GNSO Protection of the Rights of Others (PRO) Working Group Teleconference

6 March 2007

19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO PRO Working Group teleconference on 6 March 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/PRO-wg-20070509.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

 Attendance:

Kristina Rosette - IPC Chair of the working group

Peter Olson - IPC

Lance Griffin - IPC

Kelly Smith - IPC

Margie Milam - Registrar/IPC

David Maher - gTLD Registries c.

Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registries c.

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Eun-Joo Min - WIPO

ICANN Staff:

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Councellor

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Kelly Smith - IPC

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by.

The recording has begun.

Kristina Rosette: Excellent. Thanks.

Glen, I know that we've done somewhat of an informal role, but if you will be so kind as to take one to see if anybody is joining the last couple of minutes, that would be great.

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly, Kristina.

We've got yourself on the line, Peter Olsen, Lance Griffin, David Maher, Margie Milam, Avri Doria and (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Alrighty. Welcome everyone.

As you probably noticed of the past couple of days, I've been rather busy. I'm trying to make sure that we have documentation, you know centralized to the extent possible.

I know that I had put together - well, Mike had started and I put together the kind of semantic chart based on a suggestion by Victoria a couple of calls ago.

I am inclined to say that at this point that unless someone feels very strongly about it that perhaps what we might want to do is look instead at some of the proposals that have already been submitted and see if there are comments one way or the other to the extent that we can identify even if perhaps there's not a consensus as to the entire proposal.

But there maybe kind of consensus at least among those on the call, as the parts of it that we can just fill those out so that we can really come down to, you know, nuggets that would be most useful.

Okay. I'll take it that no one has any strong feeling one way or the other.

Before we get started, does anyone have any additional ideas or suggestions that they have not previously made available on the list but that they are, you know, would now like to raise?

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry, Kristina. May I just add that Liz Williams has joined the call and Victoria McEvedy.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Hello Victoria? Hello Liz?

Liz Williams: Hi Kristina. I just - break into the call. Sorry.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. No, that's okay.

What I was saying is that I had set around - prepared and set around kind of a semantic set of tables based on the TLD summaries that

have been completed today and to the extent that I knew about certain aspects for once that had not been completed. I went ahead and filled those in.

Having said that, given that we are really coming close to the end of our time, I thought that perhaps what we could do is instead focus on the proposals that have been submitted today, and to the extent that we can, for example, in discussing each one briefly, identify perhaps components of them that are acceptable to everyone.

If it's the case that, for example, there's no, you know, agreement on any one in its entirety that we can then (instill) these down into sub-components that at least to the extent that we can say that there's consensus or agreement based on the participants -- based on the number of participants that we could reflect that at least tentatively.

But before I do that, I wanted to see if anyone had any additional proposals that were ready to be discussed or that they wanted to discuss that they hadn't yet made available to everyone.

All right. Peter, are you still on?

Peter Olsen: Yes.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Peter Olsen: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Do you - are you in a position to run through and you can pick whichever component, you know, part of your proposal you want to talk about the time that you have?

Do you want to go ahead and just get started in terms of just running through very - and quickly summarily because everyone hopefully got the document and, Liz, if they've seen most of it before? Just what those kind of high points are of your proposal.

Peter Olsen: Sure. Yes, basically three parts.

The first one was an outsourced Sunrise instead of each new registry having to make their own Sunrise. We outsource it once and for all to someone like ICANN or WIPO.

The second thing was a possibility of defensive removal where domain names that would only be cyber-squatted anyway would just be able to get permanent removed.

And the last thing was a name string notification, which is a kind of opposition term for domain names if they get - domain name application contains a trademark or a prior name.

Then the owner of the prior name could have the opportunity of putting it into a UDRP-like process such that it would never - it wouldn't get registered first.

And that's basically we were asked last time we talked about this, but I think we talked about mainly the first one of these that the outsourced Sunrises, people thought it was a pretty good idea. That wasn't right.

I think what we really need to talk about is that the name string notification to see if there's kind of a general consensus on that as well.

Kristina Rosette: All right. And I will kind of take that in the queue because I had added in the table that I submitted to the list about half an hour ago. I had put in kind of a variant of that proposal that really was kind of an amalgamation of certain features of the .biz IP claim process and .name NameWatch service.

And in terms of, you know, to the extent that I've had a chance to kind of cross-check it against the proposal that Peter had put forward, it would be then names that kind of (hide) the changes or at least that variances team to be, you know, to one extent timing in the sense of under the proposal that I put in, which was actually talking that I had received from someone on - from someone outside the group.

The domain name applicant, when they - when there was match will be notified that there was a match and be provided with the basic information about the watched string basis.

In other words, if a company have put in - if ABC company have put in the string for, you know, 1, 2, 3, based on ownership of trademark registrations in this country, that country and the other country, then the domain name applicant for, you know, 1, 2, 3, 4, would get a notification that if ABC company, this is the right that they've claimed, this is the basis that you want to go forward.

And then, it was only upon the applicant deciding to affirmatively afford with the registration in much the same way that the .biz IP claim process instead of that the - we then have a situation where it would be necessary for the right owner to actually initiate a challenge.

I guess, the other thing that I would note is that - in the kind of second variant of the proposal in the chart, it would be a requirement that the - whatever right the pirate owner wanted to assert.

In other words, if they wanted to watch a string of 1, 2,3, they would need to have a prior validated right through this, you know, for going to go to the centralized database or what-not that you wouldn't really to see in a position where people could arbitrarily say, well, I'm interested to see what, you know, ABC company is doing, so I'm going to put a watch on all of, you know, its march -- that type of thing. It would really need to be tied back to the centralized validate right.

The other kind of difference is kind of slipping a little bit.

The requirements for prevailing in the challenge, you could have multiple rights owners watching the same string and they could all object if they wanted to, and in that event, it would be consolidated into one proceeding.

The rights owner would bear or multiple rights owners the case may be would bear to see for, you know, this dispute resolution proceeding with the caveat that the applicant will be required to post a small monetary bond, you know, something like $50, mainly to ensure that there is in fact kind of a true interest in using the domain name as opposed to just an automated process in the event that the applicant's

mailed in the - the outcome of the proceeding would really depend on satisfying those three factors and (some of) the UDRP-type factors.

