

ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) Working Group
Thursday, 02 November 2017 13:30 GST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. On page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Philip Corwin: Okay Phil again. I am in the chat room now. Thank you for your patience. The – we are now here in Abu Dhabi because of our – can we start the recording?

Okay for the recording, Phil Corwin again. One of the co-chairs of this working group here in Abu Dhabi. The only one physically present. Let's see if our two co-chairs are in the chat room.

Woman: This is staff Phil. Both J. Scott and Kathy also on the audio bridge and so we will be able to speak as well.

Philip Corwin: Great. And I see we have – hold on where did my arrow go? I see we have 16 participants in the chat room. We have many people present in the beautiful Capital Suite 1 here in the ADNEX Center.

Is there anyone who is with us just on audio and not in Adobe? Speak now. (Mary) is shaking her head and I take that as fully authoritative.

So what we are doing here, the other day staff presented initial high level statistics regarding number of URS cases, URS being the Uniform Rapid

Suspension. A new rights protection curative rights process created for the new TLD program.

At this time it is an implementation detail of the new TLD program not a consensus policy for all. TLDs one of our charter questions is to consider that and we are beginning a review of URS so that we can use our time fully and efficiently while we are preparing data surveys on the trademark claims and Sunrise registration right protections.

So today's session and we are going to start – staff will read. We have many charter questions relating specifically to URS and then more generally to all the RPMs including the UDRP. But that have some application to the URS.

We want to use today's session to gain feedback from the community on their URS experience and lack thereof. And if there is a lack thereof why they chose not to use it.

So we are going to begin by having staff taking us through the URS specific charter questions. There is about no more than a dozen so I would ask that we let staff run through them for us.

And then we will see what discussion they generate and if we have additional time left at the end of those discussions we can get into some of the secondary charter questions.

So with that I am going turn it over to staff to lead us through the slides and the URS specific charter questions. And then hopefully we will have a robust and illuminating discussion. Thank you.

(Mary): Thank you Phil. This is (Mary) from staff and what we have on this opening slide is a reminder and also a note for those who are new to the GNSO policy development process that every working group is doing a PDP that is chartered by the council works within the framework of that charter.

And like other policy development processes groups, the charter for this particular working group has a series of tasks and questions that the working group has asked to review.

Two notable things about those questions in our charter. One is that those questions did not just come from one section of comments on our issue report. It was also drawn from prior comment periods to other assets that were attempts to gain information about the rights protection mechanisms and how they work.

So as a consequence and here is the second point of note. When the GNSO Council approved the charter for this group they did not edit or review those community questions. Instead they put all those questions wholesale in their entirety in to our charter.

And I think as folks in this room remotely as well know, what this working group has done for the other RPMs and which we presume will also be done for this one, the Uniform Rapid Suspension process.

Is to use sub-teams comprised of working group volunteers to take a look at those unedited community questions and to refine them for the working groups tasks in reviewing them.

So I just wanted to put that there at the beginning. So that when people look at these questions they will know that these are not questions that were proposed or edited by the GNSO Council but came directly from the community.

Philip Corwin: (Mary) if I might intervene and just add to that. You are correct so far as I know it is the intent of the co-chairs to develop a sub-team which will perform the same work as the prior sub-teams of reviewing the questions,

consolidation duplicative questions, making sure those questions are objective in their inquiry and not biased one degree or another.

And I also would note that these charter questions as with all PDP working groups are non-exclusive questions. Any member of the working group if they believe that there is a question that should be addressed which is not in the charter can propose for the working group to add such a question.

I recognize Brian Beckham for a comment.

Brian Beckham: Thank you Phil. Maybe just a suggestion. Before a sub-team is performed to look at these it might be useful to think about a call to working group members or the community more generally to see if there aren't questions they would like to add to this before the working group, the subgroup gets started on refining those questions. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Yes well I think that is a good question. I will certainly take it up with the co-chairs. But that would make sense to do that before we embark on that effort and not afterwards.

So go ahead (Mary).

(Mary): Thank you Phil. (Mary) from staff again. So what staff did for this set of slides we took the liberty of looking at the list of questions and for the one specific to the URS which is what Phil has asked us to focus on for today.

We took the liberty of grouping them into sub categories if you like because it seemed a little easier to facilitate both discussion and review. And to Brian's point earlier it may be that in looking at these questions there are other suggestions that you have that we can take note of today and bring it back to the chairs and the working group.

So in terms of the categories. The first one that we had is responding to complaints that are filed under the URS. Questions about defenses and questions about the standard of proof.

And so here we have got four questions and one is about the ability to file a reply for an extended period. Whether that should be changed, at the moment it is up to one year after the default notice or even after a determination and default has been made. That is part of the URS today. And so the question is whether that should be changed.

The other is about the fee in relation to a filing of a complaint of 15 or more domains in dispute. Whether that particular response fee for that particular instance should be eliminated.

Moving onto proof. The question here is regarding the standard of proof for the URS which is clear and convincing in contrast to the Uniform Dispute Resolution policy on which the URS is based. The question is whether this remains the appropriate standard for the URS.

And finally because the URS again in comparison to the UDRP does have a non-exhaustive list of responses as well as defenses. The question is whether these are being used. If so, how, when and by whom?

Phil I think Maxim had his hand up. So I will pause here for his question and comment.

Philip Corwin: After Maxim if anyone else has comments on these initial four questions let take those and then we can move onto the next group. So go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just a small note that it is not necessary one year. There is one scenario in which it could be up to 10. The (unintelligible). See that they are going to lose URS and for (unintelligible).

Unknown reasons they decide to pay for renewal up to 10 years. And the domain is going to stuck in this status for 10 years then. We investigated these...

Philip Corwin: Maxim can you explain a little more how that would work? I am not familiar with how a one year period which is quite a long period to come back after losing. But on a default determination how that could become 10 years. Could you explain that?

Maxim Alzoba: As a registry we investigated three documents related to URS. Basically rules, technical part and procedures. And came the conclusion that there is no direct prohibition for then current owner of the domain for expansion of the term.

For example, the party see that URS is coming because they have notification. And at this moment if they renew domain for 10 years we try to find the reading allowing us not to allow this procedure.

But because particular EPP statuses of the domain were demanded (unintelligible) we failed to find the scenario in which we can do anything about it.

And if URS is lost by that party then they redirect effectively to this site saying that yes basically this was lost on the URS. And it will stuck for 10 years there.

