
ICANN Transcription

Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms RPMs in all gTLD PDP WG

Wednesday, 05 December 2018 at 1700 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms RPMs in all gTLD PDP WG call on the Wednesday, 05 December 2018 at 17:00 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:

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-05dec18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p2kimzq8o3u/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/uwHuBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

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

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you. Well, welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all. Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs PDP Working Group call on the 5th of December, 2018.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now?

REBECCA TUSHNET: Rebecca Tushnet, audio only.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you, Rebecca. We have noted that. As a reminder to all participants, if you would please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll hand the meeting over to Kathy Kleiman. Please begin.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Hi, all. Thanks for joining us in our still fairly new time eastern time, and we have now 15 participants, which is great, and hopefully more to come. Let me ask first for our usual statements of interest. Okay, hearing none, what I'm going to do is talk a little bit about the agenda today and an overview of why we're doing it this way, and then staff will be presenting some documents that they spent an enormous amount of time on.

But what I want to do is take you back in time to January 2018 when we launched our request for proposal for sunrise and trademark claim surveys. That's when we halted our work on the trademark clearinghouse as we waited for data and began our work on the uniform rapid suspension.

A few teams continued, like the data subteam working with the Analysis Group, but most of us halted our work on trademark claims, sunrise, and the trademark clearinghouse itself and waited for this data. So now, we need to go back, and the question is, how do we go back to the work that we did a year ago and two years ago?

Staff has been doing a lot of work and co-chairs have been providing input to try to find these summaries that help bring us back in time and help us remember our final list of revised questions for sunrise, our final list of revised questions for trademark claim, and what data we had collected along the way.

The not too surprising conclusion from all this is at the end of the meeting, we're going to be asking of are volunteers to join the trademark claim subteam as well as the sunrise period subteam. And that's based on our discussion last week and support for that last week, and also the suggestion that we segment what would have been a third working group, which would have been the trademark claims, kind of looking at the provider, looking at the structure, looking at the rules.

We did a lot of work on that. in fact, even more work in the past. We have some draft proposals, we had kind of pushed that one particularly forward before we broke to work on URS. That, we're going to hold. We're not dividing not a subteam for that, that will follow the work of the subteams on trademark claims and sunrise, because the suggestion was made last week and the leadership team, the co-chairs agreed, that there may be suggestion coming in from Trademark Claims and Sunrise subteams that impact the structure of the trademark clearinghouse, so if we do it all in parallel, we may miss that or have to double back.

So again, right now we're diving up into trademark claims and sunrise, but we will come back to trademark clearinghouse structure. So staff has done an enormous amount of work, and I'll give you an overview of the agenda items, because they're kind of our guide to diving back into our work of a year ago.

Actually, first, the draft RPM timeline is going to take us out to the future. What does our work look like going forward? The status of TMCH and related RPM discussions is going to take us backwards. This is a timeline on various subjects, including the TMCH data, including trademark claims and sunrise, and this will take us back to show us where we were, what our timeline was, what we worked through and what are the links to the documents and the data that we collected.

Then the table – we have two tables. The tables of final agreed sunrise charter questions, and the table of final agreed trademark claims charter questions lay out where we stopped. We had worked extensively on these revised charter questions, and then this is our starting point for now, is what these charter questions are. And staff has done an awesome job of putting together some of the data – or most of the data or all of the data perhaps – that we collected on this that we'll be referring to.

And these summary tables which we'll get to after we look at the timelines, they're kind of the format for what we start filling in in the two subteams to be created. And then of course, the new data, the trademark sunrise and trademark claim survey results tool. And we'll talk about that more extensively when we get there, but staff has really tried to massage the data, not change it but put it in a form that's easily usable for us, which I totally appreciate.

So that's the overview as, again, we're trying to dive back in time. But first, I think staff is going to take us forward in time to look at the timeline. Let me pause and see if there are any questions. And as we review these tables, of course, you have questions, if you think there's more that needs to be there, let us know. And the

documents will of course be open for the next few days. George, go ahead, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Oh, yeah. I have several concerns about the draft timeline, so I don't know if now is the right time to raise them, or should I wait until people scroll down to the December and January parts of that document that's onscreen right now? Were you planning to review that first?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes, we're going to review that first. Staff – I'll let Julie respond, but George, thank you for asking. I would think it's more appropriate to do it after staff present. I was just giving an overview. Mostly, it's going to be staff today walking us through these documents and providing an overview.

So perhaps – and looks like Susan has questions too, so let me turn over to Julie, but let's hold the questions until after that presentation of the document.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Okay.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you. Julie, go ahead, please.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Kathy. And yes, staff's suggestion is that perhaps once we run through the timeline, then maybe that will help with some questions that people have. But at any rate, of course, we will allow time for questions.

So this timeline, the last time you would have seen the timeline, it would have been updated in August of 2018. So now we have an update that we've just done as of December 3rd. And we'll just note again before we dive into this that this, again, is what we would consider a best-case scenario, plausible but aggressive. But staff does think – and it captures as well, this reflects the more realistic estimation of the work that will be required to complete phase one of the PDP.

We will note that – and staff when presenting this to the co-chairs also noted that – it's still aggressive, and if there is any slippage, then that certainly can change. And that would especially be true when we get to the point – and we'll show you here shortly – if we do get a voluminous number of comments to the initial report, there's probably going to need to be more time to analyze those comments. Right now, we have a fairly short timeframe for analysis of the comments that may not actually be sufficient.

I'm not going to go through all of where we've been, but just quickly, you can see that looking at August, we have the development of the surveys and the testing of the surveys, and then we have the surveys going out, and if you're just scrolling, I'm right in September, October timeframe. It's been unsynced, so you're welcome to go ahead and go through it.

But bringing us from August through the fall, the sunrise and claim surveys went out, they came back, we had ICANN 63 where we finished up on the URS, and then we had a refresher on the 14th of November on the TMCH technical and operational features, and then we had Analysis Group on the 28th of November running through the responses to the survey and bringing us to today where we're going to discuss the formation, scope and role of sunrise and claims subteams and their revised phase one timeline.

So as we move ahead, the next anticipated steps are for, as Kathy said, two subteams to be developed, sunrise and claim subteams to begin analysis of the survey results against the refined charter questions, the final refined questions, and we are anticipating three meetings for that work. And we'll just note we're showing the number of meetings and showing in blue you'll note where we've indicated that the subteams are completing their work, the subteams are anticipated to meet simultaneously using this time slot, although if subteams wish to choose a different time slot, they can while noting that we would have to avoid conflicts with other groups.

