

01:12:15 Andy Gleadow: Is there a relationship to the track width and orientation that we could use to more consistently select confined tracks for measurement?

01:12:37 Kalin McDannell: Rich very interesting work. Maybe the elephant in the room by the looks of huge etching variation, do we think the AFT community should settle on a standardized etching protocol to help reduce some inter-lab scatter?

01:13:30 Alyssa Abbey: wow! Not being a fission tracker this is amazing! So enlightening.

01:14:15 Kalin McDannell: Also, Andy Gleadow has a question above mine ^^

01:18:21 Paul O'Sullivan: Morat/Rich - in the figure showing the change in track shape/length, what was the difference in *measured* length for the primary track between time 20 sec and time 30 sec? Is this difference actually *measurable* by the standard approach using a digitizing tablet approach used by most labs - or is this really only discernible using the new high-res digital means that you utilized?

01:19:39 Ian Duddy: Comment: Here Here Andy. Natural samples contain apatite with a whole range of etching rates due to compositional variation. There will always be underetched tracks. Training is the key. Analysts need to count and measure a whole range of standards and get them correct before moving to unknowns. This can be done and must be done. There is no magic etching protocol that will reveal the *full* etchable length of 100% of tracks.

01:23:01 Noriko Hasebe: Practically I measure track length with certain width, hoping to normalise the difference in degree of etching. If your length data is corrected regarding to track width, not to etching time, how your data will be changed?

01:24:14 Eva Enkelmann: Did you look into the change in the track density with an increased etching time. With other words, would a 5 sec longer etch time influence the age?

01:25:54 Noury MÈlanie: Could it be possible to correct analyst deviation using a similar approach as Zeta?

01:26:20 Daniel Stockli: So does mean that Cf irradiated track length data has or should be treated differently from un

01:27:04 Andy Gleadow: A crucial thing is that we use the same etching protocols and selection criteria for the annealing experiments used to define our kinetic models.

01:27:10 Barry Kohn: In terms of etching more measurable lengths have you tried to compare the effect of a Cf irradiation with a longer etch time

01:27:19 Noury MÈlanie: sorry my mic doesn't work

01:28:21 Daniel Stockli: Does this mean that Cf irradiated confined data should be treated differently?

01:29:57 Samuel Boone: I sadly have to run to another meeting. Thank you very much to Rich, Hongcheng, Murat and all the discussion participants. Great fun! See you next month.

01:33:32 Peter Zeitler: Same for me (where *meeting* = dinner). This was a great event! But Rich -several people said their shipment of Thermo2020 cocktails didn't arrive.

01:33:48 Andy Gleadow: Many thanks Rich and all the presenters.  
Great to see everyone.

01:34:05 Mike Krochmal: Thank you, Rich, for organising this great session !

01:34:06 Kalin McDannell: thanks to to Rich, other organizers, and presenters!

01:34:07 Daniel Stockli: thank you very much Rich!!!!!!

01:34:17 Ling Chung: Thanks Rich!

01:34:23 Spencer: Thanks everyone!

01:34:30 Paul O'Sullivan: Great job Rich/Coö

01:35:13 Ian Duddy: This all worked very smoothly. Cheers

01:35:25 Lidia Vignol: Thank's Rich and all people

01:35:25 Lucie Novakova: Thanks a lot. Hope to see you next year personally.

01:35:37 Noury MÈlanie: Thanks !!!

01:35:38 Paul and Suzanne NY: Thanks Rich and all speakers, everyone