

**ICANN
Transcript
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working
Group
Thursday, 21 April 2016 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Mp3: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-21apr16-en.mp3>

The audio is available on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr>

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms, RPMs, in all gTLDs PDP Working Group call held on the 21st of April, 2016.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. So if you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. I'm on the audio bridge trying to get into the Adobe Connect room but not been able to right now. Thanks.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Amr. Hearing no more names I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep our phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any

background noise. With this I will turn it back over to Phil Corwin, GNSO Council liaison and our interim working group chair. Please begin.

Phil Corwin: Well thank you very much. Good morning all and good afternoon and evening for those of you in Europe, Asia and Australia. I'm Phil Corwin, I'm a member of the GNSO Council. I presented the motion to adopt the charter for this working group at the Council meeting in Marrakesh. It was approved. And I was appointed interim chair, a role that I will surrender before the end of this meeting.

I want to thank the – we've now reached 50 participants on this call. I've checked the total sign-ups this morning and that is less than half of the total membership of this group. We have grown to 132 members as of this morning as well as 56 observers. And we thank everyone for committing their time and energy and knowledge to this effort.

It's going to be a very important effort. We all know that the because of the cost of litigation and the time it takes to maneuver through the court system that the vast majority of trademark disputes involving a domain name system are resolved through ICANN created arbitration processes and that trademarks are also subject to other safeguards, particularly those created for the new top level domain program.

We're going to be reviewing all of them to see if they've achieved their intended purpose and also to consider whether developments have arisen which arisen which require some consideration of changes to them. And after that we're going to – after that, which is phase 1 of this working group we're going to begin the first ever review of the uniform dispute resolution policy, the only ICANN consensus policy that has never undergone review.

Just so everyone is aware, we've – we being the three nominees for co-chair – who have received substantial support have conferred with staff and our best guestimate of the time for completing Phase 1 is in late 2017 so we're

looking at about a year and a half of work on Phase 1 on the new TLD RPMs to complete our work. I wouldn't even hazard a guess as to how long Phase 2 on the UDRP may take but we'll develop working methods and relationships as we go along.

So last thing I'll say on that, because of the intensity of this work and the length it's going to consume I would guess that once our work is over there will be not another substantive review of these RPMs, including the UDRP, for probably a decade or more, so our work will be of lasting value and will be the rules of the road going forward for at least a decade or two in regard to trademark disputes within the domain name system.

So welcome to all of you for volunteering your time to this very important work before us. As the staff noted, with over – with 52 people now on the call we are not going to take a verbal roll call. And we've taken note of those solely on the phone and not in the chat room. We'll ask one more time before the end of the call whether anyone else has joined by phone who's not in the chat room. But if you're in the chat room your attendance has been recorded.

On Item 3 on the agenda, introductions, that's simply a reminder that while you're all required to post statements of interest, and I'm going to get to that in a minute, if you – when you join the group please send around a short introduction to the other members on the working group list just introducing yourself. It helps us know the background and perspective of everyone who's becoming a member of this group.

On the statements of interest, in reviewing the list this morning I would guesstimate that somewhere between 10% and 15% of those who have joined as members of the group have yet to post statements of interest. This is mandatory, not optional, to be a member of an ICANN working group, you must post a statement of interest. It's very easy to fill out the form on the Website. I would say it takes less than 5 minutes.

But we're going to review that next week and please don't procrastinate because somewhere in the next call or two if you haven't filled out that statement of interest you're going to be relegated to observer status until you do. Excuse me, apologize but it's spring in Washington and the time of intense pollen in the air.

Okay, moving on to Item 4, principles of transparency and openness. There are extensive guidelines that set the rules for policy development process working groups created by the GNSO that set forth the powers of the chairs and the rules for procedure. Those are available at the GNSO Website, maybe staff can post a link to that in the chat room for anyone who hasn't looked at that yet. I know I posted that in a email a little over a week ago.

But the key thing here is that everything we do, every decision we make, all of our policy discussions, and decisions, everything is completely transparent and open. We aim to have a system where everyone has an opportunity to weigh in despite the number of people in this group.

