

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) PDP Working Group  
Wednesday, 22 August 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-22aug18-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p4g7yzu246f/>

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

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

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Woman: Great. Thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanism; RPMs, in all gTLD PDP working group call held on Wednesday, the 22nd of August 2018.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Okay. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

And with this, I'll turn it back over to Philip Corwin. Please begin.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Thank you and welcome all. Thank you for being on the call. Welcome to my Co-Chair Kathy Kleiman. I don't know if Brian Beckham will be on this call. I know he's on vacation this week and wasn't sure if he could join, but let

me ask, are there any changes to statements of interest by anyone on the working group?

All right, Phil...

Mitch Stoltz: Hi. This is Mitch Stoltz from the Electronic Frontier Foundation, I'm sorry, still signing in, in the chat room. But in the meantime, I just wanted to let folks know that I've taken over from Jeremy Malcolm as EFF's representative to the working group and now I'm looking forward to working with you all.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, thank you and welcome, Mitch. We're glad to have you onboard as we get to the decisional phase of our work. Excuse me, so our agenda, we have circulated a very detailed procedural proposal for how to go forward on URS issues and if it works out well, we'll probably use the same or very similar approach for Trademark Clearinghouse and related RPM issues.

So if Staff could put that proposal up in the chat, I hope you've all had a chance to read through it. I'm going to go through it, give an overview without reading every word, and we'll take questions. So we'll see if it's acceptable to the group as a way to proceed. And then we'll - and maybe if we have time today, we'll start to get into some substance of recommendation that came out of the sub team.

So - and let me go through each section here and at the end of each pause for a moment to see if there are any questions or comments. So number one, how are we going to review proposals from the sub teams, we're going to start with them as they're already been the subject of extensive work by teams representing various parts of the community and are based on a lot of data that's already been collected.

So if members have questions or concerns about any recommendation that came out of a sub team we urge you to first contact the sub teams for - to answer your questions and to do that through ICANN Staff who will forward it

to the relevant mailing list. So I'll stop there, any comments or questions on that?

Can we unlock this so I can scroll, please, and others can scroll? Almost there. All right, thank you.

So number two, logistical requirements for submitting your proposals for all individual work group members. George, go ahead.

George Kirikos: Thanks, Phil. George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes, I'm just wondering logistically how that Section 1 is going to be handled, because I thought we're going to go through the sub team proposals basically in order of the document and if we're - if we have questions or concerns which are going to be relayed through the mailing list to each sub team that seems to mean that we'll have to go back and revisit items based on, you know, the time leg, hearing back from the sub teams. So I'm not quite clear on how number 1 is going to work logistically, if you could help me out on that, that'd be great.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Well, I think George we'll get to that part today to start looking at some team recommendations. I think for today we'll see if any - they're just so clear and so non-controversial that we can dispose of them today and we'll hold the others back until at least next week would be the way I think we should go. So - but let's first see if we can get to considering any of them today. But, if there's proposals, recommendations from sub teams where members want to raise questions and get them answered, I think we'll defer those discussions on those until at least next week. Okay?

All right, number two, if you're an individual, if you have a proposal or proposals you want the working group to consider for inclusion in the initial report for public comment, that's what we're talking about here now, this is not a consensus call process. This is putting an initial report together for feedback from the community process. We've created an online survey form and we can look at that when we're done with this document.

I think it's very clear as to how to fill it out. If you don't want to use that form, you can get a word version of it and submit it to staff. And then, but if you don't use that form, one way or the other, your proposal will not be in order and won't be the subject of discussion. We want a uniform process here. If you have four or five proposals, you need a separate form for each one.

As soon as practical after receipt, we're going to circulate all the proposals to the working group email so everybody can review them and be ready to discuss them. And then, we've set initially a deadline of next Wednesday, the 29th close of business. For receipt, I know that George has raised a concern on that in an email received a little while ago and I see his hand up, so let's go to him because I finished the section.

George Kirikos: Thanks, Phil. George Kirikos here. Two concerns about this section here. One is just a technical point with regards to the online survey form. I don't know if people have visited and tried making our test submission. But I did that earlier today and I noticed that it actually doesn't print on the subsequent page what your actual submission is. So, there's no real record for whoever submitted something to see what they actually submitted and has like documentation, especially, since you know as the criteria here are that.

You know, if you don't do it on time, it's not going to be considered having some record emailed back to you or printed out or something would be quite useful. I think the alternative of submitting to the - via email through the doc file is probably what's - the safest for most members, because at least there we could have evidence that we sent the email.

And just as a side note, there's no contact form or sorry contact email address to - where to submit those recommendations. Should we send those to the mailing list or should we send those to a specific Staff member, so that should probably be clarified.

The second point I had is, yes, the deadlines. And, given the summer slowdown and so on, I think asking for people to have this done by next week is a little bit optimistic and so I think having there another week or another two weeks wouldn't be a hardship especially because we're going to be taking probably those two weeks to be reviewing sub-team recommendations in any event, especially given that there is extensive documentation required for fields three through eight of the form or the document depending on how one submits it.

And those requirements didn't apply to the sub team recommendations, like many of the sub team recommendations are just one or two lines with, you know, a link to some data, but no real discussion. So, you know, I think we should have more time for that reason, otherwise the sub team recommendations are in some sense advantaged because they don't have the same criteria for inclusion.

Philip Corwin: Okay. George, we got your email on this. I'm going to ask you and all other members to keep remarks short. I understand your point here. I think on your first concern, Ariel can speak to that. So go ahead, Ariel.

Ariel Liang: Thanks, Phil. Thanks, George. This is Ariel for the record. So for the survey, once it's submitted it's recorded in SurveyMonkey's database that's managed by Staff and we will print out or exports the individual responses in PDF and then send it to the full working group, so everyone will have their record. And, if any respondent want to gather individual PDF just for their own response, we can send it to this individual separately too.

So - but - then for SurveyMonkey they cannot automatically create PDF records for your response, but be rest assured that it's SurveyMonkey and Staff will manage, you know, the export of data and then distribute that to the working group, and the individual member. Hopefully, this will satisfy the request.

Philip Corwin: Okay. So, Ariel, what you're saying is that very shortly after the submission of each that the technology doesn't allow an individual member making a proposal to immediately print it out as they submit it, but they'll be getting a PDF copy very shortly after submission, and if they think there's anything that's changed, they can point it out immediately.

