

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Data  
Friday, 26 January 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-26jan18-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7dhyt97r/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/bga8B>

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

Operator: The recordings have now started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much. Well welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Sub Team for Data call on the 26th of January. On the call today we have J. Scott Evans, Susan Payne, Kathy Kleiman, Rebecca Tushnet, and Kristine Dorrain. From staff we have Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Antoinetta Mangiacotti and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and I'll turn the meeting back over to Julie Hedlund. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Hold on. Thank you very much. Sorry about that, everybody. So let's finally go ahead and get started and with many apologies. We are starting up with – where we left off last week. I'm going to page to that point. I'm going to page to that point and also just to – I've got a PDF up on the screen and Susan, I want, you know, well first of all making sure that everybody can see, this is definitely redlined. I know it's dated January 19 but it is supposed to be subsequent – the one following last week's call.

And so Susan, I know you made several edits. Could you let us know where you left off? Perhaps if I unsync if you want to just scroll through to where you know you, you know, to your latest edits if that's okay?

Susan Payne: I will try. Okay. So I think I mean, I made edits after our call in Question 4 in particular and to some extent in Question 5 following the things that we talked about on the call. I guess it would be helpful to know if people feel we need to go through those again or having had the space in a week to look at them, if everyone's happy with them, you know, we don't necessarily need to go back over the same questions again. Does anyone feel they need to go back through those Questions 4 and 5? I suppose that's the way to ask it.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Susan. This is Julie from staff. It looks like in the chat we have Kristine is saying "no," J. Scott is saying "no." I'm not seeing anybody with hand raised.

Susan Payne: Okay so that's good. So I think we can go down to the next one which doesn't seem to actually have a number, but I'll try and scroll down to it and tell people what page it is. Or is everyone seeing – if I scroll is everyone seeing what I scroll?

Julie Hedlund: If you'd like actually I can go ahead and make you a presenter and then you can – then people will see where you are. I've made you a presenter, so and I've synced the document so if you want to go ahead and try to move it?

Susan Payne: Okay. And in fact I think this might be where we want to be. So this page...

Julie Hedlund: Good, because I think I just did that randomly so.

Susan Payne: Yes. So I think we're at the start of the claims section then, if people are happy to start there, I think that's sort of where we'd got to. And I'm just looking at this document and trying to get my bearings. Apologies.

Yes, okay, so the first batch – the first question in relation to the claims charter questions was about the abandonment rate, trying to establish whether, you know, whether we can draw any inferences from the abandonment rate which obviously is something that we've talked about extensively. We talked about it a lot when we were talking about the Trademark Clearinghouse.

And so it's the sort of, you know, there's some data albeit I think we're at odds about the – how beneficial that data is about people abandoning registrations on receipt of a claims notice.

So the charter question is obviously going to the abandonment rate and in our proposed sort of factual column, which is the far right hand side, I proposed some questions to try to tease out that. So it's around about, again, remembering we're talking to registrars here so it's do you have records of the abandonment rate, i.e. domain name applicants who requested a registration of a particular domain but didn't go through to complete payment? And if so, what are the rates for legacy TLDs and ccTLDs?

And then what are the rates for new gTLDs during the claim period as compared to names which did receive a claim notice and names which didn't. All of those are trying to tease out some sort of baseline data because obviously we didn't have that or we don't have that.

I would say that we have asked before, I know we've submitted questions when we were working on the Trademark Clearinghouse data gathering exercise we did request from registrars data about abandonment rates at that point and we didn't get any. But it seems to me that, you know, if we're going through this exercise it's reasonable to try again and ask them the question again. So that was my suggestion.

Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, Susan, with a locked version and different versions floating around, could you actually read the questions that you're referring to? Because I don't seem to be able to see them for some reason. Would that be too much work to read...

Susan Payne: No, no, no.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you.

Susan Payne: Okay, so in the first column, and I'm just trying to remind myself what the first column is, that's the one that's the purpose and scope column which you'll remember came out of the previous work. It's headed, Specific Survey Questions for Claims Charter Question Number 1."

And it's, Number 1, "What is the abandonment rate associated with reasons other than a claims notice being triggered?" What is the difference between abandonment rates between those that trigger a claims notice and those that don't?"