Philip Corwin: So you are saying that since any domain can be registered for up to 10 years that a registrant who is – registration is subject to URS complaint could before the determination even without filing a response extend up to 10 years. Have you seen any examples of anyone doing this?

Maxim Alzoba: We have seen requests for clarification. If it is allowed or not because one of registrars they wanted to create like for customer service they have books

with scenarios. What you are doing which case? And they were just trying to understand the procedures because front line support I would say not so advanced in understanding of the legal text.

So they just played by book. They have set of rules how they react to the – I say information coming from their customers. And it was just question and clarification. We haven't seen this happened but we decided to investigate it. And we came to the conclusion that it can happen. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay thank you. Do we have other comments on any of these questions and the issues that they raise?

And I would just say I have one comment on my own. Well two actually. One I think we all understand. Many of us are familiar with the history of how the elements of the URS were developed.

We recognized that this as the other RPMs were the subject of compromises among members of the community with different points of view. That doesn't mean that they have got it perfect the first time and everything is subject to adjustment.

But as working groups the one thing I would note is that the rationale for the clear and convincing standard of proof in a URS case rather than the preponderance of the evidence, burden of proof an UDRP is at the URS should be a supplement to the UDRP for a clearly black and white case is not shaded gray cases.

In which basically when you look at the registration it is just about evident on the face that it is infringing. That is my only comment on that. So actually (Julie).

(Julie): I am just noting that J. Scott has his hand up in the room.

Philip Corwin: Oh. I am not seeing it up for some reason. But let's hear from J. Scott and Maxim has another comment. But let's hear from J. Scott. We haven't heard from yet. Welcome J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Can you all hear me? Hello?

Philip Corwin: Yes we can hear you. If you can speak up a bit more.

J. Scott Evans: Okay (unintelligible).

Philip Corwin: Can you raise the volume?

J. Scott Evans: I just want to point out that for the record.

Philip Corwin: Hold on. We are trying to get the volume up here J. Scott. You re very faint. Why don't you try again and talk in your loudest voice and we will see how that works.

J. Scott Evans: Okay can you hear me now?

Philip Corwin: That is much better ye.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I just wanted to point out for the record that the point that Maxim was making regarding the timeframe of 10 years is not relevant to this slide. It is a relevant point with regards to the URS.

This slide is talking about whether the period in which a respondent who receives a default judgment has to challenge that default judgment should be eliminated or shortened. Because I think it is after one year.

What Maxim is talking about is the provision within the URS that says that the winner of a URS can have the domain suspended and then can also suspend it for the renewal period which generally is a year.

But he said in his case he believes that it is unclear if the losing respondent had renewed prior to the URS decision. That for a period of 10 years whether then the domain would be suspended for 10 years?

And that is an issue that should be discussed but that is not relevant to the slide. This slide is talking about the amount of time a respondent has to respond or challenge a default judgment. I just want to make that clear for the record.

Philip Corwin: Thank you. I think that is a very good point you just made J. Scott. And thinking about that a bit further if the registrant upon notice at URS extended from one year to 10 years. I am not sure that would extend their time to file a reply for up to one year. That would still be the cutoff.

And in fact by extending for another nine years they may have done a trademark owner a favor by it and the domain would be suspended for 10 years and would not drop back to be available to anyone else.

That is my initial response. I think we need to look at that more closely. But thanks for raising that. And Maxim you had a further comment.

No so any other – yes (Julie).

(Julie): Kathy Kleiman also has her hand up.

Philip Corwin: I am not – on my screen I am not – oh now I am seeing it. But I wasn't seeing it before. Yes go ahead Kathy and welcome.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you can you hear me Phil?

Philip Corwin: It is very faint again.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay I can try to speak louder. How is that? Okay first Phil thank you for leading this fourth meeting of the RPM working group and thanks for everyone specifically that are attending. I know these are very long meetings and we are towards the end so thank you very much.

So a question for (Mary) about the slides and then I will have a follow up. Which is if the charter has more questions on these subjects is the idea that we are editing out those other questions? Or that this is kind of a summary? A greatest hits of what is in the charter?

So for example, there is a question in the charter. There are lots of questions in the charter that don't seem to be quite here in this list. But one has to do with, you know, has ICANN or probably the provider done its job in training registrants about their new rights and defenses?

Not to stay they are using them but do they understand them as somebody laying them out? So is the picking and choosing what is going to be going to the sub-team? Is it the sub list or is it the full list of the charter questions? Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Kathy if I might intervene. I reviewed all the slides this morning and the question you just answered is in one of the later slides. All of these questions are the questions directly from the charter. And I believe staff when you go through the full slide deck we have got all the URS specific questions as well as many other questions which are general.

But certainly we can review the charter before the sub-team gets started and make sure that no question that is relevant to sub-team work has been omitted. But the one you just mentioned is in one of the later slides about training of rights holders and registrants about use of the URS.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so under a different category. That makes sense. The slides came in the (unintelligible) Eastern time. So thank you very much.

Philip Corwin: You're welcome. So if there are no further comment on this slide let's go onto the next slide showing URS specific questions and Brian Beckham has a comment. Thank you Brian.

Brian Beckham: Thanks I have a question about bullet point Number 2 just to get this in front of whoever is on the sub-team that would look at these. I don't know if it is clear from reading this whether this is intended to suggest that the fee should be eliminated altogether? Or that it should be eliminated in terms of only being applicable when there are 15 domain names in play? Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Yes thank you Brian. And again these are the raw charter questions. They have not undergone any review by the sub-team. And that is a question where the sub-team might think the question is too limited or biased in some way and needs to be expanded or clarified.

So we will note your remark for the record and direct the sub-team to the transcript of this session to help guide some of their work. So next slide please.

(Christine) please speak up.

(Christine): Hi thanks. This is (Christine). I just want to answer Brian's question. The response fee for the URS does not apply before if there are fewer than 15 domain names in the (unintelligible). So the respondent doesn't pay a fee unless. So what is – I am not sure what your question is.

Brian Beckham: I perfectly understand that. The question is – is the question intended to suggest that the response fee should apply in all cases not just when there is more than 15 domains? If it is not intended then I would like it to be put forward as a question when the sub group gets going. Thanks.

(Christine): Thanks for clarifying. That helps.

