

**ICANN
Transcription
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) PDP Working Group
Wednesday, 16 August 2017 at 17:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-rpm-review-16aug17-en.mp3>
Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6vrwlrqfb/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/ShMhB>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the review of All Rights Protection Mechanism, RPM and all gLTDs PDP working group call held on the 16th of August, 2017. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. We have quite a few participants.

Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Kathy Kleiman: Hi. This is Kathy Kleiman and I'm only on the audio bridge right now. Thanks.

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

With this, I'll turn it back over to our co-chair, Phil Corwin. Please begin.

Philip Corwin: Thank you, Terri, and welcome to our call today, everyone who has joined. Apologies that I was late in joining. I had some difficulty getting a dial in, but finally succeeded. So let's get rolling. We've got a lot of work. Any updates to SOIs today? Or is everybody still situated the way they were previously?

I'm seeing no hands, hearing nothing. We're going to go on to item two, which is to review updated, more targeted sunrise data collection proposals based on our discussion last week. And I was on vacation the last two weeks. I was able to join the call last week. I had technical difficulties the previous week.

And I know I'm back from vacation because this is my fourth conference call of the day. So I'm definitely not on vacation. But it's good to be back. And so let's go through this. We've got a three page document here and this is an updated document.

So staff, the best way to proceed would be to start at the top and go through this, giving the updates Yes, Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi Phil and everyone. This is Mary from staff. As you noted, it's a three page document. So we could certainly go through this and hopefully it won't take too long because what this is, is we've taken all the suggestions that were discussed last week, which in turn was the suggestions presented by the sub team and discussed by the working group.

You may remember last week it was a three column document. We've taken all of those and we've put them into three parts. Really I think it's really part one here that's on page one and part two that may benefit from some discussion, because part three at the end is simply a note on the process to go forward with a request to the GNSO council.

So Phil, I don't know if that's helpful. If you want me to explain anything, but that's essentially what this document comprises.

Philip Corwin: Okay. All right. So we've got - thank you, Mary for that clarification. We've got three headings here, three separate topic headings. The first is Roman numeral one, data collection task. It can be started immediately by ICANN support staff, noting that some items will still require additional input from the working group as noted below.

The second category, which is on page two, is collation of remaining data collection suggested by target group and format. And the third is just a list of tasks for which professional survey design or other professional resource may be useful, and that would involve a request to council for support if we agree on that.

So let's try to tick through these as quickly as possible. Mary is your hand still up or is that an old hand? Thanks. Let's - not wanting to cut off dialogue, but noting that we also have a major agenda item three today. Let's go through this, and if there's something that needs to be said about any of this in terms of the need for it or no need or some aspect of how it should be designed a bit differently, let's hear on that. But let's try to get through this expeditiously.

Item one under Roman numeral one is the staff compilation of the INTA Cost Impact Study results, and that's primarily to determine if sunrise and/or premium pricing affected the ability of trademark rights holders to participate in Sunrise. That seems pretty self-explanatory and to provided us with the study after reaching out to their members, and this would just be to summarize the results of that study.

And I would assume that staff would also indicate the breadth of that study so we can again decide how much weight to give it in terms of how many INTA members participated in that. Any comments on item one? Mary, yes?

Mary Wong: Thanks, Phil. This is Mary from staff again. I noticed that Lori Schulman has just joined the call. So as long as we're on item one of part one, which is the staff compilation of the INTA cost impact study results, the note from staff at this point is that we have actually already started doing this because the results have been made available.

As I think some of you will remember, Lori did do a presentation as well to the consumer trust or the CCT review team. So we did post those results to our own working good Wiki space that we can we re-circulate. So we would encourage working group members to actually take a look at the full results, even though we're doing a compilation.

And we anticipate that our compilation would follow the lines that you outlined, Phil and that it's something that we can do relatively quickly so the group can start looking at those results possibly as early as next week.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Sounds good, Mary. Did Lori have any brief comment on this item?

Lori Schulman: Hi. Yes. I would comment this. I had sent my apologies for next week's call. And I think it's unlikely that I could contribute in next week's call. I don't know if delay would make sense week. If not, I could somehow try to be on, but it would be extremely difficult for me. So I want to note that because I would like to be on the call when it is discussed, but I did already send apologies for next week.

I also want to again just reiterate that the costs that we were looking at were exactly that hard dollar figures rather than effectiveness, which I know that this group is looking at. So I just think it's important to keep that in mind when seeing the data.

Philip Corwin: Okay, Lori. I think we'll note that you're unable to join the call and maybe that would argue for deferring that particular conversation to the following call so

that we can have your full engagement when we discuss the staff compilation of the INTA data. Mr. Graham, I see your hand up.

Michael Graham: Yes. Can you hear me?

Philip Corwin: Yes.

Michael Graham: Yes. Just to follow that up and for Lori. If that's something that we need to do next week, I'm glad to participate. I was involved in the study and also in the summarization of it, but I think it's very important to have Lori there, especially in so far as discussing the desirability or necessity of follow up our surveys and INTA information that she was mentioning.

When the survey went out, it was directed to issues brought up by the CCTRT and not by this particular PDP so that, you know, there are some relevant findings and statements within it, but it was not directed to these questions. So I think it's, you know, important to have her on that call. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, we hear you loud and clear and we'll probably defer that discussion until the call of August 30th so that Lori can fully participate in that discussion.

So moving on to item two, which is the staff compilation of a sampling of registrars' retail pricing of sunrise registrations corresponding to pre-identified buckets of new TLDs such as geo, open and community. The purpose is to determine if the pricing affected the ability of trademark holders to participate.

And there's a note that we need to first determine which registrars and which gTLDs to sample. So let me ask staff, where - since that's staff compilation, has that begun yet or are you - do you need further guidance from this working group?

Mary Wong: Hi everyone. It's Mary from staff again. Phil, in answer to your question, we are hoping for further guidance because obviously while we could use our judgement to try to determine, you know, which registrars, either by, you know, size of the operations or something else, which new gTLDs in which buckets.

I think we would feel more comfortable if we had some further direction from the working group or even specific suggestions, bearing in mind that A, this is a sampling of retail pricing. And so the pricing is not going to be uniform even across registrars say in the same grouping.