And so that's why in the far right hand column which is the one about the sort of data questions, I'm proposing – sorry, I've just somehow managed to scrub out some of them on my screen. I'm proposing three bullets. One says, "Do you have any records of the abandonment rate? i.e. domain name applicants who requested the registration of a particular domain but do not go through to complete the payment?" Question mark.

And then the next bullet is, "If so, what are the rates of abandonment for legacy TLDs and ccTLDs?" And then next bullet, "What is the abandonment rate for a new gTLD during the claims period both for names which receive claims notices and those which do not?" And then that's one question. And then the next part is, "And after the claims period, same question."

And, Kathy, your hand is raised.

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: Old hand.

Susan Payne: Oh okay. Cool. Okay so does anyone have any thoughts on that, you know, objections in particular or anything they think we ought to be adding to that or because if not we could hopefully maybe move on to the next one but obviously looking forward to input if anyone has any views on that one.

Okay, so hearing nothing at the moment I'm going to move down. Obviously people can be – can also, you know, go into the Google Doc at a later date and still presumably be suggesting things. Okay, so the next – the next section is this – in the scope and – what's the column called again? Sorry. The scope and purpose column, or purpose and scope.

Question 2 is about “Is there anecdotal data explaining why potential registrants did not complete registrations?”

And so here I've included some questions which are in that anecdote column rather than the sort of data slash factual one. And those are, first bullet, “Do you capture any feedback from registrants as to why they do not complete a purchase on receipt of a claims notice?” And then next bullet, “Do you have any views of your own as to why registrants do not complete the purchase?”

And then next column, sorry next comment, “Some in the community think that the duration of the claims period,” oops, “Some in the community,” sorry, “think that the duration of the claims period should be changed. If the claims period were to be extended,” oh, hang on, I think this might be in the wrong place. Well anyway this is where it is.

So some people think that the duration of the claims period should be changed, if the claims period were extended would there be any technical,

operational or other concerns? If the claims period were reduced would there be,” and I’m imagining it’s going to say the same thing. Sorry, I’m trying to scroll and it’s not working very well. Sorry.

Yes, sorry, if the claims – it’s the same question, would there be any technical, operational or other concerns? And, “If you have any experiences in relation to registries which operated an extended claims period, which would illustrate your answer, please share them.”

To be honest, I think that third bullet, which is quite a long question, goes to a different question, so maybe we should pause and just deal with the first two about the anecdotes on the claims notice first if anyone has any comments, otherwise we can move on hopefully.

Sorry, this is really, really difficult to follow in this document. Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, I think the questions are fine. And even if there might be a better – I think they’re fine where they are because it’s following kind of, you know, the thought on abandonment and trademark – it’s all good. My guess is the survey people can sort it out from here, I think you’ve given them good guidance. Thanks.

Susan Payne: Yes, thank you. Yes, okay. I’m sorry about this, it’s just – it’s actually really quite hard to do because it’s not bearing a great deal of relation to the document that I have and so I don’t quite know how it’s ended up looking like this I’m afraid, but anyway. And consequently I’m not quite sure which of the – which of the questions this is going to.

But anyway, I mean, we definitely have been talking in the past about wanting to capture feedback about the duration of the claims period, so yes, I think it’s in the wrong place but I think it’s probably a reasonable question to ask. J. Scott, sorry, I just saw your hand.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, this is J. Scott for the record. My only question is just asking a yes or no question, right? Shouldn't you be asking for more additional information? I mean, do you capture any feedback from registrants as to why they do not complete on purchase on receipt of claims notice? Yes.

Susan Payne: You're absolutely right.

J. Scott Evans: Or no. We don't seek any information about what kind of comments they receive back or what kind of information – you know what I mean? And it seems to me that is – if they answer “yes” then that's the valuable data we're trying to get at. If they answer “no” of course, but if they answer “yes” we want more than “yes, we do” because that just means we have to go back to them.

Susan Payne: You're absolutely right. Thank you. That's a very good point. Okay, I can make that change assuming I can get access to the Google Doc in a format I can edit, I will definitely make that change. Okay. All right and then...