If the rights owner prevails, the applicant would not register the name. It would not be the case that if the rights owner prevail that they would be the registrant of the name. It would simple be a pure blacking mechanism.

If the applicant prevail not only would they get their (gone) back, but they could go ahead and register their names with the caveat that the fact that there had been this kind of initial proceeding would not have any conclusive effect in keeping them from later (proximity) UDRP effects what they decided is.

In terms of - I think probably the only other thing that was kind of specifically added is that, you know, the proceedings would be very standardized and solely electronic.

In much the same way, I don't know to what extent people on the call are familiar with the .mobi Sunrise Challenge process, but it was kind of an electronic form, you know, you could cut and paste a word text into it, but that was it. And you had very strict space on it which frankly were not that difficult to state with them.

So the idea would be that the process would be very streamlined. It will be very fast particularly since the name would not resolve during (dependency) of the challenge so much the same way that, you know, .biz name that were the subject of Startup Opposition Procedure did not resolve.

Peter Olsen: All right. And I think that the (name string) this and that the IP claims and other startup kind of things is a permanent kind of thing.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Peter Olsen: It will be there forever, so it's a new idea and a good one, I think, because if we can get consensus on this one, then it will go far making everybody happy.

Margie Milam: Can I ask questions?

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Margie Milam: It's Margie.

                On the defensive removal concept where, you know, I guess, it would no longer be available for registration for anybody or would, you know, it seems to me that that might be a problem from a registry standpoint because there might be - other people with legitimate rights to use it, just say United as an example, you know.

                If it gets blocked to get a particular person who doesn't have rights to it but, you know, later on someone else does - do that mean that it's forever outside of, you know, unable to be registered, I guess, that's the question.

Peter Olsen: Oh no. It should be - it would be - there would be a challenge in there right from the start. It's not designed to take out those kinds of things. It's designed to take out the pure cyber-squatting domain names.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Peter Olsen: Not common names or generic names.

Avri Doria: I have - this is Avri. Can I ask a question?

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Avri Doria: Yeah, on a particular one.

If - let's say you don't challenge it at the beginning when the original, you know, getting their standing to have the service -- use the service. You don't challenge it then because you just not await (unintelligible) new challenge at anytime and have that status removed and how would that work. Let's say another, you know, someone else comes along who does have a righteous claim against them.

Kristina Rosette: Well, it depends on - and I'm not entirely sure I understand your question.

But basically, there would be, for example, a 20-day period or a 30-day period within which anyone who participated in the watch service for this particular string could object.

Avri Doria: Yeah, no.

Kristina Rosette: If they decided not to object and allow the name to go forward, simply, you know, and then maybe for the very reason that you suggest that on its (phase), it's hard to say whether the name is going to be used in bad faith or not…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: …or would register that.

They could still use EDRP later.

Avri Doria: That wasn't (pointing) to the question I was asking or perhaps my question doesn't make sense.

It was - there was an initial period with a person depriving to any of these services…

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: …either for the name removal or the prescription service, needed to demonstrate their standing and that could be challenged.

What I'm asking is, is there a challenge against the person holding that privileged status of being able to - and of having standing for these services? Can someone standing for the services be challenged at anytime in the future?

Peter Olsen: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

Peter Olsen: At anytime in the future, there will be no statute limitations on that at all.

And basically, they just have to prove that it will be like the opposite of a UDRP and, you know, in the UDRP, they have to prove that there's a trademark right, and that they have no legitimate interest, and that there's bad faith registration in use.

And if the person wants to challenge this can prove any of these elements, then they can remove the removal -- the defensive removal.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Was that the question you were asking, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Kristina Rosette: I actually thought you might be answering and asking a different question.

Avri Doria: No, that was actually the question I was asking.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman.

I've been on for a couple of minutes just waiting for a chance to introduce myself.

Kristina Rosette: Hi Jeff.

Given that we're kind of taking your .biz process, hopefully, not in vain, do you have questions or suggestions or comments?

Jeff Neuman: I'm just listening.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: And sure, did you guys have any questions for me and how that worked and…

Kristina Rosette: I actually do, and I just have a brief one in that, and I have to say that now that I have plowed my way through all of defensive concept report, I want to thank you or whoever your company that did yours because it was by far the most helpful.

There was two points that I had a question about namely that I think there was a sense in there to the effect of that in retrospect, that there was kind of a general recommendation that in the future that the claim should be bundled with a registration application.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. There was a lot of confusion that people who sought that they had filed a claim had also applied (pseudoname).

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Jeff Neuman: So there were a few trademark owners that missed the application part of it.

Kristina Rosette: Oh I see.

Jeff Neuman: Because they thought by submitting the claim, they were also submitting a domain name application.

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Jeff Neuman: If we were to do it again in the future, we would give it kind of - you'd have - you - by filing claim, you were also filing an application to the names so you wouldn't have to apply again.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, I see. I see.

Because if my recollection was correct, oh boy, and this is - I apologize. They're all starting to blur together.

A successful STOP challenger, were they awarded the name if they could prove that they were otherwise entitled to it?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right.

Jeff Neuman: But oftentimes, there were a couple of names, believe it or not, where claims were filed but nobody filed an application. So it went in to the general pool…

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: …of names, and then someone else had registered it.

And then they couldn't do STOP that had to do the normal UDRP…

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Jeff Neuman: …and whereas, they could have just solved those. They mistakenly believed that by filing a claim, they also filed an application.

Kristina Rosette: Right. Do you think based on your experience that if the process we're talking about were to separate them out in the sense that, you know, whereas under the .biz STOP process, a successful challenger who could show they were eligible for was awarded the .biz domain name?

You know, in the process, we're talking about a successful challenger would not get the domain name. They just know no one will get the name or the specific applicant actually wouldn't get the name.

Do you think from that perspective would that kind of lessen the potential confusion by not having the application and the claim bundled?

