

**ICANN
Transcription
Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) PDP Working Group call
Wednesday, 18 April 2018 at 17:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-18apr18-en.mp3>

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/5AMFBQ>

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

Operator: Recordings have now started. You may proceed.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms RPMs in all gTLDs PDP Working Group call held on Wednesday the 18th of April, 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the WebEx room. If you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? It looks like we have Dale Nelson on the audio bridge only. Also it looks like Kathy Kleiman is also on the audio bridge only.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Andrea. And just to that note again, we were hearing a little bit of background noise. I think it stopped now but (unintelligible) hearing

the background noise so please let me ask everybody who's not speaking to mute. Thank you very much.

And welcome, everybody, on the call. So let me run through the agenda here briefly and then we have the various updates from the sub teams so we'll move there accordingly. But let me just ask if there are any updates to the statements of interest? Not seeing any hands so I'm going to think there's no updates there.

The next item will be the status reports but just to run through the program, it'll be status reports, that's the specific recommendations for next steps and timeline from three URS sub teams, that's Documents, Practitioners and Providers, then discussion/agreement on the next steps for the three URS sub teams in view of the current Phase 1 timeline, and then notice of agenda for the 25th April meeting.

So does anybody have anything else they want to add to the agenda or any other business? And again, to raise your hand there's a little hand icon kind of in the bottom...

Phil Corwin: Hey, Julie, this is Phil. We have in the chat, and I notice as well at the bottom of the screen it says "Event recording is paused." Are we recording here or not?

Julie Hedlund: I see that the recording is...

Phil Corwin: Now it's recording. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I do, again, okay all right the background noise has – actually it's not. Anybody who is not speaking please do mute your microphones. To mute just again to look at the lower right of the chat area there's a thing that looks like a megaphone, if you click on that that will mute your microphone. Thank you.

So we have the updates from the three sub teams. I noted that we have – we've listed here on Documents, Practitioners and Providers. I don't know if we want to go in that order. Let me ask Phil if you have any thoughts or if we want to...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Yes, Julie, I'm really ready to take over at this point. Kathy and I have discussed this, we're going to start by going through the Providers documents, then the Practitioners, and if we have time we can talk to Documents or we can hold that for next week's call depending on how we're doing on time.

Julie Hedlund: Excellent, thanks so much...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy. I've got my hand raised on this.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, Kathy, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Phil, with apologies, you'll see a message that just came through. Jason Schaeffer who is the chair of the Practitioner sub team has to leave the call early and was wondering if he could present first?

Phil Corwin: Okay, Kathy, that's fine.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: I'm willing to defer to Jason. But let me just say a couple of things...

Kathy Kleiman: Sure.

Phil Corwin: ...just to set context for this call. I see now we're – have 39 attendees. So what I wanted to say is clearly we've been having discussion on the email list; some members of the working group want to request a charter change from Council regarding how we do the URS, whether we do that all in this Phase 1 or move it all to Phase 2 or kind of split the baby. The cochairs are aware of that.

We are planning to devote right now since we have had substantial input a working group call on that. The first call in May, which if there's support of sending something to Council is sufficient time to get it on Council's agenda for their meeting in late May.

But the reason I'm mentioning that is because people say why are we talking about these questions and talking about sending them out to providers and practitioners if we're going to be discussing whether or not URS will be done in phase 1?

And the answer at least from the cochairs is, these sub teams have done a tremendous amount of work. The work is done, it's ready for review. We have until July when we expect the survey questions on the other issues back to us so we have time now.

So finalizing these questions and getting them out and getting answers back by late May, early June has no effect on the separate question of how we're going to deal with URS, it's – we don't want to lose the momentum of the work. If the decision is made to move part of all of the URS policy discussion to Phase 2 these answers – these questions and answers will be preserved for use at that time. So we didn't – so that's – if anyone has any concerns that moving forward on these questions and getting them answered prejudices the other discussion, that's not the case.

And we'll discuss the agenda for the coming two weeks calls at the end of this call. But I just wanted to get that out there up front in case anyone had

any questions or concerns about that. And I'll see – Mr. Kirikos has his hand up. Let's hear from him and then let's turn it over to Jason to take it through the Practitioner questions. Go ahead, George.

George Kirikos: Yes, George Kirikos. I just wanted to note that we only got the documents in the email from Ariel yesterday so many of us are seeing these questions from the – to the providers and practitioners, etcetera, for the first time only in the past 24 hours and so I think it's – it would make sense to provide more time to finalize the questions rather than just today or next week because people need sufficient time to review.

There was talk about, you know, modifying these questions with great care but I think it was decided early on that we don't defer to the sub teams, that ultimately it's the main working group that should be deciding the questions and while the sub teams do a lot of work, they're owed no deference. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, George. And in response, it's the cochairs' plan that any discussion of these questions will continue into next week and next week's call; that today's discussion does not close out discussion of their final form. I hope that addresses your concern. But we have, you know, we had – they got out yesterday because we gave Document sub team members until late Monday to consider various – not Documents – the Providers sub team to deal with some final issues that were discussed last week. So today's call is not the end of discussion, but hopefully we can get a lot done on today's call.

And I don't see any other hands up and I don't see any questions in the chat so I think if you click on the tab above the window that says "Practitioners" you will get to the URS Practitioner Background Experience and Perspective. These are questions put together by that sub team and Jason Schaeffer, I believe is ready to take us through these questions. So I turn it over to you, Jason.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, Phil. Thank you everyone. As we've discussed, this has been a long process to get there. Those of you at the meeting in Puerto Rico we presented the sub team interim report, took feedback from the Puerto Rico meeting and then when we went back to our sub team calls it was further decided on the sub team that we would actually break out and do a smaller group of volunteers to help take further feedback, make sure that we could get the questions in good working order, which I hope you will agree when you read through these with me you'll see that they have come a long way from the original discussions.

And our goal was to, you know, make this a document that was manageable for the party that is receiving the questions and try to encourage them to respond and have thoughtful responses and give us some useful data. Obviously we needed to balance that with ensuring that we covered topics that would also help you know, inform our discussion on the URS.

So as you can see on the first page, we have, you know, a couple questions that are intro questions. I want to first thank George, Petter and Scott who – Scott Austin who were working with me on the volunteer group. George took lead on helping reformat some of these questions. Also Greg Shatan had some influence – a lot of influence in getting these to final form. So everyone on our sub team were very satisfied with the results that the group put together. Yes, it's not George Kirikos, Georges Nahitchevansky.