It is true that the chair or co-chairs are going to be holding offline discussions but the chairs do not make decisions here, the chairs simply manage the process and may suggest ways to move forward at times when there's debate within the group or some disagreement about how to proceed forward and then the chairs will propose a way forward on contentious issues. But ultimately everything we do is clear for everyone to see.

There is a written record. Every working group call, there is a transcript of everything in the chat room. There is a MP3 audio recording and a transcript of everything that's said online. And of course when we complete our work we issue a draft report, which is subject to comment by the entire ICANN community. And then we take all those comments into account and revise and propose a final report so it's a very structured process and one that is completely open and transparent so everyone should be aware that everything you say and do within this working group is on the record.

Are there any questions on that? I'll stop there to see if there are any questions. And, by the way, for those of you who have not been on a working group before, when you're in the Adobe chat room if you wish to make a comment or ask a question you click on the icon, you'll see a bunch of icons at the top of the box, the Adobe meeting room.

There's one for muting your speakers, there's one for looks like a phone and then there's one with someone raising their hand and you click on that and raise your hand and that's how we queue up for questions and comments for those of you who have not been through this process before.

All right, so we are now in – up to Item 5 which is the selection of working group leaders. I will present this. We've had three candidates for chair who have received substantial support from members of this working group. One is myself; one is J. Scott Evans, also a member of the Business Constituency with extensive background in trademark law. In fact he's immediate past president of the International Trademark Association; and the other is Kathy Kleiman from the Non-Constituency – part of the non-contracted party house – the noncommercial part.

And both Kathy and J. Scott were involved with the drafting of the original UDRP. I did not go – I don't go back that far but I have been involved with ICANN work for about a decade now. You've all received my candidate statement yesterday. I will note for the record that two other names were put forward. One was Petter Rindforth. I know Petter very well. Member of the IPC from Stockholm and my co-chair of another ICANN working group which is wrapping up its work.

Petter has made clear to us that he is most interested in chairing a subgroup and we do intend to create a number of subgroups to facilitate our work in an efficient way as we go forward as not interested in a full co-chair position.

And the other person who self-nominated was Danny Glix. We welcome Mr. Glix to this working group and the contributions he'll make but I will note he did not receive any further support for his self-nomination.

So on Tuesday J. Scott, Kathy and myself issued a joint statement for consideration by the working group reflecting a phone call we had been on together last Friday. We agreed amongst ourselves that we feel we can work in a very cooperate and effective way as co-equal co-chairs to chair the – share the duties of managing this working group in a very collegial and cooperative way. We've all worked together on other things.

Our intent would be to rotate the chairing of these meetings so that each of us, you know, alternatively chairs these meetings, as I'm doing today. We will strive to make decisions on the way forward by full consensus amongst ourselves. On those occasions, which we hope are rare, where we can't agree on the best way to move forward we will share our separate views with the working group and the working group will decide the way forward by consensus.

So that is the leadership package that's been presented for consideration of the working groups. I'll open it up at this time to see if anyone has objections to that proposal for in effect a troika leadership of three co-equal co-chairs, J. Scott, Kathy Kleiman and myself. Or if anyone wishes to propose a different way forward. And I'll wait a few seconds here to see if any hands go up on that.

And seeing none let me ask staff, what is the proper procedural way forward to present a motion or other, you know, means of affecting that. And also while staff is considering how to answer that I'm going to ask whether J. Scott or Kathy have any statements they'd like to make before we get to that stage of the proceeding.

J. Scott – I see Kathy's hand up.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I'm here. Can you hear me?

Phil Corwin: Okay. Yes, why don't you go ahead since you're on the line and then we'll hear from Kathy.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. I'm J. Scott Evans. I have been – I'll give a brief – I didn't go into the extended candidate statement that Phil did because I have a big presentation to my general counsel later today so I apologize, I've been focusing on paychecks.

But I wanted to just quickly – for those of you that don't know, I know many of you, as I look in the chat room, are familiar with me. Some I know quite well; others I have just worked with over the phone such as Amr who worked with me on the Implementation versus Policy Working Group.

I have been involved in ICANN since its inception in 1998. I was a member of the small drafting team that included Kathy Kleiman, who is on this call and also a candidate for co-chair, in crafting and refining the UDRP and the rules of procedure. I also served as a member of the Implementation Review Team that put together all of the suggested RPMs for the new gTLDs which then Kathy worked to refine in the STI.

