulation subgroups of people and where their answers vary among subgroups. And then we might

have to revisit the issue at least on some of these segments market segments of whether we've collected enough data and if not what do we do then to try to go get more in order to meet these basic statistical benchmarks? So that would be the best answer I could give you right now.

(Anna): This is (Anna) from staff and next is Lori.

Lori Schulman: Hi. This is Lori Schulman for the transcript. I want to thank the Analysis Group. I am following up with Michael's comments. I am INTAs staff liaison that was responsible for the conduct of the survey. We had significant challenges. The results were also presented to this RPM group that includes the full survey package as well as a high level overview.

I would recommend that you look on the ICANN wiki if you haven't already and pull this out and read it carefully. And I would offer my time everybody would be welcome to join but we have a lot of deep learnings from this. And I among others in this data group who devised these questions did repeat all long that we had concerns about the length of the questions, about the ambition of the schedule and whether or not we may also be running into the same kind of challenges that we had in the relatively closed and friendly universe of INTA.

So I, you know, I noticed we are on an ambitious time track but if it's going to set us up for failure I would love to at least share INTAs experiences with you and maybe we can find ways to alleviate some of the challenges that we have. And then I'll end on one note we also at INTA worked very closely with the review team here at ICANN. We asked very detailed and specific questions based on inputs from multi-stakeholders participants. And what ended up is although the questions were great or seemed to be great for the review team not great for those actually taking the survey.

And so I think there's going to have to be some negotiation quite frankly between what we think we want and what we think we can get. And I'm

happy to speak off-line with you in a separate phone call or a separate call to be scheduled for the purposes of transparency anybody of course would be welcome to join. But in terms of what INTAs exact experiences were and where we found the challenge I offer that time to you.

David Franklyn: Thank you.

Greg Rafert: Yes and this is Greg. Lori I also extend my thanks. And I think something like that would be useful because we of course want to learn from what you've already learned. And I do agree with your point Lori that I think we are going to need to be, you know, pretty considered in both how many questions that we're including in the survey, the types of questions and the wording of the questions to make sure that we don't see that much in the way of drop off. And I think we - I don't know if there are any more hands in the queue. If there aren't we can certainly kind of continue going through the remaining slides.

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy Kleiman and I'm trying to be in the queue. I'm not sure if you can see my head.

Greg Rafert: Yes sure. Go ahead Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Kathy Kleiman by way of introduction along with Phil Corwin and Brian Beckham I'm one of the three cochairs of this working group. And I wanted to make two quick notes about registries and registrars. We were looking at that list below and it without going into a deep dive I wanted to make sure that you knew what I think you do is that new gTLD registries that are brands are probably not going to be in your survey area. And I also wanted to check with the rest of the working group to see if they agree.

New gTLD registries that are brands like Sony or PlayStation have one registrant for all domain names. So they don't have to worry about premium names, reserve names, sunrise periods or trademark claims notices because

they have one registrant. So that will of course change your pool of registries in the new gTLD area. And I wanted to support what you were saying about outreach particularly to the registrars and ask a question whether you don't have to answer it but whether you had thought of our resellers?

For the registrars I always hear the complaint at ICANN that from the registrars that only a small group of registrars actually come to the ICANN meetings and the ones who go feel like they're getting all the work because there are so many who don't. But that also I'm told by many of the registrars that some of the more far-flung of the companies that are registering domain names in Turkey, other parts of the Middle East, Asia are resellers. So that is often where the end user action is taking place in the registrants are taking place are often interacting with resellers who then interact with registrars. It all makes our life more complicated but I wanted to share that. Thank you.

Greg Rafert: No and thank you Kathy. That's helpful background. I think we will - yes I can't answer today whether we'll want to include resellers and if we do how but I think that's a really good point.

Ariel Liang: There is no more queue that staff can see.