So with that I guess we can start, if you all have on screen you'll see Question 1, 2 and 3. Those are pretty straightforward questions. One thing I will note is as you go through the questions you'll see where we could we put this into a format that just encouraged a multiple choice answer, A, B, C, D, E.

It was Georges felt that, you know, since Survey Monkey type of approach better to have some multiple choices answers; where necessary where we thought it would be useful to help inform the discussion, we're going to have

text boxes and in certain sections you'll see later requirement that you explain the basis for your answer when we get into more substantive points such as dealing with the standard of proof and other topics.

Any questions on the – how we got here or the background? Okay. Julie, I guess you're going to be able to move these slides forward? Okay. You'll see on screen – it looks like we're getting cut off but Question 4 is the first question where we get into procedural issues where we have A, B, C as a topic question point and then there's a requirement to explain your issue.

The question and I'll read it if you can't see it on the screen it looks like is, "When involved as a complainant or its representative in a URS proceeding, were there any issues with delivering notice of the proceeding to the respondent?"

We thought that that was an important question because to actually have some additional textual response because you know, it seems that practitioners have run into issues – potential issues in getting notice to respondents and we wanted to understand what those issues might be rather than just leave it as a yes or no response.

Okay, Julie, if you move on. Okay Question 6, 7, 8, again are – Brian it looks like has a question. Go ahead, Brian.

Brian Beckham: Thanks, Jason. I – just one clarification and then one comment for possible additional inclusion into Question 5. Where it says, "Did you experience any issues?" and this – you'll understand why I'm mentioning this with my comment, I think it may be more clear if you said, "The respondent" instead of "you." And then the thing that I thought – I can happily send this via email if it's useful but I think it may be important to include a small caveat that this wouldn't include any delay from the respondent or the registrant forwarding its receipt of the notice to its representative. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay, thank you, Brian. Those are good points. Yes, I think it might be helpful...

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: Go ahead.

Ariel Liang: Sorry, this is Ariel from staff. George Kirikos also raised his hand.

Jason Schaeffer: Go ahead, George.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. Going back to Page 1 I notice it didn't ask which URS provider was used. I think that's the question that the practitioner should be asked because otherwise when we – when they answer the question, "How was your experience with the process of a URS proceeding?" they're not, you know – the answer might differ depending on which provider was used. For example do the supplemental rules at one provider or just the user interface at one provider, so it would probably make sense to collect that information as part of the survey Question 3, right below Question 3 or above Question 3. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, George. So I guess at this point staff will be taking notes and we'll be able to incorporate these into any, you know, further discussions. But those are important topics so thank you for that. Any other questions or points to discuss before we move onto the next set of questions?

Ariel Liang: This is Ariel from staff. And Renee has a question in the comments for Number 4.

Jason Schaeffer: In the chat? Okay. Hold on. Renee, do you want to speak to your points or...

Renee Fossen: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: Okay.

Renee Fossen: It got split into pieces because I'm sorry, I'm not used to this format either.

Jason Schaeffer: No, we're all having – we're all having growing pains with the WebEx system, but we'll get through it.

Renee Fossen: My only concern with Question 4, I think it's a good question but the complainant wouldn't necessarily know because they're not responsible for the service on respondent. So I think that we should take that into account when we ask the question, you know, knowing that they wouldn't necessarily know but maybe ask it in the way that it put in the chat, "Are you aware of any issues that respondent may have had in receiving the notice?" Because it may come up in a response which then means they have received it. But I don't know how else the complainant would necessarily know if there were issues with the delivery of the notice.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay. Thank you. Okay, Julie, we have what, Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, okay. Brian? Looks like you have your hand up, Brian.

Brian Beckham: Yes, thanks, Jason. It's Brian here. I wonder if – I think this was raised during the meeting in Puerto Rico but I could be mistaken. Maybe a 6a or a new 7 could be, "Have you chosen not to appeal a URS determination?" And then I don't know if it would be also useful to have a blank spot for people to inform us why they wouldn't have done that if they haven't.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay, thanks Brian. I believe I'm not sure if we dealt with something along those lines later on but we'll take note of that. There were some areas where you could explain, you know, why you – well we know we have questions about why you chose not – may not have chosen to use the URS but we can certainly incorporate appellate procedures.

George, it looks like you have your hand up.

George Kirikos: Yes, George Kirikos again. Some of these questions seem to not differ between whether one was the complainant or the respondent – going back to even the earlier questions, Question 3. We probably want to collect that data in terms of, you know, the process, the experience might have been extremely positive if it was the complainant versus the extremely negative if one was the respondent.

So the answer might differ depending on whether one was a complainant or a respondent so you might want to have either multiple parts of Question 3, you know, the experience (unintelligible) it was positive, when you're a respondent it was negative, etcetera. So that's not really being collected at the moment. So that's probably...

((Crosstalk))

George Kirikos: ...and that goes to the later questions as well for the appeal if the – the appeal process is not conditioned on whether one was the appellant or the you know, the trademark holder responding to the appeal, then it's not really capturing that level of detail properly. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, George. Some of this is – can be informed by, you know, the way we're looking to try to structure this, and this gets back to some discussions we've had with staff. When we do get through this process and actually are implementing the questions, part of what we'll be doing is of course tracking who's getting the responses – who's getting the questionnaire.

We'll know via email. We'll also be tracking who's responding; that data will be hidden but I guess at the staff level whoever is receiving this information would be able to determine whether this is a response coming from a respondent or a respondent's counsel and a response coming from

complainant or complainant's counsel so we will be able to at some level have understanding of – and be able to, you know, collect that data in a way that's meaningful but sure, your point is taken.

Ariel Liang: This is Ariel Liang from staff. Petter Rindforth also raised his hand.

Jason Schaeffer: Go ahead, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Hi, Petter here. Going back to Brian's question, if I understand correctly, I think what you referred to is actually on the last page what we have called Other Questions and the question Number 1, "If you choose not to file a URS in a particular matter, what was the reason?" And then we have A, B, C, D and some possibilities to make comments. I think that's what was – what you asked for.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, Petter. Yes, I think, you know, I think we indicated that that would cover this topic. I think Brian may have been asking maybe to expand that question to address whether or not appeals were filed from a decision. But, yes, that last question if everybody will see and we'll get to it on the last page, a lot of thought went into how that question is worded and to ensure that there's valuable feedback on whether or not the URS process was utilized, is it effective?

