ICANN Transcription

The Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Sunrise Data Review

Wednesday 09, January 2019 at 1800 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-sunrise-09jan19-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p2xzk0iy67h/?proto=true

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/iQj_BQ

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

JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RPM Subteam for Sunrise Data review call on Wednesday, the 9th of January 2019.

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 at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

[If there are no names,] I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn it over to Greg Shatan. You may begin, Greg.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Actually, Julie Bisland, I'll just take care of going through the agenda and administrivia before turning it over to Greg, if that's okay. So, just for the agenda, item one is statements of interest update. Two is just an item to remind all that we have had two volunteers for co-leaders, and they've been accepted. Item three is to continue with the survey analysis, and item four is Any Other Business.
	May I ask if there's anyone who has Any Other Business they'd like to add today? George Kirikos, please.
GEORGE KIRIKOS:	Yes. On the first call for the claims subteam, we discussed moving the lockdown time to the day before so that people have more time to review the submissions or homework assignments that were done by others. So, we might want to do the same in this subteam, and generally, only [inaudible] those people did the homework assignments for this week, so we probably want to make sure everybody's capable technical to understand how to do it and document it and so on, everybody has [inaudible] workload and so on. But if there's some technical impediment that might prevent people from understanding how to use the spreadsheet, we might want to do that review that Ariel did in the first call to help people become acclimatized to the tools that we have. Thanks.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you very much, George. And actually, staff did plan to go ahead and do sort of a reminder tutorial at the start of item three

on the survey analysis, and we can also then bring up the point of the earlier lockdown of the document and how to reflect the suggestions to improve the viewing and analysis. So, we will do that when we get there.

Let me then go to the top of the agenda and ask if there are any statements of interest. And I'm not seeing any hands up, and let me just, I guess, check the chat. Yes, Greg Shatan saying appreciate the same run through as claims got. Yes, and we'll definitely do that.

And hold on. Covering something here. I don't have any updates to statements of interest, so agenda item two is just to note, as you saw on the list last week, that both Greg Shatan and David McAluey agreed to co-lead this group, and I want to specifically thank them for volunteering and to let you all know that yesterday, they did have a call with the working group co-chairs with some preparation.

On that call, they actually went over the – also discussed the procedural document [inaudible] full the working group. We will not be discussing that procedural document here today, but we did ask, and we do encourage folks, to provide any comments on that document to the full working group list.

So, thanks again to David and Greg for volunteering, and then let me go to agenda item three. On Agenda item three, I'm going to turn things over to my colleague, Ariel Liang, who will remind us all how we can better use the tool, any questions people might have, and noting, as George did, that the previous subteam had agreed to an earlier lockdown time of 24 hours prior to the

meeting to enable more time to review comments. So, we would suggest to this subteam that we could do the same thing here, which would be at 18:00 UTC the day prior to the meeting, unless there are any objections.

But, let me turn things over to Ariel. Ariel Liang, please.

ARIEL LIANG

Thanks very much, Julie. If you see the AC screen, you can see that I'm sharing the Google document on the screen right now. What you probably noticed is, for example, the preamble [charter] question worksheet seems blank. It's because staff had locked the document and changed it into "view only." So, all the suggested edits and comments are not showing here. That doesn't mean they are gone, they're basically hidden, so once we change that to suggesting mode, means people can edit and suggest in redline. You can see all the comments and suggested edits come back to the document.

So, that's just staff wants to reassure you nothing has changed and the link is the same, it's just basically we changed that to "view only" to lock the document. And the reason is that we want to prevent any potential confusion created by last-minute input and because we had some [inaudible] experience in the data subteam sub people tend to put in edits or comments last-minute or even during the call. So that's why we want to change to "view only" and make sure everybody's looking at the same comments that circulated a few hours – or in this case, maybe a day – before the meeting.

So that's the reason for that. And also, staff are happy to make adjustments, and that was discussed in the trademark claims subteam, is that we can accept all these newly added inputs and note that they are new, and then still make sure the document is "view only," and then during a call, we can reference the Google doc. It is easier and you can see the new input. And that will be a workaround.

Then the other thing we want to mention that for example if you look at the [inaudible] charter questions that, A, some of these questions are answered or somewhat answered by the survey, and in the instruction section, you can see that we have highlighted the relevant survey data tab and row in the spreadsheet that could help answer these questions that we have noted in the instructions section, and that's consistent in other worksheets.