The other option of course is they can request a Word form and Ariel will they submit that to you after you provided the form and they fill it out?

Ariel Liang: Thanks, Phil. First, Phil, what you summarize is correct about SurveyMonkey and second for the Word doc, yes, please send it to me individually, so - and now we'll be compiling all of these responses.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Now, on - so we have two ways to submit that. If you feel you need to have a copy, you can keep this when you submit it, use the Word version, but if you use the online survey, you'll be getting a PDF very shortly after submission and can check against that. Staff is not going to be changing a word of anything, so they're just going to convert the submission to a PDF.

On the deadline, the - what you're seeing on the screen is incorrect. The co-chairs had agreed to a - we had a discussion on this and we agreed to a deadline of Friday, the 31st. That's nine days from now. We think that should be sufficient for most people. I understand that some people maybe - feel pressed by that. We have countervailing pressures of sticking to our timeline and wanting to see even, though we're not going to get to these proposals right away, we're going to be discussing sub team proposals.

We want to see if there's proposed - one or more - two or more proposals on the same topic so we can think about how to aggregate those and also we want to see how many we have total for planning purposes for the call. So, we've had a very tight timeline if we're going to meet our timeline of finishing URS recommendations and closing it out by the end of September.

So right now it's the 31st, but if we have - if there's a lot of members who feel that that's too soon, that they need a few extra days, we could perhaps go into the early part of the following week if there's a lot of pushback on that. So, the form is incorrect. Right now, the deadline is Friday, close of business on Friday, the 31st of next week, so that's nine days to prepare these proposals.

But if you think that's insufficient, let us know on the working group list and if it's a significant problem for a number of members, we'll reconsider the deadline. And finally, I saw Susan Payne asked in the chat, "If you've already submitted something, a proposal, do you have to resubmit it?" Yes. The answer is yes. It's very doubtful that anyone has submitted a proposal in the form that we're going to be requiring. The form is designed the way it is so that we have complete proposals and so that working group members have all of the information they need to discuss a proposal in a relatively short time on each call, where it's about 25 to 30 minutes per proposal max which is why we want everything in there up front, so we don't have to spend a lot of time explaining the proposal, and what the rationale is, and what the data is, et cetera. So this is the rule we're going to use.

Moving on to Section 3. The content proposal and this is probably the most important part if you're thinking of submitting one or more proposals. We want it to be succinct but specific, not general. For example, if you're - think the burden of proof for the URS should be lowered, don't just say, "Lower the burden of proof," as your proposal. Say lower it to what and then you're going to have to put in all of the supporting information.

If you want to establish a laches doctrine for URS, don't just say, "There should be laches." Say, "There should be laches of X, you know, time period, running from X date," the starting date, and then put in all of your justification. So it's got to be specific, not general. And it's got to be accompanied by a justification statement and there's a number of boxes to fill in on the statement. We'll be getting to that form later.

There's a 250-word limit for each one, because - which means that each of these proposals are going to be a thousand words or more max which is enough we think to provide the background information to all of the working group members, so they can be prepared in advance. You need to state the rationale. If it's an operational fix, the operational rationale. If it's a policy change or change in the URS policy, what's your reason for proposing it, and then go on and cite any evidence you have in support of it.

If it's evidence based on data or analysis done by the sub teams, reference it. If you have - if it - if you have additional data from other sources, document it. We want proposals that are - that have the reason explained and backing documentation accompany them. We also want you to state whether this issue has been addressed or not by the working group or the sub team so far, whether if there's been data collected and reviewed by the sub teams on the subject, whether they show a need to address this issue.

This is a bit redundant because we're asking you to cite any data in support of your proposal. And if it's not already addressed above, what other information gathered from what other source is the proposal based on or backed by.

So, you know, we don't think that's too burdensome, we think it's - the word limits are reasonable and in the aggregate give anyone enough space to explain the reason for their proposal, and the back and forth at the same time by having a word limit. It means that working group members will have a document of a reasonable length to review before discussion of a particular proposal.

So let me stop there and see if there's any questions or concerns about the substantive requirements we're setting for proposals. Yes, George.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos, again, for the transcript. You know, I'm just going to go back, the reason I was concerned the time limits is that the sub teams haven't necessarily answered these same questions for their own proposals. And so, here the proposals that are being submitted by individual members are being held to a different standard than the ones that are - have been submitted on behalf of the sub teams. And so, either this should be additional time to allow the individual members to accommodate these additional requirements or the sub teams should do the exact same thing for each of their proposals so that they're all on an even playing field. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Thank you, George. Susan, go ahead please.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. I just - I want to disagree with George on that and I think the difference between these individual proposals and what's coming out of the sub team was that the sub team works - have been working over a long period of time to gather information, and as a group have collectively been coming up with the recommendations or at least rather been coming up with suggested recommendations.

My understanding is those still are going to need some discussion before, you know, they finalize them in any initial report as I understand it. But, I don't think they need the same level of detail as you're asking for new recommend - or new proposals, because they've been the subject of extensive discussion amongst the group of willing volunteers who chose to actually participate.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Thank you, Susan. And, you know, all of these comments the co-chairs are going to take under advisement and will be - get back by later in the week, by the end of the week if we're going to - if we hear significant concerns from members of the working group, and feel we need to adjust any of this on the deadline in particular will - if people feel that's too soon, given that Monday, whatever that date is the first Monday in September is Labor Day in the U.S. We can look at maybe going over the weekend.

But I do personally agree with Susan that the sub team recommendations having been very much involved with one of them and participating in several of the others, a lot - there's a lot of background already for those recommendations. They didn't come out of thin air. So there is a qualitative difference between something just developed by a sub team with diverse membership from the working group and something new coming from an individual member.

But if others feel that there's a concern there, let us know on the working group email list or in the chat or whatever. We're open to feedback. Let's move on to administrative review of proposals. The co-chairs and the Staff are going to review the proposals, already received from working group members.

I know Susan had brought up that concern and if they don't meet their criteria in probably few if any will in terms of checking all of the boxes in the format that we're requiring. We'll have - Staff will be in touch with you shortly and ask them to revise you to, you know, to fit in the standard format. If you already have a very well developed proposal, you may just have to cut and paste things into those form boxes.