Stacey Chan: Okay great. So then I think we can pick back up where we left off moving on from the timeline on to the next slide. All right great thanks. So this is Stacey. And so the first items on the timeline were our project kickoff and then also delivering the draft inception report. So today we've already begun discussing the deliverables, and the timeline, the survey methodology.

And as we continue to move through the slides we'll get more into the design and the proposed questions which will be I think plenty of discussion following these slides. And then once we finish this meeting we'll get to work on the draft inception report which will provide an outline of the work plan that we've discussed here and provide in writing more detail on the survey methodology

and as well the draft questions which we'll hope to finalize in the next two weeks as we just talked about.

Okay great. And so right by the 13th as we mentioned we're hoping that we would be able to have a final set of questions to present to the working group. At that point we can discuss the inception report and discuss that final set of questions any issues around that, that we should take into account as we start to move towards programming with surveys. And after we've done that working session, we'll get to work and Research Now SSI, we'll get to work on programming a survey that they will be responsible for.

We would like to a short pre-test period for each of the surveys. The intention of that is just to make sure that the surveys, once they're programmed, actually are clear and easy to remove through for a potential respondent. So internally at AG we're happy to undertake some of that testing and we would also be open to having some members of the sub team or the working group who are interested to assist in those pre-tests.

And those would be on a rolling basis hopefully during the week of the 22nd while we're rolling out the program to surveys. We can talk more in detail about, you know, who - which individuals would be interested in doing that but just to have that on your radar.

Greg Rafert: Thank you, Ariel. So then the goal is to be launching the surveys kind of in the - yes, the second to last week of June. As we're launching the surveys, we'll be closely monitoring who's responding, whether individuals are dropping out, if they are dropping out which questions tend to the point at which people drop out so we can consider whether we want to make any changes to the survey while it's actually in the field.

And, you know, we've already talked about this a little bit but we'll be working closely with ICANN staff, the ICANN community at large to kind of publicize the survey to as many individuals as possible from each of these groups, with

the caveat that the potential domain name registrants, as we discussed, will be kind of contacted and identified by Research Now SSI.

And, Ariel, if you could go to the next slide, please. Thank you. So I already covered the first bullet regarding kind of monitoring response rates. As the data is coming in, we'll begin to analyze it and we'll provide the data sub team and anyone else who is interested some initial cuts of the data to see whether there are interesting trends or results from the data that we want to raise earlier rather than later.

And then of course once the survey actually closes, we'll develop a comprehensive analysis of the responses coming from each of the questions. And then, Ariel, if you don't mind going to the next slide, it kind of flows nicely. We'll then summarize those results in a draft report of the survey findings.

And as this slide notes, this will include, well, of course those results but also a discussion of the survey design, how individuals were reached out to for each of the groups, and we'll also include, since I understand there's some interest, kind of the raw survey data so if there are cuts to the data that we didn't undertake but that the data sub team would like to, then you have the data available for your perusal.

And then I think finally we wanted to raise a couple of discussion points. It sounds like a lot of these are already on your mind and have been on your mind as you've been kind of working to develop the questions for the various surveys. But, you know, I think our kind of general view is that, you know, obviously the shorter the survey the better. I think my own personal view is that, you know, a survey that's longer than 25 minutes starts to result in pretty significant drop out of respondents.

One of the ways to minimize the length of the survey is to reduce the number of open-ended questions, and so I think that will be important to consider as we're working to finalize survey questions for the various surveys for this

project. And then, this is probably pretty obvious, but, you know, questions should be worded in a way so it's not kind of bias or leave respondents to answer the questions in certain ways. So I think we may have some subtle and kind of very marginal suggestions for some of the questions that have been developed.

And so, I mean I don't want anyone to take these numbers as being, you know, kind of too hard but I think our thought it, you know, if we could limit each survey to something like 20 questions, maybe a few more to reduce the length of time that it would take individuals to take the survey, that would be good. To the extent we can convert open-ended responses to - or open-ended questions rather to questions where there are multiple choices or rankings, I think that would be useful, and then just once again making sure that we're not leading respondents to answer questions in a certain way.

