

**Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Drafting Team (UDRP-DT) Drafting
Team
TRANSCRIPT**

Monday 18 April 2011 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the UDRP DT call on Monday 18 April 2011 at 15:00 UTC. 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/gnso/gnso-udrp-20110418-en.mp3>

On page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Kristina Rosette – IPC

Jeff Neuman – RySG

Mary Wong – NCSG - GNSO Council vice chair - observer as GNSO Council vice chair

Staff:

Margie Milam

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Carlos Aguirre - NCA

Philip Sheppard – CBUC

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Good morning. I don't think it's evening for anybody.

But it's afternoon.

On the call, the UDRP call of the 18 of April we have Jeff Neuman and for staff, Margie Milam, Marika Konings and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. Carlos Aguirre has sent his apologies. He can't be on the call. Philip Sheppard has sent his apologies. He can't be on the call. And are there apologies from anybody else that you know of?

Margie Milam: No, not that I'm aware of.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. All right well over to you, Margie, Jeff.

Margie Milam: All right, Jeff, and everyone. I guess what I wanted to do today was really to finalize the questionnaire. I sent it out last week, got very few comments.

And Jeff, I know you were on - weren't on the last call. Do you want - do you have any comments to the questionnaire that you wanted to discuss here?

And what I'll probably do after this call is just circulate the final with, you know, giving people say a day to comment. And if not I'll, you know, release it on Wednesday. And what do you think of that approach?

Jeff Neuman: I think that's fine. The only comment I saw Philip had - did you incorporate Philip's last set of comments? I think he had said that he thought this was too involved. And then he had some suggestions I think if I'm remembering correctly.

Margie Milam: Sure. What I've got on the screen is David Taylor responded to Philip indicating he thought K should get dropped. So I dropped K.

I didn't really know what to do with Philip's comments -- I think his were just general; let me just pull them up -- because he didn't give specifics. I think he just said this might be too complex. And he had missed the prior call where I think Kristina had suggested we expand

the question to include some process-type questions. And so that's why I added the ones that I had.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Margie Milam: Don't see any, you know, I don't think I saw anything specific regarding, you know, what Philip thought we should drop, just kind of general observations.

Jeff Neuman: And this again is going to be sent to all the providers?

Margie Milam: Yeah. It would go to all the providers with the, you know, and the introduction basically says, you know, if you don't have the information, you know, you can choose not to answer or tell us when you can provide the information back.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Yeah. No, I thought it was good. I mean I thank you for making the changes in the introduction.

I want to tell you I had added a couple lines in there which you took which is hoping that this doesn't become an advocacy piece than more just, you know, the straight facts. You know, we're not trying to solve anything here. And I think that's good.

And I think it'll be good information to get hopefully before the webinar which I think is the next agenda item. I mean I think it's good. I think that's a good plan.

It needs to go out ASAP. So I think if you sent it around and said this is it, last comments due by tomorrow so that we can get it out Wednesday that's great.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay. I think that's right.

Glen de Saint Géry: Kristina's just joined the call, Kristina Rosette.

Jeff Neuman: Hello Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Hey. Sorry I'm - I can't - Adobe is just not working. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: It's just you and me and ICANN staff so Margie...

Kristina Rosette: Oh, all right.

Margie Milam: Yeah. And...

Kristina Rosette: Hey Margie.

Margie Milam: The only thing I did -- since you're not on Adobe Connect -- the only thing I did to the questionnaire was to delete out K which was David Taylor's suggestion. That was the one that had the question about fair use.

I think he thought it didn't make sense to use that language and if we were to expand on it, it would make it too complicated. So he, you know, suggested deleting K altogether.

And then the other - the only other comment I received on the list was Philip Sheppard's suggestion that it - that, you know, he observed that is seemed awfully broad -- I mean comprehensive -- and thought that we should perhaps scale it back. And I didn't know what to do with that comment, whether I should, you know, try to take...

Kristina Rosette: Now is - this is the version you sent around - okay, hold on. I'm looking at the wrong one. Sorry, no wonder.

Margie Milam: I sent it out right after last meeting. And what I have posted on Adobe is that with the red lining accepted. And the only thing that I changed was I deleted Item K, 1K.