So I have chaired three or four working groups, only one did I co-chair, that was with Chuck Gomes. I also chaired the working group that put together the Working Group Guidelines which you should familiarize yourself with, it sort of explains how the groups work.

I've known Kathy since 1998, although I didn't physically meet her until probably two or three years later. And I've known Phil since his first involvement in ICANN some 10 years ago. I think both of them are people that are reasonable and that we can work with. I think that we're all adults here.

The most important thing for a chair is two things, one, is to make sure to work with staff to ensure that the process moves smoothly and the every voice has an opportunity to be heard and every view has an opportunity to be considered by the whole.

I think also it's important that chairs who do have a right under the working group principles and under ICANN just historically to have a viewpoint and are allowed to advocate that they just identify when they are taking off their chair hat and when they are advocating a particular position for either themselves, their personal view or constituents whom they may represent.

Giving those parameters, I think that we can move this forward. We have a lot of hard work ahead of us. You know, the one thing I will ask is that, you know, you give us your support by attending the call and being responsive and being honest with what you can and cannot handle. And that we are all respectful and considerate of others, even those that may share views that we don't necessarily agree with.

And with that I'll turn it over to Ms. Kleiman so that she can make a brief statement.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you, J. Scott. Can everybody hear me?

J. Scott Evans: I can hear you clear.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific.

J. Scott Evans: On my end.

Kathy Kleiman: Welcome, everyone. And it's a pleasure to be kicking off with this many people on the working group and on the call. Like J. Scott I wanted to give a little bit more background just for a second. I am with Fletcher, Heald and

Hildreth in northern Virginia just outside Washington DC. We are the country – the United States’ oldest telecommunications law firm. And I’m the cofounder here of the Internet Law and Policy Practice.

In addition, I’m the cofounder of ICANN’s Non Commercial Users Constituency, which, as J. Scott mentioned, puts me back to the beginning and the founding of ICANN. So it’s been an almost 20 year process of being in Internet law and policy.

With J. Scott and a few other very hard working people, we were on the final drafting team of the UDRP. I was also one of the leaders of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group’s team on the STI, which was the GNSO’s special team to work through the final rules of the Uniform Rapid Suspension and the trademark clearinghouse.

I joined with Phil and J. Scott in sharing that it really is in the spirit of mutual respect to quote the letter that we issued together, that we are coming forward to chair what we think will be a long and important process. With a good leadership team and a great working group team, I think we have a special opportunity to review the rules that we put into place, including the oldest consensus policy in ICANN, which is the UDRP, and really ensure that these rules are fair and balanced both for those bringing the complaints and those responding to them.

I really – I join with Phil in thinking that we’re creating the rules for the next 10 or 20 years. And with J. Scott in that we look forward to working with you and doing this in a very collaborative and open manner. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, J. Scott and thank you, Kathy. On my own behalf I’m not going to – I sent along bio yesterday so I’m not going to say much on my background other than that I’ve been involved in public policy development for four decades as a staff member at the United States Senate, as a registered lobbyist and within the world of ICANN for the past decade. And I can’t think

of two better people or more qualified people to work with in managing this working group.

On the need for mutual respect, one of the things I did note in my bio yesterday was that early on in my career when I worked at the US Senate, the operating principle was we can disagree without being disagreeable. And I hope that that's the way every member of this working group will conduct themselves throughout our work.

I'm sure there'll be some issues and some moments where things get a bit tense but we can disagree on policy matters without casting any aspersions on one another as people. And of course we all have to abide by the ICANN's expected standards of behavior as well.

You're asked to – when you join each Adobe chat they are there for your review and you have to click okay, which indicates that you will conduct yourself under those standards in each and every working group meeting. And they are there to facilitate a productive and constructive process and to keep us focused on our work and not on any individual disagreement.

I'll also – as I mentioned them – I see Danny Glix is on the line and let me also see – scrolling down, yes, Petter – either Danny or Petter, did you want to say anything at this point since your names came up before we get to the formal procedure of adopting a leadership structure?

Danny Glix: Hey, this is Danny. Can you hear me?