Julie Hedlund: Susan, I'm sorry, this is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to – we've had a lot of questions about the Google Doc. Mary and I in the background have been comparing it, you know, looking at it quite closely. The link that I put in the room is the latest version and it doesn't – it has all your edits, all the way through January 21.

But in order to see those edits a person has to be logged into their Google account so that they could see it in edit mode. If you aren't logged into Google you will see it only in view only mode and in that mode you will see no changes at all, it will just – it will be the original document before any edits were made.

So that's really the only difference between, you know, let's say J. Scott might be seeing and what you know, and what is in this link, the only difference is the view mode. So Susan, if you prefer, if you would like to look at the Google

Doc then, you know, if that's easier for you then, you know, staff can follow along with the PDF and also assist you with any hands that are up in the room.

Susan Payne: Have I got my – yes, sorry. Well I'm happy to but I'm logged into my Google account and I can't see them.

Julie Hedlund: What mode are you in?

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: ...only.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, view only mode means you can't see any edits. You have to – you'll have to be in suggestion mode.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: How do I do that?

J. Scott Evans: But you have to request edit access because that's what I just did. I don't know who grants that access. I will tell you I've never had to do this before but I recently cleared my browsing history so it probably pulled all the cookies off so that may be my problem.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Right. Thanks for that, J. Scott, because I'm just noting too that, you know, what the version that we've sent out is actually an edit version, so you should have permission to edit but perhaps if there was – if you, yes, cleared browser history or something. So how – sorry. Mary is trying to show me how...

Mary Wong: ...click on the view only.

Julie Hedlund: If you click on view only...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...you should have options, editing or suggesting. So...

J. Scott Evans: I clicked on View Only...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...for a lot of this, I'm just noting that, you know, if it's difficult to scroll through the PDF – okay, yes, and I see that Kristine, that the access – the request to access for editing is going to Ariel and unfortunately Ariel is in a meeting where she is not allowed to look at email at this moment.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, well we can continue on with what we have in the – if Susan is comfortable with what we have in the – on the screen in the Adobe Connect I think we just continue on with what we have.

Susan Payne: Yes, we can go through. I think the challenge I'm having is referencing some of the suggested questions back to where – in terms of what was our charter question that we were asking because it just – it doesn't look like the version that I'm looking, which is the one that I was working from.

But, you know, I think that's not the end of the world. So let's keep going. I think anyway, it may just be that that third bullet is probably – has probably ended up in not the right place but I don't think it's a bullet we don't want.

So if we scroll down to Question 3, the scope and purpose questions, which was about – and I'm going to read it again because we've got this slightly challenging process.

So, Kathy, it's Question 3 was about, "At what point in the registration process is a trademark record downloaded? Does this happen with the domain names are placed in carts or does it happen when payment slash attempted registrations are done later in the process?" And so within that same anecdote column, there's a couple of bullets to try to go toward that. And actually the first one is possibly even identical. So it's Bullet 1, "At what point in the registration process is the trademark record downloaded? Does this happen when the domain names are placed in carts or does it happen when payment attempted registrations are done later in the process?"

And then the next bullet, "Do you collect any feedback from your customers regarding their understanding of the claims – the trademark claims notice? Is there any particular wording which is generally well understood or misunderstood?" That one could probably do with a sort of J. Scott edit. I think it partially captures some actual feedback but it probably could do with a slight tweaking to make sure that people don't just say yes/no.

Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I'm so sorry. That's an old hand.

Susan Payne: Oh okay. All right and unless anyone has any concerns about that one then I will keep going down and we can go down to question – the next question on the document which is Number 4 and is about registration – registrars taking preorders for domain names.

So Question 4 in the scope and purpose column is as follows. "Many registrars take over for domain names before general availability-preorders," sorry. Sorry. Dash. "Preorders do not normally result in claims notices being presented within 48 hours of general availability. Does this contribute to the abandonment rate? If so, to what extent are preordered domain name registrations abandoned?"

And so I've got some questions in – or some bullets in both of the columns to try to address that one. It's probably best if we go to the kind of – the far right which is the kind of factual question first which is, you know, "Do you or did you offer preorder for new gTLDs domain names before the launch of general availability?" And then another bullet, "If you captured data about abandonment rates what is the rate for domain preorders compared to domains which were not preordered?"