Philip Corwin: Thanks and again the sub-team would be free to modify this question to include all possibilities from requiring response fee. In all cases we are eliminating the response fee in all cases. Or adjusting this 15 to a higher or lower number. So we will leave that to the sub-team when they get to it.

I think we can now get to Slide 2.

(Mary): Thanks Phil and everyone. This is (Mary) from staff again. And yes we do actually have five slides on the questions that were specific to the URS. So following up on Kathy's question.

While the staff did try to categorize these questions into specific sub categories as I mentioned for ease of review and discussion. We did not edit or alter or take out any of the questions in the charter.

And so the next set of questions is on remedies, appeals and costs. And the first is in relation to the possibility of additional remedies. For example a perpetual block or some other remedies such as a transfer or right of first refusal.

The second question in this category goes to the length of the suspension period which currently is the balance of the registration period and this context we note Maxim's observation from the earlier slide.

Third how can the appeals process of the URS be expanded and improved? So that goes to an appeal after the initial URS determination. Then we move onto the question of cost. And one question there is whether the cost allocation model for the URS is appropriate? Is it justifiable?

And in that context another question about cost as well. Whether there should be a loser pace model. So I think that there was a hand up and so I will pause here again. And I think (Martin) you are in the room. So go ahead.

(Martin): Thank you very much. (Martin) for the record. It is on the first one on the URS and operational remedies such as perpetual block or other remedies. I just wanted to comment specifically on perpetual block and the very danger of – very unfairly have blocked (unintelligible) have a right to it?

I think this sort of remedy of perpetual block to basically block a domain like (unintelligible) normal process the name will be blocked only for the period of time that the domain name holder has registered.

Perpetual block but I understand is that if you win the URS that name will be blocked forever or for a longer period of time that goes beyond the time that the domain name holder has registered for.

I just want to vigorously opposed to that because I think it goes beyond the scope of – I think it is irrational to actually propose that sort of over scope of the URS.

Philip Corwin: (Martin) can I – I think you said your concern was that the complainant wouldn't have a right to the name. But one of the key elements to bring at UDRP is showing that you have trademark or other rights that give you standing to bring a complaint.

(Martin): It is the other way around. I am taking out the right of the domain name holder from the registrar. If the registrar has the domain for one year and I challenge the URS and I win. It gets us (unintelligible) for the period of time under the domain is open again.

Then the URS is finished. And this would be posed like if I win the URS then the name will be blocked perpetually. I wouldn't say it is going beyond the scope of the right that I am trying to win over.

Philip Corwin: Well I would note that under the current URS that the complainant has the right to extend the suspension for one additional year beyond what the domain was registered.

(Christine) before I recognize you I just had a question for Barry in regard to the appeal. Have you been able to develop any data yet regarding whether any appeals have been filed in URS cases? Have you found any evidence of that as you are doing your analysis of the available data from the dispute providers?

Barry Cobb: This is Barry Cobb for the record. Yes there was a few if you will give me a second I can pull it up. I think it was like 3 or 4. I don't have it right in front of me but it was definitely less than 10 but probably even less than 5 is very few.

Philip Corwin: So that out of 780 cases filed of which I think just over 700 were decided against the registrant. There has been some use but very limited use of the appeals mechanism. Thank you.

Who had a comment? (Christine).

(Christine): Thanks Phil this is (Christine). I want to just ask (Martin) a follow up question to see if I am understanding you. What you are saying is that if there is a – if the URS was amended to have a permanent block at – that could in some cases surpass the life of the trademark registration.

So in the event that the trademark registration that the (unintelligible) was abandoned the trademark owner would lose their rights possibly. But the lock would remain perpetually despite the fact that the complainant would no longer have rights. Is that what you are saying or something different?

(Martin): You actually made more – you added something that I actually like. So I am going to use it. The problem goes both ways. I think it is provided that the

trademark may not be no longer there if it is at perpetual block. And the fact that I am blocking a domain name that was supposed to be already open to the public is also problematic.

If domain name holder only has it for two years and (unintelligible) perpetual block I am taking out of these probably legitimate users or legitimate holders. So if you want to take it back for you just UDRP.

The idea of this is that I am blocking someone that is specifically using it in a harm's way to my trademark. So I think it goes overreach in both sense. That is if you say (unintelligible) I don't get what would be the balance of perpetual block here.

Man: I can answer that. It is someone who has been a judge to be a cyber squatter. Thanks.

(Martin): Okay what if once that cyber squat goes out the name could be used for someone that is not a cyber squat.

Philip Corwin: Okay I just want to note that Barry typed into the chat room that he corrected – he has actually found 14 cases in which an appeal was found which is somewhat more substantial use of the appeals process and for a RPM that has a fairly high burden of proof.

So Maxim I see your hand up. And as people have their questions answered if they could put their hands down in the chatroom. The chair would appreciate it. Thank you. Go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: I notice as registry who had few URS cases we have general perception. I am not sure if it is relevant to this particular site that many users of these procedure they don't necessarily understand that if they are trying to have control of the domain after the process they shouldn't go to URS.

So it is like lack of awareness and then in the middle of the process they realize that they should have done something else like go into court or UDRP. Because in the end of the process they see yes. This domain is going to be in this locked status for this one year. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: In response I would just point out that the name of the RPM is Uniform Rapid Suspension. So it is kind of headlined there at least it is presently constituted.

John. John McElwaine please.

John McElwaine: John McElwaine for the record. Just really quick. I think the purpose of this right now is to go over the slides and we are kind of getting into discussing the substance of some of the questions.

I think if people find that a question there to be unclear we should discuss it. But I would like to get onto the rest of the slides and then maybe talk about next steps.

Philip Corwin: That is fine with me. I don't want to – if people want to comment as we go through the slides. But I think that is a good suggestion that we look to comment primarily on whether the questions are properly framed. But recognizing that issues of substance may arise during the discussion.

And yes (Julie).

(Julie): I am just noting that we have two hands up on the chat.

Philip Corwin: Are those new hands or old hands? Those were the people who just spoke.

(Julie): I thought J. Scott was new at least.

Philip Corwin: You know I am – for some reason I am not seeing these – oh they are appearing very late. (Martin) – okay so J. Scott go ahead. Sorry your hand just popped up. There is some delay on my screen between when hands are put up and when I see them on my computer screen. So go ahead please.