But some of the worksheet, for example for preamble charter questions, when Analysis Group developed the survey, this charter question wasn't directly included in the development, so that's why we're not able to point you specifically to the tab [with that row] in the survey analysis tool. That doesn't mean the survey response wouldn't help answer this question. So, that's some difference here.

And I see that Maxim has a question which [you are asking] on the screen, so we're just sharing the Google doc for the sunrise preamble charter question Google doc. But during today's team meeting, since it's in "view only" mode for the subteam, we will reference the PDF, and the PDF has all the new comment and input. This is just for demonstration purpose.

I will stop here now. And Julie, do you have additional comments?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Ariel. I do not, but I see that David McAluley has his hand up. David, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Julie, and thank you, Ariel. David McAuley speaking as a participant now, not as co-chair. And I think, Ariel, you probably just addressed what I was going to ask, and that is – and I speak as someone who struggles a little bit with Google Docs, with both suggestions and view and all this kind of stuff, and then when a lot of suggestions come in, things really get garbled for me.

But what I liked was that you sent a PDF that showed comments that were inserted. For instance, you see George's comment on the preamble thing. And so I was just going to say it sounds like maybe we should focus on the PDF that you send. If people prefer Google Docs, that's certainly their right, but I for one am saying I like the idea of getting that PDF as per the operational document for the call, and that's what I'm planning on using. So, thanks for doing it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks very much, David. And let me turn to Ariel for a response. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG	Thanks, Julie. And thanks, David, for that feedback. For certain, today's call, we will focus on using the PDF, and in the future calls, when staff do the adjustment to the Google doc, we will still send the same kind of PDF to show the redline and what are new and [inaudible] those reference points.
	So, it's just to kind of make it easier for everyone to use PDF or Google Docs, we'll have both versions available. And today, [we need to] look at the PDF, because the Google doc is view only.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you very much, Ariel. I have Maxim Alzoba, and then Greg Shatan. Maxim, please. Maxim, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.
MAXIM ALZOBA:	Do you hear me now?
JULIE HEDLUND:	Yes, we can. Please go ahead.
MAXIM ALZOBA:	I have a question. Before we switched to this form, we were using the Google doc, to which I added few comments about the length of sunrise. And as I remember, I ask to include it to this current document, but I don't see it. Is it some kind of mistake or some other thing? because I believe that when the members of the group provided some opinion few times, it is a good idea to add it somewhere. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Let me turn to my colleague, Arial, to address your question, Maxim. Ariel, please.
ARIEL LIANG	Thanks very much, Julie. Maxim, is it okay if you could enter your specific comments in the Google doc after the meeting? We did know that you sent that request, but it seemed a little broad, and then we have [specifically asked] for example what survey question or answer, how to answer the charter question and which sub-question does address the charter question, and then have the specific comment that we requested the subteam member to provide, as well as the tab and cell number reference.
	So I think that will make it least confusing, if you could kindly put that in the Google doc after the call, and we'll make sure to address that in the next call. I hope that will be a workaround.
MAXIM ALZOBA:	Ariel, the reason to ask was that I have already once added it to Google Docs, so I believe either it's lost, or something happened to the versions of files as we experienced before. It could be a good idea to start tracking the changes. Thanks. Because adding something for the sixth time – because it's not the first time I added this, it is about the misconceptions between 30 days and 60 days of the sunrise wherein in fact it's always 60 days. And the question [itself] might be misguided a bit.

So, it's a bit of disappointment. Thanks. I think we could move [further.]

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. Maxim, thanks for this. Staff will take a look at that. But let me turn to Greg Shatan. Oh, actually, Ariel does have a response. Let me go to Ariel Liang first. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG Thanks. Sorry for kind of [inaudible] briefly. I think probably we're talking about two different documents. And Maxim, I think your comment was in this survey analysis tool Google spreadsheet, which we did note your comments here. And you can look at the screen, it's right here in the spreadsheet.

But the task is to put that in the Google doc, and we can't just directly paste the comment into Google Docs because there are some specific questions we're asking how they address the charter questions. So we do need your help to make sure that these comments are captured correctly. And if you could do that after the call, that would be greatly appreciated.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. That's quite helpful. Let me go to Greg Shatan, and then I might suggest that we need to wrap up this particular discussion so we can move on to the charter questions. Greg, please.