So the second point I'd make here is that we hope that the group is clear that this may not be as fully informative as it might be because of the sampling and because the pricing is very different across registrars.

Philip Corwin: Right. And George, I'll get to you in a minute. I see your hand up. Just two comments on this. One, this will give us clearly some snapshot for selected TLDs of the registrar pricing. It won't tell us what the wholesale price is, but we can probably guesstimate what it is based on mark - you know, anticipated markup by particular registrars.

And my one editorial comment, I wonder if the word ability of trademark holders - obviously trademark holders are always able to participate in a sunrise if they have a mark registrar request. I think it's more their willingness, which is based on pricing, if they're thinking about a sunrise registration for a mark.

Clearly if the registration is \$50 a year versus 5,000 a year, that's going to affect their willingness. So I wonder if ability is the right word, because they're always able. With that comment, let me turn to Mr. Kirikos. Go ahead, George.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. I don't think he's here on this call, but during the past week's mailing list conversations, Claudio had mentioned the possibility of staff capturing both the price and volume data, so that - to rebut the argument about the 99% reduction in sunrise use, one might look at the amount of total dollar spending on a year by year basis for sunrise spending.

And so that would require sunrise volume combined with sunrise cost and then annualized on year by year basis. I think it was Claudio. It might have been somebody else. So I don't know if that fits into the number two point on this document, but from what I can see, the rest of the document, I think number two is where it belongs.

And of course as I emailed yesterday, I had four points of my own which I'd like to in the chat room, which can be incorporated into the document later on. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thank you, George. Yes, I don't know if particular, you know, different trademark owners have different trademark protection strategies. I don't know if there's any common thread in terms of if there's a preset budget for sunrise registrations or defense of registrations generally.

Or clearly there's some budget for the trademark portfolio manager for a major corporation, but how they allocate it could differ widely. But we'll see what we get here. Let me add staff, two things. One, do you have enough guidance now?

And two, are we going to be taking a look at whether there were any significant drop in the price between the sunrise period and the price for the same domain when it went to general availability? Would that be something that's looked at and whether they was a registration post sunrise of a mark? Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Sure. And so I'll attempt to answer question and I'll confess that I don't off the top of my head recall what the data points are that we have on some of these items. So I'll just go step by step. I think one, as to George's point, while that may fit within this number two, the specific task that was outlined here in number two was more limited.

So for example, it would not, at least as originally foreseen, include registration volume. That's not to say that it can't. It's just that it wasn't originally seen that way because if it is going to include that, then obviously we would need to look at, you know, additional sources of that information versus just pricing information.

And then Phil, in response to, or partial response to your question, we can certainly include the, I suppose the table of pricing, you know, doing sunrise at retail and after sunrise and then what the working group will have to analyze and the conclusions to be drawn I suppose would depend on what differences, if any, that shows and whether that's consistent.

Philip Corwin: Okay. And not to belabor this point, but one last issue that arises in my mind that relates to the current sub team we have that's looking into private protections. Is there going to be any attempt to compare sunrise registrations between. TLDs that were part of a portfolio management group that offered the DPM L service versus those?

Because that could certainly - price is not the only thing that could affect sunrise registrations. The decision to register a mark via blocking service would eliminate the need for sunrise registration. So I'm just trying to think about the different aspects here, make sure we get data back that's meaningful and doesn't just raise more questions. Mary?

Mary Wong: Sorry. Old hand.

Philip Corwin: Okay. But I guess my question is, are we going to be trying to differentiate any of these? When you pick the - which TLDs to sample is, there's going to be some meaningful disbursement of samples between domains that are - where the DPML is available for the domain, versus those for which the only way to protect a particular mark in the new TLD would be through a sunrise? Go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Phil. And Mary from staff again. So we would really welcome any suggestions and comments from members on this because well, I'm sure we will be able to explain what it is that we chose to sample without further guidance. I think the point that you just raised, Phil, really argue for us having some more specific direction here.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Susan Payne, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes. Hi Phil. Thanks. I just wanted to flag that I think sort of the wide ranging nature of this conversation is slightly as a result of the fact that we did have a document that used - what charter question were we looking at and what were we trying to get from it?

And we now don't have that in quite the same way, although the information is there. And so this sort of bucket (unintelligible) if you like, was an attempt to address this issue of, you know, is sunrise pricing sort of so much higher than GA pricing, that it has an impact on uptake? And is premium pricing also having an impact?

You know, is there a set convention or is there the appearance of the set convention by virtue of the price? And then there may well be other things that we want to ask in relation to uptake as well. But this is why this question is here.

And so we sort of - we're starting to stray away from this question and on to other parts of - you know, other data and other charter questions when we're

starting to look at what was the impact of a blocking mechanism or something like that.

So I just think - I think we need to kind of - I agree that we can't send a lot of - a load of questions to the same people. You know, we need to gather them together, if you know what I mean. But I think we're kind of straying from what we'd identified as being the problem we were trying to seek data to investigate by moving into other areas of our work, which are probably somewhere else in this document.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, I appreciate that, Susan. And let me just clarify and bring up the relationship to DPML. I wasn't suggesting we add additional questions. I was just suggesting that in selecting the new TLDs for the sample that staff is going to look at, that there be some meaningful mix between those that were part of a portfolio group for DPMLs available, versus those that -where it isn't and see if there's any significant different between the number of sunrise registrations, to try to see how that affected the use of sunrise.

But I wasn't trying at expanding the question. But with that clarification, let me go on item three. I don't see any other hands up on item two, which is about outreach to supporting organizations, advisory committees, stakeholder groups and constituencies, via sending a letter to all of them with specific questions in the form of survey to get their input on charter question four, the use of reserve names list and charter question five, the efficacies of 30 day mandatory minimum sunrise period and whether or not they, the community beyond this working group, wants to continue to make sunrise mandatory.

And we need to get an outreach letter drafted and this co-chair at least as soon as - we're going to have to work with staff to get that letter drafted ASAP so we can move forward on that. We need to develop the survey questions and that's the question, and I'd like some feedback on this call hopefully on whether we want to use professional survey designer if the council will approve some funds for that.