And I see some hands going up, so maybe I'll stop there. I see a question in the - or maybe two questions.

Ariel Liang: Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, lovely. Thank you. Yes it wasn't really a question, it was more of a response to what you were saying about the - editing to remove potential bias. And I would just say that, you know, as one of the data sub team I think we all tried really hard to, when we were coming up with the document for you, we tried really hard to remove bias, but I think we did all recognize that there were occasions where we maybe didn't manage to do it as well as we could.

Certainly we had a number of cases where we kind of talked amongst ourselves and then sort of made the comment to ourselves that, you know, you guys are the experts and we would hope that you would be able to refine what we've done if we had inadvertently left bias in or made, you know,

something is unclear. And, you know, we were hoping obviously that you as the experts would be able to improve on what we've done.

Greg Rafert: Yes, I think we certainly have some suggestions for improvement for some of the questions. And in terms of the question regarding testing on people, I think it would be useful, and David please feel free to chime in, especially if you disagree, but I think I think it would be useful to have some people who are kind of not cognizant of, or not aware, of what the purpose of the survey is and seeing kind of easy it is to understand for someone who doesn't have kind of the deep background that you all have.

But I think it would also be useful to have at least couple people who do kind of have this deep institutional and kind of practical knowledge about the RPMs ticket as well, just to make sure that it's kind of understandable for both sets of people and there aren't any kind of things that seem off or that are just difficult to understand.

Susan Payne: Yes, I mean I was just thinking of a comment that had come up in relation to the INTA one, where I think it was Lori had certainly said in the past that, you know, that the team that works on it and worked closely on the survey, you know, didn't necessarily feel the challenges that someone actually trying to complete it would have seen. So that was what I had in mind.

Ariel Liang: There's no more hands in the queue.

Greg Rafert: Okay. Great. I think that's - that largely covers what we wanted to talk with you all about today, but I know there were several items on the agenda so perhaps we can turn it over. And I guess -- this is Greg speaking again -- is it helpful for me to begin or Kathy or others on the data sub team.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, this is Julie Hedlund. I was on mute. So, can you hear me now?

Greg Rafert: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Oh excellent. Thank you so much now. So, going back to the agenda, and apologies for that, the next item is to discuss the guidance and draft questions that were developed by the data sub team and then go through these and hopefully we can answer any questions or concerns that, you know, Analysis Group might have with these. So those are on the screen right now, and I think you can make that larger yourself. I know it's maybe a tad blurry. And we'll also put - yes, we've also got the link into the chat as well.

So that might be an easier way to reference these. So just I guess let's go ahead and start from the top. And this is an appendix that, you know, was something that I know that, you know, we had provided to Analysis Group. So perhaps, how would you - what is the easiest way for us to do with you, Greg, Stacey, and David?

Greg Rafert: I think if you could just give us maybe a little bit of background as to how kind of the various, and we don't need to go in - I'm not saying for each question, but how kind of categories of questions were developed based on the guidance that you all were receiving, and then I think we'll probably have some questions and comments that follow that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. That's helpful. So just to explain a little bit about this and, you know, certainly Mary and Ariel jump in as well, but so we had charter questions that provided guidance and then - so those were questions that were originally identified in the working group, the PDP working group's charter and then that served to use sort of as a foundation for the actual draft questions that the sub team developed.

And the sub team, as you see here in the chart, tried to develop questions that were more anecdotal in nature and some that were more data questions, so those questions that might get, you know, might elicit anecdotal responses and questions that would elicit strictly sort of data responses. And, as you can

see then, we have a set of questions for each of the different groups and actually I am going to - I'll - it's probably best I guess if everybody looks at the link that we put in the chat because you can't scroll through this document yourself, as you see it on the screen. And so it might be easier for you to get an overview.