Jeff Neuman: I think you're creating some other problems. I think you're not providing an incentive for challenges.

In other words, what - well, let's go to - there's a couple different alternatives you mentioned. If you're not awarded the name and then it - or it could just take in out of the pool, why would someone not want the name and just have it take it out of the pool?

If they've gone through the trouble of filing a STOP proceeding, I mean - or whatever you call it, why would they not want the name?

Kristina Rosette: Well, they very well might, but it just seemed that it was easier and cleaner to keep it separate in terms of trying to come up with kind of

baseline suggestions that would be least likely to encounter resistance. At least that was my feeling on it.

Jeff Neuman: So you're giving the person who files the challenge an option of one of those three?

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Jeff Neuman: It's their option.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Jeff Neuman: And you're not talking about doing anything upfront as far as - would it be - you're talking about the watch notices, right? I mean…

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Jeff Neuman: So essentially, you could give them a choice when they want to file the watch notice or whatever you call it. They could also count that as an application for a name.

Kristina Rosette: Arguably yes, and then you just - the only thing that you would run into is if you had multiple people with watch services for the same string.

And when I say string, I mean not necessarily marked.

Jeff Neuman: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: And then you would have to deal with it on the back-end if you had multiple rights owners or however you want to define them wanting to

challenge the same name, you know, and I know, you know, .biz randomized those.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. And that was - yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: And there's a lottery loss and other things that you have to watch out forth.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

I should note that perhaps the other thing that we could put in is that once the applicant in this kind of scenario with the watch service - if the rights owner - if an applicant loses a challenge, they can note they're not eligible to apply for the name again, that it would basically pull them out of being a potential applicant.

Because the idea, I think, was trying to deal with some of the really kind of obvious kind of cyber-squatting type problems, but do it in a way that was kind of fair and simultaneously without having trademark owners end up with more registrations than they actually can use.

So who would keep that information of registrars with no ahead of time that that person can't register? I mean, that seems to me to be kind of a little unworkable.

Well, I mean, you know, that's something that is left open. I mean, maybe you could put it in a, you know, keep it to the extent you're

going to have a centralized database for all the right verification and validation information. You know, can I have the same?

Jeff Neuman: And you're talking about the watch services, not just initially up at the launch, but a watch service that continues?

Kristina Rosette: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: That's expensive. And to be honest, I mean, that's something that - or just think about how much you pay Thomson & Thomson to monitor, right, if you're in the US? And these are not cheap services.

Kristina Rosette: Well, that's true. But given that the UDRP filing fee is $1500 and that, you know, that I have yet - I think kind of the general consensus even on - and the (lip service) that you can't prepare a successful UDRP complaint for under $5000. I mean, as long as it's under $6500 per year per mark, it's still pretty, relatively speaking, cost-effective.

I see your point though, I mean, and that - and then it wouldn't obviously be intended to displace the UDRP.

Jeff Neuman: And there's lot of things - as long as people who wanted to pay, there's lots of things that - but just don't want to set the expectation that that's kind of something that a registry could do for free or cheaply or even 80 bucks a name or 90 bucks whatever that this IP claim was.

Margie Milam: The model would allow for charging a fee for that watch service by the registry, I guess?

Kristina Rosette: Oh absolutely. I mean, and you know, you could do it on kind of a subscription basis in terms of, you know, you could do it on a kind of per mark basis or per TLD basis or, you know, annual basis.

I mean, this might also be something that depending upon how you configured it could be done centrally as well.

Margie Milam: I suggest, I mean, theoretically, you got - a registry could figure out what that would cost and then, you know, charge an appropriate fee, right?

Man: Yeah. I mean, there's lots of things that can be done certainly for - yeah. That's - it's just an expanded service of the IP claims, which we had thought about it one point BIZ have thought about doing.

It is expensive and would require a pretty high demand, right, so you got to build the systems whether or not there's demand, and that's kind of taking a risk.

But that's - I mean, it's not something we - I mean, if we're just talking about possible alternatives as opposed to mandating it on a registry, yeah, I'm sure there are ways that registries configure this out.

Kristina Rosette: And I don't think at this point, we're talking about at least for this level of specificity, I mean, it was not my intention that we be talking about mandates. It will be more, you know, a recommendation.

I mean, there are other aspects of someone using that frankly I have not done into the chart yet that I think could be - well, at least some of them I did actually, could be kind of baseline, you know, requirements

namely, for example, you know, any rate upon which a domain name applicant seeks to rely in a rights protection mechanism must be subject to some validation.

It doesn't say by whom. It doesn't say to what extent. But then it must be, you know, some validation.

Jeff Neuman: So anyone - is that - that would anybody who wants to watch a mark or that's just anyone who wants to enforce their rights?

Kristina Rosette: Anybody who wants to participate in a rights protection mechanism kind of defined broadly to include, you know, that sense of removal or an IP claim or Sunrise or, you know, any - whatever is developed and implemented that anybody who wants to participate and what, you know, needs to basically that right that their claim, it needs to have some validation.

Jeff Neuman: Or meaning you could separate it all out. In a watch notice, you don't have to - if you just want to talk about a watch service…

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Jeff Neuman: …you don't have to have a legitimate right and a mark to just have a pure watch service. You just want to know what's going on, right?

It's like Thomson & Thomson doesn't - have you that - if I wanted to search of if I wanted to have a watch notice on anybody that registers any mark that has the letters NEU because I'm NeuStar, they don't validate that I am NeuStar. I am who I say I am. They just say okay and they build in.

Kristina Rosette: What we would actually in this process, at least in my - in the second variation of it, they would require that you have a validated right.

Jeff Neuman: Well, I'm just saying if you wanted to do something further and go to…

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: …the next step…

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: …like you can separate the watch service out from the next step, which is having some ability to do something with that mark either taking it out of the space or using it yourself. That part would require the authentication mechanism.

But the first part is just having a straight (unintelligible) watch service doesn't really matter.

Kristina Rosette: Well, I think one of the concerns that came up in talking about this was the fact that in many cases, you know, a company will apply either directly or through an intermediary or domain name in connection with the new brand launch even before they filed their trademark applications for example.