If you chose not to file a URS why would you – why did you do so? And of course we're sensitive to the fact that we don't want you to be violating client confidentiality or privilege issues in providing your response but those that are able to articulate it and choose to will hopefully have some good feedback there.

Okay, staff, I don't know, I don't see any more hands up. If you do, we can move on on the document there. Okay.

Ariel Liang: Sorry, Susan Payne just raised her hand.

Jason Schaeffer: Go ahead, Susan. Susan.

Susan Payne: Sorry, sorry, I couldn't find out how to unmute myself. Yes, I was holding off because I wasn't sure that we really covered Question 7, but it seemed like we're moving on. So stop me if I'm speaking too early. But I just thought on Question 7 it would be maybe helpful to include some similar wording to what we've got in Question 3 wherein Question 3 we say, you know, how was your experience leaving aside the result of the proceeding?

And if we're asking a similar sort of question about an appeal process I thought it would be useful to have that same kind of caveat of, you know, we're not asking you whether you're happy with the result but, you know, we're asking you how you experienced the proceeding.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay. Thank you. All right, on screen, are we getting – I can't see if we're having – if we're reaching Question 7 in the next section. Okay yes, so here we are on screen. If you'll see, we're getting into some topics, Question 6, 7, 8 that's the appellate process, then de novo review where this may relate to Brian's questions or concerns about is there, you know, appellate discussion, we can probably get there. Any questions on Question 6, 7, 8 or 9 before we get into this next subsection of substantive issues? I see Susan's hand up. Scott, your hand is up. Susan, is that from before?

((Crosstalk))

Scott Austin: Can you hear me?

Jason Schaeffer: We can hear you, Scott.

Scott Austin: Okay great. For the question that was asked earlier about, you know, respondent versus complainant and whether or not that needs to be further granularized or made specific, it seems to me that was one of the reasons we

chose to use the first two questions to identify the prospective who's filing it and the problem too is that there could be counsel, if it's a practitioner, that had represented both complainant and/or respondent which would at least give some point of quantitative understanding of how many proceedings they may have participated in for each side, if you will, or each party, if you will. And that in addition to those that would I believe give some – shed some light on the responses that follow whether on behalf of counsel or a particular party in which particular role.

There is Question 10, which we're going to get to but that essentially allows them to expand on their answers if they would like to identify, you know, which answer is from a complainant perspective and which answer is from a respondent perspective. Just wanted to make a note of that.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, Scott. And further to that point, well not for the topic of this call, we did go through for some – at some length and you may recall at the Puerto Rico meeting discussion of the practitioners and creating a list of practitioners. And as we found very few practitioners have represented respondents in these proceedings and if memory serves me correct I think we only have one or two practitioners that actually represented respondents in URS proceedings.

So this may not be something that by its design and by nature it may – because the way the URS is structured this just may be something where we have a lot of feedback from complainant's counsel and very little from the other side.

Looks like Brian's hand is up. Brian, is that an old hand or?

Brian Beckham: It's new, thanks, Jason. Just a very minor comment on Questions 7 and 9, just for parity with Question 3 on the first page it may be worth thinking about some language to the effect of "leaving aside the result of the proceeding." Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, Brian. Okay, I don't see any other questions. So let's move to substantive issues, staff, that'd be the next subsection of questions. Thank you. Okay, as you can see here we begin to get into some more thorny issues concerning the URS.

As you can see, Question 5 – 4 and 5 get into implementation of course and relief. We felt it important to require additional response and textual response if – especially in Question 5 so that we can understand what the basis is for, you know, determining whether relief is adequate or inadequate.

Likewise if we move onto I believe next page would be Question 7, right, 7 and 8, you'll notice we get into the topic of the clear and convincing standard. And 7 and 8 work together as you can see you have your A, B, C, D option on 7 and the same for 8. And then if you are arguing for lowering the standard or changing the standard you'd have to provide a basis or position, likewise if you wanted to make it a stronger standard, same requirement to provide some textual response.

Susan.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks Jason. I had a comment on Question 3, if you don't mind...

Jason Schaeffer: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: And that's the one that says, "Do you believe the URS is being used for the types of cases for which it was intended?" And I may be reading – or I may be being too concerned about the nuances of the language, but it seems to me that you could have a URS being used for a type of case for which it wasn't intended and in which case one would anticipate the claimant would be unsuccessful.

And that would be fine if you like. I mean, I'm assuming what you're trying to elicit is whether there's feeling that it's being used to decide cases for which it, you know, whether cases that are being decided using the URS are the ones for which it was intended. Is that right? Or was it – were you not trying to elicit that?

Jason Schaeffer: So, Susan, I guess to your point, I mean, I don't recall the genesis of this question but we – I believe it was – as it's stated, you know, it is just a question going to is the URS being used for its intended purpose, clear cases of abuse, right? So whether or not the panel is handling it in a proper manner is a different point.

But your point is taken. I don't think this question was intended to deal with both issues; I think we do – I think we get into you know, issues in the other questions about how panelists are handling and how these cases have been decided, you know, in a number of other questions without stating it the way you did. But that was not the intention here to my knowledge. I don't know if Scott, George, or Petter have any further comment on this third – Question 3 and Susan's question.

Okay, no...

Ariel Liang: This is Ariel...

((Crosstalk))

Ariel Liang: ...from staff. There's a question from Claudio in the chat. "Can we add a question about the general availability of the URS? For example should be extended to all gTLDs?"

Jason Schaeffer: Okay, thank you, Claudio. Susan.

Ariel Liang: And George Kirikos.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay. Looks like Susan and George. Susan, then George, go ahead.

Susan Payne: Thanks. Whilst I've got no objection whatsoever in the sense that I'd, you know, I'd probably on the side that thinks it would be no bad thing to extend the URS, I'm not sure what the benefit is of asking the practitioners this question. I mean, that's very much an opinion question.

So unless, you know, unless we can – unless there's some particular question that we want to ask about you know, the appropriateness of the procedure for working for all cases or something, which I'm not sure what Claudio has in mind, but it seems to me we don't need to go out and ask practitioners whether we should be extending this to other TLDs. I think that's the job of our – of our working group to make that determination when we've got all the information back, isn't it?