And then moving one column to the left, which is then our sort of more anecdotal questions, we have, "If you offered preorder for new gTLD domain names before the launch of general availability, when was the claims notice submitted to the customer?"

And then following on from that, "What if any challenges do you encounter when sending claims notice in respect to preorder names? And were there any particular TLDs or types of TLDs where the operation of the claims was technically or operationally difficult or where the claims was otherwise problematic or unnecessary? And please explain."

That one doesn't particularly go to the preorder question. So again I may have managed to put that in the wrong place. So the first two bullets are around the preorders trying to capture more anecdotal information, and then that third one was just asking about particular TLD types where there might be technical difficulties or other operational difficulties for a registrar which I think is probably looking to answer – to help answer that question about – or the various questions that we have in Column 2 around the claims period, you know, should the claims period be mandatory, should any TLDs be exempt from claims RPMs and if so, which ones and why? It's seeking to gather information to help us answer those questions in the third bullet.

Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine for the transcript. I was only going to suggest, and this is probably a distinction without a difference, but your first bullet point in the third column I think is actually a factual data question, so if you offered, when was the claims notice submitted to the customer, I believe that that's a data question. I'm not sure if we want to move it or not but that was my question.

Susan Payne: Thanks, Kristine. Yes, that's a – I'm quite happy to move it. I agree with you that it is actually gathering quite factual information. So unless anyone disagrees I could suggest we move it. Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Susan. This is Kurt. Yes, so first I agree with Kristine. There are a few questions like that on one hand, but on the other hand I don't know if it matters. The point I wanted to make was whether we should ask registrars why they offered preregistrations before date.

It'd be interesting to know, you know, if there's like a community protection reason or a special registrant protection reason or, you know, was it financial in nature? Was there some sort of immediate demand that needed to be addressed because of delays?

So I wonder in, you know, we know preregistrations were offered but it'd be good to know why because there's probably really good reasons and maybe some not so good reasons too.

Susan Payne: Thanks, Kurt. Anyone else have any strong views one way or the other on that? Oh, Kathy, you've got your hand up.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, Kurt, could we be getting a little far afield? I mean, going into those business decisions of preorders, is it, I mean, we promised efficiency in the data gathering, I think that's the reason we're doing this exercise was that the Council wouldn't give us the money without the efficiency so I'm just wondering whether we're now talking about a new area that we're going to

have to teach the survey people about, one that we haven't really discussed a lot so I have lots of questions marks about what you just said on the business side. And I'm wondering how directly it links to what we're talking about here with the trademark claims. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, so won't belabor this, and I can let it go. I mean, why are we asking questions about preregistrations in the first place, you know, are preregistrations a way to ameliorate the rights protection mechanisms or a way to around them or are they there for some other means? So we know they exist but now we're going to ask, you know, if, you know, how the process worked, but we're not even going to know why preregistrations were offered and we're going to come up with some policy decision that preregistrations might be good or bad, I don't know.

If we're talking about them, we're going to make some decision whether they're good or bad so I wanted know the reason. On the other hand, I'm fine to let it go so I'll stop talking.

Susan Payne: Okay, Kathy first and then Kristine.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Yes, I don't think any registrar is going to tell us that preregistration is designed to avoid trademark claims notices because even if it's true they wouldn't tell us but I think what we're hearing is that they were – that, you know, they are doing this preregistration. It sounds like they're doing it for business reasons, and yet there's this problem with the trademark claims. So I don't know, I like the idea of solving, you know, seeing if we can address the problem because we've heard about it from people who seem willing to talk to us about. Anyways, thanks. Looking forward to what Kristine says.

Susan Payne: Sorry, Kristine, do you want to go next?

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine for the transcript. So I'm going to draw attention to that first column again as we've done multiple times now in the sub team. That

(unintelligible) column again was directed shorthand for the gNSO Council. We – it did not present the scope of what this point – the point of these charter questions were about, and I think that the problem in this case is that that shorthand is very limiting. What we were really talking about on the claims sub team was the operation of the claims process, did it work? Did it not work?