And also consider whether community feedback on sunrise question number 12, which is whether sunrise or other rules should apply to specialized gTLDs should be solicited as part of this outreach effort. So do we have comments on anything to do with item three here, particularly the use of a professional survey designer and whether it should address question 12 in addition to charter questions four and five? Any comments on that? George?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes, in terms of the questions - sorry, the data sources that I had sent to the mailing list earlier, there was that number one of my example, the surveying the business partners of registrars to see if there were reductions in value added services due to the sunrises because they would obviously impact the ability to order FSO and SEO and other web design service and so on.

So whether those sunrises had a negative effect on their business partners. So if my - number one would go into that section. That's probably the most appropriate for the (unintelligible) have to include those and not just the ones that are listed. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay. So George, are you asking here that any of these questions should be expanded to add additional data points?

George Kirikos: Correct.

Philip Corwin: Is that the gist of what you're saying?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos again. Yes. Correct.

Philip Corwin: Okay. And what specifically are you proposing in regard the question three?

George Kirikos: That's the cost and benefits are - this is George Kirikos again, that the cost and benefits - the costs are going to be imposed on, you know, the reseller

partners and their clients in terms of reduced spending on services that would have been related to sunrise names.

So for example if it would say Apple dot firm, if the iPhone company makes sure Apple, the famous Apple, bought that domain name and just redirected it to Apple.com, they're obviously not buying FSO. They're not buying web design services. They're not doing anything like that, whereas if it was an apple farmer, then the purchase of that domain name would have spawned a whole bunch of other related services/.

So by serving that broader community as well through the outreach and through the appropriate questions in the survey, that cost of sunrises can be captured. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thank you, George. You know, on item three, we don't have a draft for this working group to look at yet. The co-chairs will work with staff to draft up a proposed letter to the broader ICANN community on these points and that's I think the appropriate time for members of the working group to propose expanding or adding to any of those questions.

Susan, I see your hand up and now down. I don't know if what I just said addressed your concerns, but so ...

Susan Payne: Well, I took my hand down because I noticed that J. Scott had sort of made the point I was going to make in the chat. But whilst I recognize that in a way nothing is ever closed, I mean I can't tell you we had a sub group looking at data gathering.

And then following that, I can't tell you how many weeks this whole working group has gone through those data gathering proposals and sign them off. And I'm mystified as to why now we're getting a load of suggestions that we haven't had over the last, I don't know how many months. I mean it's really, really frustrating.

And to the extent that they may or may not be good suggestion, it would have been really beneficial if the person making them had weighed in at the appropriate time rather than now. But I'm not sure that I do think they are beneficial. I think they're seeking to establish information which is of limited past usefulness.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Understood, Susan. I understand your concern. Lori? Go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes. I completely agree with Susan, and I also - even if we were to suppose that I think that these proposals are timely, which I don't think they are by the way. What's really being asked is how to measure opportunity cost. That's completely (unintelligible).

I'm not even sure it's scientifically valid if we want to talk about statistics. And I don't think that opportunity cost is relevant to what we're talking about today. And I strongly oppose the addition of your question.

Philip Corwin: Okay. All right. Well, let me just say this. If we do a survey, on item three we have to share a draft outreach letter with the working group and get feedback on that, and then if the - and I haven't yet heard from working group members on whether they think it's a good or bad idea to get - to try to get a professional survey designer to help frame these questions.

Personally, I think that would be helpful if it wouldn't be too costly. But what we - in any case, whether we do it ourselves or employ someone, we'll be running a draft of the survey before it goes out. That will go with the outreach letter.

So this item three is not complete yet, but I understand the concern of those who don't want to reopen a lot of issues that were close to completion in terms of the data that would be solicited.

With that, I'll move on to item four. The staff compilation, of which registry operators ran ALP, QLP and LRP, and I will confess, I don't at this moment recall exactly what each of those acronyms means. But this is a job for staff and the purpose is to compile factual data for the working group analysis of the efficacy of these mechanisms really is to sunrise charter question eight.

Does staff have any - where is staff in terms of compiling this factual data? And I hate to always call on Mary, but Mary, you are our resource on this. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Yes. I chose a great time to go on vacation. But just to answer your question, so this is Mary from staff. We are pretty much done with compiling this particular set of data and the reason is and where we got this, as some may recall, there is a new gTLD startup page that's hosted on ICANN's micro site for new gTLDs.

So we basically exported the data from there and for these various periods, the approved launch program, the qualified launch program and limited registration periods. And so this data can be sent out.

And Phil, to the extent that we will not be evaluating the results of the intern survey next week for example, this is something that the working group can take up as soon as it wishes to, recognizing of course that this doesn't mean we're jumping around a bit in the sunrise questions. But that's probably a consequence of when the data is available. So essentially it's pretty much done and it can be analyzed pretty much right away.

Philip Corwin: Well, great. Then I'll presume that we'll have that compilation sent out to the working group shortly so that we can discuss it on a call in the near future. And I think everybody in the working group is kind of used to jumping around a bit because of the breadth of our work and the fact that different parts of different issues are completed at different points in time.

So does anyone - I don't know that this item needs any further discussion, but if somebody feels compelled to say something, now is your chance. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hello. This is Kathy and thank you. on this issue, I thought the idea was not only to look at which registries and registrars were involved in the registration periods, but also to reach out to them for anecdotal data, for information about the issues and concerns that we began to hear about in Johannesburg with (unintelligible) and others telling us about some of the issues and concerns there.

And I thought it was to better understand. So I thought that was the starting point kind of who did what. But then there should be a next item, which is to reach out to them with more specific questions. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, thank you Kathy. And Mary, besides this sort of hard data, we're going to have any kind of more anecdotal background information when staff provides its report?

Mary Wong: Thanks, Phil and thanks, Kathy for bringing it up because that's probably something that I should have mentioned. You're right that this piece that we're talking about here really relates just to the piece that staff is compiling based on publicly available data. So there was certainly some discussion and anecdotal evidence presented and discussed in Johannesburg, and I believe we've captured most of that in notes and so forth and certainly in the transcripts of previous calls.

So what we would do in sending out this, you know, set of facts, is to include the definition for each of these periods because I recall that early on, there was a request that we should really keep reminding people what these periods stand for. And secondly, we can include some of the comments that came out of Johannesburg.

In respect of further outreach, that's not covered by this part of the document because we're really focusing here from the staff side of what we can do now. So that could certainly be part of any kind of survey of registries and any kind of outreach which would not take place now, but would be part of the overall survey design.