Phil Corwin: Yes we can, Danny.

Danny Glix: Sure. So, yeah, I mean, I definitely would defer to the three chair trifecta proposal because you guys, you know, I definitely don't – it's my first working group in ICANN to be straightforward with you. And I'm part of the IETF, recently signed up as a IANA ccTLD group.

And, you know, just interested in governance and policy from an altruistic standpoint but, you know, I don't have any of the cache or experience that the three bring. But I wouldn't mind just keeping my name in the running for a subgroup if the need arises.

Phil Corwin: Thank you very much for your support, Danny. And, yeah, as we create those subgroups we'll have a process which is open and transparent for people to volunteer to lead them and to be chosen for leadership so rest assured on that point. Petter, did you have anything you wish to say before we proceed?

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Petter here. Just echo the last speaker. I think for the first – I'd like to say that if we select the three mentioned proposed chairs we will have an excellent leadership for our working group. And there are many interesting and the most important topics.

And we also have to consider that we are such a great number of active working group members so we'll have the possibility to have comments from different kind of structure and people there work on these topics from different kind of views. That's good, but it also means that we need to focus on keeping on time limits and topics as such.

And while I have dealt with dispute resolution policies since they started as a panelist basically so I hope that my experience can come to some assistance in some of the subgroups. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, Petter. And as I mentioned, Petter and I have been working together co-chairing another working group which is focused on a very narrow issue relating to curative rights processes for international intergovernmental organizations. And we've had an excellent working relationship and Petter is highly qualified in the – in this field of trademark protection and trademark law and certainly would be a strong candidate for any subgroup leadership position.

So let me ask staff now what is the – maybe Mary or someone else – I see Mary’s hand. What is the proper way now for – to put the proposal for the three co-equal chairs in – before the working group? And do we need a formal vote or can we simply ask whether there’s any – something a little less formal? I see Mary’s hand up so I’m going to defer to her expertise.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Phil. I don’t know about expertise but I’ll try to answer this question. And hello everybody, welcome to our working group. Mary from staff. So the Working Group Guidelines don’t specify any particular procedure or a vote for the selection of the chair, co-chairs or vice chairs.

There is (unintelligible) the guidelines that it is really up to the group in question to select the chair that they feel (unintelligible) suited to lead the group in its work.

So typically obviously (unintelligible) to give people a chance to (unintelligible) and...

Phil Corwin: Mary, you're breaking up some.

Mary Wong: Oh I’m sorry.

Phil Corwin: At least on my end.

Mary Wong: I’m sorry. I’ll try to make this better. But anyway what we’ll do is (unintelligible) to the names to the mailing list for a set period of time, see if anyone has any objections. If not then we’ll submit your names to the Council as your chartering organization for the confirmation.

Phil Corwin: Okay. So you’re proposing that the – the trifecta or troika, we can decide which description to adopt, proposal, be put out to the working group on email to see if anyone objects and if no one objects, and I think we want to set a

time period out of the next 24, 48 hours that staff would simply forward that arrangement to the Council to notify them, is that correct?

And I see J. Scott suggesting that we post the names for seven days which would mean until our next meeting ,which will probably be – J. Scott, our next meeting may be in six days. We haven't – I don't want to jump the gun on next meetings but...

J. Scott Evans: You know, until our next meeting is fine but I just want to make sure we give an ample amount of time for people to consider this...

Phil Corwin: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...and not seem to have rushed it in any way.

Phil Corwin: Okay. And I saw Doug Isenberg said – can people hear me? He said he's having trouble hearing me.

J. Scott Evans: I can hear you fine.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Yeah, that's fine with me so let's do it that way. Let's put the – staff will put out the formal proposal to the working group for its consideration that will be out there until our next meeting, which will be next week and we'll get to that scheduling as the last item on this call. We'll see if there's any objections to it or any other proposals.

And then we'll lock down the leadership at the beginning of the next meeting, is that acceptable to everyone? I hear no objections so I'm going to assume it's the way to proceed.