And so that, you know, by requiring the watch service to be tied to a validated right that you would basically present that type of possible bas faith use of that information.

Jeff Neuman: Well, I'm just saying if you separated the watch service out completely from any other action…

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: …like it's just a pure watch service…

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Jeff Neuman: …they wouldn't matter. It doesn't matter who wants to search it, right? They pay the - whatever fee it is to have a watch service. It's like you do at Thomson & Thomson. It doesn't matter if they're authenticated.

If you wanted to go to the next step and want to actually have some action, like okay, you find out hey, I'm NeuStar so I find out someone registers or want to register my neustar.xyz TLD.

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay, and I want to take some action and prevent someone from registering it assuming there were some sort of objection period. Then, to exercise that right, I would have to authenticate that I own it.

Kristina Rosette: I don't disagree with you. I guess, I'm just thinking that if in the process, the name is not going to resolve until all challenges are, you know, filed and decided.

If you wait until that point to require that the rights owner to have the right validated that that would draw that out even longer in fairness to

the applicants or you would want to avoid that in fairness of the applicants.

Well, I mean, there's all kind of ways for doing it.

I guess, the other question that - and maybe I just want to get back to this kind of centralized right validation and database.

I mean, for - of those on the call, is there anyone who objects to the idea of that?

Man: Of having a centralized - can you go into that again? Sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah. I have - sorry, yeah. This is Victoria.

I have an - is this - and you know some…

Kristina Rosette: It's in the most recent document that I posted.

Victoria McEvedy: That came in just before the call?

Kristina Rosette: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, fine. Can we reserve out until we've had a good look at this?

Kristina Rosette: Well, I actually like to kind of go through it simply because if there are ways that come out of this discussion that perhaps if we change this or we change that, we could have agreement on it to the extent we can move forward with it, you know, I'd like to be able to do that.

I'm happy to kind of run through now.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I'm sorry because I just can't read (anything) on the call.

Kristina Rosette: No, no. I was…

Victoria McEvedy: I haven't had time to do this.

Kristina Rosette: …just going to describe it to you.

And that essentially, there will be a centralized rights validation process and database, which to be designed and administered by ICANN, WIPO, some other designated entity with experience in this regard.

Or arguably, ICANN should put it out as an RFP and do it to a third party much the same way that you would outsource everything to PWC.

Every rightholder that wanted to rely on a prior right and use a right protection mechanism should be required to submit information about and documentation of its claimed rights for validation. Rights that had not been validated could not be relied on.

The rightholder could theoretically designate that gTLD rights protection mechanism that they wanted to participate in. And then the processor or database administrator, whatever that entity is, would then be responsible for upon validation relaying that data to the registry or registrars appropriate.

And further the rightholders will be required to affirm on a regular basis, probably annually would make the most sense. The continued validity of each document is right.

So in other words, if someone was relying on a US principal register registration, that, you know, when they initially submitted it, it was between the fifth and sixth year for proving that it can be used in the mark, and the next anniversary came up, they would have to basically affirm that the US registration was still valid.

And, you know, arguably, really set this up in much the same way that, for example, I get emails from Network Solutions and various registrars saying, you know, you need to confirm the validity of, you know, that your WHOIS data is complete and accurate.

Participation fees could be levied on a subscription basis with the relevant period kind of tied whatever the affirmation obligation is. In other words, if you're going to do an annual obligation to affirm the validity, then you could have a, you know, it would only make sense to have a one-year subscription basis.

In terms of calculating the fees, it could be based on the number of rights, the number that the rights owner wanted to have validated, the number of rights protection mechanisms in which they wanted to participate, you know, I guess, there's a variety of different skills that you could do it.

Another aspect of it would be to require the rightholder to whatever - whoever wanted to participate to create essentially the passive account similar to the types of accounts that, for example, the US

Patent and Trademark use and that the WIPO International Bureau uses against which the fees will be drawn.

The advantage of doing this way is that you can then allow for payment in mechanisms other than credit cards to allow those participants who may not - who may be in economies where credit cards are not widely used, can still participate like sending, for example, a wire transfer, a bank draft or that type of thing.

So that was really - I mean, the idea really is so that - first off, you don't have rights owners having to kind of submit over and over and over and over the same documentation.

Second, you have basically a way to ensure that there's some check on the continued validity of whatever rights the rights owner is claiming to have.

Third, you avoid a situation where the registrars and registries are having to reinvent the wheel in terms of, you know, for example, if you did have a registry that would have planned to have a complete validation process, they don't have to do that anymore.

That costs would be, you know, that would be kind of borne by the centralized registry, which of course, would then pass it on. But it would avoid those kind of upfront costs that the registries would have.

You know similarly, you would have the registrars in a position where they wouldn't have to redesign and if each time there was a new TLD with a new type of mechanism and new types of requirements to write,

the registrars wouldn't have to design kind of new software, new interfaces to deal with that.

I mean, the idea really is to kind of making this standardized and efficient and most cost-effective for everyone.

Man: You're only - the centralized the database, it wouldn't save costs for registries who want to validate something other than a trademark intellectual property right.

Kristina Rosette: No. You could put in anything, whatever, you know, the registry decided would be kind of the scope of rights that it was going to allow as basis would - that will be submitted to the centralized database.

So for example, owners in literary title, for example, could submit the documentation, the information, sufficient to basic claim on their, you know, ownership of rights based on that title.

And then it would just be a matter of the subset -- the relevant subset or subsets of data being relayed to the registry as needed.

Man: I guess, I'm talking - my point was that the registry wants to have a - the lack of better - to have a sponsored space that wouldn't help them with solving that kind of stuff, or it have to be a legitimate travel association.

That one has got a IP right in a travel mark but…

Kristina Rosette: Right. Right.

It wasn't at least the initial intent of that, but I don't see why you couldn't have a parallel one except for the fact that you would, you know, I can't imagine - and maybe I'm wrong, but I would think that you're really the sponsored TLDs that are going to have those type of eligibility restrictions and requirements are really going to be one-off, I would think.