Philip Corwin: Okay. All right. Thanks for providing that further information, Mary. With that, I'm going to move on. And Kathy, your hand is still up. Unless you have something further to say, it would be great if you could lower it. And moving on to item five, which is the staff compilation of IDN gTLD registry Sunrise numbers to determine efficacy of sunrise for trademarks in non-Latin scripts.

Sorry to do this, Mary, but is there any more information there as to how we're going to determine the efficacy? There's just not much description here in this item as to what staff is going to be trialing - compiling. Is it just going to be how many sunrise registrations were in IDNs, or is going to go beyond that?

Mary Wong: Thanks, Phil. That's correct. It really would just be numbers, and also of course which registries on the IDN side ran sunrise. So any kind of analysis or conclusions and further review would be done by the working group. So we would really just be compiling the numbers.

And I'll add here that this is not something we've started on yet, but it's probably something that we can start on very shortly.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Anybody have any comments or questions about item five here? Going once, going twice. On item six, staff compilation of investigative journalists and other media reports, as well as coverage from industry blogs and publications.

So this is going to be a staff review of public information in the industry press about - relating to charter question five on mandatory/optional sunrise and

efficacy of 30 day minimum sunrise period. And number 12, the need for priority or special rules for specialized gTLDs.

There are some notes here we may need additional sources for industry blogs, and there's quite a number of them. I don't know which ones that staff is - and then for media reports, staff is going to search on Lexis Nexis. Staff, let me suggest maybe the best way to proceed here is that there's lots of industry and other blogs that follow ICANN or the domain factor from various angles.

Maybe staff could provide a list of the ones you're already reviewing, which my experience with them is that you can - any one of them usually has a search box where you can search and get pretty accurate results on a given topic, and maybe circulate that list to the working group and see if other - if members have suggestions for other publications you should be looking at.

I'll stop there. I'm going to take a quick comment from George and then back to Mary with her hand up. Go ahead, George.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos. For the list of domain name industry blogs, that was point four of the email I sent earlier today, which I will send a link to again, which had domain name dot com list of probably - nearly every, if not all of the major domain name blogs.

So yes, as you said, they can go to each blog and do a search for sunrise or TMCH or ICANN and capture the relevant articles that way. Not just the articles, but also the comments of the articles because of often the comments to the articles contain valuable data that is even more valuable than the article itself because commentators find that the - of the sunrise period, that the author of the articles didn't originally notice.

As for the Lexis Nexis stuff - oh, sorry, off of those logs can be used for outreach when seeking additional data and ICANN staff might want to use sponsored posts to outreach for some of those features that are surveys.

So in terms of the Lexis Nexis stuff, well I was going to say, the legal research I had wanted with regards to Westlaw, might also be incorporated into point number six where the search for the cases on point number two in the email for that generic side that was claimed to be a justification for the Sunrise program in terms of people needing to register their marks, otherwise they risk their domains being - sorry, their trademark being lost. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay. And so I'm going to jump to Mary and then back to Susan because Mary has had her hand up for a while. And Mary, let me - before you speak, besides industry blogs, this industry blogs include trademark centric blogs, which have been looking at the TLD program from the trademark perspective. Go ahead and so the floor is open, Mary to say whatever you want to say on item six here.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Phil and thanks for the suggestion to send a list that staff is thinking about to the group for comments and for further suggestions. We will do that. What we're thinking about really is I think the main blogs as you mentioned.

And so those that follow the industry, whether it be domain insight, domain name wire the domains and so forth, there's a couple that was suggested by the sub team that's in that document. So I think just off the top of most of our heads, we can come up with at least half a dozen, if not more of blogs and, you know, that sort of news media that follow the industry.

We had not thought about the more trademark centric logs and sources. We can certainly do that. And so that's what I was going to suggest in terms of where we were without thinking on this. And also to note for everyone that again, this is really staff just compiling the list.

So what presumably we see at the end of whatever it is that we do, is really a list and dates and link. You know, this was the news coverage. This was, you know, that article. This is where it's from. But, you know, any kind of analysis of the content, bearing in mind that these are news and media reports, our assumption is that that will be done by the working group.

And depending on the list of sources we come back with, that could be a fairly extensive task. But I said the point is that we're assuming that that review will be done by the working group and not by staff.

Philip Corwin: So wait. The review - are you going to compile the article, then have us review them or just - are we just getting a list of publications?

Mary Wong: Well, I guess it depends on the source. If it's all online, we could provide links. We could certainly download quite a lot of them and, you know, compile them in some kind of folder for the group. At this point obviously, we don't know how many we're talking about it, but the essential point that we'll give you guys whatever the content is, but that our assumption is that staff is not being asked to analyze or comment on that content.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well let's get the list of articles. From my personal perspective, I think we're going to - if staff doesn't compile meaningful articles for review by the working group, we're almost going to have to set up a sub team to do that because just a list of publications without anything further is not of very much use.

And because these folks were reporting in real time on particular TLDs and feedback they were getting from trademark center, from domain investors, from others as to what was going on with particular warranties. So that's the type of more anecdotal than I think hard data information we're going to see in those reports. Susan Payne.

Susan Payne: Yes. Thanks, Phil. I think - what I was - the point I just wanted to quickly make, and I think it sort of was touched on by you was, there were a couple of charter questions identified where this idea of blogs and news reports and media reports and so on were specifically highlighted.

But my sense from our call last week was that given that the idea was that there would be a kind of search and presumably the best way to do that would be some kind of a keyword search, that it was going to be looking for kind of both sides of the coin if you like.

So, you know, the sort of the reasons why the specific questions that are identified here, but also some of the other questions that we're asking ourselves, there may be articles which touch on some of those as well. And so my understanding was that the kind of keywords would be fixed in such a way so that it would kind of capture, you know, the kind of product trademark and the anti-trademark press if you like.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, I think when we get the list of publications, we should also - I don't know if staff is going to be providing us a list of what they believe are relevant keywords, but we're going to need to get some general consensus on what topics should be searched for in those publications.

It might be as simple as putting in Sunrise or pricing or something else, but we're going to have to decide on that. So we're closing out Roman numeral one if there is no further discussion and moving on to two, which is the collation of remaining data collection suggestions by target group and format.