J. Scott Evans: That is okay. I mean I just wanted to make one comment is I don't want to – I know that John spoke up after my rant at hand so I don't want to take up too much time. But just to point out that if there was any sort of talk of having a perpetual block there would also be a mechanism that would need to be put in place.

So if someone did have legitimate rights they could then put that forth and obtain the domain for legitimate rights. Similar to how I think (unintelligible) defensive blocking mechanism.

If you own a blocked domain you have paid for it but someone comes along. It is a third party and they have legitimate rights. They can establish those legitimate rights and obtain the domain for legitimate purposes.

But I understand that John didn't want to get into that. But I just wanted to put it out for the record. That there are ways to handle these concerns.

Philip Corwin: Yes thanks for pointing that out J. Scott. So you are basically saying we can look at the private mechanisms for some precedence for adjustments we might think about when we get into the substance of URS after the sub-team develops the refined questions.

And I thank you for that. So let's go onto to Slide 3 and I think John's suggestion was good that we focus first and foremost on comments that may be useful to the refinement sub-team in terms of adjusting to questions. Although recognizing that we may start to raise some stuff for the discussion as well.

So Slide 3.

(Mary): Thanks Phil. This is (Mary) from staff again. So and actually I will take this opportunity to say that we have to keep the Adobe the windows the way they are for all the sessions. And also for the audio stream there may be folks with connectivity issues. So we just have to keep the sizing the way they are.

And to follow up on John's observation because there were some additional folks that came into the room after we started. One of the primary purposes of showing these questions is to get experience while to get feedback from users whether complainant or registrant of experiences in the URS.

So if as we go through these slides people have comments about their or their own company's experiences we think that would be very helpful to take down as feedback to the working group.

And so in this third of five slides we are talking about whether there should be sanctions for misuse of the URS by trademark owner complainants. Whether or not express provisions should be developed to deal with repeat offenders with a question as to whether that needs to be defined and what that is.

There is also a question – again these were submitted by the community and not edited by the GNSO Council or the working group as of yet. So these are all the questions that will go to the sub-team to be formed.

The next question is whether ICANN has done its job in training registrants in the new rights and defenses of the URS. And finally for purposes of this slide do we have evidence of problems with the use of the English only requirement especially in light of there now being IDNs and new gTLDs.

And on that note I will note that I believe in our Saturday sessions there were some comments and some discussion about the English only complaint form.

But that in terms of notice to the registrant and subsequent proceedings it is not necessarily in English only.

So Phil again I will stop there. And I don't see any hands in the chat but I don't know if anyone in the room has comments again primarily on any experiences or feedback that they have about using the URS in these respects.

Philip Corwin: Go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: About the experiences. I cannot name the company but at least one quite large European company with I would say huge capitalization on our scale I would say requested us as registry to give explanation why the domain is still in duress and they don't have ability to register it.

It means they decided to use URS instead of UDRP. I am not sure if it is an abuse or misunderstanding from their part. But it could be due to lack of training of registrants.

And the other thing is about repeat offenders. I am not sure if you have information about URS cases. Those are choice of lost parties. I would say the parties who were registrant before the URS and lost the case.

And if we see like pattern that this particular party registered 10 or like 12 domains and they lost it as a result of URS process. So my thinking was in case they had the same repeated cycle of doing wrong things I would say I am not a lawyer. On the URS why can't we simplify the process for them as like sanctions?

Philip Corwin: The chair will comment. You know a complainant, I would presume a complainant would rely upon an attorney to file a URS. And if an attorney reads the URS policy they should note what the available remedies are. And if they

have hired an attorney who doesn't understand it they have not hired very good counsel.

It is quite clear when you read the policy what the available remedies are. Anyone who files a URS thinking that they can get a domain transfer to their control for proactive use has been very poorly informed by counsel.

I have one comment on the substance of the first question which is what sanctions should be left from misuse. I think that is going to need to be massaged by the sub-team because they are already built into the URS sanctions for abusive complainants.

So the question needs to be rephrased to something like are the available sanctions appropriate? Should they be narrowed or expanded or whatever. But the question as stated kind of implies that there are no sanctions available for abuse of the process when they are already are.

So that I want to get that comment on the record for their use of the sub-team down the road. And likewise, the second question there are more severe sanctions if you repeatedly abuse the URS as a complainant.

I see well I mean (Christine) had her hand up first and then (Susan). I may have misstated something slightly there.

(Christine): Well I think that – (Susan) and I were just chatting that this is (Christine). (Susan) and I have different opinions of what this means? So that is why we are wondering. The first question talks about sanctions for the misuse by trademark owners.

The second question just says repeat offenders. So we are unclear whether repeat offenders means repeat complainant offenders, you know, complainants that repeatedly misfile.

Or does it mean the repeat cyber squatter offenders? And we are not entirely sure and now I will cede to (Susan) to offer her explanation. Thanks.

(Susan): Okay hi it is (Susan). I would say it is the lesser interpretation that (Christine) just suggested. The Question 1 is about, you know, abuse by the trademark owner if you like. And Question 2 is about multiple abuse by the respondent for want of a better word.

The two sides of the same coin. Because of course there are sanctions in relations to misuse of the URS by the trademark owner but there are no sanctions if you are a repeat offender, a multiple cyber squatter. And so the question is meant to be addressing should that be?

Philip Corwin: Chair has one excuse me comment on that which I presume with the URS as with the UDRP that if a registrant has a history of losing RPMs of being judged as cyber squatter multiple of times. Then the burden of proof, the meeting of the burden of proof has eased considerably in terms of bad faith use and registration.

As to whether there should be additional sanctions that is open for discussion by the sub-team. But I think clearly you have identified a question that needs to be refined or split into two parts. Because if it is not clear to you two experts it is not a clear question. It needs to be made better.

(Susan): Something where it is – on the slide I don't think it is particularly clear. But I know where that question comes from and I know exactly what was intended.

Philip Corwin: I am going to recognize staff and then Maxim. (Mary) go ahead.

(Mary): Thanks Phil. (Mary) from staff. So two follow up comments. One is that as in the prior sub-teams there have been questions as to what particular charter questions means. And that certainly is an exercise for the sub-team to go through.

In that context what staff can do and I think we did that for some of the sub-teams as well is to go back to the origin of these questions. Like I said, some of them originated in comments to the issue report for this PDP. Others were in comment periods in prior exercises that predated this PDP.

But if we can do that and provide additional context as the sub-team goes to work we are happy to do so.