But so - and as I've noted previously, I'll just say that, you know, the sub team did try to be as objective as possible in drafting these and did try to provide guidance - oh, and I do see a hand is up. And sorry, I can't see the hands, so thank you Ariel for letting me know. Kristine, please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. This is Kristine Dorrain. I'm not trying to usurp Julie's conversation, because she's doing a really good job explaining. I chaired the first section and the way, maybe this will help the analysis group a little bit, but the way we split this up was we had - this was a very small group. We all came at it from different perspectives. I think we had sort of some of everybody in the room, registrar, registries. We had brand owners, we had non-commercial represented. So I think we had a good mix of people.

And what we started out with was a list of like quasi charter questions that were very much a list of grievances or gripes that people did or didn't like about RMPs that were shoved into a public comment period and then sucked out into this working group.

So the first thing that we did was we went through and sort of pulled out like what we thought the relevant charter questions were getting at. And so we sort of tried to draw on both our own experiences as part of the industry but we also tried to parse out from some of those documents, and staff did a really good job of trying to guess at what peoples' underlying concerns were.

So one of the things that we came up with - so you'll notice data questions and anecdotal questions. One of the things that we came up with was of course data is the - what we want. We want data, we want data-driven

questions, so that was a top priority. But we also recognized that at this point contracted parties, and quite frankly even brand owners, don't have good data-gathering mechanisms.

So when we say, you know, how many people did X, how many did Y, nobody's collecting that data, you know. As Amazon, I didn't collect data. We didn't collect data to figure out how many times we applied for, you know, a mark in the clearinghouse and how many claims notices we got and, you know, how many were, you know, were already taken before we were able to apply, you know, those sorts of things. That's just not data people were really gathering.

So we came up with a need for anecdotal questions. So knowing that you guys are survey providers and you guys probably cringe when you see anecdotal questions because oh my God now you need a text answer, but what the problem was is we didn't know why some of these people had been saying, you know, should the RPMs be this way or should the RPMs be that way.

So you'll notice that some of the anecdotal questions really try to drill down to the why, why was this question there, what do you think it should be differently. So a lot of the original, quote-unquote, charter questions were merely suggestions, such as should the trademark claims be limited to a specific class of goods and services.

Now we can infer or guess as to why that someone might have entered that question into their public comment but we don't know because nobody said. So I guess I just wanted to tack on to Julie a little bit, you know, she's doing a really good job explaining, but to back up and talk about the historical reference as to how we ended up with two categories of questions, specifically, and I know Rebecca Tushnet's questions are really good at this, and starting with the data question but then giving people off ramps to like extrapolate on to anecdote.

So in the concept of mindfulness, we really wanted to make sure that our data questions were data driven but people had opportunities and off ramps to say, you know, I want to give you more information, I want to tell you how I think it should work, I want to point out a pain point to you. So we wanted to use it not only as a way to get the hard numbers but provide input and suggestions into the team so that we don't just find out yes this particular thing had ten people.

Well that's not useful if five of those people said hey had an idea, this would have worked better. And so that's - this is a hybrid. So I'll stop rambling now but hopefully that helps a little, and feel free to just tell me I'm wrong, Julie. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: That was extremely helpful. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thank you very, very much for stepping in, Kristine. And so with that explanation, let me just pause for a moment and see if that's helpful to you, Greg, Stacey, David, or if you have any questions, you know, before we go on. And I see that Stacey and Greg are saying yes that was very helpful.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks so much. So that's the foundation for, you know, how we, you know, derived to these questions. And so I'm just wondering now do we want to just go ahead and start at the top right where we are now? We've got - what we have on the page. So that's a survey of new gTLD registry operators and the relevant questions. So we're on Page 1 right now. And then can I, if this is a good way to proceed - and Kristine, you're going to save me again. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi. Sorry. This is Kristine, Amazon Registry Services again. I don't know if I'm going to save you but my main question is, and I didn't get the sense of this, how much have you studied, Stacey and Greg and David, how much have

you studied these questions? Because yes certainly we can burn up, you know, an hour or ten going through them all in great detail but I think from a perspective of the team, we've - I think almost everyone is on this call. So each person that owned a section of this is on the call.