And let's plunge into that, noting that we're just a bit more than halfway through our call time and about the same point in this document. But the rest of the document may go faster or not. Item one, survey of registry operators. The purpose of this is to obtain anecdotal evidence to facilitate review of sunrise charter question two, which is whether the sunrise or premium pricing limits trademark holders' ability to participate.

And again my comment, I'm not sure ability is the right name. Maybe I think willingness is probably a better question to ask. Two, the second part is charter question four, whether the user reserve names list limits the trademark holders' ability to participate. Number five, items three which is question five, whether sunrise should be mandatory or optional, if the 30 days is sufficient. Number eight, which is the three letter acronyms on registration periods.

And number 12, any need for priority for special rules for specialized gTLDs. And notes here, we need to develop survey questions. And again - so this is another area, along with the one under Roman numeral one where we need to consider whether we use a survey, professional survey designer. And that survey not going to the community, but just to the registry operators and new TLDs. And the co-chairs to consider if this can be bundled with outreach request to the stakeholder group.

So this might be overlapping with the stakeholder group question. So this is quite a broad survey. Let me open it up for comments. George?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos. Some of these questions I think the registry operators will simply say we don't know because we're not trademark owners. Like they're going to ask, do hot prices - they're going to be asked something like, is the higher price for your trademark - sorry, your sunrise period affecting a trademark owner's ability to buy it?

They can simply say, I don't know. So I'm expecting a lot of no - sorry, I'm expecting a lot I don't know for these proposed questions because it's asking the wrong person. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay. And all right, Susan. Go ahead.

Susan Payne: Thanks. Susan Payne. Yes. George, to respond to you on that, my sense of this, and I'd love to be corrected if I've got this wrong, but my sense of this is that those are the charter questions that we as the group have been tasked with answering.

We're not necessarily going to send registry operators a list of our charter questions and answer them. What we are supposed to be trying to do is asking them questions that will enable us to gather information that will enable us to answer the charter questions.

So no, we're not going to be saying to them, you know, have sunrise pricing, the limited trademark owners' ability to participate in sunrise. We're going to be asking them about their pricing, if that's what we decide we're going to do. And then we have to make - you know, we have to make an assessment of whether that's had an impact or not.

Philip Corwin: Okay, George, do we make this quick on your response to Susan?

George Kirikos: Yes. George Kirikos again. But I think it's not going to be necessarily a survey of registry operators that answers those questions. It's going to be collecting the targeted data sources that we can use to infer that specific information. So I think the survey format isn't necessarily going to be the correct method of doing it.

Just to go back to the questions, I thought should be incorporated into the data collection number three, which is in terms of getting to provide options through sunrises, not looking at the growth rate of TLDs. It's kind of the same kind of data sources that we'd be using for this.

You'd be looking at basically total volume of sunrises' average price and average price is something that they're not going - at this point, they're going to - we're going to get that data also to the end users. So some of this, it's not clear that it's going to get to the place we want to be. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, let me say this. This requires designing a survey to elicit useful information. Let me ask again, both on this and the previous question about the outreach to all the ICANN community, the different SOs/ACs etc. I still haven't heard any feedback from this group on whether they think we need an expert survey designer to do this.

If anybody have any comments on that, on the desirability of that? Or do you just want the co-chairs to decide in consultation with the council? Okay, I see a comment in the chat room for Rebecca that she thinks a professional would be useful. Also from Cyntia King. And George?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos. I was going to say that ICANN have a list where they solicit like invitations to tender a contract. So we could call for professional surveyors to compete for the contract. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay, thanks. Yes. Well, the co-chairs will discuss it. My personal bent is that it would be useful. We're only going to get a chance to do this survey once and we want to make sure we're asking targeted questions that produce useful data to the extent it's available.

Unless there's further discussion, I'm going to move on to point number two, which is another survey of registry operators in jurisdictions where profane or other words and strings are prohibited. I presume it's for registry operators headquartered in those jurisdictions, because of course TLDs are global and how their - that would affect registrations from those jurisdictions.

Notes, to determine a list of jurisdictions and relevant registry operators. And staff wants to solicit suggestions from the sub team or the full working group. I don't know where that data is available on which countries prohibit which words or strings. These are the top or second level. And let me ask staff, and I see your hand up, Susan. What charter question are we - I guess it's question number four, use the reserved names list.

So this would go to- name is going on that list because they can't be sold out of that jurisdiction. Is that correct?

Mary Wong: Phil, this is Mary from staff. Yes, that is correct and I'll note that a couple of suggestions and Maxim said the same thing in the chat, were sent to the group by Maxim. So we're not disputing his list, but just saying what other jurisdictions and registries should we be looking at besides those?

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thanks, Mary. Susan, go ahead and then we'll hear from Maxim.

Susan Payne: Well, actually I'm going to be really quick because I was just going to say, could Maxim explain what it is that we're seeking here? Because I think this came up. This is something Maxim raised and I'm not clear why we need this information and what it really helps with. And it would be really good to understand that.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, let me turn to Maxim and see if he can enlighten us.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually the logical change was, it was a suggestion that registries publish their reserve name list. And it's not as - it's not bow the existence of the second level names in the TLDs. But in our cases as gTLD, we'll not allow it because it's not good for image of the cities and we filed a decision.

But if we as a registry, publish it on our website, it's going to be seen as an insult, public insult with all the consequences, yes and also damage the image of the funds, which is the registry. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, let me say this. Maxim, you just mentioned that CC and I saw through the comment from Cyntia King about being aware of an LY (unintelligible) council. That's another ccTLD. We're dealing with a new gTLDs here.

So and I did see David McAuley's suggestion. We just put this in the - one more question, the registry operator survey and that seems logical to me. If we're going to send the survey to registry operators, why not just add a question as to whether they included any terms in their reserved names list because of legal restrictions on the use of that term in a relevant jurisdiction? And if so, what jurisdiction?

That would seem to be a very efficient way to go rather than a separate survey just on this one question. Further comments on this, on item two about profane or other words prohibited in particular jurisdictions?

Okay. Let's move on to three, which is survey of trademark and brand owners to get feedback on charter questions two and four related to Sunrise premium name and reserve name pricing. And we need to agree on an outreach method and target group, IPC into others. And if the IPC working group co-chairs can say whether it's going to be bundled with the outreach request.