And we got into talking about this idea that registrars were having to solve a problem with when and how to present the claims notice because the way that these RPMs were drafted assumed that registration would happen in this sort of linear fashion and didn't even think about preorders, etcetera.

So the way preorders came up was in this idea of how can we help resolve that issue without unnecessarily constraining registries and registrars in the order of how they solve things. And so it wasn't necessarily related just to abandonment.

I think that was a side point of anecdotal data that we were interested in, so we're definitely interested in anecdotal data. I think we also came away from that claims notice understanding that we probably weren't going to get good abandonment rate data because that kind of data just isn't generally being collected, however, we're going to ask and that's fine and I'm not going to argue about that. But in this specific instance, I think it's important to get at these questions which I think is what you're getting at here, Susan, to talk about how the claims notice interact with things like preorders.

And there might be other things that registries and registrars did to – that kind of ran up against or butted up against the mandatory claims process. And so I think it's important that our questions dig out not just a known problem, known problem is we have to do preorders, we have to do claims, so we want to preorders, we have to do claims. But were there other problems related to what we wanted to do and the presence of those mandatory claims period and how can we make that more fluid for registries and registrars?

And so I think it's that problem, the interaction of the claims, the mandatory provision of the claims notice and the way it related to the preorders and how the preorders came in on let's say January 1 but the TLD didn't go live until March 1, and so when does that claims notice get presented? And so I think that's really what we want to think about here, not limit our conversation to these terms of abandonment which is a separate but sub related issue.

Susan Payne: Thanks, Kristine. And yes, I agree with you. I don't think we are limiting our questions to just to abandonment. I think the idea was to try to tease out if there were particular problems, you know, for the preorder in terms of how the preorder interacts with this obligation to submit, you know, to go through the claims notice process.

And I think that's probably also why when I was marking this up when I last looked at it I think that's probably where the third bullet comes in which is why that third bullet moves away from the specifics of preorders and is seeking to kind of tease out if there are other issues around particular types of TLDs which, sorry, excuse me, I'm just going to cough. You know, whether there are other sort of operational or technical problems with having to do the claims notice for perhaps other TLD types or other types of operation. Does that seem workable or do you think we're still – we're missing a step still? Yes, thanks Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, thanks. Yes, and I needed to be clear in my wrong rambling answer was mostly agree with you questions and your placement of them. I mostly wanted to sort of defend I guess why I thought these questions did actually belong here more terms of scope. But I also do think that the questions could be misinterpreted. I think that we understand what we're asking, my worry is that we're not going to get the breadth of answers that we want.

And I think – I don't know, maybe we just have a note, a second bullet point, because when we say “Were there any particular TLDs or types of TLDs

where the operation of the claims was technically or operationally difficult or where claims were otherwise problematic or unnecessary?” Seems kind of vague and open ended, and I’m a little bit afraid that recipients might sort of miss the point.

And I guess I don't want to spend hours (unintelligible) it but I’m wondering if we need the – to somehow draw that out a little bit so that we can be focused – so we can focus their attention on this sort of relationship. I don't know if I can – I don't know if I can be more specific than that, I’m sorry, maybe J. Scott has a suggestion.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott for the record. No, I think I have a couple of questions with regards to this. So it seems to me that, you know, our remit is decide if the rights protection mechanisms are working as designed, you know, the purpose they were designed and if not what if any changes need to take place, right? That’s sort of our overall general remit.

And so I guess, not being a technical person and not being a registrar, I wonder we’re getting into a lot of the technical part of this and rather than – so are we saying that how the work flow works is just as important as what the solution is, what the rights protection mechanism is, because it's been designed and if it is designed in such a way that it causes hiccups within the registration process or when the work flow of opening a registry, that’s something that needs to be fixed just as well as whether the wording of the notice is correct and that kind of thing.

So is that what we’re sort of aiming to get to the bottom of is, you know, there’s sort of this one question with regards to how it worked as far as does it provide the relief that it was, you know, designed to provide for trademark owners, and the protections that it was designed to provide for potential registrants or applicants, as one part of the question.