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, Susan. Speaking as just a working group member here, I do agree with you, Susan, on that point, and I think obviously we raised it at the top of the call with Phil and we've seen the emails going whether or not all of our work is going to be utilized or postponed. So I think it is a fair point to consider as a wider working group issue down the road depending on what we decide with respect to the URS.

And I'm not sure how helpful it would be to ask practitioners even if we do decide to move forward with all this great work now in some fashion I'm not sure it will – asking a practitioner a yes or no question or, you know, a short question of whether we should expand to other TLDs is appropriate for what we're looking to do in this document.

Greg, looks like – oh we have George, and then Greg.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos here. Yes, I just wanted to agree with Susan on that, that we should be in the fact collecting business, not the opinion collecting business. My main comment is with regards to Point Number 6 where it asks about educating practitioners.

One of the things – sorry, I’m not sure if it’s this Number 6 or – can’t find the question right now. But there was something about the guidance document about the – like the WIPO overview, I can’t find that question...

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: Yes.

George Kirikos: Actually...

Jason Schaeffer: There were two questions that go to that. One was the, “Should we have something along the lines of the WIPO Guide to Practitioners for URS?” And then there’s this Question 6 of providing more guidance on the – how you meet the standard or how the clear and convincing standard is met and what it really means.

George Kirikos: Right. Yes, my question was whether the practitioners are actually able to search the historic decisions themselves properly with the current state of the decision history? For example, WIPO has a lot more detailed search engine capability on their site to drill down to find decisions related to certain types of situations which I don't think the Forum provides as well.

So basically a question to the practitioners whether they are able to, you know, research the historic decisions in fact with manner. I noticed a lot of people probably used search engines like udrpsearch.com which is now defunct for their past research and, you know, practitioners might want to have a central repository of all the decisions so that they could be effectively searched. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks. Thanks, George. Greg, it looks like you wanted to follow up.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan for the record. Yes. I think the – I just wanted to say what I said in the chat which if we wanted to ask at all about the URS in all gTLDs to ask a more fact-based question like would – “If the URS were available in all gTLDs, would you use it?” So at least, you know, in terms of complainants and their attorneys we would, you know, know something about the desire of – or the market for it, if you will. It seems like an opportunity to ask that question.

But on the other hand I understand it can be a loaded topic, not to say a loaded question, so if we don't – if we want to hold that whole issue off to some other time if we think we're going to have another chance to ask providers questions or practitioners questions, we could hold it for another time. But if this is out one bite at the apple then maybe this is the time to do it. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, Greg. Well I guess, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: This is Claudio. Can I get in the queue? I'm sorry, I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: Sure, Claudio, go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, thanks. Just to clarify you know, and I might not have phrased the question as skillfully as it could have been, but, you know, one of the features if we're looking at the URS as a rights protection mechanism, one of its features is that it's limited to new gTLDs and TLDs that have added it to their operations through their contractual agreement with ICANN. There are

obviously a few legacy domains that have done that but generally it is just applicable to the new gTLDs.

And so really it's to look into whether from the practitioner's perspectives, who are dealing with abusively registered domains, whether that particular feature of the mechanism is something that could be changed; is there value in changing it from their perspective. That was really what I was trying to get at there.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay. Thank you, Claudio. It looks like, Petter, your hand is up. Is that to respond to this?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. And thanks. Good to be the last one because what I wanted to make just a quick summary, it's good to have comments and questions on the questions we have created, and once again please remember that we started with great number of questions that was also very generally phrased from the start actually asking people to write some novels on – in their replies.

So what we tried to do was to cut down the questions to a more convenient questionnaire and in doing so there may be that we lost some of the identifications or specifications. So I appreciate the comments we got from now when you read through the questions and think that well you don't understand a question or if it really covering a specific topic that you wanted to from the start to have in this questionnaire.

On the other hand, I think we don't need to add a number of questions or make it more general, but if there is a need, a specific need to further clarify that's perfect. And thanks for that.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, Petter. And, yes, to that point, I mean, I think if everybody at some point if you can print out the document and read it in its entirety and think about it as if you were answering the questions yourself as a practitioner, I

believe you'll find that the document satisfies 99% of what we're discussing here, hopefully 100% but certainly it's a high percentage.

I think we – once you read it through and actually consider how all the questions interrelate, I know it's a bit disjointed when looking on the WebEx, I think it'll satisfy most of the questions.

I think we've also gotten some great feedback today. And I'm actually pleased that it's very little feedback in terms of requiring or requesting changes so it looks like we're in a pretty good shape, so I thank everybody for their participation on that point. Obviously the questions that are raised that would expand, you know, some points that Greg is getting to and Claudio and others, I guess that's also a question for Phil and Kathy and the wider working group, as to do we really go into that territory today?

Yes, we know that URS and expansion of URS to legacy TLDs is a topic and is something that will certainly be discussed in the future, you know, whether we open that door now or not is a fair question. So but, yes, we will certainly have opportunity to deal with that, that's for sure.

Ariel Liang: Phil has his hand raised.

Jason Schaeffer: Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil for the record. Thanks for leading this discussion, Jason. It's been, as you noted, most of the – not a lot of suggestions for radical changes to the questions. On Claudio's suggestion about asking about whether URS in essence should be consensus policy, I don't object to adding that.

It is – it's a little different, we're trying to get practitioners feedback on their actual experience with URS but of course if they – the target group to answer this is the ones who've used it so it's useful input.

But the policy question on whether any of the new TLD RPMs should become consensus policy and it's really only relevant to two of them, not one – of which is the URS, not some of the ones that are tied to the opening of a new TLD, is a policy question for this full working group.

And it's fine to get practitioners opinion on that, I suspect most lawyers if you ask them, "Would you like one more possible tool in your toolbox?" will say, "Sure, why not?" but particularly if they brought the action.

But we can get into that in our discussion in a couple of weeks on whether we want to ask for charter change because one of the consideration is that if we put off policy decisions on URS until Phase 2, I've assumed, I guess it can be debated, that that would mean postponing any recommendation on it becoming or not becoming consensus policy because we wouldn't know what it's going to be until the end of Phase 2 and whether there's been significant changes in it, which would be pretty relevant to whether it should be available against 150 million plus legacy domains.