So if you've already kind of gone through these a little bit and looked at them and you have some specific call outs that jump out at that are like well why did you go with this question, why were you looking for here, I'm hoping that that would be more helpful than us just starting at the top and pushing through, because I'm telling you we're going to get through like the first two bullet points if we do it that way.

So maybe you can answer that question and then if you have a specific question, we all know what section we wrote and we'd be happy to just jump in in the order in which we led. We had a rotating chair. I was not the chair. I'm just the bossy loud one. So basically we, you know, we all, you know, chaired our own section. So is that going to be helpful for you if you guys call out some key questions and we're able to answer or do you need us to go through this line by line?

Greg Rafert: This is Greg speaking. I don't think we need you to go through it line by line. We've all had a chance to review the questions in a pretty detailed manner before this call. I think we have a relatively small number of specific questions. My questions I think are just a little bit more broad, but maybe I'll let Stacey and David jump in with any specific or broad questions and then we can kind of go from there.

David Franklyn: Well this is David. Yes I've had a chance to review it in detail. I have two thoughts. First of all I think Greg and I talked, and Greg I don't know if I'm reflecting our conversation accurately, but didn't we think this survey would take well over an hour to complete as articulate, as drafted?

Greg Rafert: Yes. That was - I think our primary point was that it seemed like at least for some of the groups that the survey could potentially take a long time to fill out, especially if they were offering detailed responses for some of these open-ended questions, which I realize are valuable. So I'll stop there but yes (unintelligible).

David Franklyn: Yes, it's a very meta-analysis. I mean I don't know how much to spend wordsmithing if we have this greater concern with the overall length, because if - and that's why it's important for us to figure out as a group whether we're going to try to do any sort of drastic cut to it, and if we were, we would do that before we would, you know, wordsmith the individual questions.

If we're not, then I would still suggest that what we do, Stacey and Greg and I, is send you all a detailed redline commented response to this and then, you know, with a call out of maybe, I don't know, 10 or 15 issues and let you mull over them individually, read them, and then have this kind of line-by-line discussion. I would think that would be a more productive use of everybody's time.

Ariel Liang: Kristine has her hand up again.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you very much, Professor Franklyn. This is Kristine again. Yes, I'm not going to speak for the group. I hope everyone will also raise their hand and weigh in. But it is my understanding from our calls that that is exactly what we were hoping for. So we erred on the side of including sort of bullet-pointed details step by step how you get from A to B to C to D to E, if the world was our oyster, every question we would ask, every permutation, yes or no, if yes then what, if no then blah because we didn't want to leave any gaps for you to figure out what were they trying to get at.

We were hoping that that anecdotal questions would layer on the top to help really drill down for you what it is we needed to get, but the how of getting it was going to be left to you. So I believe that our intent was yes to get a

drastic red line from you so that we can sit down in our group and go through it and decide did you cut too much, did you make good suggestions, do you still retain the nugget core of what we're trying to get it or have you taken too much away or, you know, changed it in some way.

Please everyone else raise your hand so I'm not the only loud mouth, but this is what I understand we wanted from you at this point was a pretty drastic red line that we could go back and discuss, because you are the survey experts, you know the types of questions that are going to get answer and the best way to formulate them, and we thought we should give you too much rather than not enough. Anyone else, Kathy, Michael, anyone, Lori, Rebecca, anybody?

Ariel Liang: Michael is next.

Lori Schulman: Yes this is Lori. Sorry. I was just saying I agree with every word Kristine says. So.