This is, we think, an aggressive schedule for the analysis of the survey results, that is in three meetings, brings us into early January, then we begin the analysis of previous collected data, and some of that actually had already been looked at by the working group, so we're anticipating that might go a little bit more quickly in two meetings. then we're looking at the beginning of development of preliminary phase recommendations, again in a subteam, and also, by January 23rd is where I'm looking right

now, there'll be a deadline for individual proposals to be submitted to subteams, at least that is as suggested.

Moving from January 23rd, we had two meetings to do the preliminary development, development of preliminary phase one recommendations. Again, this is quite aggressive, and we note here that we might need longer meetings or additional meetings to finish this work. And then beginning on the 6th of February, we have subteams looking at individual proposals, and two meetings for that. And again, that may require longer or additional meetings. That goes through the 13th of February, the 20th of February.

We have done the subteams presenting the recommended potential sunrise and claims policy proposals and operational fixes to the working group for discussion, and the working group discussing those on the 27th of February, followed by working sessions at ICANN 64 to finalize the sunrise and claims recommendations.

And then we have either the working group or subteams are going through the open TMCH issues, and we've got two meetings for that. And then moving to, on April 8th, the working group discussing potential TMCH recommendations at two meetings. And then by 22nd April, the working group should begin a review of all potential phase one recommendations as well as remaining issues. We have two meetings for that. Again, that's quite aggressive.

And then we have staff circulating an initial report as of May 6th. The working group should begin a review of this report, and to finalize that initial report by 27th of May. Again, a very aggressive

schedule. We're noting the possible need for longer or more meetings. And then publishing the initial report for public comment on June 3rd and beginning a mandatory minimum 40-day public comment period. Note that this timetable does not take into consideration an extension of that time period. That of course would change the schedule.

And in the interim time while comments are coming in, we're suggesting preparation for phase two could begin and also continue at ICANN 65. And then in July, we have four meetings to review public comments. That is an extremely aggressive schedule, and if we do get a voluminous number of public comments, that could definitely change.

And then we have the subteam presenting results to the full working group of that analysis and the working group discussing recommendations. That's in August. And then the formal consensus call, August 19th, reviewing any substantive changes in August and into September with finalizing the substantive changes in the final report on the 9th of September and signing off on the final report on the 16th of September.

And I'll just note in that chat, as Mary says, "To highlight Julie's point, this is a best-case scenario that is nevertheless very aggressive." It does not take into account further slippage or unknown factors unknown at present, and as just noted, it does not take into account how many public comments we have and how much time we will need to analyze and then the number of preliminary proposals that the working group would decide on to put into the initial report.

So I'm going to stop there and turn things back over to you, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great, Julie, thank you, and thank you everyone who worked on this table. Now it's open for questions. George, I think you're first. Go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Thanks, Kathy. I had three main concerns. If we look at the fourth column of this table, [inaudible] the subteams are going to have simultaneous meetings, which is something I disagree with, because in particular last week, we discussed the fact that membership of the subteams would be open to everybody and people could participate in both subteams. That was one of the highlights of last week's call.

However, having the meetings be simultaneous means that it prevents active and meaningful participation in bot subteams, which severely disadvantages especially the smaller participants that don't have multiple employees participating in this working group. So I think the solution to that would be to either have the meetings be non-overlapping, being on different dates, and we're helped by that because ICANN published a consolidated timetable, which I posted a link to in the chat room, which shows that there's lots of dates that were not being scheduled.

And the alternative solution would be to take advantage of the fact that we already have been using an APAC-friendly timeslot and a regular timeslot, i.e. the 17:00 UTC time, 12:00 noon eastern time, and the 8:00 AM eastern time slots. So the to her alternative then

would be to have one subteam meet at 8:00 AM eastern time and the other subteam meet at 12:00 noon eastern time and then just flip back and forth week to week so that if the claims group meets at 8:00 one week, they would meet at 12:00 noon eastern time the second week. So that would ensure that participants can be in both subteams and not be disadvantaged.

The second concern I had was on the actual time slot in the third column, it says on January 2nd, 2019 that that was the date where the submission period for individual proposals would begin, and then on January 23rd, the individuals proposals would be submitted – [inaudible] would end for submissions on January 23rd. That made no sense to me, because the subteams are still analyzing all of the data until the 23rd, and so you're having the proposals be submitted before the complete analysis of the data has taken place. So that's putting the cart before the horse, so obviously, you'd want to have complete analysis of the data first and then develop recommendations based on that analysis. So I think those need to be shifted in terms of the dates.

And a third –

KATHY KLEIMAN: George, can we stop at two? Just because it's opening up questions. Can we just stop there? Because I'll lose track.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Okay. Yeah. [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Can you come back in the queue for the third point? Because let me respond and open this up to the working group. Is that okay? Okay. And then Susan, you're definitely in the queue, and we'll consider George back in the queue. But I want to open this up to a larger discussion as well, I'd love to know what other people think because this is – we're really trying to do –

Last week, we've heard several things. One was the desire to go into subteams for trademark claims and sunrise. There was a suggestion of putting them in different timeslots, but in general, we've been most successful when we worked in parallel, and this is how the URS did it. Subteams held additional meetings occasionally, but in general, we work in parallel. This is a slot that is reserved by staff, by members, and we worked in parallel in this slot and it worked really well.

What we did hear also was another suggestion, and you'll see it incorporated in January 9th and then someplace else, is that the subteams brief the full working group. In this case, it says brief working group plenary meeting to receive subteam progress report.

So the idea was to keep the whole working group informed over the what the subteams were doing. So that was kind of the suggestion that the co-chairs went with and incorporated into the schedule. Would love to know what other people think. And then in terms of individual proposals, also again experimenting with somewhat of a new idea, but it came up last week in the meeting, which is that it would be useful to have the subteams [instead of] the individual proposals, because the subteams will be up to date on the data, they'll be up to date on the issues.

So not for the subteams to vote the individual proposals up and down but to provide input and analysis would be really useful, and they'll be kind of at a perfect point in their work to do that. So the hope was that the briefings of the full working group would then help the individuals prepare their proposals and that we wouldn't wait until the end of the subteams.

Again, this is something that came up last week. So would love to know what people think. We'll go into Susan and then back to George. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Kathy, yeah, it's not in relation to the points George was - however, so I don't know if you want people to weigh in on that point first.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

TO George's two points, I would love that just to keep those two threads and then come back to your point and into George's initial point three. Thank you. Thanks. So I'm going to look at the chat room. So Brian says that, as he said on our prep calls which he did, the updates are a great idea, and we're not sure, but whoever's idea it was is free to take credit in the chat.