Philip Corwin: Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Could we split this question into two – just for sake of clarity – in like the first about abuse by the complainant – the second is abuse by – by frequently losing party – I don't know how to say.

Philip Corwin: Well that's – the determination of how to clarify this question will be up to the members of the sub team and you of course as a member of the working group are free to volunteer to be a member of the sub team. So, but your suggestion is on the record now for review by the sub team. John McElwaine.

John McElwaine: John McElwaine for the record. I think this goes this goes to what (Kathy) might have been saying – what Maxim's been saying. Do we need to add a question that says, "Has ICANN done a good job of training registrants – no, no complainants concerning what the remedies are under the URS?" Because it sounds like Maxim was saying that there were situations where they were surprised that they wanted – it was only a suspension.

Philip Corwin: And again John McElwaine on one of the later slides there is a question almost exactly like that – about this efficiency – of ICANN education of both registrants and trademark owners. But that question too can be looked at to

see if it's focused enough and clear enough. Other comments on this slide?

I

am not seeing anyone in the chat room with a hand up – but I just want to check since I have had a latency problem. I don't see any other hands raised in the room. So, lets proceed to slide number 4.

(Mary): This is (Mary) from staff again and what you see on slide number 4 is a set of questions again from the charter about the dispute resolution provided. Our note that these questions – while we have put them here as URS Charter questions – because they were actually just talking about the providers – they probably apply and were intended to apply when the working group comes to phase two as well so, when we do phase two – which is the UDRP we may need to go through this exercise in terms of looking at these questions again and certainly at least one of these questions was also directed towards another type of provider and that is the trademark clearing house – so at the moment I think we will just assume we are just talking specifically about URS. Phil did you have a comment?

Philip Corwin: Yes, thank you (Mary) for reminding us that this working group is engaged and I biathlon where after completing review of the new TLDRPM's we will then commence the concerted task of conducting the first ever review of the UDRP – and we all anticipate that with relish. So, why don't you take us through these questions and then we'll see what comments we have on them.

(Mary): I will do that Phil. (Mary) from staff again and perhaps the last of the ICANN meeting was not the best time to choose to remind folks that there is Phase Two to come. So, in relation to the providers there was a comment that Forum – which is one of the providers had done a self-review and that WIPO had done a workshop on Domain Name Resolution – with a particular date. This may well be something that as we have more of those reviews available that we can add to this question, but it is really to assess the benefit of those reviews in which inconsistencies of panel decisions including in areas of free

speech and freedom of expression were discussed candidly. Then we have another about whether processes being adopted by URS Providers are fair and reasonable – are these procedures fair and equitable for all stake holders and participants – are the stake holders and participants consulted as these new procedures are evaluated, adopted and reviewed? And finally, for purposes for this slide – What changes need to be made to ensure that the Providers procedures are consistent with ICANN policy and are fair and balanced. So, a family of questions and I'll pause here as well.

Philip Corwin: (Brian Santaz) I am going to recognize him, then the chair has a comment or two on these slides. Go ahead BrianBeckham.

Brian Beckham: Thank you, Brian Beckham for the record. I would like to move that this first question be stricken. First of all, it's outdated – second it involves CDRP – third it's inaccurate. We just had a workshop in Geneva last week where this topic was discussed and in fact the way it was presented by two of our most esteemed panelists was quite frankly the exact opposite of the way it's expressed here – was that there is virtual unanimity in the way free speech is protected under the DRP – that's also captured in our revised (unintelligible) over so again for all of those reasons I would like to propose that this question is stricken from this review. Thanks.

(Brian Santaz): Well, you've mentioned three strikes against it and it certainly is clear on its face that it's outdated since we are now in 2017 and WIPO was issued a – the three zero version of guidance. I have two comments on this as chair and then I will recognize Maxim - I note his hand up. The first is that – if anyone I spoke to the (Geck) on Tuesday afternoon on a panel that also included Brian Beckham and Brian Winterfeldt and Susan Payne – and others where we discussed the work of this working group and I had just a minute or so to make points, but one of the key points I made is that as my personal hope that this working group certainly gets to the UDRP – I think that the most important word in the UDRP is uniform – and while the UDRP was created by WIPO it was the sole provider. Now I think we are up to five or six accredited

providers and there well may be more accredit in future years and there can be no uniform administration of a policy without uniform guidance to the panel. So, I think that's a question when we get to the UDRP that the working group – I will encourage them to look at is how we can assure that panelist that all providers are operating under uniform guidance so that we don't get them going off in different directions on key questions and encourage forum shopping or anything like that. But again, it's supposed to be uniform policy for the global domain name system and not different administration of the policy depending on which provider you go to. So, far as the processes being adopted I just want to note and I would expect the working group to get into this – that there are very explicit requirements for URS providers to follow set forth in the applicant guidebook and in addition to that there URS providers unlike UDP providers are under a rudimentary contractual relationship with ICANN in the form of a memorandum of understanding which imposed additional requirements as to how they administer the – this RPM. So, I would expect in the course of our work on the URS we'd be taking some look at whether the providers are actually acting in a way that is consistent with both the applicant guide book and MOU requirements. That's all I had to say on the subject. Maxim, did you have a statement?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba just notice Geroge Kirikos just typed the request to have like a more extended audience given the text on the (unintelligible). So, not on the usual subject talked today. And about (unintelligible). I think (Mary) could read the George comments because he is typing and typing and we're not paying attention.

(Brian Santaz): Maxim Alzoba I don't even know what that comment means but (Cherish) is recognizing people as they wish to speak and I'm not going to sensor anybody in this room or in the chat room. We have members of this working group who tend not to participate much and members who tend to participate a great deal and it's not the roll of the chair to limit comments or questions by working group members. (Mary)

(Mary): Thanks Phil and thanks Maxim and George and others. Just to be clear that everyone is welcome to speak and that there is no picking of certain folks, so everyone is welcome to raise their hand either physically or virtually and that is the practice. One of the things I did want to note from the staff's perspective is that we do ask that anyone who is participating remotely – if they have a question to indicate as such very clearly – similarly if they have a comment that they want read into the room and the record – that is so that if folks are having side chats that we are not reading every comment but that we are only reading comments that are intended for the discussion in the room.

Philip Corwin: Thank you (Maire) and I see that my co-chair Kathy Kleiman has her hand raised in the chatroom and following her, George Kirikos. So, let's here from Kathy Kleiman and then from George Kirikos.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: Under suspicion of anything.