So I don't know that it would necessarily be cost effective to put those into a centralized function.

In other words, how many registries are you really going to have or you would have to show , for example, that you're a member of one of the how ever (many) industries in the travel sector.

I don't know. I'm just kind of thinking all out.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I just say - it seems like and quite seems (unintelligible) idea of not reinventing the wheel every time. But the flipside of this that they are probably be competition concerns in the sense that they won't be and, you know, this will be into competitive and intensive, not encouraging competition between at least the number of providers.

And therefore, you know, services may suffer and process may rise, you know?

Kristina Rosette: Would there be any structural reason why? And again, I'm going to, you know, I don't know enough about how you would set this up and how the data would need to be relayed.

But would there be any reason why you couldn't have multiple authorized providers? Aside from the fact that everybody would need to kind of stay current with your data.

Victoria McEvedy: Is that not what happens now or there's no accreditation process, is that what you're saying?

I mean, there's no - everybody has to design their own.

Kristina Rosette: Everybody has to decide their own.

I mean, basically what I'm saying is, is that in much the same way that you have - I guess, what I'm wondering and this is the question I'm posing to the group is, you know, is there any reason why you couldn't have a situation where you have multiple, you know, database administrators.

And as long as they were all kind of communicating amongst themselves, you know, perhaps on a daily basis to make sure that everybody had a complete set of data.

Man: You know, that's not going to happen.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I mean…

Man: No, there's no way that PWC would establish a lot of connection to a - and say a KPMG or another entity that's able to do it. It's just - it won't happen.

The same way that UDRP - or the - yeah, the UDRP providers aren't connected.

Margie Milam: Right. But UDRP - there are several UDRP providers, I mean, I was thinking you probably could do it if they all had to report - standardized the reports to their registrar that IP right, you know, exist.

Man: Well, but you guys can tell me UDRP was out there, but if you file UDRP with the National Arbitration Forum and later file one with WIPO, to what extent does WIPO look at National Arbitration Forum decision and coordinate, you know, it's my impression because I doubted that WIPO does its own fact-finding independent of what National Arbitration Forum may have found in another case.

Woman: Yeah. I think that's right.

As long as there some general standards that providers have to adhere to, they probably would have some leeway in how they do it.

I'm just saying it's probably not impossible that to have more than one provider assuming there's a standard and there's a, you know, standard reporting mechanism to either the registry or the registrar.

Kristina Rosette: Victoria, other than those concerns, and I don't mean to suggest that they're not important ones, but if the competition issues can be dealt with, what would your thoughts be on this?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, it sounds pretty sensible to me.

Kristina Rosette: Right. Well, then maybe that the questions are kind of deal with multiple, right?

Woman: (I'm sure) late. This is (unintelligible).

Tell you this place (I forth) that on the UDRP side, when there is a decision rendered by NAF and we are made aware of it, then we generally take it into account.

That is, if we get a new UDRP case for the same domain that have been already decided by NAF, and we would treat exactly the same way as we would treat an UDRP decision decided by WIPO, and we would expect you on these certain conditions and those certain (refilling) conditions on this.

But it is true that if the complainant does not inform us, that there has been a previous case, it is possible that we might go ahead unknowingly. But there is little information sharing which they've tried.

I would admit it's not ideal.

Man: Right. (Coming) competitors for a particular service even the UDRP service are not going to communicate on a day-to-day basis and not develop some sort of interface the most of each other.

Woman: Well, it just seems it's doable in the sense that in the beginning of the UDRP, all the cases were recorded by ICANN. I think the first three years were all recorded by ICANN and therefore we could use ICANN's database to know which domain names would - if you could before the other providers.

It's just that ICANN had unfortunately discontinued that database and then, we could make it difficult for the providers to know - to gather information about the cases before the other providers.

But I - so I think it is something that would be possible if it is intended.

Victoria McEvedy: The parties must surely bring that - at least one of the parties will bring that to the attention of…

Woman: Right. That's how…

Victoria McEvedy: …relation provider and practice wouldn't they though.

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: You know, you got to say the beginning, I think, of these things were decisions that I do. You got set the beginning that nobody's aware of any other proceedings, so at least one of the parties allowed you to inform…

Woman: Uh-huh.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah.

Woman: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Well, and in fact, you don't have the same kind of incentive to provider shop where you're talking about validation, if everybody's taking the same types of information to validate the same types of rights and

applying the same standards, which have different processors as opposed to kind of different standards, I think I hope.

I know if that's just made up.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: You know, I can certainly see - I have someone who has (foreign shopped) myself when it comes to UDRP. You know, there are certainly not in terms of multiples but kind of depending around the facts where you go, et cetera, but I don't think you're going to have this type of an incentive.

And in fact, I mean - Liz?

Woman: (Gone).

Kristina Rosette: No. Well, maybe she'll join us.

So it looks like, you know, if we can kind of tinker with this and assuming that it's workable that this might be something that we have some consensus on.

Woman: But just to clarify, so this would be one layer and that each gTLD would have its own protection mechanism? Is that type thing (to BIZ)? I mean…

Kristina Rosette: Well, it could -- it could.

I mean, and that's one of the things that we have it. You know, I think there - and maybe this is a good time to raise this that, you know, that in my understanding based on previous calls that there is a consensus that you cannot have one single mechanism that applies in its entirety to all TLD despite virtue of how some of the TLD fees will be intended and defined and sponsored.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: So we - I mean, is everybody in the call in agreement on that? And that was my understanding from previous calls, but it is an important point.

Woman: I think that was my understanding - that there was no consensus toward the mechanism across all TLDs.

Kristina Rosette: Well, but this type of somewhat different. I guess, you know, I know that there's no consensus as to which one…

Woman: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: …but this would go a little farther and say that, you know, there is consensus that it's just simply not possible.

Woman: Right.

Kristina Rosette: Margie, Lance, Peter, Jeff, David?

Margie Milam: Yeah, I agree.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Liz Williams: That is an (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah. I mean, I agree that there is not one mechanism that should be mandatory across all gTLDs. I agree.

Man: I go along with that.