And the second question is – I'm asking you all, that we're perhaps trying to answer is well regardless of the first question, there's a process problem because the way you've designed it to be sent out it doesn't really fit into the typical business work flow for opening a registry.

I'm just wondering why we're digging into all of this unless that's the answer that how – were they – are they working as designed is as much a technical question as it is a relief or equity question.

Susan Payne: Thanks, J. Scott. I'll go to you, Kristine, and then I put my hand up as well but I may not need to say anything if you say what I'm going to. I've lost you, Kristine, did you put your hand down?

Kristine Dorrain: One question. This is Kristine. Thank you. Yes, I think I do – I agree with you, J. Scott, I think that's what we want to get at. Maybe the most simple way to say it is, is the way the claims period is prescribed in the RPMs, is that too prescriptive?

I mean, is it the type of thing where limited by definition you shall for 30 days from such and such a date provide a claims notice is the way claims period is mandatorily positioned really limiting registries and registrars from doing their business?

And so I think we can get to that. I wonder if we could merge – take Susan's first bullet and just (glom) that out a bit? So what if any challenges do you encounter when sending claims notices in respect of preorder names or other aspects of the domain name sales channel or something, I mean, just so then you can really open it up to just – to thinking specifically about preorders but while you're thinking about preorders other similar types of situations where the process of claim was troublesome but you're not complaining about the fact that you had to offer them at all. Just that for a suggestion. But I think you hit it, J. Scott.

Susan Payne: Thanks, Kristine. And, yes, I think I was going to say something similar. I mean, I think we have various charter questions that, you know, we're tasked with answering which relate, you know, which include things like you know, is it serving its intended purpose good faith registrations, is it having unintended consequences?

And so I think this is what we're trying to understand, which doesn't necessarily mean, you know, if it has unintended consequences it doesn't necessarily mean that that's the end of the story, we don't have claims but it's to seek to elicit that information.

And I think on the other side, you know, we do know that there were preorders and we do know that there were concerns on the brand owners' side about how the preorder process was working with the claims notice and whether people were actually getting sent their claims notices and, you know, was it operating as it should do?

And so I think, you know, if we get a lot of technical answers back that go, you know, you know what, actually we can't do it, well then we have to think about what we do about that. And so I think that's why we're asking these questions.

And I like your suggestion, Kristine, about just kind of using those bullets and just slightly expanding them so that even if registries don't offer particularly preorders in particular we still capture that feedback from them. Okay. All right. So I think we can move further down the document hopefully. Just put my hand down.

So our next section is about would it be feasible for registrars to run surveys or domain name applicants? Let me read this information, this is, again, just as a reminder of Kristine reminded us, this is the scope and purpose section which is just meant to give kind of guidance.

Point 5 in that column was about, “Would it be feasible for registrars to run surveys of domain name applicants during subsequent rounds of new gTLDs for anecdotal evidence on why registrations are being abandoned? Is this something ICANN should mandate?”

Oh sorry. Oh sorry, I’m sorry, I’m reading your notes, Kathy, to Kristine and I thought you were saying you couldn’t hear me, but hopefully you can hear me.

And so this is – this sort of section is around this, again, really is looking to go back to this kind of – this notion of abandonment and whether the claims notice is serving its purpose or having unintended consequences. And I think this was really looking to the future and with the assumption that sometimes we may not be getting the evidence, you know, the information that we want this time around.

And we know, for example, that I mean, some registrars may have captured anecdotal information from their customers but we suspect that a number of them won't have done.

So this is seeking to ask the question, rather than us, you know, sort of sit in our isolation and mandate in some way that they should be doing various things in future rounds that we think would help us, it was really just to try and elicit whether that’s even feasible.

And so the bullet in the sort of anecdote column, for want of a better word, that I was suggesting were firstly given the registration process that you operate, would it be feasible for you to run surveys of domain name applicants who decide not to proceed with registration during subsequent rounds of new gTLDs for anecdotal evidence on why registrations are being abandoned. And then second bullet point, are there technical or procedural reasons which would make this impossible or disproportionately difficult or costly?