Michael Graham: Yes and this is Michael for the record, Michael Graham, and that was exactly our discussion. In a lot of cases we would start bickering over wording and the discussion really was this is an area that we think needs to be explored. This is the issue that we think is the one that we identify that's going to help us in reviewing the effectiveness of the rights protection mechanisms and the possible overreaching. But we're not going to go for the specific wording because that's what we're hiring you all -- congratulations -- to do and to also tell us look if you answered this one you don't need to follow up with these.

And just to follow up what Kristine was saying on the anecdotal answers, that was something that I think we found too in the INTA survey is that whereas metrics in a perfect world we'd have metrics and we could determine everything from but in the real world that may not be possible and there may be pain points that a number would not be able to convey.

So some of those anecdotal sort of questions for narrative responses are based on that, as well as, you know, just going beyond what the experience is, and also not knowing exactly what sort of experiences we would be finding out there. A lot of this is based on our discussions as a PDP group, extrapolating what might - we might find out there but not knowing what actually was happening and wanting to have some way of getting that information so that when it comes back to us as a group now we're able to utilize that in evaluating the RPMs.

So we look to you for the exact language. We're trying to give guidance. And in fact you're doing a red line and coming back to us with questions I think is, as Kristine said, exactly what we were looking for. Thanks.

Rebecca Tushnet: This is Rebecca Tushnet.

Ariel Liang: Kristine is next. Sorry, Rebecca.

Kristine Dorrain: I will defer to Rebecca and then I'll go next. Go ahead, Rebecca.

Rebecca Tushnet: So this is Rebecca Tushnet. I just wanted to say a couple of things. The first one is something you surly noticed, which is that questions for the registrants and potential registrants have a different character, and that's where I put my focus. And of course they're about how you understand something or what you understand it to mean, so much more like a traditional consumer survey than most of the other questions for the other groups. And so of course that affects how they have to be treated. And this also goes to the question of narrative responses versus, you know, ticking boxes.

And then the other thing I want to say, you know, I think I've expressed this discontent before, the terminology anecdotal is just completely unhelpful at this point. Narrative I think is a great explanation of the difference because, you know, as Kristine says, Amazon has its experiences but within the context of, you know, surveying different registries, registrars, registrants, et

cetera, Amazon's experiences are, you know, one entity's experiences, an important entity no doubt, but to call it data driven if Amazon puts in a number, or any other respondent puts in a number, and anecdotal if they don't, doesn't actually seem to me to capture what we're doing.

So I understand that got worked in but if I guess my suggestion to you guys as you go along in formulating is you not take that distinction too seriously. Thank you.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I'm just going to piggyback on that then because that was a perfect segue, Rebecca. So I wanted to also touch back on the anecdotal question but because, you know, and this was a question for you all to consider and get back to us on and it might not have been clear from the wording and the instruction in the doc, but we had actually contemplated places where we did ask more of a data-driven type question.

If you wanted, you know, in the interest of trying to keep it shorter, we didn't have a consensus on whether or not this would be a good strategy but it's certainly one that I think we can enter into the discussion, is for off ramps do you have to collect all the information at one time? You know, can you collect as much - let's think about not the potential registrants for a minute because I think that's like, as Rebecca pointed out, that's kind of a different animal altogether, but let's think about brand owners who want to talk about their interaction with the claims service or something.

You know, you can collect the data, how many, how much, you know, how long did it take, what were blah, blah, blah, but then can you tick a box that says, and I've seen this in surveys, like I want to provide more, I have more information, I want to talk to somebody, I want a researcher to call me and hear my story and hear about the pain points that I had or hear my suggestion.

I mean that would shorten the survey so we wouldn't keep asking do you want to talk about that, here's a text box for this, and it would make people type less and it would allow - I don't know if the budget allows but, you know, assuming that only a small handful of people actually wants a researcher to call them, you know, you could get on the phone and actually ask follow-up questions and hear those stories and collect the narratives, as Rebecca pointed out.

Again, we had some discussion about this in the group. I do not believe there was a strong consensus that this was the way to go but I think I wanted to throw that out there for you because I'm not sure if that's something that's sort of done or if that's something that's even possible in the survey. Thanks.