Kristina Rosette: All right. I would actually suggest that we...

Jeff Neuman: So Kristina...

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I think K is going to be complicated.

The one thing that I would suggest that we do at least with regard to 1B is I would just use the language that's in the - that the UDRP providers use which I think is are terminated before decision because in many cases they're not going to know whether it's actually settled or not so to speak. And I don't want to get - have them get hung up on that.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: If you look at whatever WIPO and NAF - at their sites where you can indicate what the proceeding status is for searching I think they both

use terminated. And that - if that's what you're talking about in 1B I think we should use those words.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's a good change.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Margie Milam: So I'll change - instead of settled I'll use the word terminated in 1B.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Or it - yeah or it terminated before decision. I think that's - that would be fine.

Margie Milam: Do you have anything else?

Kristina Rosette: The only thing I'm wondering is I'm looking at N and I'm wondering why we're asking only about registrar and not registrant. Other than that I think it looks good.

Margie Milam: Yeah. Yeah I got that observation. Yeah. Thanks for picking that up. Somebody else raised that too.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I mean just looking at these, yeah, I mean, you know...

Jeff Neuman: So the - in J it involved cases - okay, never mind. Yeah, cases where it's upheld, got it.

Kristina Rosette: Or why don't we say of these how many - I mean - I don't know. It just seems to me that if we're asking about in one the number of proceedings then we should probably say that instead of saying involving cases. I know I'm getting nitpicky.

But for example like in J, Jeff brings up a good point. You know, how many - of these how many proceedings -- I'm just looking back; I can't - for some reason my computer's really -- how many respondents asserted reverse domain name hijacking.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: You want me to just mark this up, Margie? Is that easier?

Margie Milam: Yeah. That's fine if you want to send it to me, whatever's easiest for you. Or I can take notes. I mean it's up to you.

Jeff Neuman: And Kristina, what we had talked about before you got on is putting this out for a final last call and having all revisions by tomorrow so that Margie can send it out on Wednesday. Does that work? Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. No, that's fine.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry.

Kristina Rosette: I'm sorry. I've got like - my email is just going nuts. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: That's fine. That's fine. Yeah. I mean and at this point it would just be kind of tweaks just so that, you know, folks don't get confused as to what it is we're asking them.

Margie Milam: Sure. I actually last week spent some time with (Khalil) in our compliance department. He kind of focuses on the UDRP compliance-related issues.

And he had some observations. I thought he was going to be on the call. But he had some observations that he thought could be clarified in the questionnaire.

And he - in looking at this he said that there's - it's a little confusing the way some of this is phrased because I have -- let me see -- I have questions that relate to when proceedings commence. But he says that that's a term of art in the...

Kristina Rosette: It is.

Margie Milam: UDRP and if I'm trying to get at changes that occur prior to the proceedings commencing that I need to clarify that. So for example if you look at I guess it's M or involves domain names that are deleted due to expiration during the course of proceedings or involves domain names that are transferred during the course of proceedings he says a lot of the issues arise prior to when the providers consider the course of...

Kristina Rosette: But not exclusively. And so maybe...

Margie Milam: Right, right.

Kristina Rosette: What we should do is have both, is, you know, before or during. You know? After the, you know, after the complaint is filed - well see the - I don't know. Then you start to get really complicated. But I know of at least a couple where it's actually been transferred during the proceeding.

Margie Milam: Right, right. And a lot of the complaints that are received by the compliance department often deal with that - kind of that period before, you know, it's officially commenced. And so - and he thought it was useful to at least, you know, clarify what, you know, time we're talking about if that...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Margie Milam: Makes sense.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Have - do any of the UDRP providers have a heads-up that this is coming to them?

Margie Milam: No. But I was going to reach out to them. He was going to give me names of, you know, contacts at all the providers to let them know it's coming. Do you have a suggestion of how to deal with that?

Kristina Rosette: I mean I would just send them just kind of a form email. And you can probably just send it to all of them at the same time.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Because I assume - I have to think that they're all aware that this issues report has been requested and that, you know, basically layout, kind of this is the date that has been - you'll be getting a questionnaire in the next day or two, it seeks quantitative information to the extent it's, you know, available and we're planning to have a webinar and we'll be in - I'll be back in touch about that later and in the meantime, you know, blah blah blah.