EN

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. A couple of logistical points with regard to the PDF. It would be helpful if the PDFs could be done in landscape rather than portrait mode so that the print is somewhat larger for those of us with less keen eyesight.

Also, if the Google doc is downloaded as a Word doc and then made into a PDF, the names of the people making the marginal comments will be preserved. But if you download it directly as a PDF from Google Docs, you'll lose the name and then you'll just end up with "comment commented 1," and not knowing whose comment that is. So, it may be an extra step.

The alternative is to have people put their names into the comment box, but one way or the other, if we're working from the PDF, we need to know who made the marginal comments. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Greg. And staff have noted that. We'll check on the possibility of whether or not we can do the PDFs ion landscape, and also noting going from Google to Word as an intermediary step and then going into PDF from that. And Ariel's saying also that we'll note the dates in the title of PDFs to keep version tracking.

George Kirikos is noting that when he prints out the PDF, they're in landscape. Anyway, let us go ahead, and we have taken note of these suggestions, and let me then suggest that we move on to agenda item three which is continuing with the survey analysis starting with sunrise charter question 5A. And we'll bring that up.

Greg, I have your hand still up. Do you have some additional comments?

GREG SHATAN: No, but I did see that George noted that he had printed from the Google doc, that was why it was in Landscape. So the PDF remains in portrait for this week, but hopefully not after this week.

So, I guess let's turn to the meat of the conversation.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excellent. Thank you very much, and then for all of your reference, we have this on screen. Charter question 5A, which I won't read, you can see it there yourself. The document is unsynced. And Ariel, if you could remind us where we are starting here.

ARIEL LIANG The new content is from page 4 and [onward,] and I just want to note that from page one to three, you may see some redline comments, and that was the summary of the discussion of these inputs in last week's call, and we do note that Michael Kranicolas has a comment on page four as well for the staff summary of what was discussed for the input.

So, perhaps we could suggest moving from page four, and then after that's finished, we can revisit the previous redline comments.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Ariel. That's most helpful. So, we are then at he bottom of page four, and we have new comments from Griffin Barnett that you can all see here on the screen. And let me then turn things over to our co-chair, Greg Shatan, and to the subteam for discussion of these comments.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you Julie and Julie, and Ariel, who [could be named] Julie. So, let's see who has comments here on Griffin's work, which had been on the e-mail list but was just put more recently into the Google doc. I don't know, Griffin, if maybe you want to hit some of the high points here or if we just want to turn directly to third-party discussion of Griffin's comment. Or I can do the walkthrough. Not sure how we want to do this, but might as well figure out what our best process is, and so we're doing this a number of times.

In the absence of –

JULIE HEDLUND: [inaudible].

GREG SHATAN: Yes. David, go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY: Greg, thanks. And I'm going to repeat a comment I made last week based on what Griffin put in. I'm speaking now as a participant, not as a co-chair. And the comment that I thought he made that was fairly cogent is there should be a single dedicated

and reliable online resource where sunrise periods are clearly stated and where the timing cannot be changed more than a certain number of days, etc. Appears at the bottom of page five and goes over a little bit, I think.

In any event, I thought it was a good idea if it's technically and cost-wise feasible. So I would thank Griffin for that comment, and think that a centralized source where people can go to to find out what the various sunrise periods are would be welcome. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, David. So, just –

JULIE HEDLUND: George Kirikos, you have your hand up.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. George, go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Just responding to that point, [inaudible] useful suggestion, it's not something where if you look at that column, it says literally, how did that survey result [inaudible]? We're trying to look at what data supports various answers to the questions. [inaudible] in terms of coming to the recommendations, what we should be really focusing on is pulling from the survey results the appropriate cells that answer various questions. So, Griffin's statement about a solution that might help is not really appropriate at this time. But

GREG SHATAN: I'll just chime in before we go to the hands. And I actually agree with George on this. I think there are a lot of good comments here, or at least comments that are worth dealing with, but I think we do need to avoid scope creep in each of our tasks, and the task here is, thankfully, relatively narrowly defined, which should help us get through it more quickly. So I think we need to reserve a number of Griffin's comments for kind of later in the process. so we should put a pin in these. It doesn't mean we shouldn't discuss them now since we have them in front of us, but I think on a going forward basis, I think we should try to answer the question that's at the top of the document, how do they assist, and then we can kind of work on next steps, conclusions and recommendations kind of from there. Thanks. And I'm on a tablet, so I don't know who is first, Griffin or Maxim.