(Kathy Kleiman): Terrific. I was wondering if we wanted to add a question about providers backgrounds. The preparation for providers. So, in these in might be a modification of the first question – which I know would go to the sub team – I should have said this is Kathy Kleiman for the record – but kind of how – I think it links to something you said, you said also Phil. What's the preparation for the URS providers? We know a lot about the preparation for the UDRP providers – but what's the backgrounds of the URS providers and what's their preparations? So, the arbitration form self-reviews might be – or whatever's in the first question – might be useful as guidance for other questions we might asking. Kind of how is the UDRP doing it? Should the URSP be doing something similar? Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Thanks Kathy and we'll take that under advisement. That question can be added to review by the sub team. I would just note that two of the accredited

URS providers are also UDRP providers. The National Arbitration Forum and the United States and the Asian Domain name dispute resolution center. In Asia and the third one is located in Europe. I forget the – I still haven't memorized the acronym yet but I think it's certainly – we can inquire as to what interaction they've had with ICANN – if they proceed to administer these – this RPM and let's here from George and then I think there are some people in the room that would like to speak. George go ahead.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes, I just want to repeat the point earlier that Maxim tried to make was that the reason why we have these meetings is so that the broader community can be heard and so folks that are not usual members of the PDP should be encouraged to speak now while we have the last half an hour – since we don't normally hear from them. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Thank you George. Stated that way – the chair whole heartedly agrees. I encourage everyone in the physical room here and in the chat room – if they have – don't be shy – if you have anything useful you think you want to add in terms of a comment or question – this is a great time to share it with the working group. And with that – who in the room had a...go ahead Martin.

Martin Sutton: Martin Sutton for the record. I don't know if you thought along this particular question but I will say it and if not then I will just ignore it. We've done a little research on (Diverse and Arbitrators) backgrounds. Most of them come from U.S. commercial big law firms. They are also part of (unintelligible) Lawyers litigating - and I would say that there's an unbalancing white males commercial U.S. lawyers on these sort of panels and maybe something to answer why we have so many (unintelligible) processes and stuff.

Philip Corwin: Let me just sort of quickly comment and then go on Susan Payne who has her hand up. I don't remember whether it's in the applicant guide book or the MOU but the URS providers are required to place on their website a list of all their panelists and their background. So, that information should be available. Susan?

Susan Payne: Yes, hi – Susan. I was just going to say – two of the providers are not U.S. based and I would be astonished if the agent dispute was (unintelligible) for example: is using U.S. attorneys for its decision making – that seems unlikely to me at the best. Now it is true that the forum based in the U.S. has heard most of these cases but that's choice of the complainant which venue they go to.

Philip Corwin: Thank you Susan. I see (Richard Hill) hand up and we welcome participation by non-usual suspects.

(Richard Hill): Thank you, Richard Hill. Yes, I have been a UVRP arbitrator since the beginning of the scheme and also URS since the beginning of the scheme. I am up to something like – I think now 400 EDRP cases and my current rhythm is about a hundred a year right now. Default cases from the forum. So, I may have an American accent – I am not American – and I live in Switzerland and I think there are two different issues. One is if you look at the published list of panelists it's clear that there are more people from the U.S. than other countries but all of the lists are very well balanced. They are available on the website and the other interesting thing would be to look at the actual cases. I realize it's a little bit difficult to get cases by arbitrators but I think you will find that's considerably more balanced. I don't think it's true that these days the cases are all done by the U.S. I don't (Brian) if – obviously you can't comment officially but maybe you have some anecdote data on that.

(Brian Beckham): Thank you (Richard). Brian Beckham for the record. Of course, this is a discussion about the URS providers but frankly the comment couldn't be further from the truth when it comes to WIPO's provider list for the URDP panelists. We have talents from over 65 countries so again this is focused on the URS but as a concern with the EDRP and WIPO it's not accurate remotely. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: I am going to allow Martin to respond and then I see Kristine Dorrain has her hand up and of course she was counseled at ANF so I'm sure she has some insights on this. Martin go ahead.

Martin Sutton: Yes, I didn't mean just U.S. based (unintelligible). Europe and (unintelligible) these two we pass a sort of diversity when it comes to region but my words were focusing on Latin American cases – I do look over the arbitrators and the results I could use that sort of data and if you see how many cases are being actually from Latin America being resolved by a U.S. arbitrator – and again – I'm not saying – I'm not state a fact here, it's just a question. If we don't have enough diversity in the judiciary system of this maybe we have an unnatural bias we should be taking care of – maybe not. Just a question.

Philip Corwin: Martin let me ask you... I'm sure that arbitration is used in Latin America – I would think it's used for commercial disputes around the world – do you have any idea of why no arbitration body in Latin America has ever applied to be a UDRP or URS provider?

Martin Sutton: Yes, I understand there has been a few groups interested in actually developing them – maybe their (unintelligible) are in suspension or ongoing but they just didn't find enough interest of funding's and – I know people that tried – I don't know the specifics of why they didn't succeed or why they didn't continue with the projects.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Kristine Dorrain was next and then Maxim had a comment. Kristine Dorrain.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. I just wanted to mention that on (unintelligible) if you look at the panelists list for URS there are 42 different panelists. They are from all over the world and what I – I was at the forum I designed fair online case management system and at that time I don't know if it's still true now but at that time cases were auto rotated to all the panelists for URS – which meant that no one panelist got – and there was some batching because they go

such low fees – but with the auto rotation it was like two or three cases each and then it would run through. So, the theory was it shouldn't have given any particular person prejudice. That was the design of the URS system at least for (unintelligible). I don't know if they are still doing that and I don't know what the other providers are doing. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Thanks Kristine. Through the actual preface we can have full authority to look into that as we review the activities of the providers. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, we as a registry – we investigated possibility of creation independent legal party – which would potentially take care of URS or UDRP as an applicant and completely and if (unintelligible) through the hoops as an acting provider of the services and we came to the conclusion that URS actually – we found no way to make this activity sustainable from financial point of view. Due to lack of interest and due to the cost of answering the markets. So, it could be the reason for the lack of providers in other parts of the world. Thanks. Just a note.

Philip Corwin: Kristine, were you with NF when it started with URS? I assume you – you've looked at it and the fee schedule and decided you could provide or at least break even a small profit bases that you are not offering it a loss? Would that be a correct assumption? When you were there?