And that brings us to Item 6 which is the background briefing to this PDP. And I believe Lars is going to provide that to us, is that correct, Lars?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thank you, Phil, yes. Sorry, I had to come off mute. That took a moment. Let me just pull up the PowerPoint presentation. I'm not going to sync this as I will go through the presentation on this call. However, I'm going to paste quickly a link into the AC room and if you go to the site it's the working group's wiki page. And on that page you'll find all background documents that are pertinent to this group including this presentation at the very bottom.

The purpose of this is to give you just a very quick high level overview of how we got here, what the main policies are that the group is going to review over the coming months, possibly years, how the two phases kind of will pan out during that time and also I'm going to look quickly at the next steps that are following this call.

As I said it's going to be very brief. I'm not going to go through the slides in great detail. In 2011 this whole process actually kicked off with a GNSO Council ICANN for an issue report on the UDRP review.

The Staff back then recommended to kick this down the field until the new gTLDs are launched; 18 months after that that the review should start. The Council agreed to that and subsequently, you know, the very long/very short.

And in October last year the Staff published a preliminary issue report and their review of all of them, and generated this year the final issue report that published within the public comment period.

And then in March as you probably all know the Council voted to approve the charter for this group and today we're meeting for the first time. These are the main rights protection mechanisms that we're just going to review.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: So it's just some background noise. The Sunrise period and Trademark Claims Services, the Trademark Clearinghouse, the Uniform Rapid Suspension, the URS and the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures – those we'll all feature in Page 1 -- I'll come to that in a minute -- and then the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy that Phil pointed at earlier, a longstanding policy that will be reviewed in Phase 2 of the group and our charter.

And I've been talking about two phases. For those who haven't followed the run up to this first meeting in the – let me just review this a bit more. It's not great.

In the charter the – that the Council approved it looks like that the first phase will include a review of the new gTLD RPMs only, so all policies you saw in the previous slide minus the UDRP.

As part of that phase the working group is also going to understand the purpose and the punching of the various RPMs before they actually propose changes or amendments to them.

And obviously also this should feature a review of the community identified topics for review that are listed in the final issue report. And also the group is expected to communicate with the ongoing subsequent rounds of PDP, what there is that still crosses along both from overlapping subjects but to make sure that it is this group that will take on the review of the RPMs and might receive input from that from other groups including the subsequent round PDPs.

Following this phase there will be a hard stop and – which will include an initial report with preliminary recommendations on the RPMs and the new gTLDs.

This will be put up for public comments and the group is to inform the GNS Council of its findings. Following that the second phase will start, which is the review of the UDRP.

Essentially the same procedure would happen that would happen in the first phase in the middle there of the top row. In addition to that the group might want to update any recommendations on the new gTLD RPM, and take into account obviously the public comments that are submitted and any parallel efforts that are ongoing.

Following the review of the UDRP and any updates there will be a second or if you want final initial report that contains recommendations on both UDRP and RPM, again public comment forum from the Council and then following that the group will then draft hopefully the final report, taking into account all community feedback from prior efforts and from the community and submit the report to the GNS Council for approval.

And then it's a very hard stop back then, which will include for me at least a glass of wine. If that's your sort of thing I can highly recommend it and we probably will all deserve by that time.

Here's the required steps as per the charter of the working group. In addition to what I just pointed out I just want to highlight the group is expected to assess the effectiveness of the relevant RPMs for which the inputs of experienced online dispute resolution providers and other subject matters should be sought.

The working group should also consider the interplay between complementary roles of each RPM to seek to more fully understand the overall functioning and effectiveness.

And finally the working group is expected to consider the overarching issue as to whether or not all RPMs collectively fulfill the purpose for which they

were created, what additional policy recommendations are needed including to clarify and unify policy goals.

And then on this page here you see the PDP workflow. This is just a quick overview of those. For you who might not be fully familiar the past PDT work – PDP work, I'm sorry – at the moment as you can see we are in the form working group phase and the next phase is the top right if you want of the diagonal strip.

And the next phase I will point this out is one of the following subsequent slides. It's a request that goes out for input to the SO and AC and so we will move through this – that or snake and up until hopefully the implementation of the policy down the line.

And here are the next steps. We start with a first step – obviously affect the first steps for any obviously that decide on the leadership and the meeting times, which I think is the next agenda item.