JULIE HEDLUND: I have Maxim and then Griffin.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, there was [inaudible] information about all new gTLDs, about the time of start sunrises, of limited periods with the rules for periods, with the timing for claims periods, etc. It's all in ICANN's database, I believe, and I posted a URL to the chat. And about different types of sunrises, actually, [end date sunrise is auction.] And there could be some financial concerns. For example,

company doesn't want to have auctions. So, first come, first served [inaudible].

So it's not only timing. It's the model of choosing who is the winner, I'd say. One option is to be the first, another option is to be the highest bidder. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Maxim. Next we have Griffin.

GRIFFIN BARNETT: I agree with the point that others made about [inaudible] first on what our conclusions about what the data says, and then reserving discussion of potential solutions or recommendations that come from that. I just wanted to clarify that [my comments, they're] sort of a collection of both. I didn't make probably as good of an effort as I maybe could have to separate out in my input here sort of what were my conclusions and analysis of the data itself versus what are some of the potential solutions that correlate to that analysis or conclusion.

So, I just wanted to mention that they're both kind of in there. If you'd like me to try and do the exercise of finding some way to separate those out or perhaps it's something staff might be able to do. I know last time, I think we talked about potentially highlighting recommendation [number four] suggested fixes in like another color or something along those lines to differentiate them from any other comments. That might be something that would be helpful to do, not just in my comments but other inputs in the Google doc is

of a similar nature [inaudible] as well, if it hasn't already been done.

And then on Maxim's point that he just made, yeah, I think I also at the end of last week's call mentioned the existing microsite through the ICANN website where you can find all the information about sunrise periods and so forth so that that resource does exist today, but I think the data suggests – and this is [inaudible] my comments, the data suggests that there were still some folks who either may not have been aware of that resource, or even if they were, there were some problems with making sure that all of the information there was always kept appropriately up to date. And at least in my own personal experience – and I don't know that this necessarily went out in the survey results, but it's corroborated to some extent, I think – sometimes folks would change the information for like sunrise start and end dates for example, sort of like right at the last minute, or people would be expecting a sunrise to start, and then it would suddenly push back to another time. It's more of those consistency-type issues that I wanted to highlight about that type of resource. But anyway, that's perhaps discussion for when we reached a solution [inaudible]. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Greg, we don't see any other hands up at this point.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. Thank you, Julie, and also Griffin and Maxim. And I think that when we do get to discussing solutions, publicity and kind of more consumer-facing resources as opposed to a microsite might

be something to suggest at that time. But at this time, the question is whether anybody has any other comment on Griffin's comments, which bring us through the remainder of the table, and so not seeing them, I think it's probably time to loop back to the comments on the comments, and there's one on page one that's now up. Just noting that there's a – if you don't know the difference between sunrise period types, here is the short answer, and I think Maxim also kind of summarized it nicely. One type, you want to be first, and the other type, you want to be the high bitter, if there is more than one claimant or applicant at the end of the period.

so, I don't know if we have any – this seems noncontroversial. Anybody who needs to look at the ICANN Wiki can do so.

JULIE HEDLUND: And Greg, Maxim has his hand up.

GREG SHATAN: Great. Maxim, go ahead, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Greg, just short clarification, it's not the registrant chooses the method, it's the registry chooses the method all potential registrants are going to use [inaudible] TLD. So, if the registry chooses that [inaudible] superdrink.superdrink is going to be the auction type [is end date] and the period is 60 days. If this super drink TLD is going to be first come, first served, it's 30 days

notification, and in 30 days, there is a 30 days period for who is the first, actually. Just clarification. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Maxim. Does anybody else have any questions about sunrise types as we analyze this?

JULIE HEDLUND: [inaudible].

GREG SHATAN: I'm not seeing any.

JULIE HEDLUND: Alright.

GREG SHATAN: So I think we can move on to page four, and wait for that to come up in Adobe.