Victoria McEvedy: Is it making as in for validation or is it for STOP? Sorry?

Kristina Rosette: When I say mechanism, I'm talking about Sunrise versus IP claims versus, you know, watch service versus…

Man: Something new that nobody's follows.

Kristina Rosette: Right. But in terms of - and I think this is what we had talked about a little bit before that the other way to kind of - the other point within this is that although there is consensus that there is no one mechanism that should be applied or should be mandatory or it must be applied if we're coming to with the must - may - and I was given - have confused on that terminology.

                 But what we also talked about is whether or not we could agree that within certain types of mechanism that there were common features or common requirements that could be applied.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: And I don't think we really explore that very much.

Woman: That's right.

Kristina Rosette: And just to kind of give you an example, what I'm talking about is, for
                 example, if the TLD elects to proceed with a - and this reminds me we
                 need to talk a lot different.

                 But if the provider elects to proceed with the Sunrise type mechanism,
                 these are the minimum requirements that it must have.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Can I just jump on (unintelligible)?

                 I mean, I would have thought it's premature for us to be able to decide
                 whether or not there's anything that might apply across the borders,
                 not to mean - what would we - what are we working on?

Kristina Rosette: I would say kind of based…

Victoria McEvedy: I mean…

Kristina Rosette: …on the summaries and the proof of concept report and just based on
                 the fact that you had, you know, for example, if you look at kind of the
                 very tightly sponsored TLD where you need a specific ID just you
                 would be eligible, and then you've got a restricted universe of names
                 that you can pick from.

                 I mean, I view that as a rights protection mechanism.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean, I - look, my view is that I would have said we haven't done
                 the - we haven't really - well, I said, may have done any real analysis
                 as to commonality or applicability across - and I would have thought

that we ought to have a look at that, you know, that data - is proper and thorough and (logical) work done on it because, of course, you know, your suggestion is such a good one sort of standardizing the Sunrise process in some way.

You know, obviously, this increase, you know, obviously, this got to be benefit to people for standardizing other aspects of the processes where they could be standardized. So we ought to see - but I don't know, I mean, I think it's just - it's kind of preemptive to say that…

Kristina Rosette: Well, I think you're talking about different layers perhaps. It might be the better way to say it.

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Or maybe that may - all I'm saying is maybe, but maybe not. I mean, I got - I mean, I'm just saying I certainly am not clear.

Kristina Rosette: All right, all right.

Liz Williams: Kristina, it's Liz here.

Kristina Rosette: Yes?

Liz Williams: I just have a question to raise with respect to that.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Liz Williams: I haven't heard any discussion about the results of the questionnaires that was going on, and I (own) the side of caution and appreciate Victoria and you about it.

And it seems to me that I don't have and I certainly wouldn't be comfortable writing a report and have recommendations about one size fits all or ways of doing things that applied to everybody because I just don't think that that work has been done.

And I also didn't think on the basis of reading the questionnaire results that a one size fits all procedure was actually sensible.

Woman: All I'm saying is I have announced that question for myself. I haven't done an analysis.

If everybody else has - in the group has decided, then that's fine. I just like to put my own mark down in that I'd like to think about that. And - but I'm just wondering, you know, have we really analyzed the results of any of our work in that way sufficiently.

If you feel that we have, that's absolutely fine.

Kristina Rosette: Well, I don't think we have a kind of a group on a call. I mean, I know that I have gone through the summaries of the TLDs fairly closely as well as the proof of concept report kind of with the caveat that - as well some strategies report with the big caveat that not all of the registries have proof of concept report available on the ICANN site.

So, from - in that context, it is my view that it is not possible to have - independent of whether it's desirable to choose one mechanism that all TLDs must apply.

And when I say mechanism, I'm talking about kind of - everybody's got to use IP claim or everybody's got to use the Sunrise or everybody's got to use the defensive removal.

That when I say -- when I say that, that's what I'm talking about.

Liz Williams: I know, I think the supplementary point to that is that, Kristina, if you look at the responses to the survey, the majority of the people used in IP claim, which is opposed to fact, not pre-registration mechanism.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: Even though Sunrise mechanisms were offered in each on the TLDs that were surveyed.

I'm just urging caution…

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: …on the part of the group to make sure that sufficient analysis are being done, and to make sure that we understand what we're trying to put together for a report because from my side, it's now becoming very critical that the writing of the report gets done very, very soon.

But it takes into account the inputs from the work that is being done with respect to the surveys, respect to the (unintelligible) reports and

other reports that are being done, and then also the questionnaire results.

Kristina Rosette: How does everyone want to proceed? Because what we can do is kind of run through a list of things that we think it would be worth focusing on in the remainder of this call and our remaining calls because we think we can come to consensus on them.

Or in the alternative, we can just identify, you know, basically divide this up amongst ourselves into, you know, who's responsible for coming up with various proposals pertaining to each type of mechanism or, you know, if somebody wants to take on the job of coming up with a series of possible definitions for some of these things.

Well, we can do this in a number of ways and I, you know, frankly have no preference as long as what everybody agreed to do does in fact have done.

No one has a preference.

All right. I guess, one of the questions that I have, Liz, is I'm still kind of struggling with, you know, exactly how elaborate this report is supposed to be simply because we can, you know, I can rally kind of push and try and, you know, spend the next week transaction side from, you know, and to kind of putting together, you know, a huge chart that got various iterations or various aspects of proposals that we can all talk about.

But if that's really not what the council is intending to get from us kind of above the baseline, you know, here's what's been done, here are the issues that precipitated these mechanisms, here's the issues they created, you know, a lot of this has already been done and some are strategies that we're not gone reinvent the wheel, but we're just going to refer to that, so on and so forth.

You know, I guess, whatever guidance you can provide from - based on your experience on working on these types of reports, I would appreciate for one.

Liz Williams: Well, let's get back a step.

If the report has to go to the committee -- the GNSO Committee and they either accept or reject the advice of the working group, that's based on pretty much about structure. What can we get this group to get through to agree on as a report whether it's five lines or 5000? That's the practical question.

Then - so that's one question.