I would just make it very neutral simply because to the extent that folks might not plan to be in the office on Thursday and Friday that they could at least start pulling their numbers together.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay. So you even send them the draft or...

Kristina Rosette: No. I would just say that, you know, the questionnaire seeks - that a group of counselors put together a questionnaire for the providers that seeks quantitative information, for example the number of proceedings and the number of proceedings in which a response was submitted, you know, I - we planned - I plan to send you the questionnaire on and then whatever date. You know, I would go ahead and tell them about the webinar now so that they can block it in their calendars.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Margie Milam: Okay. I'll do that. I'll get that out today. I think that's important.

Another observation that (Khalil) made on the questionnaire is he thought I should take out the word favorable in P where it says involves cases where a favorable decision is not implemented by the registrar. And that seemed to make sense to me because that...

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. That's fine. I would say - okay now I've lost it again. I would change it to...

Jeff Neuman: I think just...

Kristina Rosette: Involve cases where a decision to - a decision ordering transfer is not implemented by the registrar because that's what you're talking about, right?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I...

Margie Milam: Right.

Kristina Rosette: Say that.

Jeff Neuman: Well it doesn't have to be transferred because in theory it could just be a deletion.

Kristina Rosette: Right, transfer cancellation. That's fine.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Which...

Margie Milam: That's all I've got from him. Are there any other comments? And I see that Mary's joined the call as well.

Kristina Rosette: Hey Mary.

Mary Wong: Hi everybody, sorry I'm late.

Jeff Neuman: We're just looking at the questionnaire. And it's just you - Mary, it's Jeff, you and Kristina, Margie and Marika.

Mary Wong: Oh really? Okay.

Kristina Rosette: So a small group.

Mary Wong: A good small group. Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Mary Wong: Yeah. No I was listening in for I think the last five, ten minutes or so, so just catching up. The suggestions sound good to me by the way.

Jeff Neuman: What's the difference between P and - or O and P now I guess? If we change the word O then what - or what's the difference now between those two?

Kristina Rosette: Cases - I don't even understand why you think they're the same?
Maybe I'm missing something.

Jeff Neuman: It says - so you had involved cases where a favorable implementation to - you'd say a transfer is not implemented by the registrar. And then...

Kristina Rosette: Or a transfer or cancellation is not implemented by the registrar.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And then the next one is involved cases where they desire to transfer the name. Like how are they going to know a desire?

Margie Milam: Jeff, I think this one has to deal with a registrar...

Kristina Rosette: This - oh yeah, this happens all the time for me where clients will get domain names. They'll prevail in the UDRP proceeding and the registrar is one that not only do they not currently work with but they don't really want to work with. And yet they're stuck having to open an account with that registrar and then keep the name there for 60 days as opposed to being able to say I have my entire portfolio with blah blah blah registrar, as part of the order to transfer the name to me I'd like it also transferred to blah blah blah registrar. And you can't...

Jeff Neuman: Margie, is this something...

Kristina Rosette: Now.

Jeff Neuman: Is this something the provider is going to know?

Margie Milam: I don't know.

Jeff Neuman: The provider knows whether to transfer a name to a registrant, another registrant or sorry, to the complainant. But we're asking a provider to weigh in on whether a complainant desires to transfer to another registrar in addition to the transfer of the name to a different registrant. I'm just not sure that that's a provider question.

Margie Milam: Yeah. That's a good point. I hadn't thought about that.

Jeff Neuman: It's a great question to attorneys or to complainants. My recommendation would be probably to drop that from this but have people speak to it at the webinar when you have complainants on.

Mary Wong: Could we have something -- this is Mary -- on that point about, you know, to the extent that you know or it's been indicated to you rather than drop it entirely?

Margie Milam: Mary, this is Margie. I think in the introduction we basically say if you don't have the information, you know, you don't have to answer it.

Mary Wong: Oh that's a good point. Yeah. And the reason I mention it too is -- and I don't know how far we got with this or we dropped the idea entirely -- is whether we want to use this questionnaire or some form of it or if other people have tweaked as well. So it just seems to me to have - if we have that there and give people the option to say we don't know, we don't have the information it would be better than not having it.