But we'll deal with that on the call discuss and suggestion to change the timing of URS decisions. Other than that, good job, and I'll let you get back to it.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, Phil. And, you know, just to remind everyone that's on this call and we'll of course be dealing with the data collection and presentation later, one thing we were sensitive to try to avoid and Phil touched on that, you know, to make sure we have, you know, good data points coming back to us on their experience with the URS.

The other thing is worth noting, you know, even if we do add questions you know, if we look at our practitioners' list, if we have 75 or so practitioners that we're going to be sending this to, we wanted to avoid getting, you know, just skewed – wholly skewed responses where you – in this case you'd probably get 75 yes answers.

While that may be useful if it's – and, you know, we would have to also temper that by saying well, this was sent to, let's just say, you know, 74 complainants' counsel and one respondent's counsel, I'm making that number up for the illustrative purposes, but it's not that far off.

So as far as getting a useful response to that question I mean, I think we may be in a you know, we may just want to make sure that if we do include that question that, you know, when we review the data it may not be particularly informative.

Ariel Liang: George Kirikos raised his hand.

George Kirikos: Yes...

Jason Schaeffer: George, go ahead.

George Kirikos: Thanks. George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes, I just wanted to follow up on that skewing topic, that's a very important thing because if you for example ask the 100 users of a highway that only 100 people use, whether they, you know, like that highway even though it costs, you know, say billions of dollars, it's not counting the opinion of all the people – the opportunity costs of that highway, so there are obviously costs and benefits to these procedures that are outside the actual people being surveyed.

One thing I noticed, which we didn't seem to capture anywhere in the questions so far is the practitioners aren't being asked questions with regards to the number of court cases they've brought with regards to cybersquatting, because the entire purpose of the URS was basically to provide a more cost effective procedure compared to the courts and so we should be trying to collect data on, you know, have these people filed court cases? What are the number of court cases they've caught? You know, what are the number of

court cases that have been, you know, been diverted to the URS instead of having to go to court?

And so if there's like a cost savings, we're not capturing that anywhere here so I'd want to make that as a general suggestion, you know, if we look at the overriding concern of the URS, you know, as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism we want to collect data on, you know, what's the primary, you know, dispute resolution mechanism, i.e. the courts. So I don't see that being captured anywhere here. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay thank you, George. So your question is going to a broader point of what has a practitioner decided to do with their clients trademarks and how they've proceeded with all of avenues that are available to them. You know, as you see we do get into Question 1 – 1 or 2 regarding, you know, how many URS proceedings you've been involved in and later on we do get into the questions of whether or not you chose the URS as a – the rights protection process.

We were sensitive to not get into attorney client issues or work product issues in terms of those determinations. This question might get into that a bit if I were a trademark practitioner and saying – and revealing how or why I may have chosen to go to court or file a UDRP or file a URS, I think that's a sensitive issue that we do, you know, we want to temper that obviously. I think counsel would not want to necessarily reveal their strategies, but your point is certainly taken.

Ariel Liang: This is Ariel Liang from staff. We have two hands raised. One is from Georges Nahitchevansky, the other is from Greg.

Jason Schaeffer: Go ahead, George.

Georges Nahitchevansky: Hi, Georges Nahitchevansky for the record. So the issue with this question that George raises is that it's really an issue if you're going to look at

UDRP – people who have filed UDRPs, practitioners who have filed court cases and what not. The limited – the survey was meant to go to URS practitioners.

And we designed so the people who use the URS to give us feedback. If we're now going to go into the avenue of like, you know, what have they done in terms of court filings or what not, you're creating a very skewed universe; a subset because you don't have all the people who practice in this area commenting on what they've done or not done.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, Georges. Greg. Greg Shatan, are you there?

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan for the record. I found that you cannot have the chat up and unmute at the same time rather an inconvenience. In any case, my concerns are along the same lines as Georges raised and that Brian raised in the chat. I also fundamentally on characterize this as an alternative to bringing a court case but rather probably most primarily to bring a UDRP, probably least, you know, given that it's for slam dunks, probably not ones where court cases would be likely to be brought. But who knows?

And there's so many different ways, as Brian Beckham mentioned, you know, there are a lot of different arrows in the quiver; everything from negotiated sales through actions through cease and desist letters, you know, making other arrangements to have the site, if there's infringing use to get rid of the infringing use rather than necessarily the domain if the domain is one that could also be put to legitimate non-infringing purposes.

And also I think if you look at the practitioners that we're asking, many of them do not appear to necessarily be kind of full service domain dispute practitioners, more a number appear to be kind of brand protection companies that maybe they're going to get into URS or UDRP but they would not be bringing court cases at all just by nature of their – of who they appear

to be. So I think that kind of gets us off into a really whole separate level of question here.

And I think we cover the basic issue adequately with the question we asked about whether we – whether the practitioner believes a – the URS is being used you know, for its intended purpose. So to ask whether, you know, they considered a UDRP in any given case or whether they – how many UDRPs they filed, there may be people who try to avoid doing UDRPs at all, you know, in any event, and others who, you know, file them, you know, three times before breakfast really, to kind of – the whole concept of how one decides to deal with this issue in any particular event is driven by so many concerns, the practitioner in question, the client in question, the mark in question, the domain string in question, the TLD in question.

I just don't think we're going to get anything really useful unless we had a very narrowly crafted very factual question and then we'd have to deal with all kinds of skew issues because again the population that we're asking. Thanks. And I think I would just, you know, not ask it basically. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, Greg. And I guess, you know, I also agree with Greg's point there as well just as a member of the group. But again, you know, let's go back to the intent and purpose of why we're doing this set of – this document and presenting these questions and I think we can come to consensus on that and understand the intent and purpose of what we're doing and ask the question, does this document achieve that? Hopefully the answer would be in the affirmative and yes, it does achieve that, we're getting valuable feedback about the URS itself. But that's – I can leave it there. Any other points, questions, concerns?

Ariel Liang: Georges Nahitchevansky's hand is still raised but not sure whether it's old or new.

Georges Nahitchevansky: It's an old hand. I'll take it down, sorry.

Jason Schaeffer: Thanks, Georges. Anyone else? I don't see any hands? Staff, do you see any hands? No hands. Okay, well thank you, everyone. I think it was a valuable feedback and I think we made some great progress so I appreciate everybody's time and assistance here. I can turn it back to you, Phil and Kathy.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Jason, I don't know if you're about to leave. Before you go, have we – we haven't finished this document yet, have we?