And the second question is, let's adequately and sensibly reflect the statement of work, which has described what happened in the past which is the summaries, and came up with a series of good ideas based on fact.

So, I would suggest that all of the materials that we refer to are useful in determining some top line guidance for the committee about things that they could consider. It doesn't have to be elaborate or anticipation, but it has to be something that is palatable to the broader committee.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: And then frankly, of course, palatable to the - I mean, the steps that we need to go to are, then incorporating the work of the program to the new TLDs report and then incorporating it into a board report that is part of an implementation plan.

So, mandating everything is not going to work, so being practical about what is a good suggestion about what can go forward.

It is much about politics, if it is about survey results or everything else. So I suggest that we focus on a very high - but a good summary, a good - all the summary with all of the summaries included that are being done on the existing registries, a very good topline analysis of the question and - because that's been a major piece of work that we spent a lot of time dealing with.

And judging by the responses and the response rates and who the responses have come from, people have being thoughtful and knowledgeable about how they responded.

And then, I suggest that you'd come up with a plan that says, well, we consider that these questions are very detailed. They're made - they are worthy of more attention and design the scope of work that the GNSO Council could perhaps consider for future work because frankly, this is a very, very, very tight time frame, so very serious issues to be raised and then resolved. And I don't think it's practical.

Kristina Rosette: All right. Well, why don't we do this?

What I think - I have to think that everybody is on this call because this is an issue that they have (attended) about.

So what I would suggest is everybody between now and Monday, and I would like to have a call on Monday simply because I think we're going to need to unless everybody wants to keep going right now, which I can do.

I don't know if everybody can do, that they identify kind of the top 10 kind of general principles that they would want to see in any rights protection mechanism.

The other thing - and then once we've got that, we can - and maybe that we're all were on more similar pages than we think.

You know, for example, just with the point that we talked about earlier, you know, based on my review of all these materials, I can say that I personally cannot believe that there is on one side to draw mechanism and, you know, I can go from there.

The other thing, I mean, is that something that everybody can do and is willing to do or in the alternative has an idea that they think would be most helpful?

Because the idea with that would be then we can consolidate those and to the extent that, for example, you can find semantic agreement even - and perhaps there might be opportunities for people to kind of say okay, well, I can change my view on this or if we go with more

generalized language, then I could agree with that, but I don't want to be as specific as this.

(Will) everyone do that or just somebody want to suggest something else?

Man: Sounds reasonable to me.

Kristina Rosette: All right. I have another request.

It would be extremely helpful because these are things that we've kind of (bandied) about for a while, you know, we still do not have a formal definition and, Liz, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we do need to have them if we are going to talk about them.

Liz Williams: Oh absolutely. That has - actually, that's been a critical improvement in the working group materials that are being produced in the last couple of months where we - the front page of the report says these are the definitions, this is what we mean, this is what we're talking about.

Kristina Rosette: Right. Can I ask for two people to work together on coming up with definitions? And it maybe necessary to come up with multiple definitions of the relevant terms…

Liz Williams: Depending on the context.

Kristina Rosette: Right, depending on the context.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Can somebody agree to do that?

Margie Milam: Yeah, I can do that.

                  This is Margie.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Margie Milam: And so, what you're talking about is terms that seem to be used over and over again, right?

Kristina Rosette: Right. But, for example, you know, obviously, I think we need to have a definition of, you know, IP claims.

Liz Williams: Right.

Kristina Rosette: I think we need to have a definition of Sunrise.

                  And to a large part, I mean, the definition that Jeff provided in connection with the questionnaire for IP claim, you know, I think would be an excellent starting point kind of - with the, you know, we may want to, for example, tinker with it a little to try and bring in to, for example, the processes that .dk and .name use in terms of requiring kind of a confirmation or acknowledgment of rights where, you know, maybe we want to split it up to cover that.

                  So, I think we need Sunrise. We need IP claims.

Liz Williams: A sense of registration is probably another one, right?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Especially since I've noticed that, for example, in .pro, .bz - yeah. Exactly, because it seems to be that in some cases, they're talking about blocking and in some cases, they're talking about removal and then some instances, it's used to define registration, you know, domain names that are registered full and sole purpose for maybe someone else from registering them.

Man: Right. Right.

Kristina Rosette: I mean, I've seen so many different meanings and maybe we just need to come up with different terms for some of those.

Woman: Correct.

Kristina Rosette: And other - do we need a definition of validation?

Margie Milam: I would think of the same thing actually, probably.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Margie Milam: And, you know, you guys on the lines, if you just - you too, if you don't have the definition, if you think of words that should be defined, just post them in all, you know, and I'll try to come up with a definition forum because that will give me - that will help as well.

Man: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Avri?

Jeff Neuman: We do need - with validation, there was one concern and I can't remember if I mentioned or not what needs to be considered.

One of the issues with .us that we have is they not only need to be validation of the fact that the materials submitted are actually registered marks. But one problem that are registry has as opposed to a trademark database, trademark databases do not maintain email addresses, which is very crucial because domain - that's a key part to a domain name registration.

There's no way to validate that the email address actually belongs to the entity claiming the IP right.

So - I can be (John Smith). I could have johnsmith@yahoo.com, but I can submit all these validating information about Coca-Cola and to valid it that could say yes, you know, the person who submitted or could say that the stuff that was submitted does authenticate. But we could accidentally award the domain name and the person who's got the email address of johnsmith@yahoo.com.

I'm not being very clear.

Woman: You know, actually, I understand what you're saying. You're kind of validating the registrant as well as validating the trademark and making sure the registrant and the trademark owner are the same.

Man: Right. In .us, we had a process that our decision was if this had ever come up and, you know, knock on wood, it never came up.

But the decision was that if someone has spoofed their information that since we awarded the domain name based on the Coca-Cola registration, for example, that if someone from Coca-Cola wrote us a letter on the letterhead who had authority like if Coca-Cola saying that the person that was actually awarded the name was not someone at Coca-Cola, we would have given it to Coca-Cola because they are the ones that, you know, they got it on their behalf.

Kristina Rosette: Oh.

Woman: Got it.