There is nothing to prevent a subteam from picking a separate time and date, as staff noted, but that would have to be a time and date not conflicted, and not everything may be on the calendar you posted. Right. And I should note that people who are involved in SubPro – and there are people here - there are three subteams' meetings there, so that's really busy, the SubPro working group.

And then George mentions that, again, our Asia Pacific time at 8:00 AM eastern is still available. So Zak says, "Would it be possible to participate in more than one subgroup if the subteams met at the same time?" No. The idea, Zak, is that we would do what we did last time with the URS providers and documents and practitioners subteam. The vision is that we divvy up and do this in parallel and then have our peers kind of report back to us about what they're thinking, but that we only take on basically, in this case, half the work.

And Brian, "To George, could you expand on why you think the subteam scope expanded? They were there to propose operational fixes and they did not eclipse the [ability.]" It looks like a different issue. So let me ask. Again, the idea that the leadership team, the co-chairs and staff are positing, is that we divide into sunrise and claim subteams, they work in parallel, probably in the slot that we have now, which everyone has on their schedules, and they report back to the subteam, to the full working group, and then they receive towards the end of their schedules, which is in January, they receive additional proposals from individuals who might have things to add.

Zak, it looks like you're commenting on this, so go ahead, please.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thank you. So, what I'm concerned about is that if we're only able to participate in one subgroup, would that kind of encourage people who aren't in one subgroup to be compelled to make personal proposals down the road? In other words, if people were actually able to voice and express their proposals within the

subgroup and they're dealt with either by way of support or nonsupport within the context of the subgroups, that could, in my view, eliminate people having to make proposals outside of the context of the subgroup. So it's something to consider.

But again, after this call, regardless of the way it works, I'm still going for lunch, for sushi lunch, so it's not a huge issue for me.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Hold on a second, Zak. So are you saying you support being able to be part of two different subgroups? Because what we were thinking is that that just is kind of a ridiculous – a lot of work to ask of somebody. So divvying it up the way we did with the URS might make sense.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

I mean the subgroups notion is attractive to me because it does divide up the work, and by not allowing people to join two subgroups, it makes the subgroups smaller and arguably more – but on the other hand, there's people that have contributions to make to both subgroups, so if there's no effective way for them doing that, then it seems to me that the effectiveness of the subgroups is somewhat depleted, because people are going to have to make individual proposals outside of the context of the subgroup. So I see upsides and downsides to it.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Great. Thank you. Phil, go ahead, please.

PHILLIP CORWIN:

Yeah, thanks. The co-chairs in discussing this, I think you can see no one's happy that we're looking at going into past the middle of next year on wrapping up phase one, but that's the reality of the work remaining. And the prior timeline we all acknowledged was not realistic, the one that envisioned everything being done by the full working group.

So based on what we felt was that there was a successful outcome for division of labor on the URS subteams, we decided it would be more efficient and would bring the finish line a little bit closer for these two RPMs, not the underlying trademark clearinghouse they're based in. We divided up the work between two subteams.

Your question was, can someone be on two subteams if they're meeting simultaneously? Well that's a physical impossibility. I would note that [your council,] the ICA, the ICA has other board members and other members on this working group, so certainly, ICA – not you personally – could have a presence on more than one subteam.

I don't think we ever said no one can be on – can only be on one subteam, but we really need to check with staff whether there's a practical way for the subteams to meet at different times. If there is and if someone wants to serve on more than one and do that level of work, that would be fine.

And we're thinking about two significant changes from the way the URS subteams where one would be this regular reporting, let's

say if the subteams meet on Wednesday, we would want them to deliver a short summary report to the full working group by close of business Friday on what they discussed and what they concluded at that Wednesday meeting.

So we keep the full working group fully informed, and we give them some number of weeks for individuals to submit their own proposals. With certainly URS, the subteam tended to report out consensus data-based recommendations for operational and policy change and then individuals had other ideas and submitted those.

And all of this, whatever the subteams do do both in recommending consensus recommendations and giving us some analysis of an individual's recommendations, all that comes back to the full working group. Nothing is final in terms of, "Oh, it's going to be put out for public comment in the initial report" until the full working group gets a chance to discuss and decide on the subteam output.

So I'll stop there, but I hope that explains our thinking a bit more and how we're hoping this will work. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you, Phil. And Phil, of course, reports so well the discussions that the co-chairs have been having with staff. It looks like Julie would like to comment on this. And I just want to say I think Christine may have kind of the golden solution. Run the subteams in parallel and people can decide to join one or more. Julie, go ahead, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Kathy. Just one note on Christine's suggestion, I think she says she supports the parallel work but not calls scheduled on top of one another. So I think not calls scheduled at the same time. So staff will note that certainly, we could have two subteams meeting at different times but meeting in parallel, meaning meeting in the same week, and use the times that we already have, the timeslots we have that are nonconflicted, which is the 13:00 UTC and 17:00 UTC times on Wednesdays.

We did also have a time, I think 17:00, scheduled on Fridays that we were using for the data subteam's work, but that would make the reporting out on Friday to the full working group somewhat problematic. So yes, we could use the already agreed upon slots. The only caveat to that is we would need to have enough participation. So we'd have to make sure that enough people could meet at those times, and we might just have to see how that works.

Staff notes that in the SubPro PDP working group, there are subgroups that are meeting, and sometimes those have been a challenge in getting enough participation. So if we're going to split things that way, we'll have to see how that works. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. And I'm going to note that being a participant in the SubPro working group is hard to track, because they do go back and forth in time. I personally think the best way to keep the vast majority of

people on our working group engaged is to stay with our current time for both subteams, but that's a personal opinion.

So please continue writing things into the working group – I also think that the Friday proposal [inaudible] about the Friday reporting, it could be close of business Monday, not a problem, [inaudible] notes that also in the chat. The idea is just that kind of regular reporting back, even just with the subteams in progress and what they're working on, what they're looking at.

So it looks like we're going to move on to – we're going to look for, again, comments in the chat for where to go with this and how people would like to handle it in their own schedules. [To new issues.] Susan and George. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah. Mic check. Thanks. Yes, it's just a quick one. I need to find the right page on the document now. if we go to June 2019 – and I'm not sure if this is sort of a holdover from some previous discussions of this timeline, but on the 3rd of June, we have the initial report, so phase one being published for public comments, and on the 10th, it's proposed that we should start the preparation for phase two, the UDRP refresher, then we'll have a gap of no meeting for I think [inaudible] a week, and then we'll go into the ICANN meeting. What I will be doing, I'm assuming a little bit of work on phase two. That's what it refers to.