So let me stop there, questions or comments? All right moving on. Meeting duration and when you see the timelines, you know, if we get a proposal on which there's very little oral comment in a meeting and where there seems to be substantial support within the working group, which is the criteria for including it in the initial report for community comment, there may be items that we can dispose of in five to 10 minutes.

Others may take the full time and we'll get to that in a minute on the oral requirements, but even if we had - if every proposal discussed in a meeting takes the full time in a 90-minute meeting, we could get through three. Depending on the number of proposals received we may, for some of these

meetings, go to two hours from 90 minutes. We'll give you advance notice, but we're going to have to see how many proposals we receive and where we are to try to stay on the timeline.

We also have an issue that Wednesday, September 19 is Yom Kippur, two other co-chairs will not be in that call. We're not going to have a call that day. We'll look possibly rescheduling that week's call to another date. We'll work with Staff and the working group to see if there's another date the week of Wednesday, September 19 that works for a significant number of - that's available and works for a lot of folks.

So - and we are urging we have pretty good participation today, 32 members, but that's still only about 20% of the full working group membership. We really want as many members to be on these decisional calls as possible and if that's just not possible for you to give us input in advance on the email list, so we get a good sense of where working group members are on particular proposals.

I'll stop there. And let me just review the chat. Okay. So let's move on. The actual presentation. If you've submitted a proposal or proposal, you're going to receive advance notice that we plan to discuss it on a particular working group call. And if you can't be on that call and present your proposal, you'll be permitted to request an alternate date, if there's a conflict. We're going to accommodate that.

But if this happens a number of times and you're never available, you're not - your proposal is not going to be put in play, because we want the proponents to speak to it and answer questions about it from other members of the working group. I don't think that will occur, but we're trying to be flexible and accommodate it here, but we're also not going to consider proposals where the proponent is unwilling or unable to describe it, and defend it, and answer questions about it from other working group members.

Susan Payne, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Yes. Thanks, Phil. Actually, I agree with that and I completely understand the reasoning behind it. But I do think, you know, this is all proposed to be happening over a pretty short time period. And, I think I heard you mention on a different call earlier today, you know, sort of late September. That's - you know, so that's not many weeks.

And in some cases, you know, the time zone issue can be a really significant one for some people, more significant for some than for others. And so what - obviously, it would be better if the proponent can be on the call to present their proposal. I think it would perhaps be a good idea to allow for the opportunity for - you know, for example, if for some reason I'm not available for the next month and I've made a proposal, but someone else that I know is willing to kind of stand behind my proposal and take it forward. Then, I think it ought to be possible to designate an alternate.

Because, you know, just the fact that you're tied up for some reason or you're in the wrong time zone, it shouldn't mean like the - what you're proposing can't even be discussed and sort of goes in the bin.

Philip Corwin: Well, thank you, Susan. I think that idea of being able to designate an alternate, if you have a colleague who you feel confident in and are willing to represent your proposal, if there's no way you can be on any of the opportunities that are provided for you, I think we can - I don't have authority on this call as a single co-chair to accept it, but I think that's something the co-chairs can take under advisement.

I think in most cases if we tell a working group member your proposal is scheduled for X date and they say, "Look, I've got, you know, I've got a - I'm speaking at some meeting that day," or, "It's - that's 3:00 in the morning for me, can I wait for the APAC call?" Or - we - we'll try to accommodate everybody as well, it's possible. I think in most cases the proponent will be

able to find a date for them, but this idea of designating an alternate if you can find a willing alternate and let them present it is worth consideration by the co-chairs.

So I'll stop there and let - well, actually, let me continue, because that's not the end of this. Now, during the presentation we're going to - some people may put in more than one proposal. To be fair to everyone, we're going to rotate presentations to try to ensure that the same member is not making more than two proposals on a single call. We'll see how it goes towards the end. There may be one member with a lot of proposals and we're hearing from them a lot, but at least in the early stages we're going to do this rotation with this goal in mind.

And now, given that every proponent will already have submitted this very detailed form, weighing out a detailed proposal, and the rationale, and the evidence in favor, we're going to limit the oral presentation on the proposal to five minutes. We're going to keep time clock just like they do at public forums at ICANN meetings.

Five minutes should be sufficient to summarize what's already in your form, and working group members will be expected to already read those forms, and be prepared to engage in a knowledgeable discussion of the proposals that are going to be up at any given meeting, and everyone is going to get advanced notice of which proposals will be scheduled for a meeting. And we'll probably schedule a few more than we might have time for, because we can't tell when we schedule them whether a proposal is going to remind require five minutes or 30 minutes.

After that five-minute presentation, other working group members can comment or ask questions or whatever they want for two minutes each, with total discussion of a proposal limited to 20 minutes. That means up to 10 members of the working group can ask questions or comment on any given

proposal. That's the oral comment and question. There's still going to be a period after presentation for a working group email list discussion.

And then, at the end of 20 minutes or when there are no one else is in the queue, and that's before the 20 minutes are up, the proponent will have two minutes to respond to any of the comments or questions have been made. And if the proponent wishes to, based on that input, they can propose a modification to proposal if they think that there are some change they can make that can make it more - to get more support by the group or to respond to reasonable criticism, something they hadn't thought of.

So let me stop there, because I see two hands up. Susan and then George. Go ahead, Susan.

Susan Payne: Thank you, Phil. Yes. But the 20 minutes - I understand what you're trying to achieve here and I'm supportive of the idea of trying to keep these discussions constrained or, you know, into a reasonable timing limit. But I - I'm a bit concerned that it might be possible, you know, if many people are wishing to express their views on the topic, that coming in this 20 minutes you might only have heard from, if you like, one perspective and there may be, you know, people with another perspective still in the queue. And, I think that is a risk that, you know, that could be kind of key stuffing you know for want of a better term.

And I'm not sure that they're - the way I've read this proposal, there isn't so much opportunity after the event for engaging in a debate by email, because those - the suggestion that if there's to be a poll, you know, it's a very narrow time period for a poll. You know, the poll would have to open pretty much straight away and then it closes again by, you know, before the next meeting comes around.

So I'm not sure that post call, they just - that just doesn't seem to me to be all of that - of much opportunity for those people who didn't get a voice to have a

say. So, I think maybe there needs to be just a bit of leeway, I think. You know, if it's quite clear that only one perspective is so far been aired and there are plenty of people still queuing, I think maybe there needs to be some extension to that 20 minutes.