Jason Schaeffer: As far as running through it?

Phil Corwin: Have we gone through the whole thing?

Jason Schaeffer: I believe we – did we get to the last page, which is Page 6? We can quickly put that on screen. We went through the burden of proof, the adequacy of the process...

Phil Corwin: Yes. Julie had one saying no, but...

Jason Schaeffer: Okay, let's go to that page.

Phil Corwin: ...that's okay.

Jason Schaeffer: That's fine. No, no, let's do it, so, I mean, we have that last page right there.

Phil Corwin: Okay, can you stay? If we have just one...

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: Yes, I can – yes, I can hold for a bit.

Phil Corwin: Yes, if you've got 10 more minutes...

Jason Schaeffer: I can hold for a bit, no problem.

Phil Corwin: ...let's finish this then we can start on Providers and I've got some thoughts on how we can expedite the Providers' questions review because clearly we're not going to complete that today. But let's go ahead and finish the last page of this and get done with this document.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay, it looks like we've got – hopefully everybody can see the last few questions. It looks like Brian, Kathy, and Zhou – Heng Zhou. So I guess let's start with Brian.

Brian Beckham: Yes, hi. Sorry to take us backwards, maybe I was looking at the chat and we were kind of whizzing through the last few pages, but I had two extremely practical suggestions on the question Practical Issues Number 1, it's about the current mechanisms for proving use.

I appreciate that this is to practitioners who have either used it or have considered using it, but I thought just reading this kind of with a fresh set of eyes myself today I thought it might be useful to list out what those mechanisms for proving use are just to refresh people's memories when they're doing the survey.

And then sticking with the section of practical issues Question Number 6, kind of a similar comment just to list out the different types of avenues for filling, filings so there was just literally listing response, appeals, de novo review, just again to refresh people's memories when they're answering the questions as to the timeframe so they could provide us with more specific data as to which particular timeframe they thought may be worth reconsidering. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay thank you, Brian. So that's Question 6, which I see and understand your point and the other one was Question 1 or – in Practical Issues? Or where you? Yes, was the Question 1?

Brian Beckham: That's right, Question 1. So just to list the various means of proving use may be useful to refresh people's memories.

Jason Schaeffer: Got it, okay. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Jason, this is Kathy Kleiman. And I had a question about procedurally how the sub team wants to move forward. And I'm asking – I was also a member of the sub team but I just thought maybe kind of next steps after we get to the end of the discussion of the questions, next steps with Survey Monkey and other things might be...

Jason Schaeffer: Sure.

Kathy Kleiman: ...useful for the working group. Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay. Heng Zhou, is your hand still up?

Heng Zhou: Okay. Can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: Yes.

Heng Zhou: This is Zhou Heng for the record and I have a very specific suggestion (unintelligible) Question 3 in practical (unintelligible) about the fine (unintelligible) you know, and I hope we can add some comment here that if you answer D or E, would you provide a estimate price or fee? And we can – that's the practice to add their ideal fee here, you know in Question 3, yes.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay yes, so we're talking about the filing fee.

((Crosstalk))

Heng Zhou: ...filing fee is too high or too low, maybe they can provide a suggestion right and I hope we can propose them or chance to write a suggestion here. Yes.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay perhaps we can allow for...

((Crosstalk))

Jason Schaeffer: ...the participant to – yes, understood, okay. Thank you.

Heng Zhou: Okay, that's all.

Jason Schaeffer: George. Looks like your hand is up, George.

George Kirikos: Yes, George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes, just to go – follow up on that point, there are actually response fees when the number of domains in dispute are above a certain number, I think 15 or whatever in the Forum, so a question on that or a subset of Number 3 or subpart of Number 3 might be appropriate to cover those response fees. Thank you.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, George. Claudio. Claudio, is your hand raised or you're just typing in the chat room? Okay. Okay thank you. I guess at this point we now have reached the end of the questionnaire. We're going to – if everybody has seen the last page and we can move on if anybody has any questions I guess we can get to Kathy's point on next steps and how we can proceed a sub team and how we intend to move forward. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. I'd be happy to summarize, Jason. This is Kathy Kleiman. And the sub team wanted to suggest to the working group that we would be happy to continue working as a sub team and working with staff and so that kind of

next steps would be – next steps we propose for this one, once it's finalized, is staff would set up questions on Survey Monkey. The Forum, Renee, has volunteered, which we appreciate, to help us work with reaching the practitioners and going through and doing the research which we did on hundreds of cases in the URS.

We sometimes found the practitioner was identified; we sometimes found that they weren't, that the law firm was identified. And so how – who and how to reach people is somewhat of a question but Renee has probably a really – I mean, she offered to work with us so if there's no objections we'd probably work with the Forum to reach the practitioners. You know, some of the practitioners we all know, Doug, for example, Doug Isenberg, but many we don't.

And then the sub team would volunteer, volunteers, to put the results of the survey together, not to analyze them but more to compile answers because we could be getting up to 60 results if people really respond to kind of this short succinct survey that people worked so hard on in the sub team. So that is what we wanted to put forward as a procedural way forward to the working group and then provide the working group with the detailed results as well as summary results of what happens in this survey. Thank you.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you. George.

George Kirikos: Yes, one last question. Is this survey going to be an anonymous survey or is this going to be one where we actually collect the names and identity of those responding because one can perhaps expect slightly different results or responses depending on whether it's anonymous versus non anonymous survey.

Jason Schaeffer: Right.

George Kirikos: Thanks.

Jason Schaeffer: So at this stage and, you know, as Kathy explained, our intent is to work, you know, to – we would do two things, right, we would work with, you know, among the subgroup and with the Forum to identify the contact information for all of the participants. We anticipated making sure that there was some identifying measure making sure that an email was tied to the response and that, you know, you couldn't respond again.

But we wanted to decouple that information and make sure that that information wasn't necessarily revealed beyond the response, right? So we wouldn't tie it up and identify you as the respondent in the – to the wider group or to the people reviewing the data necessarily. So it would be anonymized in that sense but we would know who responded at the higher level.

And in order to be in compliance with GDPR, of course we have to be cognizant of that too. I'm joking – half joking. But okay, any other questions?

Claudio DiGangi: Jason, it's Claudio.