Then we have the gap of a week when we come back from the ICANN meeting, and then we go into reviewing the public comments on the initial report on phase one. And it just seems to

me to be completely pointless, frankly, to start work on UDRP, to start work on phase two, in the middle of that period between publishing the initial report and then going back and spending months reviewing the comments and finalizing the phase one report.

For one thing, I think by the time we've got the initial report out, I imagine that many of us will be [inaudible] break, but also, we'll start work and then we'll pause it again for months. It seems to me to make no real sense. And I'm not sure what the thinking was, but I'm hoping that it's sort of inadvertent rather than an actual belief that we should start phase two before we finished phase one.

The other point I wanted to make is that, of course, the URS and UDRP or obviously different, but we all know, and particularly in relation to the individual proposals, there's overlap. Some of the individual proposals on the URS are referencing the UDRP as well, it also seems to me to be crazy to start thinking about the UDRP until we've actually reviewed the comments on the URS, because they have some interrelation.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Susan, thank you. I can see what you're thinking, it's completely mindboggling to think about going to phase two and then coming back to phase one. The thinking here was that we didn't want to waste any time, and the publication of our initial comments on June 3rd does lead us directly into the next ICANN meeting, wherever ICANN 65 is. And I haven't looked that up. So I think the idea was to use the face-to-face meetings to begin to lay the groundwork for phase two.

But staff is taking notes. We should definitely take this back to the leadership team and try to figure out whether this makes sense. Events may overtake us in that it may take a little longer to review some of the initial comments. But kind of the best use of working group time. So what I'm going to do is table this for a little bit, because you raise an awesome point, and we will take it back to the leadership team.

Julie, is that a new hand or an old hand?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Kathy, that was just to note a couple of the points that [I still have from staff that staff had put in,] that really, this is a kind of placeholder. It's up to the working group whether or not you want to throw in a little bit of work on UDRP or to take a break. It's really there as a placeholder and it's up to the working group to decide. Or it may be that the timeline slips and we may not have a need for that.

And just another note too [inaudible] folks that ICANN 65 is the policy forum so it's a much shorter meeting, so we won't have the usual several session that we have at the longer meetings. It might be more just one session. So just noting that as well. Thank you very much.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Great. Thank you, Julie, noting that Phil says that the UDRP discussion could be on how to structure phase two rather than starting actual work, kind of organizational rather than substantive.

So important things to think about. George, go ahead, please.
New point, I think.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. Just to comment on the prior points that were raised responding to my first concerns. I guess the issue of simultaneous meetings has been kind of resolved if they won't be overlapping, so people can participate in both. And it's still unclear to me about the individual proposals being submitted before the full analysis of the data. That seems to – that still doesn't make sense to me, so seems that those should shift.

But my third point was how in this phase of our work, we seem to be deviating from what we did for the URS in terms of the individual proposals. Here, it seems that the subteams are being empowered to go through all the individual proposals rather than having it be presented to the plenary, to the entire working group. And that seems to be giving a lot of power to the subteams, and it's unclear that that'll become a mechanism to block individual proposals from being presented in the initial report for public comment. So that's something of concern to me, that the plenary isn't being consulted for those individual proposals like it was last time for the URS proposals. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Good point, George, and there is this tension between having the individual proposals presented and shared with kind of these now expert subteams by the time they finish all their work versus the full working group. And this was done, I think, purely from an

efficiency point of view, because we are on this tight timeline and it was thinking that this might both provide more input and insight and background to an individual proposal while still giving individuals the opportunity to present their proposals as well as save us some time with not having the working group deal with all these directly.

But I welcome discussion on this from the working group. What do people think? Do you like the new version or the old version? I see Susan and Brian are in the queue, so let me go to Susan and then Brian. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: I'm going to defer to Brian and I will just follow him if he doesn't cover what I would say.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sure. Sounds great. Brian, please.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Thank you, Susan. Yeah, Kathy and Mary and Julie, you guys all know that I raised a similar concern on some of our prep calls that George had raised, and one idea that I had to possibly address that would be to ask people – because if everyone remembers, we had already done quite a lot of looking at TMCH-related issues before we moved over to the URS. There were proposals, for example, to address some concerns around gaming in sunrises, etc.

So my idea to address that, George, was that we asked people to kind of get their proposals on the table early, not to say they couldn't do that later, but to give people an opportunity to feel that their proposals have been fairly heard by the subteam if we want the subteams to look at those individual proposals. Thanks.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Right. Thank you, Brian. And we've also discussed in the co-chairs' meeting that it is hard to prepare an individual proposal until you know where the subteams are going, because some of the idea of the individual proposal is kind of filling holes or issues that you don't think have been addressed by the subteams, or once you look at all the data, some individuals are saying there's a different way to look at that or perhaps to propose a different operational fix or policy recommendation.

So I see it on both sides, but the way we [proposed it,] we think we'll streamline it a little bit faster. But yes, the individual proposals, I think, would be presented to the subteams, not to the full working group. Question is how people feel about that. Susan, your hand is still raised, so go ahead, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah. Thank you. I feel pretty fine about presenting the individual proposals to the subteam. I think you've made a good point, which is that – or I think [you have] made it, but unlike the URS, when we convened those working groups, we have had a conversation about these other RPMs before we had to pause our work.

So it's not as though we haven't already been talking about sort of these issues. So that would be one of the points. I think we've already done a lot of the background discussion, and I think the notion that individual proposals get surfaced in early stages is a really helpful one.

And indeed, I think it could actually assist in getting a bit more buy-in to those individual proposals, because if you think about the way we handled this in the URS, basically, individual proposals got sort of raised on a call, there was a smattering of discussion. And some of those with a bit more focus and attention paid to them might have actually become more than individual proposals and have gained a degree of support.

So I think it's actually beneficial. But I would also say that generally, I think [inaudible] I personally didn't really anticipate that we were going to have individual proposals in relation to URS. I think we talked originally about starting URS and looking at very much the sort of procedural-type fixes that we could do and that's why we set those three [inaudible].

And my understanding – and clearly, I was wrong or else the plans changed, but I didn't think we were going to get into the detail of some of the things that then eventually surface through the individual proposals, because we talked about trying to streamline the work on the URS and cover the stuff that we could cover quickly, and then moving on to a more detailed discussion in phase two where it seemed appropriate, and yet, at a later point, suddenly, some of those things that perhaps should have been moved into that phase two discussion ended up coming back as individual proposals.