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. No, when we were there it was essentially considered to be break even at that time because we figured that it was a service that we were offering to the few people that were using UDRP. So, the point is that the difference between the URS and UDRP at that time would encourage people who wanted to use the UDRP to keep filing with us. So that we wouldn't lose that revenue – so it was customer neutral at the time. I don't know if they've made changes since then. Then that would change that model.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thanks for that and of course with the UDRP the fee is higher but there's substantially more work involved usually. And Maxim had a follow up.

Maxim Alzoba: Small additional note. One of the other reasons was low cost of litigation for us. For example: the price of UDRP – I mean average price – is comparable to litigation up to high court in our jurisdiction. I mean if the person decides to use lawyers not from capital and it's comparable and it's the reason – because the courts – they have high power I'd say for the same cost. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Thanks, and then (Mr. Hill) had his hand up.

(Richard Hill): Yes, (Richard Hill) yes, I wanted to reinforce what Kristine said from the point of view of an arbitrator. For me it's also kind of not exactly a loss leader but somewhere I don't find those URS cases particularly interesting but I figure you know you have to be on that list and show that you are doing a little bit of not quite pro bono work but pretty close to it. But since we are discussing questions here – that's something that you might want to think about – you know – what is the – kind of the financial model for the URS? UDRP is clearly viable both for the arbitrators and the centers. It's not clear that's the case for the URS so maybe you want to think about that and see how that could be addressed. And it's not necessarily raise the fees, right? It could be some kind of like we have a lot of consumer arbitration schemes – some kind of subsidy. So, somebody would subsidize the scheme so that people have quick access to justice or something like that.

Philip Corwin: Thanks (Richard). And I just wanted to note we have a comment on the chat from Ivett Paulovics stating there's no requirement that panelists shall be lawyers. We will be of course looking at the requirements in the applicant guide book and the MOU. I don't remember if there is a requirement for attorney – I do remember there's a requirement for expertise and intellectual property and we'd want certainly panelists to be expert enough to decide whether any given case meets the eye or burden of proof. So, we've got 20

minutes left in this session. Do we have further comments on slide four and if not, we can move onto slide five and then open things up more generally. So, why don't we go to slide five then.

(Mary): Thank you Phil. This is (Mary) from staff again and I will note in respect of some of the comments and going back to the presentation on Saturday that there is a requirement that the URS panelists be certified in URS proceedings and have demonstrable relative expertise. So, not limited to being a practicing lawyer. And on top of that we do have two of the providers who have representatives who are members of our working group. So, hopefully if we do require some additional information we can rely on them for that input. So, if we move onto the last slide where we have listed the URS specific questions and mostly again these are questions relating to the providers and their services – one is about if providers are exceeding the scope or their authority in any of the procedures being adopted. Secondly, are there any remedies that exist or should they exist to allow questions about new policies from the providers on URS? How can they be expeditiously and fairly created and the note here is that the same question was also asked relating to the Trademark Clearing House and the UDRP. Thirdly, our providers training – both complainants and respondents as well as the communities and representatives fairly and equally in the procedures and finally, a question about where the ICANN is reaching our properly and sufficiently to the multi-state holder community in terms of the evaluation of these procedures and whether that process is open and transparent.

Philip Corwin: The chair has some quick comments. I think the first question I would encourage the sub team when it's appointed – when the volunteers join it to consider bifurcating this question. I think the first part would be whether would be whether the providers are – you know administering the URS in a manner that's consistent with the requirements and the guide book and the MOU and the second would be whether there are supplemental rules which are supposed to be administrative rules are in any way inconsistent with those provisions and we certainly will look into or at least this chair will

encourage the working group to look into the relationship between ICANN and the providers when we get more into the weeds on this. That's all I have to say now. Are there other comments on these questions? Noting that question three is the one that was raised by several people about whether we finally got to it on slide five about whether the providers are doing a good job educating complainants and responding about the URS procedure and policy. Come folks...this is your chance to weigh in. Yes. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi Kristine. Anybody in the room – do you understand question number 4? I have no idea what this means. Is I can be reaching out properly and sufficiently to the multi-stake holder community when such procedures – I assume that's referring to the bullet point above which is the URS procedure – are being evaluated by ICANN at the providers request. What procedures are evaluated by ICANN at the request of the providers? I have no idea what that means. Anybody.

Philip Corwin: Personal observation from a co-chair. I agree that this question either needs to be discarded or radically revised because it implies that I can as a pro-active duty to reach out to the – I'm not sure whether it's talking about ICANN the organization or ICANN the multi-stake holder community under a GNS charter is conducting this RPM review. So, we are reaching out to all members of the community to provide us with input on how the URS is doing. But, if it's talking about us, we're doing it. If it's talking about ICANN organization I'm not sure it's their job – and I don't know of any case where providers are asking – I can't evaluate the procedures that the providers are supposed to be falling in the first place. And certainly, our process here is about as open and transparent as you can get. Susan did you have a further comment?

Susan Payne: Yes, I was just going to comment. I'll talk because a review will help you. This one appears to be going to the – How does a PDP get conducted and what are the processes of a PDP – which is not a review of the RPM's. Quite far from the fact that if it means what you are interpreting it to mean – we're doing it – but if it's something about how does the PDP process operator get

input from the multi-stake holder community – that is not a question for this RPM PDP working group to be asking or answering. I mean that is a question that goes to the heart of PDP process.

Philip Corwin: Yes, and I would further note that we have more than 150 members of this working group and almost 100 observers and we welcome new participants in either status at any time so it's a very open process in terms of being open to participation by anyone with an interest in this subject. So, that last question is clearly one that sub team has to consider about whether it's going to be kept in any form or simply go into the circle file. Other comments on any of these questions? (Mr. Hill)?

(Richard Hill): (Richard Hill). Yes, I wonder if you'd – could (unintelligible) fit into your terms of reference but if not here then when you do the EDRP review. A more general question which is whether there should be some kind of alternative to the URS – a summary procedure in the UDRP. In the UK and (unintelligible) that's what they have. You can ask for a summary judgement and then basically it's not motivated and obviously the fee is lower. I am speaking against my own interest as an arbitrator, but in the interest of the community – and there is a scheme that used to be used in certain Swiss compounds before they unified the code of (unintelligible) procedure. Which perhaps also could be considered selling certain compounds you got the operative part and if you were satisfied that was it. And if you wanted to appeal then you ask for the reasoning, but then you paid extra. So, basically you had the option of deciding whether or not you want the fully reasoned decision and then you pay more and otherwise it's quite a bit cheaper because your just satisfied with the decision.