Kristina Rosette: Now, I understand.

Woman: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: Avri, are there any terms that you think, you know, given your perspective and what you think - I don't want to say constituents because that's not the right word, but in your expertise that have not been defined that you think we need to define?

Avri Doria: (And) jump out at me at the moment, but I will take a look through and see - I mean, I have to think back to - when I didn't know all these terms yet. So yeah.

Kristina Rosette: All right. And of course, you know, everyone else had to, but I know that, you know, and Victoria, this thing would go for you with regards to the non-commercial users. I want to make sure that…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Right. Okay.

Liz, is there anything else that you would suggest that we do as a work item?

Liz Williams: I'm fine.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Well, everyone, I very much appreciate it.

I'm going to continue - well, let me ask this. Do you think it's useful to continue to update these little proposals and comments chart or should we wait until everybody's kind of posted there, you know, top 10 things I like to see -- comments.

Liz Williams: I would kind of recommend that you wait until people that are going to contribute the 10 have had a day or so to do it.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: And then do an update…

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Liz Williams: …as opposed to putting yourself or doing to test. But I would recommend putting a time limit on us and then just assume that both of us that haven't done it. I'm thinking about 10 things to put.

Kristina Rosette: All right. It's - I don't even know what date is. What date is - what's Wednesday?

Okay. You laugh. It's just so sad.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: If we were to say - I mean, given that I very much like to have a call on Monday at the same time, and I understand that, Liz, that the line is available then. Is that right?

Liz Williams: I'm just looking at that now.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Liz Williams: I have - sorry, I was just on speaker so I could use my computer until some time. I am only - I have a call at 9 on Monday -- starting at 9.

So, a call at 8 running until 9 is hard for me, and I've got to get the new TLDs report prepared for another committee meeting, so it's possible to do it, but it's a big stretch on a Monday…

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Liz Williams: …given that what else we're wanting to do prior to the 17th, which is the last call.

Kristina Rosette: Well, what I was hoping to do was that basically all of the core (footwork) would be done and things would be, you know, written far enough that the writing would have progressed far enough so that basically what would happen between Monday and Wednesday is that the BIZ would be put together, and I don't necessarily mean by you.

So that when we have on the 16th, they're basically were looking at kind of what is going to be the report or at least, you know, it might not have all of the bells and whistles, but it'll have kind of the basic information that we intend to convey.

Liz Williams: Yeah. I would have thought that's a sensible way to do it.

So, consider the draft report on the 14th and finalize it and agree on the 17th.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: So that between Monday and Thursday, there's - oh wait a minute, Wednesday, the 16th at 8 o'clock that there's an agreement on the call that the work can be finished.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: A draft report can be (turned) the 14th and then agreement on the 16th at the last pieces.

Kristina Rosette: Right. Is there - and I apologize because I'm feeling you've circulated this. Is there a framework or an outline or a structure that - yup, you know, those of us that we should use?

Liz Williams: Yeah. I've already sent that.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: You - would you say it again?

Kristina Rosette: If you wouldn't mind, I think I have it…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: …but I just don't know if it's the right thing.

Liz Williams: Yeah. Let me get back a step there because I did that specifically for the reserved names working group and (know what) the subgroups. I'm not keen on lots of - simply it's going all over the place.

If the intention is to, for example, the PDF version of the summaries that you sent out yesterday is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the first part of statement of work with some text that says, these are the many different examples, this is what we did, this is how it was looked at, this is what's missing, these are our, you know, this is our summary.

And then the second part is that that document is that (RPM) document you sent out today to satisfy the second part of it. So I would have thought the templates are not necessary…

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: …that I can resend it for you…

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Liz Williams: …as the penholder…

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Liz Williams: …to put that together if you wish.

Kristina Rosette: All right. That would be great.

Liz Williams: Okay. I'll do that.

Kristina Rosette: All right. Did we - does everybody's availability - (unintelligible) said that people are available Monday at the same time. Is that availability changed if we made the call one hour earlier?

If, Liz, if we were to do that, would that work better for you?

Liz Williams: No, because you'll have all kinds of extraordinary sound effects in the background…

Kristina Rosette: All right. Never mind.

Liz Williams: …from my family.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Never mind.

Okay. Given that we're going to have a call on Monday, can we - what would be a realistic deadline both in terms of giving everyone to do this, but also giving everybody time to reflect on it?

I mean, I'm inclined to say kind of Friday at, you know, 6:00 pm Eastern or, you know, Friday at close of business wherever close of

business is depending from where you are. I mean, is that realistic for everyone?

Margie Milam: Are you talking about for the top 10 things?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Yeah.

Margie Milam: Yeah. I think that works.

Kristina Rosette: All right. All right.

Sooner would be better, but I think that would be kind of drop dead. So why don't we just say close the business on Friday, close the business kind of depending upon what your time zone is? All right?

Liz Williams: Kristina, I just had one more question.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Liz Williams: I don't know who's on the call. Would you mind just doing a reverse roll call so I know who's on the call?

I'm sorry, I…

Glen Desaintgery: I'll do that for you, Liz.

Kristina Rosette: Oh okay.

Liz Williams: Oh I can (bend out). It's all right. Fine.

Kristina Rosette: All right. And I guess, the other questions that I had that would save me tons of time is, is there a mechanism by which we can easily extract or create, you know, a document that identifies the members as well as kind of who participated on each call? I mean, is that…

Liz Williams: If that's normal…

Glen Desaintgery: I'll get that for you.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right.

Liz Williams: Not participation that is normally included down a little forth.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right.

I just want to make sure I wasn't going to have to listen to kind of - meaning of every recording.

All right. Excellent.

Well, thank you everyone. I very much appreciate it. I'm much more optimistic that we're actually going to have something done.

If you have any questions in the mean time, you know, please don't hesitate to post them to Liz, and to the extent that, you know, any of you have particular experiences that may not be reflected in kind of your top points or that you feel particularly strongly about, you know, I would encourage you to post them so that we can keep those in mind. All right?

So thank you everyone. Have a good afternoon, evening or early day depending from where you are.

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: All right. Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

END