Jeff Neuman: It's not that I don't want the information there. It's just that we're asking about a desire. We're asking a provider about a complainant's desire.

Kristina Rosette: All right, then drop it. I actually am having another issue, Margie. Is there something going on with the ICANN website?

Margie Milam: I have no idea.

Kristina Rosette: Because I've...

Margie Milam: Marika...

Kristina Rosette: Tried to actually read the UDRP policy just to make sure that I'm - when I'm making changes I'm making the right terminology. And WIPO for example, instead of having a PDF of it links to the ICANN site.

And I've noticed this over the weekend that when I scroll that basically the bottom half of all website pages on the site is cut off. So when I go to look at the UDRP itself it cuts off after 8A and the rest of the text just isn't available.

Jeff Neuman: It's also hard to find. How do you find the UDRP from the ICANN if you just go straight...

Kristina Rosette: Oh it's a nightmare. I always just use the search at the beginning.

Mary Wong: Yeah. It's faster to use the search. My students complain about that all the time.

Margie Milam: Crazy. Yeah. No, I agree. I had the same problem doing my research. I thought it would be simple.

Okay, so wait. Let me go back. So we want to delete - which one are we on?

Jeff Neuman: The new P or wherever that...

Kristina Rosette: The new P.

Margie Milam: Delete the new P. Okay. It sounds like that's fine. I'll take that out and it'll be consistent with Philip's observation that this thing's too complex.

Kristina Rosette: How bizarre. This is on like every page of the ICANN site.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm on the UDRP site now. And I don't have any problem scrolling to the bottom like to nine and I see the bottom as well of, you know, other links.

So I don't know if it's possibly a local issue for you. I don't know if - you can paste the link in Adobe Connect so people can check if it's the same for them or not.

Jeff Neuman: Well thank you for publishing it because I cannot find the UDRP.

Marika Konings: Just put the link in the Adobe Connect.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: And just on a note of the website we are actually in the process of I think, you know, just selecting a provider and then restructuring. So hopefully it will get better over time. But I think we're all very well aware of how difficult it is to find information.

Jeff Neuman: I'm having the same problem that Kristina is. I'm going to try to use Firefox though and see if that's different.

Kristina Rosette: Oh good idea.

Marika Konings: Which browser are you using, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Explorer.

Marika Konings: Okay. But I'll - because I'm actually in (MDR) at the moment so at least I'll alert our IT team and - so they can at least look into it.

Jeff Neuman: All right. I'll tell you in a sec whether I'm having a problem with Firefox. Not having a problem with Firefox, only with Explorer.

Mary Wong: On Explorer I go all the way to the bottom of nine.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. No, I'm having a problem. I get to 8B and then it gets cut off.

Kristina Rosette: Right. Yeah, I'm fine with Firefox too but not with Explorer.

Marika Konings: I'll look into this. I'll send an email to our tech support noting that some have issues with Explorer and some don't so they can check what's going on.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you.

Margie Milam: I have another question for you. Should this be a Word document or like a Zoomerang online survey format? I don't know if you guys have any particular preference on how to get these questions out.

Jeff Neuman: I think if it's knowing the providers probably Word because they're probably...

Margie Milam: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Going to submit documents and...

Margie Milam: Okay, all right. Any other...

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Margie Milam: Observations on the questionnaire?

Jeff Neuman: No. I think it's good.

Margie Milam: Okay. So as we discussed on the beginning of the call I'll circulate today after the call essentially the final version. And if I don't hear anything back by close of business tomorrow I'll publish it on Wednesday. And I'll give the providers a heads-up that it's coming.

Now with respect to the webinar I selected May 10 to - for the webinar date. And I'm thinking essentially this time, right, as the time so that we can get - it's not too early for the West Coast folks and you can get a lot of the European and East Coast folks. So this would be 1500 UTC. Does that seem like an appropriate time for the webinar?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, what's 1500 UTC...

Margie Milam: Right now.

Jeff Neuman: In my...