Philip Corwin: The name of that procedure was brought up in another meeting the other day and it's already been called to the attention of the working group as something they want to look at as – well actually it was a different working group that it was brought up in but it's out there and there's no reason to

working groups can't look at it to see if it has useful precedent value. Brian Beckham, please.

Brian Beckham: Thanks Phil. Brian Beckham for the record. I just wanted to add to (Richards) comment. It may be relevant for this group to consider. In the nominate system as we understand – that this be resolution system while as (Richard) mentioned it has a lower fee structure is subsidized by the registry – a number of other CCTLD's apply this model. So, that may be something that this working group would like to look into.

Philip Corwin: Thanks Brian and I just wanted to note that because of the organization of this working group into phase one and phase two, I think it has to be done this way because trying to review the new TLD RPM's in the UDRP simultaneously would be extremely difficult if not a logistical nightmare. But, we have a process here where we're reviewing the URS and seeing if any adjustments should be recommended as a RPM available for UTLD's. Then, at the end of our process we are going to take up the overarching question of whether the URS or any of the other new TLD RPM's should be recommended to become consensus policy that is applicable to legacy TLD's and that would be in whatever form we've – if we've recommended modification type – presumably it would be in that form – though it's not my decision, it the sub – it's the working groups decision. And then, whatever we do with the URS and phase one this proposal and I'd invite any comment from Brian because I think this is something he has talked about sometimes – about whether there should be some expedited form of the UDRP available and then if we – if that's taken up and if there was ever and affirmative decision to that in phase two of the work I guess we'd have to ask the question if we're going that way – and I'm not saying we will go that way – it's just a topic that could be addressed in phase two – whether we still need a URS. So, so, that's just kind of the nature of the beast of the process we are following and I didn't – I'm not in any way taking a position on any of those issues. Just pointing out that the process kind of dictates the way we are going to go forward on this. So, I don't see any hands up in the chat room – I

don't see any hands up in the room – physical room for comments on this. How many more slides were there – in the more general questions. Two, we have nine minutes left. Let me take a show of hands – how many – here are your options: Option one we wrap it up here and you get nine minutes back of your life, to enjoy the beautiful weather in Abu Dhabi and the sunshine and sauna affect and number two we could quickly review the Charter Questions and if people want to stay and make any comments – we can stay an extra few minutes and have some initial comments on that. So, option one, we end now. If you are in favor if that please raise your hand in the physical room and we can also – Marie has a hand up but I think it's not to express a view on this question.

(Mary): This is (Mary) from staff and staff has no views on this question but I did want to point out that there is a comment from Rubens Kuhl in the chat and who it basically saying that there is no Charter Questions currently regarding the provider registry connection which from a registry point of view is the main implementation for the URS. If URS rules become attractive to complainants these problems will become clearer so the URS is kept and turned more useful that implementation needs to raise in reliability as well.

Philip Corwin: Well, thank you for that comment Rubens Kuhl and I'm intrigued by it. I'm not sure I fully understand it but we welcome further input. But Susan and Kristine did you have comments on this?

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, I think Susan was asking for an interpretation of the question. So, the provider registry connection is during the UDRP the registrar puts on the lock and transfers the domain name. Under URS the registry operator is required to suspend the domain name, however registry operators do not control the DNS and so it's really complicated for a registry operator – especially now that I am one – to really learn how this works. When the STI and the IRT were doing this – there wasn't a whole lot of thought back then as to how this sort of back end technical flipping switched part worked and so this is not a very smooth technical implementation. There's not good way for a registry

operator to suspend a domain name and in most cases registry operators actually work with the registrar to kind of make stuff happen. It's really convoluted and it is something to control. The second thing and I will tag onto Rubens point is that the URS also has a provision that basically instructs the provider to order the registry to tell the – to prevent changes from being made to the website itself – which not only can a registrar not prevent changes to the website but a registry cannot prevent changes to website either. So, at the moment that the respondent defaults the URS says, "Notify the registry operator that you can't make changes". And there is no way to prevent that. So, there's two sort of implementation flaws in the URS that have just been sort of worked around until now. I think that is what Rubens is referring to.

Philip Corwin: I want to thank Rubens for raising this issue. I was not aware that this – the URS departed from UDRP practice in this regard and I have certainly have no idea why that occurred in leading up to the creation of the URS and I would certainly encourage – let's keep this on the record. I think that's certainly an issue. If it's creating a very difficult technical issue to actually technical implement the policy. I would think that would be something the sub team should develop a question – a focus question on.

Are there any other comments on that? I'm going to – we have four minutes left – unless the people really want to stay a real long time I'm going to suggest we continue this discussion and continue onto the remaining slides at our next meeting of this working group – because I don't think within four minutes we can possibly – we would just be rushing though reading them and then we'd be asking people to stay and not go to other sessions they need to go to have any intelligent discussion of them. So, I do think it's been a useful session today. I hope you have all found it to be useful in this initial review of the Charter Questions. We've reviewed all the questions directly focused on the URS. We haven't reached the one that are more overarching questions for the URS and other RPM's but I think we've made a very good start and can these – I see a question from George. George, I see your question – if you click on the upper right corner let's keep this here. You can save the

slides right now to your computer. So, we can both – anyone participating right now can immediately save them to your laptop or desktop and review them at your leisure and I'd also ask staff, (Mary) and (Julie) can we make sure that following this session that the slides are sent out to all members of the working group so they can all see what we've been discussing at this session and what we will be picking up on in future calls of the working group.

(Mary): This is (Mary) from staff. We will do that Phil. I think what we'll – I'll plan is to send – upload all of the slides and materials that were used for this week to the working group Wiki as well and we'll actually send a consolidated note to the working group with the notes and the link for all the four sessions because we thought that would make it easier for everyone instead of for scattered emails, but we will certainly do that.

Philip Corwin: Well, thank you and I want to thank all the usual and unusual suspects for participating in this meeting and wish you the – hope you get good results in the rest of this meeting, which ends this evening and wishing all of those here and in Abu Dhabi safe travel home because many of us came from quite far away to get here and have a long way to travel home. So, thank you and I think we can stop the recording now.

END