Philip Corwin: Okay. So, yes, thank you. Again, I'm not authorized on this call to make any changes. I think I appreciate your input and the input from others, the co-chairs will take all of this under advisement during our next call. And I would urge you -- since so we only have 20% of the working group members on this call -- for you and others to put your concerns about this proposal on the email list to catalyze feedback from others.

But I want to point out a couple of things. One, to - for a - if you ever proposed or that you think it has merit what you're looking for is to demonstrate that there's substantial support for that in the working group. If a proposal has substantial support even if there's also substantial opposition, even if it's controversial, it's going to be included in the initial report for feedback from the ICANN community in the form of public comments.

So the bias of this process is toward inclusion of all proposals that can demonstrate - that there's a substantial or significant portion of the working group that thinks it's a good idea. So - which is one reason that we don't need to hear every - from every person who might have a point of view orally on every proposal, but let me stop there and again we're going to take all of this under advisement and perhaps make some adjustments. George?

George Kirikos: Yes, George Kirikos for the transcript. First, I'd like to agree with the points that Susan raised. She's - I think she's completely correct there and I think that we should not necessarily just defer to the co-chairs on this procedural matter, but should ensure that the members, you know, have a say in deciding it, not just how did the co-chairs decide it. The...

(Crosstalk)

Philip Corwin: That's why we're having this call.

George Kirikos: Right.

Philip Corwin: To get feedback from the working group.

George Kirikos: We could have a little...

Philip Corwin: We're not trying to shove anything down anyone's throat.

George Kirikos: Right. But, we could have, for example, a little straw poll, you know, agree, disagree if that's a concern to measure the whole group's response not just to defer it to the mailing list or to the, you know, private discussions amongst the co-chairs. But I have two other points to make which was - though the way that page two and page three are proposing to go forward, there's a potential problem in that.

The first time the presenter is hearing the questions will be during the presentation, so I - what I would suggest is that if we go to the - before the presentation part which is on the top of - or this - or at the bottom of page two, that people should be encouraged to submit their questions before the presentation.

It's kind of like - if you look at how I responded to this document on the mailing list, I kind of laid out my concerns in writing. Giving people advance notice of the topics that I was going to raise and so - but I think that might be a useful approach that it doesn't blindside the presenter with questions that they've never even considered.

Philip Corwin: You know, speaking for myself, I think that's a good proposal and fits right in with our goal of having as much work done in advance of the call so that we're not spending time on that, and so that everyone is fully prepared,

including the presenter to have a useful discussion. So, I think that's a good proposal and we can adjust - I would support adjusting this to accommodate that.

George Kirikos: And my last point was the - at the end - on page three where it says the proponent will have two minutes to respond, that might be inadequate, given that they're responding to discussions that have taken at least 20 minutes and maybe more if the limit is changed depending on Susan's input and my input regarding the queue length. So two minutes might not be enough, I would suggest maybe making it five or maybe seven minutes or something like that just to give them enough time to make a meaningful reply, you can't really state too much in two minutes. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Before I comment, I see my Co-Chair Kathy Kleiman has her hand raised. Go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Go ahead and comment. This is Kathy. I was going to respond to some things going on in the chat room.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well, on that one we can look at an extra minute or two. Our goal here is to keep the total time, given that there's always - we never get started quite at the beginning of the hour, because people are coming on the first two to three minutes, and there are some other stuff. We want to keep each section just under thirty minutes so that in a 90-minute call we can get through at least three proposals if it takes the full time for each proposal.

But maybe we can limit that response time, maybe we can up it to three or four minutes. I think seven would throw everything off and we'd have to go to two our meetings every week even for three proposals. Go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific, Phil, and I agree with you on that. An extension of time for response makes sense. Timing, I wanted to respond to timing. This is Kathy Kleiman,

of course. So, there's material in the chat that says, "It doesn't take a month to review the proposals for formatting."

So I just want to respond in general about timing. Obviously, we need a deadline so that all of the proposals come in, Staff will check the proposals for completeness. We'll be checking them, you know, for scheduling. As Phil said, we don't want to have the same person dominating the meeting, we have two hours of 20 minute or there are - about presentations, we want to have a diversity of people presenting.

So September is not about just reviewing the proposals, but deciding which ones have sufficient support to go forward into the initial report. And so, I want to emphasize what someone else mentioned in here is that - for that support and it's written in several points into the document in front of us. We're looking for - it would be ideal to have a diversity of stakeholder groups of constituencies, of participants in the working group supporting a proposal.

That's that best way to move it quickly forward to the initial report is to have that diversity to have support across the working group. So I just wanted to share that. If you want to go - get to the finish line fastest into the initial report, see - you know, build that support and that will make it go faster. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Thank you, Kathy. Let me move on to after the presentation. So very soon...

(Crosstalk)

Philip Corwin: ...oh, you have another comment, George?

George Kirikos: Yes. George Kirikos here. I just want to...

Philip Corwin: Could you make it brief, please, so we can move on?

George Kirikos: Yes, I just want to - yes, George Kirikos here. I think the point I want to raise is with regard to Kathy's last statement. For the diversity of views, that should also apply then to the sub team recommendations which are - it's unclear whether they have the same diversity of support that might be claimed. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Okay. I'll move on. After the presentation, soon after the call concludes when Staff sends out the usual attendance chat and the link to mp3 recording, they're going to post to the email list the final text and rationale of the proposals considered that day. Now, of course, they'll already be distributed prior and you're going to get advanced notice prior, but this is kind of a belt and suspender approach that everybody who wasn't on the call knows which proposals were discussed if they want to - and then they can check the mp3 and all of that, if they want to hear the discussion.

Everyone will, on the working group list, will be invited to comment on the proposals after the call. Co-chairs have the discretion and move the proposals straight to the initial report without a poll if we deem it either non-controversial or already having significant support based on the work group discussion. And my own thoughts on this, we might, on some proposals - after the notice goes out, that they're up for discussion on a common working group call, we might see evidence just from feedback on the email list before the call even takes place indicating substantial support and, again, that's the criteria for getting in.

So that discretion is designed to expedite the process for proposal that seemed to have a lot of support, and just assure that there are going to be an initial report for comment. If the co-chairs deem it appropriate for additional discussion due to lack of sufficient representation across participating stakeholder groups at any particular meeting or doubt about whether proposal has significant support, we're going to invite working group members to indicate their opinions via an online poll no later than close of business of Tuesday following the call.