And the working group will then agree on a work plan to kind of pan out how they see this develop and whatever is happening, so it will all be done in (cana).

And then also the next step is to reach out to the community for input. Normally a letter is sent out to all SOs and ACs including the GNSO secular group and constituencies to see if they have any additional feedback to provide on the charter and the charter questions, and bearing in mind that obviously many of them have already submitted some of these that are already contained in the issues report.

So the group should point out that anything that's submitted is in addition to what is featured already in the issue report. And I put up two links here to the wiki page and the project page.

And I know that you can't copy or click this from the AC room but I'll copy them straightaway into the chat. And with that I conclude and invite you for any questions you may have. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Phil here. Thank you very much Lars. Lars I noticed that this PDF you just went through is not downloadable from the Adobe so can you – I'd send it around as an attachment to an email to the entire group so everyone can have a copy if they wish and be able to refer to it?

Lars Hoffman: Sure thing. So that is not a problem. I also point out that I just put a link in the AC room and you'll find the document on that Page 2, but I will also send around a separate email. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay. And I'm just going to make a few comments on your presentation and then, excuse me, open things up to other questions and comments. As Lars noted our work at least in regard to the review of the new rights protection mechanisms created for the new generic Top-Level Domain program – we are sharing the work of preparing for a – either a second – a discreet second round of new TLDs or a permanently open window if that's the decision ultimately of the ICANN community and the board.

With the other working group that started one month before us on subsequent procedures for next rounds of TLDs, those of you familiar with the new TLD program know that there's an Applicant Guidebook of several hundred pages that took about three years for the community to work out.

We are focused solely on the trademark protection aspects of the applicant Guidebook. The subsequent procedures working group is focused on everything else that relates to a future opening of applications for new Top-Level Domains.

And we are going to be appointing a liaison to their working group as we hope they will be appointing one to us, because it's very important that we

coordinate our work so that it all fits together in a sensible way at the end of both working groups.

And to repeat again the specific trademark protections we are charged with under the charter for this working group to review are the post-delegation dispute rights protection process, the Trademark Clearinghouse, the trademark claims notice, which is generated to a potential registrant when he or she attempts to register a term that is registered in the Clearinghouse.

The sunrise period when I name – when a trademark is registered in the Clearinghouse – its owner has a first right to register that term and during the sunrise period of a new Top-Level Domain that's opening up and of course the Uniform Rapid Suspension which was designed as a narrow supplement to the UDRP.

So that's the scope of what we're going to be reviewing in Phase 1. So let me – it – open it up now. Do – does anyone have any questions or comments regarding the presentation we just received?

And let me add that next – the tentative agenda for our next meeting is to actually go through all of the questions that were set out in the charter on the rights protection mechanisms for new TLDs.

So we're going to be spending our time next week going through all the different questions that were raised and comments on the report that preceded the creation of this working group, and also noting that those questions are non-exclusive.

This working group is free to pursue other questions that have not been brought up before. We are also free - if at any point we think that our charter is too broad or too narrow and needs to be adjusted we can petition the Council for an adjustment in our charter.

So I'm going to stop there. Any questions or comments? If you have them again please raise your hand in the chat room. And I don't – I see a checkmark from one person but we need a hand raised if there's going to be a – well seeing none I'm going to proceed to the next to the last item, which is scheduling the working group meetings.

And the three tentative co-chairs have had a online discussion of this with Staff. Oh Susan. Yes Susan. I see your hand up Susan Payne. Go ahead. I'm not hearing anything. Are you off mute? Susan is typing. I see.

Okay so she's having trouble with audio so she will put it in chat. Getting back to the meetings we are going to strive with exceptions. Of course we won't have calls the weeks of ICANN meetings and apparently the week before or after given the intensity of the work around ICANN meetings.

But the tentative judgment of the co-chairs is to schedule weekly calls for this week – working group of 60 minutes' duration. We know that we've looked at the various time zones that folks are in and it's going to be hard enough getting acceptable call times with 60-minute calls.

We are going to reserve the right on particular issues where we think a 90 minute call will be advisable to try to wrap something up - to occasionally schedule a 90 minute call.

But our regular calls will be every week except for weeks of ICANN meetings and before and after and perhaps at other times during the holiday season.