Mary Wong: That's 11:00 am for us on the East Coast, right?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I'm - Margie, I think it's just too early. I think you can't really do it earlier than 9:00 on the west Coast.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Is there any chance as well that you do, you know...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Two, that you just rotate it like we normally do with the policy update webinar where we do one which is earlier in the day, more accommodating people in Europe and Asia and one at a later time that's more accommodating to U.S.?

Jeff Neuman: I think this is going to be too complicated to do it that way. I think it's more than an update. You - it's going to be more of a - I would think debate. But it's going to be - I would only do one if we can do it.

Margie Milam: Yeah. I agree with that, Jeff, because it's not like it's fixed content like we do on our webinar updates for the policy group.

So yeah, you're right. I was - I forgot about - I thought what time it would be on the West Coast.

How about an hour later then, 1600? It would be 8 o'clock on the West Coast. Is that too early because it's - it would be a two-hour block?

Mary Wong: You know, I think...

Jeff Neuman: WIPO...

Mary Wong: That would...

Jeff Neuman: WIPO too, you know, like what time to people work at WIPO still?

Kristina Rosette: Oh you know what, Margie, maybe the better thing to do is to map out where all the providers are time-zone-wise and then work backwards.

Mary Wong: Yeah. I think that's a good suggestion because I mean this is an important issue to a lot of people so presumably even if it's a horrible hour if it's important they'll make time. So the better thing is probably make sure the providers are available and whoever else we've got.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And the...

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Check - so you have WIPO in...

Kristina Rosette: WIPO in Geneva. You have check arbitration in Prague. You have NAF in Minneapolis I think.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I'm still thinking that you probably want to do it 8:00 am on the West Coast. I know it's early for them. But it's just provider - with all the

providers in check arbitration. Although I don't know. How about the Hong Kong one? Or is that - I wonder what time it is there.

Mary Wong: What, Hong Kong? For noon EST, that'd be midnight.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. So it'd seem like you'd have to do it more towards - I don't know.

Margie Milam: I know. It's really hard. I mean that's why we do the webinars for the policy group, you know, at two different times.

Mary Wong: It may be that the 8:00 am Pacific Time, the original time Margie suggested might actually work best.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's right too.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay. Yeah because I want to get the invitation out at least so that, you know, the announcement for it pretty quickly as well so people can block out that date.

Jeff Neuman: So who again are we inviting? I was on a INTA call last week. And it's obviously, even judging from their reaction and probably be the same for others, it's going to be a very political - it's going to get politicized, the decision of who we issue invites to speak at the webinar. So have we thought about that real carefully?

Margie Milam: I believe we were going to ask the providers for two panelists. They usually would pick from that list. And then we'd also ask the providers for attorneys that rep, you know, one attorney that represents each side, you know, that the, you know, frequently does it.

And then - so we were going to have providers, panelists, attorneys.
And then the last group was observers, professors, the, you know, and
that was the part I was going to do some research to figure out who,
you know, who's a professor that, you know, writes about UDRP, you
know, has familiarity, that kind of thing. So I was going to come up with
that list.

So what do you - and then I would...

Jeff Neuman: I would...

Margie Milam: Send it - so I would send it to the email list just so you guys know what,
you know, who is being suggested. How does...

Jeff Neuman: You might all...

Margie Milam: That sound?

Jeff Neuman: I mean I think that's good. I might also ask a registrar that processes a
lot of these to see - because some of these questions ask about
registrars implementing things. And there may be issues that a
registrar wants addressed by this whole thing too.

So I might ask like a Go Daddy or a - I mean I think they'll probably Go
Daddy, Network Solutions, (unintelligible), one of those to just provide
any observations that they might have. What do people think of that?

Kristina Rosette: Well I'm not sure that actually makes sense simply because I can tell
you from my experience the registrars that we would likely ask and that
would likely agree to participate are not the ones who are doing this.

Jeff Neuman: Well - but they can tell you maybe some of the issues. I'm not looking for why registrars don't cooperate. I'm not looking for that. I'm looking more for any issues with the UDRP that registrars see need to be addressed from a standpoint of dealing with transfers, dealing with whatever it is.

I mean there are issues. And that - I mean some of them are being addressed in the IRTP group. But the - it's just another aspect. When you look at the review, the UDRP from the compliant registrars are there any issues that they might have or need to be addressed?