So the way this will work probably is by the day after the call if we think one or more proposals should be polled, we'll circulate that poll on the working group list, and you'll have six days to respond. And the poll choices will be support, oppose or number three defer to phase two and that's only for policy proposals, and not operational fixes. The co-chairs if there's an administrative issue in the administration of the URS, it ought to be fixed now.

If there is support for fixing it, it shouldn't wait until the end of our UDRP review. On the other hand if you think something is intertwined with UDRP and that the URS discussion shouldn't be the tail wag in the UDRP dog, you'll get that choice on all of the policy proposals and we're also going to provide on the pole besides those three choices a space for additional comments. So you can tell us whatever useful thoughts you have about it and then before the next call.

So, you know, this will be close of business Tuesdays, so we're talking about Wednesday morning. Staff is going to publish the poll results for each proposal consider during the prior meeting with a link to the poll and that's going to be fully transparent. It's going to have your name attached to what you checked in any additional comments you provided. It's going to be a fully transparent process.

And, again, please note that when we do poll is to provide the co-chairs and the full working group with information to determine whether or not it's the sense of the working group that a particular proposal is or isn't supported by a diversity of participants. And if it is, it's going to be deemed to have significant support and get into the initial report as a recommendation for community comments. Let me stop there and see if there are questions or comments. George?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. I have three points here. The first one I raised on the mailing list already which was the transparency of the poll.

There should be names attached everybody and Phil kind of addressed that. I just want to make sure that that was the position of the chairs and not just his personal opinion that, you know, we have to abide by the ICANN bylaws about transparency.

My second point was in the - after the presentation part, this kind of went on - this is linked with the prior section. The proponent might not have had enough time to respond to the questions during the actual presentation, so they should be permitted to elaborate after the presentation by email as to their, you know, response to the - on that topic. And so, perhaps they should be given...

Philip Corwin: Well, George, as you say - it says, "All working group members will be invited to comment." So, of course, the proponent can comment and add additional thoughts after the discussion.

George Kirikos: Okay. As long as that's, you know, clear. But linked with that is - if we're setting a poll, if we're starting a poll immediately then people might not have seen the full discussion before they voted. So we might want to give a few days like start the poll, say, on Friday or Saturday to give time for a few days' worth of discussion and then enter the poll which people can respond to as needed.

And then, I do have concerns about this thing - idea about significant support that there should be at least a predetermined level that applies equally, so that it doesn't just, you know, vary from proposal to proposal in an ad hoc manner, but just kind of understood by everybody in advance so that people say, "Well, 10 people spoke about it here. On another day, five people spoke about it here." And, you know, you can have a different threshold for each proposal that isn't understood to have met the criteria.

And, furthermore, just kind of jumps ahead to page four, but I believe that all of the URS sub team proposals should go through the exact same poll so that

they're not deferred to as, you know, automatically be included, but (this is basically) support, opposed, defer poll after they're presented so that they are on an equal footing as the individual members. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Thank you, George, and as I replied on the email just on your suggestion for objective criteria, that's very difficult for two reasons. One, different proposals may get radically different amounts of feedback. And two, you know, objected - that starts to look like a vote and working group guidelines don't let us conduct votes.

But, again, the bias here is toward inclusion and if any - if on any proposal, the co-chairs think it just hasn't demonstrated substantial support, we're going to state that publicly. It's going to be transparent. We're going to give a rationale and if there's a significant number of working group members who think we're wrong, we'll listen to them.

We'll take that - we'll - so, you know, it's not going to be our way of the highway, but there may be proposals that the proponent may be only one or other - two other people out of this very large working group think makes sense and those just aren't going to make it in the initial report. They will be in there if the proponent wants it as something for the community to read about, but it's not going to be something put out officially by the working group for public comment because the initial report has to be a report from the working group and not the end of - and not multiple individual views of every member of the working group.

So I'm going to move on to co-chairs. I think we covered it. Let me see. Okay. No, co-chairs review. Okay. At the end of - oh, and also George on your - about delaying the poll, there's likely to be some - we're going to start it today after the discussion. If a member already knows how they feel about a proposal, why make them wait to vote. If a member wants to wait and see how others weigh in and wait until the last minute to - I misused the word vote there, but indicate their views, their opinion on a proposal, they can wait till

the very last day and do it one minute before the deadline for submission of the poll.

So, we just want to get it out there. So after the end of all URS proposal discussions, the co-chairs will promptly publish the working group list, their views as to which proposals should be included or referenced in the initial report. And if there are multiple proposals on the same topic, the co-chairs may wait until all related proposals are reviewed before making their suggestion.

Just let me kill this call, which is probably one of the many robo calls I receive on that phone each day.

And so, we'll wait till the end. If - unless there's substantial opposition, sub team recommendations will be included in the initial report as constituting working group recommendations. If there's a lot of opposition to a sub team recommendation, we'll poll it and have further discussion to see if they really is substantial if the view of the sub team reflects the view of at least a substantial portion of the working group.

So all proposals that we designate is receiving substantial support will be included for public comment even if there is opposition. This is not - again, this is not the consensus call process where you have to achieve full consensus or consensus which is basically unanimity or near unanimity to move a recommendation to GNSO council and then on to the Board.

This is to get feedback from the community. So it's a much lower standard. We're going to have discretion to designate proposals that we think lacks substantial support following working group discussions. Again, if we say that, we're going to explain it, our reasons for that, and working group members if they think we're wrong can push back and demonstrate that indeed there is substantial support. So we don't claim to be infallible.

Proposals that lack substantial support at the end of this process can still be documented. The initial report, if they're sufficiently specific and include a policy or operational rationale, and if they've - if you filled out the form properly, they're going to meet that criteria. And that's to ensure that a full record is publicly available - all of the proposals that were received and considered by the working group.

So they'll be in the report, it just won't be something that the working group will be requesting public input, public comment on. If a member of the public thinks that one of those proposals that didn't get substantial support and the working group has merit and wants to comment on it, there's nothing to stop them in their submission to ICANN when there's a public comment period on the initial report. Okay.