Jason Schaeffer: Claudio, go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: Sorry, I got dropped off earlier. I just had a – I put in the chat I was just wondering if we had a general question like a catch-all question where the practitioners could provide input on what they see as any sort of general advantages or limitations to the RPM?

Jason Schaeffer: So we do have a couple sections for catch-alls and I think nothing that is actually keying in on your point, right, but we do have – please provide any additional comments to your questions above. I think it actually is a catch-all in each section so we do allow for, you know, further expansion and I guess, you know, it may – your question may lend itself in a certain section or another but we don't have a specific point saying what you just articulated.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, I mean, because I think the questions – I think you guys did a great job in identifying specific issues where, you know, we want feedback. But I was just thinking there might be things where you might have missed or (unintelligible) and, you know, maybe if we just have a question in there that isn't sort of bound in any way to the particular topic where we just sort of ask in general terms if there's any additional views that they might have on the advantages and limitations of the policy.

Jason Schaeffer: Okay. Thank you, Claudio. We can certainly note that. I think as I said before I think that we do allow for that in each section, and I think as you go through the questions or as you – as a questionnaire – as someone being questioned as a participant you would naturally at some point say hey, wait a second, I want to spend more on this point. But if you're looking for, you know, a final at the end of the entire document a text box to allow you to, you know, pontificate about your feelings of URS, we can certainly raise that as an issue. I don't know if fits necessarily structurally with the Survey Monkey structures to allow. And then I guess the question would become a word limit, right, are we inviting, you know, people to write pages and pages and volumes of material? And is that really what the point of this is? But your point is taken so it's certainly something to consider.

Claudio DiGangi: All right, thank you.

Phil Corwin: Okay, Jason, this is Phil. Thank you very much for taking us through this and to you and all of the members of the sub team for the very hard work and thought that obviously went into this so thank you and I'm going to take the call back over now and run through some things, so thanks, Jason.

Jason Schaeffer: Thank you, Phil.

Phil Corwin: It's now – we've got 20 minutes left on this call so clearly we're not going to get through Providers so I want to talk about procedure going forward and

how to expedite things. Those of you who were in San Juan will know that moving PDP working groups forward more expeditiously is a big aim and concern for GNSO Council. There was robust discussion in San Juan about how to do that. And that's kind of a backdrop for what I'm going to talk about now and these are.

So we've just finished a review of the questions for Practitioners. There's 40 plus of us on this call but that's not the full working group membership. So I'm going to ask staff to send out the questions with any adjustments made as a result of today's comment to the full working group membership as soon as possible with a cover note that these questions were fully discussed on today's call, that for members of the working group who weren't able to participate we're going to hold things open, I would suggest one week until next week's call for further input on them; if people think questions need to be rephrased or other things have to be done with them or questions added to get that in by next Wednesday call time, and after that we're going to finalize these questions so we can get them out to the practitioners and get answers back by the end of May.

And that's – I want to talk about the timelines we're under here. We want to get the questions to practitioners and to providers out by early May so we can have answers back by late May, early June to give us time noting that there's no call the week before the Panama City ICANN meeting to begin some initial analysis of what the answers mean or what they suggest so we can have informed discussions in Panama City.

I saw a question in the chat how much time do we have in Panama City? We're going to have many hours in Panama City, the final schedule isn't set yet but policy meeting and we're going to have a great deal of time but we need to lay the proper groundwork for our face to face discussion in Panama City.

So one timeline and time pressure we're acting under is the need to get these questions out by the first week of May so that we can get answers back by late May, early June and have some discussion of those answers before we all head – many of us head to Panama. Other time pressures, we've got a active working group discussion of whether we want to ask Council for a charter change.

As I noted at the beginning of the call, Kathy and I have tentatively agreed that that call to discuss that suggestion and see where we are on that as a working group should take place on the first call in May to give us time to finish up some of this work on the questions but also to see if there is sufficient support and we can decide how to tee that up if we're going to send something to Council.

We want to get that done before the 10-day document deadline for their – that closes out what they can address on their call at the end of May. So we have that time pressure.

Another thing is that Brian has indicated to the cochairs that he's interested in accepting that nomination that was placed on the list to be a cochair and I thank him for that willingness that he's preparing a statement for the full working group to consider and it's practice to carve out some time so that working group members can ask questions of anyone who wants to assume a leadership position before we make a decision as a group on that.

And that's also a time pressure with Council because while a new cochair can act in an interim capacity they can't fully assume the role without Council signing off on that; that's another deadline for Council consideration in May.

So we've got all that going on. And Claudio, I see your hand up, but let me just say one more thing before I take your comment if that's a new hand? We've got – you'll see on the tabs above we've got two things that start with

the word "Providers." One is the one further to the right is responses to proposed questions to URS providers.

This will show you where we had proposed questions and discovered that either between the discussion we had in San Juan or other feedback we've gotten from the providers, mostly in preparation for that session, we already have a lot of those questions answered.

And there's no need to ask them again. We don't want to burden the providers with asking them to tell us the same answer they already gave us. So that document is not one that requires a great deal of discussion on a working group call.

But I would ask you all to review it and if you think in any case that we need to expand the question or that the answers are insufficient and we need to include it in some way on what's going out to the providers rather than deleting it from the questions we're preparing for them, get back to us on the email list and all of that will be fed to the sub team members on providers for consideration and some feedback to this full working group.

Similarly, moving to the other thing that starts with providers, that's the consolidated questions to URS providers as of 17th of April, which is yesterday. You'll note that this is a 12-page document and it's somewhat more complex than the document we just went through. So if we follow the same procedure that we just followed for the practitioners questions we're going to be devoting several working group calls to this and miss our deadline for getting it out in early May.

So I'm going to – I hope it's not burdensome but it's your choice; we can either do this collectively as a group, which means everyone has to listen to everyone else bring up some times minor suggestions for tweaking questions or arcane points or we can ask all of you and all working group members, and this can go out after today's call as well, to review the questions and if you

have any concerns about any question or any suggestion for rephrasing it or any belief that some question that should be asked hasn't been asked in this 12-page document, get it to the working group list.

I'm going to ask you to all do that by close of business Friday, so it can be fed to the sub team members for consideration. And if we do that, we can come back with an amended document next week which includes a lot of those suggestions and save a lot of time for everybody.

So it's your choice but if you probably put an hour's work into reviewing this and generating questions it can probably save us many hours of working together on the call.