Margie Milam: Yeah. We hadn't talked about it before. The, you know, if the purpose of this call - this webinar is to really issue-spot for the issue report it does seem like that, you know, that would be an important perspective. Mary or Kristina, what do you think?

Kristina Rosette: I don't have a problem with it. As a matter of fact I have a wish list of registrars that I would love for you to invite to this.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: I would invite the compliant registrars as opposed to...

Mary Wong: Well I think I had a broader question than this. I mean did we - and I - since I wasn't on the last call did we resolve the problem of how many people are speaking and which perspective they're going to represent?

Kristina Rosette: Well actually that's a really good point. I mean Margie, didn't - wasn't (Wendy) going to give you some additional names?

Margie Milam: I think she was going to help me figure out how to identify, you know, academics if you will. But that was really all.

Kristina Rosette: And where did we leave the whole issue of independent - individual respondents not represented by counsel? How did we leave that? I wasn't quite sure how that was left?

Margie Milam: I thought we just dealt with it in the questionnaire. I wasn't sure how we would incorporate that in the webinar.

And I was a little - I'm a little concerned. You know, we're talking about two hours. I think we were originally talking about 20 minutes for providers, 20 minutes for panelists, 20 minutes for attorneys that typically represent respondents or complainants. So now you're talking hour, 20 minutes and then 20 minutes for the kind of other observations: observers, academics category. And then we also want time for Q&A.

So I mean the more we expand the categories the longer the webinar becomes I guess because you've got to...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Margie Milam: Give people a reasonable amount of time to speak. You know? And I think we're talking about five minutes per speaker at the moment which isn't a lot.

It's, you know, I mean I do think the - these are important perspectives. If we feel that it's important to solicit, you know, more viewpoints we

can have two webinars and break it out versus, you know, the perspective, Part 1...

Kristina Rosette: I...

Margie Milam: And 2 because I just think expanding it more than two hours, the - is probably pretty draining as well for the participants.

Mary Wong: I guess I asked my question because I do think that it's important to, you know, get the perception going at the outset that this - we've tried to make it as balanced as possible.

So - and I agree with you, Margie. I don't think we should expand it. On the other hand I don't know about doing two. That's also a lot of time. I mean maybe we will leave the option of a follow-up. I think that within that two hours if we can get some representative sampling to some extent that that would really go a long way to building goodwill for this project.

Do you want me to coordinate with (Wendy) on the academics she has in mind?

Margie Milam: Yeah. That would be helpful.

Mary Wong: Yeah. I think...

Jeff Neuman: What was...

Mary Wong: I mean I know a few people but I don't know if she's talked to people or she has different people. Or I can just shoot an email out to folks as

well. So I'll send her an email and - because I assume that she hasn't given you names yet, Margie?

Margie Milam: No she hasn't.

Jeff Neuman: I'm assuming one of them was (Constantinos).

Mary Wong: I don't know. I mean I - she hasn't talked to me about it so I have no idea.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. But he's one. Obviously he's written a book on it so I mean he obviously has viewpoints.

Mary Wong: Right. I mean this is the other thing. I mean whether we're talking about academics or registrars or anybody else there's always going to be some element that's going to say well that's not the right choice. But at the same time you can't have three people representing one particular group on the call because that will be totally unwieldy. So maybe that's just something we have to deal with when we get to it.

But I'll shoot her an email right now and see where she is on that.

Jeff Neuman: All right, just for the call -- and Marika reminded me of this -- the registrars and the IRTP reports -- and there's actually a comment from WIPO too -- there were some issues that the transfer group decided not to deal with and to push it off to the UDRP reviews since they dealt with uniform way of doing certain types of transfers as a result of a UDRP. So I think my memory is not as bad as I thought it was.

But yeah so that's why I kind of wanted one registrar to just at least be able to give a perspective on that.

Margie Milam: Okay. Then I suggest in my last category where I've got, you know, observers and I forgot what the - I'll just include some registrar reps there, at least two.