So I think we're handling these trademark claims, sunrise and the TMCH, in a slightly different way. And again, makes far more sense to be trying to deal with it in the subgroup context. Which doesn't mean that that work doesn't all come back to the full working group. It does. But it comes back in the knowledge that there's been a robust and sensible conversation and a degree of agreement has been reached and that we don't, when we come back to the full working group, have to relitigate issues all over again when they've been already given substantial air time in the subteams.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Interesting. Thank you, Susan. And to the URS points, I'll just say that – let me validate what you said, because I don't want to disagree, but in this case, it's a little different with the TMCH because we don't have a phase two of the TMCH. It's not like the kind of interaction depending on how close or how far you see the UDPR and the URS. This is it of the trademark clearinghouse issues, is just phase one. So it closes.

And so to join your idea that the subteams – or the [idea we] were talking about that the subteams would look at individual proposals that go into the subteams, and George's idea that starting a month before the subteams report out is really hard for individuals because you're not seeing, even with updates, a lot of the work of a subteam. It comes down to the final days. We know this, right? We know that that's when the recommendations close, the operational fixes, the draft policy recommendations. There's a lot of work that gets done in those final two weeks when we're facing

a deadline. That's when things really come together and that's when people really hammer things out.

So, is it possible – and I pose this both to the working group but also asking staff to put this for the next leadership, the co-chairs' call – to move the submission period for individual proposals to these two subteams to be later so that they correspond with the closing or close to the closing of the recommendations so that the individual proposers can work off of that final or close to final material.

Let me go to Phil, and then it looks like George's hand is still up so we'll go to George. Phil, go ahead, please.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Yeah. This is a somewhat different approach than we'd used on URS, and we're frankly, as co-chairs, experimenting a bit. We have fairly broad latitude under the working group guidelines to employ subteams under section 2.3 of the guidelines as an efficient means of delegating topics or assignments. It's also quite clear that the members of the subteam report their results to the whole working group for review and approval. So as I said before, nothing's final out of the subteams, they're just providing feedback to the full working group which will make final decisions.

Yeah, I think it makes – I'm [speaking] personally now, I think it makes sense to maybe move that submission time, but I do think it's important – the whole point here was to get some holistic overview of all the proposals relating to either sunrise or claims from the dedicated subteam that's looking intensively at it. So I

think we [ought to] have all individual proposals vetted by the subteam and have them give us some analysis back to the working group with the working group making final decisions on both the subteam consensus recommendation about operational and policy and the individual. The subteam shouldn't be in a position to put an individual proposal over the goal line or kill it in the crib. It's up to the full working group.

And again, it's up to the working group – with URS, we had wide opening for individual proposals. We tried to set some standard for them getting into the initial report. Obviously, it has to be short of consensus because the consensus requirement is only for the final report, but it has to be more than just one or two people in the whole working group thinking something's a good idea.

We kind of abandoned that at the Barcelona meeting, and now everything on URS is going to be in the initial report for public comment. Some people think that's a good idea, some people think that's like throwing spaghetti [at a] wall, and since it all stuck, it all gets commented on. And that's somewhat of a burden on the community to comment on all those things, many of which may never achieve consensus.

But again, there's conflicting objectives and values, and it's up to the working group to decide. But personally, I think this idea of having the subteams vetting the individual proposals and providing some analysis back to the working group, while it's somewhat different from what we did on URS, it makes sense and we can experiment with different approaches and they can inform how the working group tackles the UDRP work in phase two.

We don't have the answers and events, we're just trying to do things that are efficient and set up the same rules for everybody so that they're fair to everybody and everybody knows in advance what the rules are. Thanks.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you, Phil. And for fleshing that out, this is a slightly different approach. One thing that I'm gathering as I listen to you and listen to others is that the individual proposals for trademark claims and sunrise will go through the subteams. Mary Wong seems to agree that the dates can be changed, so she writes, "These were suggested dates to enable the subteams to have time to consider the individual proposals. They can definitely be changed if the working group agrees."

We can also adjust our format a little bit for the presentations of the individual proposals. If we want to, we can allocate some time in the full working group when the subteams report back maybe to allowing the individual to present the proposal and having the subteam chair – which, remember, does not have to be a working group co-chair. Jason Schaeffer was the subteam chair with the practitioner subteam. And here I'll just throw it out, having an individual proposer present so that they have that air time in front of the full working group, short time, and then having the subteam chair respond or comment. So that could be a way to kind of quickly bring us up to speed on individual proposals as well as the subteam recommendations.

George, let me go back to you, and I also see that's Julie has her hand up. So back to George and then Julie. Thanks. George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. This goes back to an earlier point that Brian asked about regarding whether the plenary model could even work better than the subteam model if it becomes almost mandatory for members to participate in both subteams.

If you look at the schedule, the plenary only meets one time in January, January the 9th, and then the next meeting after that is February the 6th. So if you look at the actual dates that work gets done as an entire working group, it's essentially being shunted to the subteams from now until March or whatever with occasional updates to the plenary.

So this goes also to the point that Kathy raised earlier about how people will tend to wait until the last minute to make their individual proposals anyways and not really be following the work of the subteams closely until the very end.

So from a time management point of view, it's kind of slower sometimes to go through it with the entire working group, but because you don't have this duplication of having to communicate back to the entire working group, it can actually be faster because everybody's up to speed week after week instead of trying to digest a month's worth of work in one e-mail and [tending] to ignore that e-mail. So I'm just throwing that out there. I'll go with whichever way people want to go, but I'm not necessarily convinced that the subteams are actually more efficient. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. Thanks, George. I think the decision [on] subteams has been discussed, vetted, made. I just want to note thought that these updates to the full working group which you'll see on the 9th of January and the 6th of February as George has pointed out may not be possible. The idea here was that the subteams were meeting in the regular working group slot and meeting in parallel, and that then we could go into a quick predesignated time, maybe 15 minutes before the end of the working group period, we could go and then convene all together, the two subteams coming together with anybody else who wanted to join us from the working group who wasn't part of the subteams and meet together for a quick update.

If we're meeting at different times, this may not work. So just to put a question mark next to these briefings. The briefings may now have to be in writing if we change the times. So let's go to Julie, and then the queue. Julie, go ahead, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Just very briefly, if the working group decides that the presentation of the individual proposals will not happen until after the subteams have reported back to the working group, it's possible that that will add time to the timeline. We'd have to work that in and see how that would work. But that's just something to consider. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I think in general that we've decided that the individuals will share their proposals with the subteams. What I was doing was just

playing around with an idea of how the results of that evaluation might be shared with the full working group. And I don't think we have to decide that now ,we can decide that as we get closer. Cyntia, please.