And as I say, I think this is just seeking to understand whether if we were going to be making suggestions around this area whether there are, you know, whether it's realistic for us to be thinking that that can be done because I know that there's been feedback from some registrars that, you know, in relation to the abandonment rates where they sort of said well, you know, we don't, you know, we – if we don't have – if we're a retail registrar and we don't have like an ongoing contractual relationship with the registrants, then we don't necessarily know who they are or what they are right up until the point where they conclude their business with us and we then have their name and their contact details.

And so it was, you know, seeking to understand whether that is in fact a real concern. I'm going to pause in case anyone has any comments on that one.  
Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: So, Susan, would it – the question is fine to fully effectuate it, would a small change to the third column, so given the registration process that you operate would it be feasible for you and/or your resellers to run surveys? Should we try to extend it to the reselling network? It's a legitimate question to ask I think.

Susan Payne: Yes, I guess so. We don't have any questions for resellers specifically, do we? I don't think we do. I don't have a problem with that. I'm happy to make that – to suggest that if – does anyone see a problem with that? Okay I'm not seeing any objection so thank you.

Okay, and then – we're quite close to – actually we're quite close to the end so why don't we just see if we can knock this on the head because I think this next question is the final one.

So scope and purpose column 6 is about the claims notice and the translation of that into the language of the registration agreement and is it being made

available to registrants in that language. And so I have made some suggestions in our – in the far right and column on which is the sort of more factual basis which is what language is, other than English, do you use for your registration agreement with new gTLD domain name registrants and do you translate the claims notice into all of these languages?

And I'm just going to scroll down in case there's any more questions after that. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine for the transcript. (Unintelligible)...

Susan Payne: Kristine, you're really, really quiet.

Kristine Dorrain: ...(unintelligible).

Susan Payne: I'm not sure what you said. You sound like you're underwater.

Kristine Dorrain: Well again, okay, I'll type.

Susan Payne: The last thing you said was better so try speaking again and we'll see if we can hear you.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay. This is Kristine for the transcript. I just thought it would be helpful to gather (unintelligible) so we have the languages of their agreements and the languages of the (unintelligible)...

Susan Payne: I'm sorry. Kristine, I'm really sorry, you started off okay and then I certainly couldn't hear you. Are you saying would it be helpful to capture information about where the registrant is that what you were talking about? Yes, oh location of the registrar, okay, as opposed to the registrant. I'm pausing because I can see J. Scott typing and Kristine typing. Yes the language of the registration agreement might or might not correlate to the location of the registrar. Yes, it might be useful.

I mean, I think it's the – I would need to go back and remind myself of exactly what it says in the claims notice but I think it says – I think it has to be in English and then I think there's a – it may be in the language of the agreement with the registrant. So I don't think it's a – yes. Okay but I'll make that note, I mean, maybe that would be helpful to have information about location of the registrar. Thank you.

And I'm not seeing anyone else's hands. I know we're like a minute or two over now in fact. And I think J. Scott has just had to drop off. So perhaps we should pause there and we have hopefully, unless anyone has any other comments on this section we have actually got to the end of the registrar section. We've got an agenda of 3 which is timing of future meetings. Should I hand this back to you, Julie, or Michelle?

Julie Hedlund:: Yes, hi, thanks. This is Julie from staff. So, yes, so I think that we will expect to have a meeting at this same time next week, that seems to be a time that is working for most people.

So it will be then February 2 at whatever this is in UTC, pardon me, I'm LA and I'm really discombobulated now. But we'll – we'll send a notice right after this call. Thank you.

Susan Payne: It was 1700 UTC, it's now 1800, sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: I think we're all a bit discombobulated today.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you so much, Susan, for soldiering through the document and everyone for bearing with us as we sorted out the issues, we really do appreciate it.

Susan Payne: Oh thank you. No, thank you for your help as well. I think we got there, I just got a bit, you know, you know what's like when you've got sort of different versions and they all look sort of slightly similar but not quite. So thank you very much and I think once we've got the ability to edit the Google Doc obviously I can make a few little tweaks based on what we've talked about today but there doesn't look like there's that many changes but obviously if anyone else has any suggestions they want to make they should do so too.

Great, thanks very much, everyone and have a lovely weekend.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Yes, please have a wonderful weekend and we'll talk next week. Thank you.

Susan Payne: Thanks. Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

END