Proposals that receive no substantial support and are not sufficiently specific with no inadequate policy or operational rationale will not be included for public comment but may be referenced to show the full record of working group discussions. Now, this - we're going to need, I think, the co-chairs need to go back. Our intent here is that things that don't receive substantial support as long as the form was fully fold-out are going to be referenced in some way in the report for recording purposes.

So if there's any disparity between this bullet and the one two bullets above, we're going to have to sort that out, but that's our intent. And, again, proponents of the proposals that didn't get any substantial support may request that the original or modified version be included in a minority views appendix with the understanding that will be made clear to the public that these proposals fail to gain any substantial support in the working group.

I see your hand up, George. I'm just going to finish this section and then turn to you. As I said, working group members will have the opportunity to question the co-chairs' initial designations and push back if they think we're wrong. And following our consideration of those objections will - our

determination will be considered final. Someone has to have final responsibility and you've appointed us as your chairs.

So important to note that the process of preparing the initial report is not intended to replace or replicate the formal consensus call and I think I've made that clear many times. There will be proposals that are being put out for public comment in the initial report that focus - unless the gap is bridged and a compromise is made, and they move to full consensus or at least consensus with minimal opposition, there not going to be consensus called recommendations to council.

But we're not at that stage, we're at the stage now of getting community reaction to ideas that are put out there by the sub teams, and by initial - and by individual working group members so long as they can demonstrate some substantial support within the working group. And, I'll finish up here, because this is the end and then we'll open it up for final comments on this document and then turn to looking at the form.

If these procedures prove successful and we hope they are successful, and allow for a fair, uniform, and efficient process, they'll probably be deployed for decisions on proposals related to the Trademark Clearinghouse and related RPMs. They could be tweaked based on experience with this model, the basic portions of this model proved to be a good way to go. We'll use them, again, if not we'll try to figure out another way.

I'll stop and call on George. Thank you.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes, I have two major concerns with page four. The second point, number - on Section 7 says, "Unless there is substantial opposition within the working group, sub team recommendations will be included in the initial report as constituting working group recommendations."

Now, if you look at that carefully and look at the rest of that page, that implies that regardless of the level of support of an individual working group, members or recommendations it can never be included in the initial report as being a working group recommendation. So sub team recommendations might be, you know, unless there is substantial opposition included in the working group report as a working group recommendation, but individual working group proposals can never be working group recommendations which I think is a major problem.

And then, the second concern I have is that the - as I pointed out on the mailing list is that there's a huge double standard in the defaults treatment of sub team recommendations compared to working group member submissions and that double standard needs to be eliminated, because we've all known from the very beginning of this PDP that there was no difference to the work of the sub teams. They would always be reviewed by the plenary, like the main working group.

And so, if we look at the - careful - language of page four carefully, sub team recommendations are included by default and then in quotes unless there is substantial opposition on the other hand, working group member submissions are excluded by default unless there is substantial support. So that's entirely different standard and if Paul Tattersfield noted on the chat room, one of the big problems we had in the IGO-INGO working group was a perception that silence was treated as support some of the time and then silence was treated as objection another time.

And so, it's kind of like that same issue here, there's a framing effect depending on where the proposal originated. Now, in response, Phil had mentioned, Phil Corwin had mentioned on the mailing list that the working group, the - I'm sorry, the sub team proposals are in some sense vetted. Now, here I would disagree because the sub teams were very small and going into the process in advance we didn't know that the sub team proposals would be treated any differently than proposals from somewhere else. And

so this creates a problem that ex post, the - their proposals are being treated differently than what everybody had understood going in.

So, what will happen...

Philip Corwin: George, can I intervene here? This is really going on a long time. Can I finish on to some of this?

George Kirikos: You've been the one that's...

(Crosstalk)

Philip Corwin: Well, wrap it up then, please. Thank you.

George Kirikos: Yes. This means that everybody is going to be - feel compelled to join every UDRP sub team or every future sub team in order to seek out the same advantage if they believe that the sub teams are where all of the action is and that their own, you know, work will be treated to a different standard later on if they didn't participate in the sub team. And so, that's a major concern that - and Phil said that, you know, these were - these sub team proposals have support. You know, let them go through the same process that an individual proposal goes through. If that support exists, it should - it'd be no problem for them to actually display that level of support.

And so, I'm just trying to say that, you know, the support level needs to be much, much higher. I'll just say - I'm saying it needs to be identical if, you know, those five or 10 sub team members want to show up and say, you know, we support this proposal. It'll be measured, documented, and then it'll be compared to all of the other proposals on an equal footing. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Let me respond briefly and I invite my co-chair Kathy to respond as well as any other members. I have to disagree with you. There's no double standard here so far as I can see. Sub team recommendations are already

the result of - now, George, you chose not to join any of the sub team, so you wouldn't be directly familiar with the amount - intense amount of work, and discussion, and compromise that went on in those groups to reach the recommendations that they came out with.

But they already represent this - our starting point among the co-chairs is that if a working group made up of multiple members from diverse constituencies and backgrounds reached agreement on a recommendation, that is de facto evidence that there's substantial support within the working group. It's a presumption.

Now, it can be rebutted. If we hear from a lot of members in the working group beyond the sub team that they're opposed to recommendation and there's no further support outside the sub team for it, that reopens the question. But there's an opening presumption that it has substantial support which is very different from a new proposal coming from an individual that hasn't been vetted by other working group members.

Second, the - if a proposed - silence will not be indicative of support to show support for proposal. We're going to have to hear from working group members that they support it. If we don't hear anything, we're going to assume that it's not obtaining support. And that second bullet point about substantial opposition to flesh it out that substantial opposition if a proposal only elicits substantial opposition in little or no support it's not going to be included.

If it gets substantial opposition, but also get substantial support, if the working group is divided on it, if there's divergence, it's going to be in the initial report and out for public comment. So, we're really trying to be fair here, I understand your point. I don't personally agree, but you can put them on the working group email list and if others agree with your concerns, I want us to change this, we can revisit it.

Kathy, please. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi. Thanks, Phil. Kathy Kleiman. I'm - still I'm to agree with you and I'm sure that won't surprise anybody, because we did spend a lot of time putting this material together, this proposal together with Brian and with Staff.

So - and I'm going to reiterate it from a slightly different perspective, the sub teams, the three URS sub teams were data sub teams and what's rising is really data-driven. I'm going through the super consolidated table now, the third column, and looking at the operational fixes that are arising, things that appear to be broken and aren't working according to policy or aren't consistent across providers, for example.