The need to develop survey questions. Once more the question of using a professional arises. And bear in mind, INTA has already done a comprehensive survey. I guess we need to look at the INTA survey and then closest when they discussed that is in the call of Aug 30th because of Lori being unavailable next week to see what information that has, and then decide whether we need this further survey.

And, you know, my personal comment and certainly IPC is a fine group, but IPC is a very limited group in terms of membership. INTA is a much broader group and probably every member of the IPC is an INTA member. So and there may - I don't - I think INTA is - I don't know if the exclusive trademark representative association in the world, but it's certainly the major one.

But I would say, let's see what we have from INTA already. And I see Lori's comment, not every member of IPC is an INTA member. Well, Lori, you need to get your recruitment team working on that.

But why don't we wait and see what we have on the call the Aug 30th, what we have back from INTA and whether it meets their needs since it was designed for a different purpose, or whether we need to go beyond that with a more targeted survey of the trademark and brand sector. And the chair of the IPC wishes to speak. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Just to clarify since it was brought up. INTA is an IPC member. There are a number of other organizations not unlike INTA that are our members such as the IPO and AIPLA. Sorry to throw out the acronyms. Hector and Marks, which is not an acronym.

And well, there are members who are primarily not concerned with the brand issues. There are trade associations that represent brand owners and also other types of owners of IC. So as a - IPC can be looked at in the sense of an umbrella organization embracing all of those organizations and their members, as well as the direct members of IPC. Just wanted to set the record straight. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Yes. And Greg, thank you for that and I appreciate that. Someone needs to mute. Okay. I was just noting that, you know, there's - you know, INTA and these other groups, INTA has thousands of members. These other groups, I don't know the number of members they have.

IPC is very representative in one way, but it's - the discrete number of members in the IPC is smaller. But we can deal with who to send this further survey out to if we decide there's a need for it. I think we may be putting the cart before the horse and probably should reserve further discussion of this item number three, a further survey of the trademark and brand sector, after

we review the information we already have back from INTA and decide if we have further data needs that aren't met by that feedback from INTA.

Is that acceptable way to proceed to the working group? I don't hear any objection, so let's go on to the next item, which is the survey of non-trademark and non-brand owner registrants, which is pretty much the rest of the planet.

Obtain feedback of Sunrise charter question four about reserved names. We need to agree on outreach methods and target groups and need to develop survey questions. So once again yes, if we're going to use a professional survey designer, we should probably use one for all of these so there's a consistent approach and there's not - to avoid excessive overlap or unnecessary gaps in the information being gathered. The different surveys should reinforce each other.

But I don't know whether we want to get into a full discussion now, but in terms of agreeing on outreach message and target groups, that could be a very open ended discussion. Does anybody have any brief comments on that now, with this co-chair noting that that seems to be such a broad subject. We may want to return to it rather than mix it into this call.

Okay. Nobody wants to speak to that right now. So on this item four, we're going to have to get back in more detail at some point shortly. And final item under Roman numeral two, outreach to public interest groups and trade associations to obtain feedback on sunrise charter question five on whether sunrise should be mandatory or optional and the efficacy of the 30 day minimum sunrise period.

Here's another one we need to agree on outreach methods and target groups. And I can tell you, the co-chairs haven't discussed this question yet about who we might target for this and whether we should have a survey, which again would - not here, but would raise the possibility of having this

professional - potential professional survey designer involved with this too and developing questions.

So this item five is in a very preliminary stage. It needs a lot more detail before it can go forward. And Susan, go ahead please.

Susan Payne: Oh, thanks, Phil. Just a quick comment. I'm not quite sure why this would only be aimed at public interest groups and trade associations. It seems like, and off the top of my head, I can't remember exactly what charter question five is about, but it's around the duration of sunrise and so on.

I mean it seems like all the parties might have some insights to give on this rather than that very limited group of people or body, which again if we're having some kind of professional survey, it seems like it could get covered off in more than one of those surveys.

Philip Corwin: Thanks, Susan. this co-chair has a question - quick question for staff, which is let me just say, we're looking here at two potential surveys item four, surveying non-trademark and non-brand owner registrants, which is everybody who is not - of course trademark owners can be registering for both proactive and defensive purposes.

One presumes other registrants are buying these domains either for investment or development use. Putting aside the bad actors who purchase them for nefarious purposes. But that one is targeted at charter question four, reserve names whereas the outreach to public interest groups and trade groups which represent various types of, you know, potential registrants, businesses, the general public, different types of interest groups.

And that's about question five on mandatory/optional sunrise. Why aren't we asking both groups about both questions? Why are we asking the non-trademark folks about reserve names and the public interest groups and

trade associations which represent a lot of non-trademark interests on question five? Can you elaborate on that? Thank you, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Phil. Hi everyone. It's Mary again from staff. And one of the reasons when we were putting this together, that struck us as well. And so one of the benefits we think of seeing it here is exactly the sort of thing that you and Susan just noted, that to the extent when we were going through charter question by charter question and a specific suggestion was made to a specific question, if that makes sense to have that same outreach for a different question, then we should probably discuss that and agree on it as well.

So I think what you guys have just raised is a perfect example of that for discussion. And then to Susan's point, I've pasted the text or the full text of charter question five into the agenda part on the right, if that's helpful for you and everyone in considering whether or not to merge the groups for all of these questions for example.

Philip Corwin: Okay. All right. Well, thank you for that, Mary and I think these items four and five under Roman numeral two, are clearly items that the co-chairs are going to have to work with staff on fleshing out and then getting back to the full working group with a more developed proposal.

But noting that we want to do that quickly because we're going to go to council and talk about engaging a professional survey design if we're going to try to look at these - the data for items four and five in the form of a survey. We probably want the same person to deal with that too and that would go into our cost estimate for the scope of the job to be done. So we'll need to get back quickly to the full working group on that.

So any further discussion on any items under Roman numeral two? And by the way, I appreciate the fact that the group is keeping our comments fairly short and only speaking up where there's a real need to. So item three is just

a list of the tasks for which a professional survey designer or other professional resources.