We're looking at Wednesday for the call and that's based upon Staff availability and the scheduled calls for other working groups that are up and running.

We – a large number of participants in this group are from either the Western Hemisphere, which encompasses a few time zones and Europe. And there

are times to schedule calls that work for both Western Hemisphere participants and European and I would say African participants at reasonable times within normal working hours.

But we are also aware that about one out of every six members of this working group is in – from the Indian Subcontinent, East Asia and Australia and that that scheduling is not convenient for them.

So we're going to decide on a rotation schedule. At least once every third or fourth call we're going to schedule a call that's within normal working hours for people in the Asia-Pacific region, and that compels those of us in Europe and the Americas to be on either very early or very late.

But we understand the need to share the inconvenience of the calls and that's something we always faced with a global participation in our work, so we're going to be reasonable in the scheduling.

And those of you who participated in the work on the IANA transition and the accountability – many of us are familiar with getting on calls at 1:00, 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning.

It's not the happiest experience but it has to be done to share the convenience and inconvenience equally. So again we're looking at Wednesdays probably for our calls.

I believe unless Staff advises me otherwise we're going to put out a Doodle poll. And I see that Lars has his hand up. Let me let Lars speak up at this point.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Phil. This is Lars. And yes I just want to add to what you said that we have sort of a great PDF in the room and also deleted that in the chat. And just to emphasize that as you said we were looking to find a convenient time,

especially rotation and that there really is no time that will be within normal working hours for all participants.

And so it won't be – the polls – the Doodle polls - I'm sure that Staff will be helping us with the Doodle poll and that, you know, bear in mind that it will be impossible to have meetings that will suit everybody all the time and that's all. Thanks Phil.

Philip Corwin: Right. And again my understanding is that we're going to put out a Doodle poll to members of this working group to get their preference for call times. We – as – we're already displaying the time zones for the members of this group, and as you can see there's no way to schedule calls where someone isn't on a call in the middle of the night.

But we're still going to do a Doodle poll because some people want to do these calls – prefer to do them during working hours. Some people prefer to do them after regular working hours, so we're going to get a sense of the group and then announce a proposed scheduled probably at the next meeting.

So again the key points are the calls will be on Wednesdays. They will be weekly. They will generally be 60 minutes in duration; occasionally 90 minutes in duration when the co-chairs believe that's the way to – needed to finish up on a particular issue.

And we're going to rotate the calls every third or fourth week to make it less inconvenient for the folks in East Asia and Australia. And Lars is – you had further comment or is that your old hand up?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry Phil, that's an old hand. I'll put it down.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thank you. And can I ask Staff – and we're up to next steps and to confirm our next meeting. As I mentioned the main thing we're going to be

doing at the next meeting is going through a detailed review of the questions presented on each of the issues in Phase 1.

I see a hand up for Mr. Agarwal. I hope I haven't mispronounced your name but go ahead.

Mr. Agarwal: Hi. Yes absolutely. Absolutely. Good evening everyone. It's about 9:30 - in the 9:30-ish. Just a suggestion. The meeting - I think Phil you were great here.

Just a suggestion that if Staff can send out the minutes of the meeting, recorded good comments of the chairs and the co-chairs and the speakers, I think it would be very helpful in a summarized format.

Philip Corwin: Right. Well our standard practice for any ICANN working group and I'll let – see if Staff wants to supplement what I'm about to say – is that very shortly after the calls we all get a email with the mp3 recording and the chat – what's in the chat room and usually within a day after that we get a transcript of the recording.

And beyond that the job of summarizing what's happened and proposing next steps usually goes to the chair where we'll – well the chairs will all meet and kind of sum up whatever we've done in terms of decision making and proposed next steps forward.

That's the general way these groups work. Did Staff have anything they wanted to add on that point?

Mr. Agarwal: Right.

Philip Corwin: Okay. And I see there's a comment in the chat room asking which document contains the questions we'll be reviewing. Those are contained both in the

final report that was the basis for this working group, and also they are attached to the charter for this working group.

And I'll ask Staff to either provide the links in the chat room or to provide those links in a follow up email to all the members of this group so that everyone who wants to can review those questions before the next call because we'll be getting into them.