Greg Rafert: This is Greg. I'll jump in first. I think that's a really interesting suggestion and we'll certainly consider it as we're reviewing the questions and thinking about how to make the survey kind of manageable from a time perspective. David, I don't know how that sounds to you or (unintelligible).

David Franklyn: Well I have a mixed response to it. I think it's a wonderful suggestion. My concern with telephone interviews is unless they're conducted according to strict scripts, the information can get inadvertently filtered and interpreted by the interviewer and then, you know, recorded in a way that doesn't necessarily reflect what the person calling wanted to communicate and then the reliability of the information for generalization purposes and decision-making purposes can go down unless we really had a protocol in place for that, which we could do.

We'd just have to talk it through as a team and I mean that is AG and myself and be ready for that but kind of control that if we do that. Greg, I don't know what you think about that.

Greg Rafert: No, I agree with that, David. I think it's a really good point.

David Franklyn: Okay. I think - I don't know, are there any other hands up? I don't have a way of seeing that for some reason. I haven't figured out that feature yet.

Ariel Liang: No hands in the queue.

David Franklyn: No hands in the queue? My recommendation then would be that Analysis Group and myself do a hard redline with comments and cuts and rewording of the document and also a clean version of the actual instruments that we would propose to put to field and that we then circulate them all to you, the working group, with enough advance notice to have a reasonable amount of time to read and digest and think about what we put forward, and then we schedule a call for shortly thereafter and we discuss it then, you know, in - on an issue-by-issue basis.

That'll be much more concrete and specific and efficient. I would hope, and I don't want to speak for Analysis Group's schedule, but given the time press here, I would hope that we could do that in a week and get that all out to you. Is that going to be a doable, Greg, on your end? And, B, you know, give enough time for the rest of the process to play out the way we've scheduled it?

Greg Rafert: Yes, I appreciate the timing consideration, David. I think we were - Stacey and I were just discussing is a little bit internally while on mute and I think given the timing I might even try and be a touch more aggressive and even shoot for something like next Tuesday to circulate to the data sub team so that they would have enough time to hopefully get us feedback by I think something like Friday of next week. But I know that's a pretty short timeline and so would welcome any suggestions to revise that timeline.

Ariel Liang: Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Hi this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So thank you very much for that suggestion. I think it would be extremely helpful if it was possible to get a red

line by next Tuesday. There is actually a regularly scheduled slot for a meeting that is actually this time that we used this week. This time would be available also next week for a call.

Now that would not give a whole lot of time for the sub team to have reviewed the material so it might be that the sub team meets next Wednesday to review the redline and use this, you know, so uses that time to review the redline and then to also prepare the response back to Analysis Group. And I'll just note that probably, you know, if we said, you know, COB next Tuesday, you know, that, you know, since Analysis Group is on Mountain Time that would still I think still be fine for the sub team.

But let me ask if any of the sub team members have any issues? Kathy is saying I'm not sure this time is available next week. This is the regularly - the 1 o'clock to 2 o'clock time is actually set aside for the full working group call. So the co-chairs would have to decide whether or not the full working group would cede to the sub team or whether or not there is actually a need for the full working group to meet next week. But that's something that we can all take offline with the co-chairs. But if that were to work, just let me ask if any of the sub team, data sub team members have any concerns with that and, you know, that is assuming that a redline by next Tuesday is feasible for analysis group.

 I see Kristine is suggesting can we do the Friday time that we used for the data sub team but also notes that the regular working group time would work. And I see that Susan Payne cannot do this time next week but not to stop others from meeting. I think that we can probably work out the details offline of how we can do a meeting but it seems that there's agreement that we should have a meeting next week of the sub team to go over what Analysis Group sends to us.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori.