Philip Corwin: So Item 3 is just a list of the tasks for which a professional survey designer, other professional resources, might be useful, and that was on (unintelligible) scope. Nature target groups had a request, timeline impact, obviously want this done sooner rather than later.

And we've gone -- as we've had this discussion of this document -- we've noted all the separate areas where a professional assistance might be useful.

So this is just a list of the tasks that the survey designer would be engaged to perform. Does anybody think that anything here is not necessary to address, or that we missed anything important that we should be thinking about in putting out - in going to council to request support in this area and to solicit professional services if we get council's support?

I will take the silence as indicating that the folks on the call today think that this list is pretty complete. And okay, George, go ahead.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos. Yes, I did want to add the Westlaw searches, which aren't on this is list. So if the incorporated questions from the mailing list of the past week are incorporating this document, I'd have no further objections beyond that. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Wait, George, can you just - how would Westlaw fit into this - fit into the work of the survey designer?

George Kirikos: Oh sorry, nothing to do with the survey designer. I thought you were referring to the overall document.

Philip Corwin: No, I was talking about Item 3 here. But okay, so thank you. And I think we finished. We have 15 minutes - about 17 minutes left on this call. And we do

have another agenda item (unintelligible) one to review the initial collated draft proposal for data collection on trademark claims. I don't know if we can get through that in 15 minutes, but let's at least start, if (Steph) can put that document up.

And this is an 11 page document, so I'm not sure we're going to get through this on the remaining 15 minutes.

I hope I'm not opposing too much on (Steph), but since this is such a lengthy document -- and since I just got back from vacation two days ago and haven't fully reviewed it -- perhaps, (Mary), if you could just quickly take us through the high points of what's in here and then we can kick off a discussion for a few minutes.

Mary Wong: Certainly so...

Philip Corwin: Thank you.

Mary Wong: ...everybody. And I could probably summarize it really quickly for everyone, because it'll be self-evident as you look through this that we are talking about a lot of surveys. We're talking about a lot of the same types of questions that you were asked for Sunrise.

So if I can just -- maybe for the remainder of this call -- focus everyone's attention on as you know something more general tasks ahead. One is obviously that if we're talking about surveys of the same target groups and responders as for Sunrise, whether they be registry operators, registrars brand owners, registrars, etc., one consideration is to essentially do a ginormous survey with everything included but Sunrise and claims.

I don't think I need to go through the possible downsides of doing something like that, just given that we're probably going to be talking about fairly long

survey, and (Laurie) and others from intern may have some insight into the design of their survey, which was also fairly detailed.

But if we don't do it as a giant survey of the same people but of a different subject matter, then of course the consideration there is, when do we do each of them? So I think that's one general overarching question for the group.

The other question for the group is -- again, it's very similar to what we did for the Sunrise exercise -- which to look and see if there are any gaps that should be filled, whether there are any overlaps that should be combined.

And the third observation I'll make here is that in this particular sub team -- and I'm glad to see that (Christine) and (Michael) as the chairs and a lot of the members of the sub team are on this call -- there was quite a lot of discussion that even though we are looking at URS focus date for Phase One of this PDP and Office Depot trademark claims, that it would be helpful maybe not now, but as a consideration going forward into Phase Two, to have a similar type of exercise for the UDRP.

So Status thought a lot about that and, you know, for purposes of us completing Phase One and the dependencies around us doing that for the new GTLD program, it would probably be prudent to start with URS data gathering now and to the UDRP later, unless folks have any suggestions or rationale to the contrary.

I just have a couple other observations still but maybe I can just stop here and see if anybody has any feedback or questions.

Philip Corwin: Okay, (Mary), let me just clarify. You mentioned URS -- and of course, there's a document collecting data relevant to reviewing trademark claims -- as I - we're not talking about a full URS survey here, we're talking about the relationship between claims notices being generated and URS cases later

occurring for domains that would've generated a claims notice. Is that correct?

We're talking about the URS in context of its relationship to the generation of claims notice. It's not broader URS survey. I assume that's correct but can you clarify that?

Mary Wong: That's correct (Phil). But in looking at how we might do this, based on the suggestions, you know, from the staff side, looking at the numbers, I think we're looking currently at something like 780 odd URS cases.

So essentially what we would do is really pull down what those cases are and then you can sort them by case name, complain and domain issue, etcetera, which is very to what the analysis group did. So they have that data as well.

And so the point is that we can then use this data for other types of analysis as well, because essentially you're just pulling down what all the URS cases are as of a certain period in time.

Philip Corwin: Okay, we'll need to consider that further, to look at what data we're collecting. But whatever we collect here is not closing out the possibility or the decision to do a broader analysis of URS cases further down the road as we're approaching the URS. I just want to clarify that. Well, (Mary)?

Mary Wong: Oh, hi, sorry (Phil), I just typed yes into the chat because I noticed (Christine) has her hand up.

Philip Corwin: Oh, okay, okay. I'm going to let (Christine) talk in a minute. I just want to - my own views on this, you know, on one hand, in terms of the relationship with this possible survey and the other one we just discussed relating to Sunrise and whether they should be combined or not, on one hand, I guess the argument for combining them is to hit the same parties with only as few times as possible with a survey.

The countervailing argument would be that the more you put in a survey, the more overwhelming people see it as being and the less likely they are to fill it out. And also timeliness, if we're ready first to send out a survey on Sunrise and not ready yet on the claims notice. We need that data to proceed further to policy decisions.

So I think I'm weighing things where we should do surveys when we're ready to do them and now wait until everything can combine into one mega survey.

But I'll stop there and welcome comments from (Christine) on that or any other question raised by this document.

(Christine): Thanks (Phil), this is (Christine). I wanted to just make a couple of points, not necessarily advocating for anything in particular. There is a fair amount of overlap between the proposed data collection for the Sunrise team and the Claims team. And so I think it's definitely worthwhile to look and see where that overlap is so that we are not annoying people.

I mean, I get two separate surveys is itself annoying, but if on the second survey half of the questions are a variation of the first one or just a slightly different take or a slight alteration, then that's not good efficiency in my mind.

Secondly, when speaking about the URS and the possible use of UDRP data, obviously, yes, the point is, is we're suggesting specific data related to when the UDRPs were filed relative to when the domain names were registered and prisms of an SMD file -- to the extent, however, that this is going to require a very significant undertaking, because you can't just pull that down from any provider site.