CYNTIA KING:

Thank you. Just two quick things. First, I just want to say that this is common practice in business and organizations to split work up between various departments or divisions where folks have expertise and to do deep dives on the material, turn it into recommendations and present to an executive group or a board or whatever. This is common best practice. So it doesn't seem like it should be that difficult for us to implement.

And then secondly, I think that it's really important that we understand how the process is going to work. There are lots of ways that we can make it easier. So for example, the weekly updates would be great. I also think that as the subteams work through each of the proposals, they could do a list of pros and cons that have already been debated in the working group so that folks can see what the majority and minority of opinions were so that they don't have to rehash some of that information over and over.

And then finally, another good way, something [that's fielded] in our subteam, was to have – when it comes time to do the discussion to a broader group, not the subteam but to the broader group, have a person present the pro side, have a person present the con side, and then have questions. That way, you don't have to rehash everything. A person who knows what the pros there, a

person who understands the cons, they present, everybody understands, and then there are questions. I just think that that would make things more quick and allow people with expertise to give the expertise. Thank you very much.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Cynthia, I think you've just given the roadmap to the subteams, pros and cons debate, a majority and minority opinion. If our multi-stakeholder model delivers that in terms of a variety of viewpoints as well as expertise, I think that's a great idea and I hope staff will capture that and put it in light to the materials that go out to the trademark claims and sunrise groups.

It looks like all hands are down, which gives us half an hour to go through the other documents, which staff will lead us through to see what we'll be diving into and what we'll be working on, and what the materials are that have been summarized to help us remember what we have and where we've been to make it easier to go forward faster. Julie, I think I'm handing it back to you. What document are you taking us to?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Kathy. Actually, I'm going to take us to Mary, turn things over to her. Thank you. Mary Wong, please.

MARY WONG:

Thanks, Julie. Hi, everybody. And we do have a few other documents that were circulated along with the agenda by Julie that we want to show you today just to be clear as to what they

are, what purposes they serve, and of course to remind you that they are there for use of the working group and/or the subteams as applicable.

So the next document that you see now in the Adobe Connect room, as the title says, it's basically a summary, and it's a summary of the status of the working group's progress and discussions to date, starting from where the group left off when we completed the initial discussions of the trademark post-delegation dispute resolution policy, I think in late 2016 when we started talking about the trademark clearinghouse or the TMCH structure and operations, and going through to where the Analysis Group then took us to with the survey results.

So essentially, this document covers something like a two-year timeframe from late 2016 to just about a couple of weeks ago. And what we've done is that we've structured it into a few different sections, as you see. One is on the TMCH, another is on sunrise and trademark claims, and then we also added a status summary of previous discussions on what we've come to call the additional marketplace RPMs, and a very brief section at the end on the work of the CCT, or what they call the Competition, Consumer Protection and Consumer Trust Review Team whose final report is now out, as I think we notified you some time ago.

We have done this, like I said, to provide you with a one-place, quick summary of where things stand in the working group in relation to each of these sections and each of these RPMs or discussions. We have not arranged them in any order of priority. They are more or less –except for the CCT stuff at the end – chronological. So what you hopefully get from this document is a

snapshot of all the discussions that took place of when subteams were used and for what purpose, when the subteams presented their reports to the working group, what the working group did with those reports, and in particular, for sunrise and claims, hopefully, you'll also see that the evolution of the discussions within the working group where we started with the list of charter questions that were put in the charter unedited from all prior community suggestions, subteams took those, worked with them, refined them, the working group discussed those subteam proposals as well as how best to collect the data that you thought would be needed to address those final agreed questions. And of course, like I said, I'm highlighting sunrise and claims because part of that data collection exercise became what we did with the Analysis Group, which is the most recent report that you've got.

So the only other thing I'll highlight about this document, Kathy, Julie and everyone, is that at the end of each section, we have tried in a very short "notes and conclusions" paragraph to summarize where based on what has occurred in relation to that particular issue to date, where things stand, and so we hope that that section allows the working group to quickly see where and what you can be picking up on the TMCH, on sunrise and on claims.

So I think that was really all I thought we needed to say about this document, but if there's time, I'm happy to take questions along with Julie and Ariel.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Mary, thank you so much for this presentation and for this extraordinarily important document as well as the notes and conclusions. It's a lot, I think, for everybody to take a look at, so over the weekend [inaudible] to look at it, and Mary, I'm sure – well, let me check if we have any disagreement. If people see as they're reviewing it that they have questions or that they think that something maybe should be added, they should send that to [the] working group, right?

MARY WONG: Hi, Kathy. As with all the documents that staff prepares for the working group, definitely, any questions should be asked, and any clarifications we can provide, we will be happy to do so. And obviously, things are never perfect, so if we got something wrong or left something out or put in the wrong link or something like that, then we welcome people letting us know that, preferably to the mailing list so that's all on the record too.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Fantastic. Thank you, Mary. And everyone should just know that Mary, Julie, Ariel have been deep diving through our Wiki pages and really working hard. It's a tremendous amount of work to put this together, because the co-chairs have seen the evolution of this.

So let me pause, see if anyone has any questions. Otherwise, we will move on to the document we'll be living and breathing for the next few months, the table of final agreed sunrise charter

questions and data collected as well as trademark claims. Okay, back to you, Mary.

JULIE HEDLUND: And actually, just to be confusing, this will be Julie.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Back to you, Julie. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: I pulled up the summary table of the review of agreed sunrise charter questions and data collected, and I've unsynced it for all of you if you want to move it yourself. So what staff envisioned – what staff did here, actually, was if you followed the links in the materials that we've gathered on sunrise and claims, in that summary document, you'll note that we've linked to the discussions that happened in June, July and August of last year where the working group took the questions that were proposed by the sunrise and claims subteams and refined those questions into final refined questions, some of which were used in the DMPM that went to the GNSO council, others that were pulled out to be addressed by the other data that was collected.

So what we've done here is on the left-hand column, you've got that final list of sunrise charter questions, and then this is a table then to be filled out as the subteam does their work to indicate the survey results that apply from the sunrise questions in the survey, and then also the relevant data that applies that was reviewed previously, and then for the subteam to indicate based on the data

being considered against those questions, then what are possible policy or operational fixes.

So this is to be filled out as subteams do their work, and there's no need to run through these questions right now, but that is the gist of the structure of this document. And then most importantly perhaps is to look at the end of the table, and this has the links to all of the data that's available to date. So this is where the subteams will go to look at the data, to go ahead and compare it to the questions that were asked and see how the data does or does not answer or address those questions.

And you can see there's really quite a bit of data, and just noting of course that – and we'll come to this and show you a tool that staff has developed to help the subteams do the analysis of the analysis data, but this listing here reflects all of the data that was collected, [both that and the previously collected in that] in the survey results.