And again those are non-exclusive lists. Any member of this working group is free to propose additional areas of inquiry for our work as we proceed. We are not confined by the list of questions.

We are confined by the charter but we have the ability to ask for the charter to be amended if we feel at any point that it is – it needs amendment to allow us to proceed in a logical and consistent manner.

So Staff have we set a time for next week's call – a time and date in terms of Item 8? (Mary) go ahead.

(Mary): Hi Phil. Hi everybody. I hope this mic works better. It would seem that we can try to set the time for Wednesday, which I can't find the date for at 15:00 UTC.

In the meantime we will proceed with the Doodle poll so that the chairs can then select the rotation times for future calls. But it may be helpful for people to be able to put next Wednesday, 15:00 UTC on their calendars now instead of waiting for the Doodle poll to close.

Philip Corwin: Okay. So 15:00 UTC would be 3:00 pm in London, 11:00 am in Washington, D.C., 8:00 am in – on the West Coast of the U.S., et cetera. Is that correct?

Man: That's correct.

Philip Corwin: Okay. All right. So everyone tentatively put on your calendars for Wednesday the 27th of April. And I see Ed Morris correcting me on the London time, which is different than UTC or GMT I gather in the summer.

And so anyway everyone if you can put on your calendars that our next call will be on Wednesday the 27th at 15:00 UTC. And there are all kinds of world clock applications on the Internet that can help you nail down when that is in your location.

And the order of business for that meeting will be a detailed review of all the questions that are appended to the charter for the RPM review for the RPMs created for new TLDs.

And that will be - after that meeting when we get into May we'll be starting to get - the chairs will then propose a - an order to proceed on those separate RPM questions, some logical order in which to address them and if we get consensus from the working group to proceed in the suggested manner that we'll begin our substantive work the first week of May. (Mary) I see your hand up.

(Mary): Yes Phil. And as Sara Bockey has just posted in the chat I've been reminded by Terri -- thank you Terri -- that at the moment the quarterly stakeholder update from ICANN is scheduled for exactly the same time, which is next Wednesday at 15:00 UTC.

So perhaps after this call yourself, J. Scott, Kathy and Staff can get together by email or otherwise to try to figure out if an alternative time might be preferable, and we can get a note out to the working group as soon as possible either to confirm next Wednesday or to propose a new time and date.

Philip Corwin: Sure. Now may I ask (Mary) how long is that quarterly update? Is that an hour call or an hour and a half?

(Mary): I believe it is normally scheduled for an hour and a half, although I have – do not know about this next one but in any – it's probably going to be an hour but it would – nevertheless if it goes ahead - and I believe it will clash with the proposed time for our next call.

Philip Corwin: Okay. All right. Well then in that case members of the working group we will have a follow up call to review the RPM questions next week. Because of the potential conflict with the ICANN quarterly update call it's unlikely to be at 15:00 UTC.

But we will be back to you hopefully before the end of the week, hopefully by tomorrow with a proposed meeting date that's – will work for the working group and doesn't conflict with that ICANN call.

So that completes – I think that completes our agenda for this call so I'm going to – unless Staff thinks I've missed something I'm going to open it up now to any other business if folks want to raise any other questions or points before we adjourn this call.

And we're 59 minutes into it so we have one official minute left. Well I see no one raising their hand so I'm going to – again to – as we conclude this call we're going to circulate the proposal for the three party co-chair and see if that's acceptable to the group and nail that down for – before our next call next week.

We're going to kind of – the tentative co-chairs are going to confer with Staff and agree on a time and date for a – our next call next week perhaps on Wednesday.

I don't know. We may have to move it to Thursday but we'll let you know as soon as we look at the options there. And the agenda for the next call will be

detailed review of all the questions that were raised during the comment periods on the report on RPMs that led up to this group being chartered.

So I don't see anyone's hand raised. We're - officially have been on for one hour now so I'm going to call this – I'm going to ask to adjourn this call. And again thank the 54 participants who joined today, which is less than half of the total membership of this working group and I expect we'll probably have more on once we get into substance.

And we will be back to you by email in the next 24 hours or so on all those items, and we look forward to working with all of you on this important project moving forward. So thank you for your participation.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: And once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END