And the few and they really aren't a huge number of drafts of policy recommendations coming out of the sub teams, but there are some and those are also data-driven. So, this is what the sub teams told us after looking at a vast amount of data, large number of questions to providers, the Harvard Law School material looking at every URS case.

These are things that come out of this body of data that, you know, seem to be clear to the sub team. So I think they do get some weight and certainly thanks to everybody on the sub teams who worked hard. I don't think anybody was trying to stack the deck since they were trying to work with the data and what was arising out of it.

And so, new proposals coming in do have kind of that burden of proof and that burden of persuasion. So, agreeing with you, Phil, and thanks for leading us through this proposal today.

Philip Corwin: Thank you, Kathy. So I don't see any other hands up. We're going to move on from this document and take a look at the form. And let me say to George and to everyone else, if you're - have concerns about anything we've proposed here and the co-chairs had a lot of discussion about this in trying to

create a process that was fair, that would give sufficient information to working group members, and would be efficient, and keep us to our timeline to the greatest extent possible in putting this out, we don't claim to be perfect, but I think it's - I think it will probably work very well in practice, and we should give it a chance.

But, you know, right now George, the concerns you've expressed are solely - your concerns, I haven't fully reviewed the chat, but put them on the email list and let's see if others - a significant member of other working group members share them. And likewise if other members of the working group don't share your concerns, I would urge them to state that on the working group list so we get a full airing on this.

We'll take - the co-chairs will take all of that under advisement and announce any modifications we're going to make to this proposal before the next meeting and before we start employing it. And George I see your hand up, again, can I ask you to keep it brief?

George Kirikos: Yes, of course. George Kirikos here. May I go?

Philip Corwin: Go ahead.

George Kirikos: You know, I just want to - for the co-chairs to confirm that based on point number two that on page - point number seven that any proposal from an individual member can never constitute working group recommendations in the initial report. That's my question.

Philip Corwin: No. I don't know where you get that from, George.

George Kirikos: It says unless there's a substantial opposition with the -- George Kirikos again -- within the working group, sub team recommendations will be included in the initial report as constituting working group recommendations. How can any other working group member make a proposal that can achieve working

group recommendation status as per the initial report under this document?

Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Well, there are going to be initial working group recommendations for the purpose of soliciting public comment. They're not going to - in terms of whether they're going to be in the final report as consensus call recommendations, that's a whole other issues. They're not going to have any advantage or disadvantage in the end compared to individual statements. We're just going to put in the report for clarity that one these are sub team recommendations which at this point represent initial working group recommendations being put out for public comment and two this is an individual recommendation that has achieved substantial report on which we're soliciting public comment.

But whether a proposal at this point is working group or individual will not determine in any way whether it's in the final report as a consensus recommendation, that will be determined by the consensus goal at the end of this whole process. Greg, please go ahead.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks. Gregory Shatan for the record. I think what George is pointing out is that there is some non-parallel drafting in the second and third bullet points on page four, and my question is whether that indicates a substantive difference or whether that's just bad drafting. In the second bullet point, it says that sub team recommendations will be working group recommendations and in the next bullet point it says that proposals with substantial support will be included for public comment implying that they are not being treated as working group recommendations that they are in essence second-class citizens.

I don't know if that's - was substantively intended and if that is, the base - and I think George, you know, has a point, if that's just sloppy drafting in the - everything is going to go in there without, you know, it actually makes it into the report, every item is going to be essentially, you know, given kind of

treated equally and, you know, won't - there won't be a way necessarily to - for somebody who's going through it to see something being presumptively, you know, of a higher order than others, then it would be just helpful to know.

But, you know, right now this - you know, sometimes, you know, there's just bad drafting that creates the impression of substantive differences. But in fact, there isn't a substantive difference. So before we get off of this, that's the...

Philip Corwin: Sure, Greg.

Gregory Shatan: ...that's the question.

Philip Corwin: Let me respond and - as best as I can and, again, I ask Kathy to join in if she has further thought. You know, we might have chosen better words. I think the intent here is that when we put out the initial report, we're going to say, "Here are the recommendations that came out of sub teams and here are recommendations that came from individual members of the working group and demonstrated substantial support within the working group."

None of them at this point are work group recommendations. The only work group recommendations will be those that achieved full consensus or consensus at the end of the process. So I think there's a confusion here between identifying for public comment purposes, recommendations which came from sub teams versus recommendations which came from individuals.

But in the end neither one sub team recommendations in the end won't have no advantage over individual recommendations to become working group recommendations at the end of the process, whether it came from a working group sub team or from an individual if a proposal doesn't demonstrate full consensus or consensus at the end of the process next year, it's not going to be a final working group recommendation.

So if there's some reading that we're trying to give an advantage in the full process to sub team recommendations, that's not the intent, and I'm going to call on Kathy first to follow up on me and then I can hear from George.

Kathy Kleiman: Phil, this is Kathy and thanks. I think that second bullet point we can clarify probably just putting a period after initial report, so it would read, "Unless there's substantial opposition within the working group, sub team recommendations will be included in the initial report." That's probably what we meant to say.

And you're right, nothing constitutes a working group recommendation till after we go through the initial report, get the public comment, and go to the close in our final report, that's when we do the consensus call. So thanks for clarifying that and, you know, we did the best we could but we can certainly add a little bit of Staff could make a note of that. And if you agree with it, Phil, we'll run it by Brian and we'll have that out in the next draft.

Philip Corwin: Okay, and George.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos...

Philip Corwin: And I know that it's 2:14 and we need to review the form. So, again, I'd ask you to be brief.

George Kirikos: Yes. George Kirikos again. If the intent was to not advantage the sub team recommendations, then it's good that point number two will be clarified and I look forward to seeing the proposed language. But it - still is - sub team recommendation still are being advantage though in terms of their treatment, that went to my original point in terms of the double standard. You know, we have the sub team recommendations included by default unless there's substantial opposition versus working group submissions being excluded by default, unless there is substantial support.

So we need to decide on a uniform standard for both. Otherwise, what will happen is that because there's - if this thing isn't modified, it means that participation in the sub team gives somebody an advantage. And so, now, from every future sub team people are going to want to participate in them in order to make sure that they're not disadvantaged by not participating, especially, when it comes to something contentious like the UDRP and that kind of defeats the whole purpose of having sub teams if everybody has to be on them.