So and the last thing I'm going to say, and I don't see any hands up right now, is I just want to tell you how these questions were generated. These questions were generated through very intense review by the sub team members, the Provider sub team members. We went through the URS rules, rule by rule; we went through the procedures, procedure by procedure; we went through the technical requirements and we went through every provider's supplemental rules. That's the work reflected in this document.

It's a tremendous amount of work that's gone into it and we went through every piece of that with basically saying, all right, what questions does this rule or does this procedure naturally generate that we want to ask providers about? So that's how the document came to be; that's the background on what we have here. So that's about what – the last thing, and I'll – Brian's preparing a report on it, on the Documents group. I don't believe the Documents group – it fed into these two efforts on providers and practitioners questions, the remaining stuff is data they prepared on the appeals cases and then there are some other data that we can look at on the cases that were decided that – where the claim was denied, they were decided in favor of the respondent.

So that's basically information for us to consider that would feed into policy considerations, if we get to that – whenever we get to that whether it's Phase 1 or Phase 2. So I see Brian's hand up. I've said a lot. I'm going to review the chat while Brian is speaking and see if folks are okay with the way I've proposed on the fly here to move us forward in a thorough but expeditious manner. So Brian, go ahead and then I see George's hand up.

Brian Beckham: Thanks, Phil. Brian Beckham for the record. I just wanted to mention – and I can directly forward the Document sub team work with staff. But just wanted to mention that there were two questions that we as a sub team were proposing to refer up to the Provider sub team. I looked through the document earlier, I believe one is already covered, it concerns communications with registries, there was another one about any observed anomalies with the process so I wasn't sure if that was quite captured.

So if everyone agrees maybe I can forward the Document sub team work with staff to just make sure that the two points that the sub team on Documents was going to refer up to the Providers sub team is already integrated into that document for people to consider when it goes out to the working list. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks for pointing that out, Brian. And George, I see your hand up. Before you speak, I do want to note that in the chat my suggestion for getting comments on the consolidated providers questions in was spurred by the very thorough document you provided to the working group list a little earlier before this call started.

And that spurred my suggestion that other members take a look at these questions and if they believe that to send any input to the full working group list so that the sub team members can consider that and we can possibly come back with an amended list of questions next week.

And if we decide that any suggestion is one that we don't want to accept without fuller working group discussion we'll indicate that as well. But – so go ahead, George, and then I'll call on my cochair, Kathy.

George Kirikos: Yes, George Kirikos here. Yes, I just want to say that other people who prepared for today's call probably did the same thing; they made notes while they read the documents so it's just a matter of typing up those notes if they haven't already done so so that they could send us a list and the sub team could work on it.

My question is – or concern is, if we set a deadline for say Friday for people to respond to that, that's tomorrow I guess, will there be enough time for the sub team to meet in advance of next week's call – scheduled call for the main group but still also have an updated document that we can review to see how those changes were reflected because otherwise we're back into the same kind of scenario where we'd be getting an updated document maybe mere hours before the next call and not have a time to review it or review the changes? Like if there's like a redline version of the document that's produced also that would be important. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yes, well, George, actually the reason I suggested Friday thinking on the fly is of course today is Wednesday so Friday is – COB Friday is 2.5 days away. I thought that was enough time for working group members who can find a spare hour to go through these questions.

And then that can be forwarded at the end of Friday to sub team members with an ask that they take a look at the suggestions and get back on – with any comments to the rest of the sub team members by close of business Monday and that would allow staff to get a consolidated document out Tuesday.

I know it's quick but again, I think we're – we want to try to expedite in any way possible here and go as fast as we can; we're not going to put out an

incomplete document but I'm just looking for ways to kind of consolidate different things and not have everything take place on a 90-minute call every week when a lot of things can take place. We don't need a sub team call, I don't think, to consider that input. The sub team has been doing a lot of work just by its dedicated email list.

And, Kathy, you had your hand up.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, Phil. I think you covered all of what I was going to say, but I also wanted to thank all the sub teams, everyone's been working very hard, everyone's been working in parallel and, you know, your sub team, the URS Providers, 12 pages of questions is phenomenal. So I think the deadlines you've provided would make sense. You know, if we all work quickly in light of what the GNSO Council would like us to do.

Also I just wanted to double check what the timeframes were for Brian's materials and the Documents sub team, and just lay those out again, and maybe staff can just put together a quick calendar for us. And as the sub teams come back, maybe they can do what practitioners did and just include a few notes of procedurally that they recommend to the working group as the next steps, whether they want to kind of continue with compilations, etcetera, or whether they want that to come back to the full working group. Thanks, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Yes, thanks Kathy. Good suggestions. So I think some of this we can do after the call working with staff. So, you know, having said all that, and, yes, George has noted that next week's call is in the APAC time slot. We just – we have to deal with that but, you know, we're going to try to combine doing work by the email list and doing work on the calls.

I think you'll find that if you put a 30 minutes to an hour in to reviewing these consolidated questions and get any comments in by the – it may pay

dividends in avoiding many hours of listening on a call when a lot of the work can be done by email and doesn't require being done orally.

We're not going to cut anything short but we are looking to – for shortcuts here to just be more efficient and productive in our work. So does anyone else have any comment or questions? I kind of covered next week's call is going to be – which is at 1200 UTC which I, works for the Asia Pacific people, accommodates the people in Europe. It's not bad for the East Coast of the US, it's a little tough on the West Coast people but no time is perfect.

It's going to be our discussion of the Providers questions. We'll figure out what to do with Brian's nomination when we get his statement and when we're going to have that discussion. It would have to be by that first call in May I think to get it up before Council if there's working group support for him to assume that position.

And the – we've talked about the first call in May being to discuss the proposal to move part or all of the URS decisions to Phase 2 and see if we want to send a communication to Council about that that they can consider in May. And I talked about all the deadlines we're facing to be ready for Panama.

So – we're at 2:28 – 28 minute past the hour. If there are no more comments or questions we can give you back two minutes of your day and you can use those two minutes to begin your review of the consolidated questions to URS providers. Okay, well I think we're done for today and we got a lot done and you have your homework and we'll be getting emails out to all working group members. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Andrea Glandon: Today's meeting is adjourned. (Lawrence), the operator, you can disconnect all lines and to everyone thank you and have a fantastic day.

END