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes. I just want to voice my preference here, and I do have one, that we have one meeting next week and get focused on this and not have a big sub group meeting. I'll be honest with you, we have put I can't even tell the number of hours, and I haven't even been on every call by the way but I've been on most, and I'm really struggling right now with spending three hours a week on this at a minimum when you do the reading as well.

And if we're going to look at this adequately then we're having an hour and a half call, possibly another hour to hour and a half call, and then reading for the prep. And I want to put my stake in the ground here. As important as this is, I can no longer afford that kind of time that consistently.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. And I'm noting that still also in the chat that Kathy has said that perhaps Friday would provide more time for Analysis Group to provide the redline. And Phil is noting that we probably would need to have a full working group meeting next week but the co-chairs can discuss this and noting, Kathy noting, that we were having meetings at 10 am Eastern and noon Eastern on Fridays as a sub team.

So, again, I think even if we were to move the meeting…

Phil Corwin: Excuse me, Julie, this is Phil.

Julie Hedlund: Yes?

Phil Corwin: I hate to interrupt. My hand's been up. I just want to intervene.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, I can't - go ahead, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Yes, I want to intervene briefly. I'm sorry, you know, this is WebEx is challenging everyone. We're all waiting to get back to Adobe. I saw that

another working group has gotten back to Adobe and I hope we can get back to it soon, but.

Yes I think my concern as a co-chair of the full working group is that we skipped two meetings May because of GDD Summit and INTA. We had a very poorly attended meeting that didn't have a key participant this morning and we have a run up to Panama where we have to get a lot done.

So while the co-chairs need to discuss, you know, on Friday what our agenda would be for a full working group meeting next week, I'm a little trepidatious about cancelling the full working group meeting for - and substituting this one without some, you know, fairly deep consideration of timelines and what needs to be done between now and Panama by the full working group. So we'll take views under advisement but I don't think we're in a position to make a decision on this call. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Phil. And just one thing that staff would like to note, so 13 June, according to the timeline for this particular project, is the drop dead date for the working group, the full PDP working group to hear from Analysis Group on the final questions. For us to be able to meet that deadline, we really are going to need to have this sub team be able to get the red line from Analysis Group as soon as possible, ideally COB next Tuesday, and then have time to meet and be able to get the feedback to Analysis Group not later than COB next Friday.

So if that's possible to do on a Friday call, fine, but, you know, certainly a Wednesday call would allow for more time. So essentially everything has to be prepped by the end of next week and we really don't have any slippage at all in this particular schedule.

So at any rate, I realize, Phil, we're not going to settle this right now and we're taking up Analysis Group's time as well on something that, you know, that we'll need to, you know, that we'll need to work out on our own. I'll just note in

the chat a suggestion from Mary Wong that Analysis Group sends red line by Tuesday, the sub team meets by Friday to give feedback by Friday, and Analysis Group meets with the full working group on the regular Wednesday call of the 13th of June. And I see that Stacey and Greg said that timeline works for us.

Are there any concerns from the sub team members with respect to that set of actions? And I see that Kathy says great and I see that Mary says in order for this timeline - in order for surveys to be programmed, tested and launched by the week following, that is the week of the 20th of June. And, Ariel, could you let me know if there are any hands up because I will not be able to see them?

Ariel Liang: No hands up at the moment.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Well thanks everyone. Greg, Stacey, David, do you have any questions before we wrap things up?

Greg Rafert: I do not. I don't think Stacey does either.

David Franklyn: This is David. I do not and I'm comfortable with the schedule. I think it's imperative that we move expeditiously.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much, Stacey, Greg, and David. And thanks to everyone for joining. We're glad we can give you back some of your time since we do all have a lot to do and we will look forward to talking to everybody next week. Sub team members, we'll get in touch with you about the time of the call next week. Thanks very much. Bye-bye everybody.

David Franklyn: Thank you. Everybody have a great day.

Greg Rafert: Thank you so much everyone.

Woman: Thanks so much everyone from (unintelligible).

END