And then I'll just quickly switch to the –

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Actually, Julie, can we ask people if they have questions before we switch the document? It looks like there are some questions in the chat room. So, can we go back to that? I also wanted to add just a little commentary, which is that the list of final agreed sunrise charter questions – I just wanted to add to what you were saying, Julie, and just remind everyone of the months spent working and reworking our original charter questions to try to make them more fair, more neutral, more balanced, and so you'll

see this is kind of the final result that went through not only our subteam efforts when we divided it up into the TMCH, sunrise and trademark claims subteams originally, but also our work in Johannesburg at the ICANN meeting.

And then just to highlight first a request for staff in this tremendously wonderful document to please put in page numbers, and then page five is where data available to date starts, and so we're looking at data available to date, we're looking at staff compiled summary data, we're looking in this case at sunrise, at the International Trademark Association cost impact survey, the Analysis Group materials, both early and later, and so just a lot of data, a lot of links as well as some additional sources that the staff found when they went through.

But in this case in particular, this might be an area that as people will review, something comes to mind that you remember that was valuable in our public input and other processes and that you think we should add. You don't necessarily have to find the link, although if you do, that's awesome. But was there other data? Because we spent a long time trying to get data. But staff has done a tremendous job on this.

Martin, I see you in chat. Do you want to actually come online? And Mary's saying the list of data sources in the appendix followed the sunrise and claims tables that Julie was describing and they correspond to the chronological data we listed in the last document summary. And Martin is asking if this includes appropriate public comment received by the working group – I'm sorry, it just scrolled off – from SOs, ACs and the ICANN community.

So let me ask staff, does this include the public comment that we received from SOs, ACs and the ICANN community? Over to Julie, and then we'll go into other queue. Thanks, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks very much, Kathy. And I'll just note too, the reference to page numbers, generally, we won't use – these are PDFs, obviously, because they have to be displayed in the room, but for actually doing the actual work in the subteams, we'll use Google Docs or Google Sheets depending on what's most useful. So the format then will be a little bit different.

As to the questions of whether or not – Martin's question, does this include the comments that we got back from the SOs and ACs? I believe so. I'll take that comment back though – oh, I see Mary has her hand up – because I was not involved at that time. So go ahead, Mary, please.

MARY WONG:

Thanks, Julie. And thanks, Martin, for the question. It is a good and timely one. And I would say that I think you're referring to the early outreach that every PDP working group is required to do to all the various SOs, ACs, stakeholder groups and constituencies, which this particular working group did do back in, I think, late 2016. And what I'll say here is that we pretty much – I think we received only one, maybe two responses, and those were not data-specific. So for purposes of listing the data that you have, they are not in these documents as such, but they are on the record and staff does have notes of them.

So at a relevant point, we do expect that – and this relevant point, I think, will probably be when the subteams – since we’re using subteams – start to develop their recommendations that they will be reminded of all other relevant information and input including letters, correspondence, requests from the board, that sort of thing. Those have not been included in the data tables, but staff does have a record of all of them.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Mary, just as a placeholder, would it be useful to include – I'm looking at the document – just a line in the appendix that says all other relevant input and information to be provided? E.g. letters, etc. Everything you just said. Just put it in there as a placeholder at the very end of the document.

MARY WONG: We can certainly do that, Kathy. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Terrific. So, thank you, Martin. Over to George, briefly, because we've got a little less than 15 minutes and I'd love to get to the other documents. George briefly, and it looks like someone else – Susan, I think, put her hand down. George, go ahead, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. On the second to last page of the PDF, there's a section saying additional sources suggested previously as articles from DNS industry and trademark-related blogs, etc. I'll put a link in the

chat room. That page actually hasn't been updated in over a year. Did somebody actually go through and get the actual articles, or are we going to be collecting that data as part of the subteams? And similarly, for the next point, it says news articles and research on sunrise and trademark claims from LexisNexis or similar databases. Has somebody actually gone and collected that data, or subteams expected to go through and collect that data? I would have thought that since this was submitted more than a year ago that somebody would have actually collected it by now. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. George, I certainly don't know the answer. Good question. I'll ask – Julie and Mary both have their hands up, so I'll let whoever wants to respond respond. And just a quick note to Susan, is there something you'd like me to read out of the chat room? Just write "yes" or "no" in the chat and I'll go back and grab it. To Mary or Julie. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Mary, please.

MARY WONG: Thanks. And thanks, George, for the question. And yes, we did put that in there because we did want to demonstrate to the working group that we hadn't ignored or conveniently forgotten about that piece of homework.

To respond to your question, staff did begin that exercise shortly after the various sources were identified. What happened is that we came up with a lot of hits that were blog posts for the industry blogs that were suggested, there's a bunch of articles, news reports and so forth.

There was a lot, I'll just say that and be direct about it. At that stage, because the working group was considering the needs for data collection and that became the sunrise and claim surveys, as you guys saw, the work that the data subteam and the full working group put into that made the survey really very extensive and asked for anecdotal evidence as well as experiences.

So staff has not completed those items, and in fact, we were hoping that we could get more specific guidance based on the survey results as well as what other data was reviewed by the working group between the end of 2016 and now, because – and I'll be honest, again, it is a lot of work, and we are not, at this point, certain that it is really necessary to do all of it, at least not without more specific guidance on what to look for. Thanks for the question.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Terrific. Thank you, Mary. Of course it hasn't been updated for the last year, because we left all this a year ago. But now I vaguely remember that there were articles and news reports and [CircleIDs] and that we tried to find a place to put them. So I assume if there have been additional articles, blogs, news reports on sunrise and trademark claims, we would incorporate those.

But I think what you're saying is fair, Mary, that this originally came from working group members and the public, and so it's really the job of the working group and others to kind of fill it in, not staff work. But if there are new articles, that's great, that we can put them into this material. Brian, go ahead, and then we're going to go back to Julie for presentation of the final two documents in a short period of time. Brian, go ahead, please.

BRIAN BECKHAM:

Yeah. I just wanted to pick up on this notion of including blogs and whatever in terms of materials. Look, if people want to use these to form their opinions, I think that's perfectly understandable, but I for one – and I want to be clear I'm speaking personally here – this is a point that I've raised on a number of calls when it comes to a number of different topics, so this could be anything from what should be the threshold for getting stuff into the initial report for the URS, whatever, but frankly, I'm extraordinarily skeptical of the utility and wisdom of putting whatever sources people [want to find] to support the work of the working group in the report.