So that's going to require somebody to actually download URS cases, open them, read them and enter data into a table. So to the extent that we want to pay twice for that, that's fine. But I just wanted to make aware to people that

if we're going to do another URS review later, I mean, I'm not sure chicken and an egg situation here, but it may be useful to kind of come up with a list of the wish list of questions and have the researcher or whoever open up URS cases and review them one time. That's the only point.

I'm not advocating for a solution. I just wanted to throw out there that that's a consideration the group needs to think about.

And then to someone else's point, yes, of course, if we could do the same for UDRP, that would be great. But I think we decided in the sub team that that really is just, like, hurdling down the slippery slope.

So anyway, for group consideration, thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay, let me just say -- and again, this is just off the top of my head and personal -- I think we're maybe mixing apples and oranges in terms of, you know, one, here we're trying to determine whether, I guess, domains that generate a claims notice is, you know, and go through the registration, wind up being disputed in a URS or UDRP later on and recognize that the UDRP data even more would be more difficult to come up with, whereas a URS survey might be on other qualitative aspects of URS decisions rather than data that relating them to - so I'm not sure a survey is the best approach for other URS questions when we get to the URS.

Saying that just personally I'm fine with the concept of the URSs as a narrow supplement to the UDRP, I have some personal concerns about the quality of some of the URS decisions I've read. But I'm going to save any further comments on that until we get closer to a URS discussion.

(Christine), you still had your hand up. Do you have further comments? Or if not, I'll call on (Susan).

(Christine): Yes, thanks, I just want to respond. Just to clarify, the recommendation here under question one is not to ask URS questions in a survey. It was to actually go in and have a researcher get the numbers of the domain names and the numbers - the dates on which those domain names are registered, which means also cross looking up in some cases in the who is record or doing some in depth research.

So by the time you hire someone to look up, let's say, four pieces of information within 300 URS cases, the question is, as long as they're in there, should they be gathering other information for future use? That's the point that you need to consider, that this group, I think, needs to consider.

At a minimum we need to check the box that we considered it and discarded it and said we're going to do this twice. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Yes, and I absolutely agree. When we do surveys, we hire people to do analysis. We want to make sure we're being as comprehensive as possible. It's just a waste of time and resources to leave gaps in the initial survey or analysis and then have to go back and redo it with a different - with more data, or different questions.

(Mary), your hand is up.

Mary Wong: Yes it is, and it's really to follow up on (Christine's) point. One, I did put in the chat that she's making the point far more successfully the point that I was trying to make earlier about just, you know, considering the sort of more generality of the use that we might be putting the data to.

But secondly, also to basically say that how (Christine) detailed the task, but just the URS cases, is exactly how the current staff discussion is going. We had - we are working on the assumption that it will probably be staff doing the analysis -- well I shouldn't say analysis -- doing the collation.

And one side observation here for everyone is that when the request is made to the GNSO council, what that would include hopefully a budget estimate, for example, for a professional survey designer for those that require surveys.

We would also put in an estimate of, you know, something like staff or researcher hours just so that the scale and scope of the task is clearly described.

So regardless -- coming back to this -- of whether it's (Steph) that does it or someone that's hired to do it, we are looking at all the URS cases, and obviously, like I said, you know when they were filed, what the outcome was, what the domain name and dispute is.

We could also look at other data like who is information, as (Christine) mentioned, and then we can basically see, you know, what date the domain was created.

What that will allow us to see is, you know, whether or not that domain that is subject to the URS was created during the claims period. It won't allow us to see whether a claims notice was in fact issued, because that wouldn't be in the URS database.

It obviously wouldn't also allow us to see, you know, if there was a corresponding Sunrise registration. But it would allow us at least to see, you know, what the domain is that was in dispute, when it was created. And was that during the claims period? And what was the result of the URS decision?

So hopefully that's helpful.

Philip Corwin: Yes, that is helpful. That is helpful. I'm going to take a final comment here from George. If anybody else has anything to say or ask on this, raise your hands now, because we're three minutes away from close of discussion. Go ahead, George, quickly please.

George Kirikos: Yes, I just had to -- George Kirikos for the transcript -- I just have to link in the chat room with a list of 2016 WIPO cases, broken down by TLD, and I don't think there are so many UGTLD cases that we should precluded from having those being analyzed.

I think it would destruct the results if we only limit the analysis to URS cases when, you know, the data analyzed for UDRP cases might either support or, you know, be at odds with the URS cases. So to be only focusing on the URS cases, we might miss a lot of things.

If we're concerned about (unintelligible) office, you know, you could do a subset of the URS cases and a subset of the UDRP cases and throw away some of the data in each. But if you just limit yourself to the URS cases, I think that would be a mistake.

Ideally, you'd want to do them both and I think the number of cases are small enough that you probably could do both. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Yes, I'd say I'm open to that, George. We can have further discussion on that. If it's (unintelligible) I think it's useful, because - to include the UDRP cases too if there's a relatively small number relating to new TLDs since their launch, because there's all kinds of reasons a mark holder might decide to use the UDRP. The might think they might not meet the burden of proof for URS but would on UDRP. Or they might want to obtain the domain rather than just suspend it.

So I think if we can get that data, you know, it would just give us more information, and all of it relate back to the efficacy of the claims notice and deterring infringing registrations as well as the advisability of, you know, the length of the claims generation.

So I'm going to stop there. We only have one minute left. So I think next steps, we're probably going to need more discussion of this document on the next call. But we can - the co-chairs will work with (Steph) on our regular Friday call to set the agenda for next week.

(Steph), is our call next week at the same time, at 17:00 UTC?

Mary Wong: Hi, this is (Mary). I'm looking at (Terry). I believe that is correct that we're not due for the next rotation till the week after. But I'm waiting for (Terry) to confirm that.

(Terry): Hi everyone, it's (Terry) and I put in chat, I do confirm our next call's at 17:00 on Wednesday the 23rd of August.

Philip Corwin: Okay, well thank you. So we're back here, same day, same time, next week. I think we made good progress. We disposed of one document and began discussion of this more extensive document today.

We had some good comments. We've had some robust discussion on the mail list of various issues. And we'll see you all next week. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thank you, (Phil), and everyone.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. 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