Jeff Neuman: I don't know if we need two.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: But we just need someone who's familiar with those transfer issues but also familiar with other issues that they may have. And I'm assuming, you know, Go Daddy has been very involved in those groups, right? I don't know if it's (James) or it's other, you know, (James) from Go Daddy or other people that - Go Daddy has a whole group that deals with UDRP complaints.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Some of the people are in a group. I think (James) is part of the group, Paul Diaz, (Mikhail Anilan), I know that he's been speaking to that issue as well because I think he has faced, you know, practical issues with that particular - relates to, you know, when you're supposed to lock a domain name that's in a UDRP case and as you guys know that uniform or no prescribed way that should be handled and open for interpretation. So I think that's the issue there.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay. Then I'll include one spot for a registrar representative.

Any other suggestions on the webinar format? And we'll keep it to one webinar, two hours.

Jeff Neuman: You know, the sooner we can announce the format and everything the better obviously just because like I said it's probably going to be politicized a little bit or a lot.

Kristina Rosette: Well I mean we can only do so much. You know?

Jeff Neuman: Oh I know. I know. I just...

Kristina Rosette: I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm just saying that, you know, we can only - we and ICANN can only do so much to keep it from being politicized and at a certain point.

Margie Milam: And we'll certainly have more opportunities for input. This is just preliminary.

So, you know, I'm hoping to have a - organize a session in Singapore. And so there'll be other, you know, other opportunities to gather input from people.

Jeff Neuman: So are we still on the same timeline (unintelligible) to get a preliminary issues report out in time for Singapore, having a comment period, this other session in Singapore and then at some point coming out with a final issues report?

Margie Milam: Jeff, yeah. That's my timeline right now. I think with the webinar being on May 10 that'll give me plenty of time to meet the deadline for Singapore.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That's what I've been telling people. But I just want to make sure I'm not wrong.

Mary Wong: And I - for some reason - I'm about to send my changes and for some reason -- I don't know; I don't know what's going on with it -- it doesn't look like it's in a different color. But I'm just - my head will explode if I have to redo it. So I'll just send it to you and I apologize in advance if you can't tell what I've added.

Margie Milam: It's not that long. I'm sure I'll figure it out.

Mary Wong: All right.

Margie Milam: All right, anything else before we close?

Kristina Rosette: Nope.

Jeff Neuman: Nope. Thank you.

Margie Milam: Thank you very much, everyone. I think we don't need another call. Or do you think there's a need for another call at this point?

Jeff Neuman: I think we should have one before the webinar?

Margie Milam: Okay. So we can get...

Mary Wong: Do we have to talk about the speakers for the webinar just to make sure with - I don't know how we're going to invite them. Margie, are you going to do it?

Margie Milam: Yeah. I mean it's - to a certain extent it's kind of hard having committee approve everything.

What I can do is for - we'll make the next call slot to talk about presenters. How's that?

And then after that, you know, I'll invite them the day after the next call. Does that, you know, is - and I'll send out a notice - an announcement for the webinar probably this week, maybe Thursday. But it won't have any speakers' names on it.

Mary Wong: Great. And I think that's a good idea, a good - as you said just now it's good to get the webinar on people's calendars. But you know once that notice goes out a lot of people asking well who's speaking, who's speaking. And for those of us kind of working on this group it'd be kind of nice to be able to say we've talked about it, we've talked it through, looked at the final list.

You're right. I don't think we can sit down and approve the whole list. But it would be nice to at least do a brief call on that so we're all on the same page.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Mary Wong: Thank you.

Margie Milam: For you guys next week or is next week - that's Easter - isn't it Easter Monday in Europe? I don't know if I have any Europeans that...

Mary Wong: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Yeah. That's right. Monday is a public holiday in most of Europe. I think Philip...

Margie Milam: Okay.

Marika Konings: But there's probably and David, they're both in - based in Europe.

Margie Milam: Okay. Then I'll probably choose Tuesday then. I think Tuesday will make more sense next week. Does that work for the rest of you?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. That's fine. That's actually better than Monday.

Margie Milam: Okay, all right.

Mary Wong: All right, thank you.

Margie Milam: Be well and we will have a call on Tuesday of next week.

Mary Wong: Okay. Bye.

Jeff Neuman: Bye. Thanks.

Mary Wong: Thank you for...

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks, Glen. I'll get the recording stopped now for you.

END