Like I say, if people want to use those to inform their own views, I think that's perfectly well-understood, but we can all run out and find a lot of different sources that purport to support our different views, and I think ultimately, that's unproductive, and so I want to express the strongest objection to having this become sort of a grab bag of blogs and articles that support a range of different views being put into the initial and final report. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks, Brian. I think that's very fair. If I remember correctly – and it's hard to go back in time – I think some of these reports actually told us a little bit about actual marks in the sunrise and people's concerns about them. It was kind of data-oriented, because something had happened specifically involving a sunrise registration or trademark claims.

So agree that we're looking for data here to the extent that we have it, but if it's some of it's in other places – but thank you for raising your concerns, and back to Julie for our next document.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. And just very quickly, you'll note – so this table is going to look a lot like the previous table. This is the summary table review of agreed trademark claims charter questions and related data, and here again, we have in the left-hand column the final agreed trademark claims charter questions as they had been refined and agreed to by the working group, and then we have the column for comparing against those the relevant Analysis Group claim survey results, and then also the relevant previously reviewed data, and then the column four, the possible policy or operational fix recommendations.

And then moving on down again, just like the other table, we have the appendix with the data available to date. And it is essentially the same, it's the same data in the data sources as on the other table. The only difference is that there were some definitions that were included on the sunrise table that that subteam had developed. Those don't apply, obviously, in the trademark claims table. [And I'll pause there.]

KATHY KLEIMAN: [Thank you, Julie.] Yeah. What I'm going to do is [inaudible] we get to the really important sunrise and trademark claims survey results tool and kind of take the discussion from the chat and the discussion we had on the sunrise table and apply it. So any changes that we're making to the sunrise and additions, I think we should make them also to the trademark claims table.

And let me turn it back to you, because this is really important, of course, for the subteams to know. Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kathy. And actually, since Ariel Liang has developed this table that you see in front of you, the tool for analyzing the sunrise and trademark claims survey results, I'm going to turn things over to Ariel. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Julie. So the document that you're seeing right now is used to fill the summary table that Julie previously presented. So if you recall, in the summary table for summarizing trademark claims, there's a column for the working group, the subteams to fill in the findings or what they think is very useful from the Analysis Group's survey results.

So this tool is to help you go through the survey results. And as we know that the survey was presented in a final report format with the multiple spreadsheets that include the raw data, so this tool is to consolidate all the information in one place and you don't

need to flip through all different documents and try to find information.

And you also may have noticed, Analysis group, they have highlighted some key findings in the first portion of the report, but the appendix in the report has the complete result. So we have made sure everything is included in this tool, and then you can go through them one by one.

And I'm not going to go into detail about this tool, just let you know that we can see that from the – you have a table of contents that shows where things are, and then the first part is basically the consolidated table for all results, for all different Respondent groups including registry, registrar, trademark owners and potential and actual registrants.

And then the open text findings and other detailed information are in second portion of this tool. So you can go through them. And also, to reiterate [inaudible] purpose and we have a Google spreadsheet that'll be much easier to review the information so the fonts will be bigger and you can flip through different sections using the tabs, so that will be easier for the working group or subteam to review that. I will finish this right now.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Ariel, would it be possible to put the link to the Google spreadsheet which sounds like it has the raw data, or does it – well, two questions. First, would it be possible to put the link right at the beginning of this table? And then I have another question?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Kathy. I will put the link in the table so everyone can see that. And please go ahead with your second question.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Fantastic. And [let me first –] this is a tremendous amount of work. Thank you so much for living and breathing these survey results in such detail and [putting them in a format.] Does the Google doc – which I haven't seen – include, say, page two where you're [outlining] the actual survey questions, the subteams' draft questions, and ultimately what comes back from the registrants, in this case the potential registrant? Are these tables in the Google doc as well, or are these tables here in this summary material?

ARIEL LIANG: So, Kathy, if I understand you correctly, are you referring to the Google doc that Julie and Marie presented previously, or you're just talking about this one? So basically, the column you see, the agreed questions, they're basically the refined charter questions and draft questions from the subteam. They're the ones included in the RFP when we're asking Analysis Group's help to give out the survey. So they're basically from the same source, and they're reflected in other documents that Mary and Julie presented earlier. I hope I answered your question.

KATHY KLEIMAN: No, not exactly. And then I'll go to any other questions if people have them. We're at 1:28 right now. And Susan says the doc was circulated with the agenda. But would we find this exact table – looks like we use the table [phase] starting on page two, that we

have to come back to this document to look at that table, and if we look at it on a bigger screen, we'll be able to see it in bigger font, which is kind of where I was going.

Let's see. Does anybody [inaudible]

ARIEL LIANG:

I think Kathy – so just to clarify, the survey analysis tool that I'm presenting now is to be used by the subteam to fill out the summary tables that Julie presented earlier. It's the two documents that Julie just presented before me. So that's the intent for using this tool, to fill out the information on the summary tables. Hope that's clear.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Great. And with adding the links, then we'll know where the Google doc is, and it sounds like some of the raw data. Terrific. Does anybody have any questions for Ariel? Ariel, let me ask you if – given how amazingly detailed this over 70-page document is, would it be okay for the subteams to buttonhole you later with questions they have as they go through this in detail?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, happy to help and answer other additional questions.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Okay. So subteams, you know who to go to, you know who the expert is on the survey data results and how to – and the tools for analyzing them. So please refer out and talk to Ariel.

We are at the close of the hour. I can't really summarize what's going on in the chat room because it's going by quickly. I'll give 30 seconds to anybody who wants to summarize what's there, otherwise the chat room will be going out to everyone and everyone will have a chance to read it.

So I will pause for a second, but just for a second. And let me thank staff for a tremendous round of work. If we were all there in person, we would give you a round of applause. Thank you for preparing this material. Everyone, good luck as we go back into the trademark and sunrise period.

We will be collecting volunteers, we'll be putting out a call for volunteers and asking for volunteers to come in before the end of the week before the two subteams, which look like we're going to be encouraging them to meet at different times. And let me throw out that one may want to meet at 12:00 eastern time, one may want to meet at 1:00 eastern time, which is our own time slot for those in North America. So just a different option there.

So that call will be going out from staff, so please think about which one or both subteams you'd like to join, and reach out to others to respond by Friday, because staff would like to set up the subteam lists and phone calls and have everyone on those lists and put that information out over the weekend for us so that when we reconvene next Wednesday, we'll reconvene in the subteams.

Thank you so much for joining us today, and have a good weekend when the weekend comes. Thank you. Bye.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks so much, Kathy. Thanks, everyone, for joining, and this meeting is adjourned. Have a great morning, afternoon or evening. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]