And so, you know, we decided from the - early on that there's going to be no difference to the sub teams. If we now changed that ex post giving some advantage, the sub team recommendations. I think that's very dangerous. And we had to correct it now or expect that everybody is going to want to be on every feature sub team, and so the sub teams really become the whole working group, that's my point. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Well, George, having to participated in one - in the provider sub team, and every meeting, and many of the meetings we had other sub teams, I'm not sure that spending many, many more hours per week and working very hard is that great and an advantage, but I think what we've proposed here - again, I'll say it again, is a recognition that recommendations from the sub teams are already the result of hours of work data, and data gathering, data analysis, discussion, and compromise to reach the recommendation stage.

So they are qualitatively different than recommendations we're seeing for the first time from individual members. But if the working group disagrees, we can spend weeks discussing, redoing the work of the sub teams, debating it all over again just to decide whether they have a presumption of having substantial support which can be defeated, if there lots of opposition, and that will guarantee that will be way off our timeline, we can do that. Can we move to the forum, please?

Okay. So, Ariel says the forum can't be displayed. If you can click on that link, you'll get to the forum, so - and the forum - I'm just going to read through it, if you clicked on that and can follow it, you can see it, otherwise I'll describe it. It's - the title of the forum is proposal for URS Policy and Operational Recommendations.

It says the forum is going to be used by working group members to submit proposals for URS policy and operational recommendations. It says, "Proposals submitted not using the required form will not be in order and will not be discussed." So we want the same uniform submission from everyone. As soon as practical after receiving the submissions, okay, one individual form must contain only one proposal for one recommendation.

As soon as practical, after receiving the submission Staff will forward the proposals to the working group email list. Final dates for submission of member proposals is closed of business. Now, this is wrong. It should be Friday, 31st of August, and we heard from some members with concerns about that deadline and we'll discuss - the co-chairs will discuss whether we can push it back to the following Monday, which would be September something. I think September 3.

And then it says if you have difficulty accessing the survey, contact Ariel Liang. We give our email to request assistance to get a Word doc version, but again we're urging it's much easier on Staff if you use the online form, so we urge that. You'll immediately -- after submission -- get a PDF back of what you submitted as discussed earlier on this call. If you think there's anything missing or changed, you can let us know right away. The Staff will not be changing anything.

The first box is for your full name. And then it says if it's from two - one or more than one member, write the full names of all of the proponents of the proposal, then it ask, "Are you proposing a policy recommendation, operational fix or other?" And then, there's a box to specify what the other

might be, so that's - so we can categorize the proposal. And then, there's a box with a word limit, what are you proposing, be succinct as well as specific and not general in nature for one recommendation only.

Then, there's a justification statement, 250 words each for these statements. The first is for the rationale for the proposal, the second is for evidence in support of the proposal, and details of that. Then, questions, and it's - each of them are subject to 250-word limit, where and how is this issue been addressed or not addressed by the working group or the sub teams to date.

Next box, does the data collected or review by the sub team shall need to address this issue and develop recommendations? Next box, if not already addressed above on the basis of what information gathered from once - what to source or sub team is the proposal base which means, if the sub teams didn't develop data, but you have other data that you think is supportive, put it in and that's it. Then you're done.

So, you get about a thousand words to put in and the form follows the description of the procedure. So, given that we're 21 minutes past the top of the hour, we're not going to begin consideration of the sub team recommendation, it's simply too late in this call. If members of the working group have concerns or questions about the procedure, please put them on the working group email list as soon as possible for consideration by the co-chairs at their next meeting.

We'll - Staff has already noted the suggestions we received orally, but members who made those statements might want to put them on the email list for the benefit of all of the members, and we're going to want to get going.

Next week on sub team recommendations on discussions of those, so Staff will be revealing them to make sure they're sufficiently specific for discussion and I think following the procedure we've outlined - we're going to give advance notice of which recommendations will be up for discussion on the

next call which is same time, same day next week so far as I know and we'll, you know, we'll give consideration of whether that should be 90 minutes or whether we should go to the full two - to two hours.

And we'll give advance notice, because there's tremendous concern by Staff and by council leadership about staying to our timeline, which has already slipped several times. So, anyway, any final new thoughts from anyone before we shut down the call. Kathy, thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Phil, this is Kathy, we may want to ask Staff about next week's call and whether that's our Asia friendly call. And if so, what the new - to remind us what the new Asia friendly time is. Thanks.

(Claudio): Phil, this is (Claudio), can I also (go on with you)?

Philip Corwin: Sure, (Claudio).

(Claudio): Yes, I just have a question about the...

Philip Corwin: We're waiting for Staff response...

(Claudio): ...oh, okay.

Philip Corwin: ...on the call time.

Kathy Kleiman: (Julie) has got her hand raised, Phil.

Philip Corwin: Yes, (Julie), go ahead, please. (Julie), we're not hearing you if you're speaking. All right, (Julie) just got kicked off audio - we'll - if another Staff person can or (Julie) can post that in the chat, just the time of next week's call, that would be helpful. Okay, and she just posted. She thinks it's at next Thursday, 1200 UTC, which would be 8:00 am East Coast time, Thursday of next week.

And, (Claudio), go ahead, we're at 25 past the hour. Please go ahead with your comment.

(Crosstalk)

(Claudio): It's (Claudio). I just have a question about the initial report and whether the - whether it's intended to include recommendations on the Trademark claims in the Clearinghouse.

Philip Corwin: Well, (Claudio), yes, of course, it will. We're just not at that stage yet. My understanding is that the analysis group survey has finished beta testing, it's going out this week, we'll have results back by late September, and then informed by those results we're going to have further process on that leading to probably more sub teams to look at some of that, and then a procedure like this to consider recommendations.

So, of course, everything on new gTLDs will be in the initial report. We're at the decisional stage for URS. We're several months away from the decisional stage for the Trademark Clearinghouse and the related RPMs. But all of that will be put out for public comment in the initial report.

(Claudio): All right. Thank you very much.

Philip Corwin: Sure, and I think that's it. So thank you for your participation and we'll see you on the Asia friendly call next week where we will begin substantive discussion of sub team recommendations. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you, Phil. Thanks, everyone.

END