JULIE HEDLUND: The document's unsynced, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: It's unsynced? Okay. Again, I'm going to bring my laptop to the office on Wednesdays or [when there's] another way, because the tablet doesn't – leaves something to be desired in terms [of this.] But so let's all turn to page four then.

The first comment, which I think was actually from me, "Disagree with the statement that serious statistical problems and likely skewing of results. We shouldn't go too far afield but note what we can't determine from the data." I'm not sure that last sentence actually captures exactly what I said, but I think we all understand what the type of survey we ended up with, and depending upon what you think it was supposed to accomplish, if we were supposed to be able to predict with great accuracy what the results would be if you expanded this to the entire population, then our confidence level, I think, is not what you would want in that sort of –trying to predict the next president sort of exercise. But there is still much to be gleaned, and I think we also decided on the last call that we would discuss the data and leave aside further discussion of kind of the validity of the data, at least until we're getting to comparing some data to other data.

So, I don't want to beat this horse any further, but if anybody else wants to, feel free. George, I see your hand is up.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I don't want to speak for Michael because it was his comment, but I would agree with his comment that [inaudible] comment from subteam, it's comment from one person or two people, it's not comment from the entire subteam. Because I stand by the statistical argument that we made in-depth. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, George. And we may rejoin that at some point if it seems necessary for the larger subteam. But yeah, those

comments were mine, and I don't know if somebody agrees with me, but that's neither here nor there. And I understand, George, I would need to go further to persuade you.

And then we do have the comment in the margin, which is there's no name attached to it, but I believe that is Michael Karinicolas.

I'm not sure if this fully captures the discussion from my part, and as I think I expressed in the chat, I think it's less about what we can't determine from the data, which implies it's a reliable data [set] that just doesn't address every issue, and more about viewing this data as a whole through the lens of [inaudible] may be too strong a word, but I think its closer to the right track insofar as it's important to consider the results as reflecting the potential biases of the respondent.

[inaudible] more on the same topic, and I think that rather than discussing this issue now, if we want to rejoin the issue of kind of weight of the data, we should plan that as a discussion as such, and so people can be prepared for that and put it on the agenda. [In fact,] that's what we're going to discuss.

But by and large, I think this is, again, still a dead horse, and we can go on. Is there any other comment on the sunrise charter question 5A? Perhaps some comments people didn't enter into the Google doc but wish to bring up at this time? George Kirikos, I see your hand is up.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. I think we talked about this on the mailing list somewhere, but there were issues about what other data sources we were

using, so it kind of goes back to the last point about how much weight to assign to the survey results. There's questions about whether staff should be going into the various data sources that were previously brought to staff's attention for the year. So, I think they were awaiting further subteam discussion on that point. So, we should probably give some time to that at some point. Not necessarily on this call, but some future call as to what are the data sources we should be going for and how to get those. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, George. I'll note on the document entitled Summary Table Review of Agreed Sunrise Charter Questions and Data Collected, I don't know if staff has that available to put up, it was one of the documents that was circulated, kind of the master document for this, I think which is where Maxim's comment may have ended up.

But in any case, from the last couple of pages are lists of the prior data sources, the February 2017 Analysis Group, the 2016 registry operators, Deloitte responses from the TMCH subteam, etc. So we should all look at that and need to figure out kind of what the best way is, because that is actually the next major step in our workplan.

Once we finish going through the latest Analysis Group survey and seeing what applies to what, then we will turn to the [universal other data] and do the same thing. So, if you thought it was difficult trying to draw things out of one survey, wait until you can try to draw it out of seven or eight, or even an infinite number of

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Greg. I was remiss in noting an item for the agenda that I just want to make sure we allow some time for, maybe about five minutes, and that is the timing and the length of the calls, and also the suggestion to perhaps continue the discussion of the charter questions and survey results into the January 30th call just because noting we have 12 questions to cover, and in our current timeline, we have only two meetings to do so.

So, just making that suggestion for the last, say, five minutes of the call.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Julie. We'll cover that in AOB, and we're at 1:43, so the last five minutes of the call will be at 1:55. So, I think if we are done with sunrise charter question 5A, we would move to the preamble document, which was our other homework document for the day.

And so here again, we have comments from George Kirikos and Kristine Dorrain. And I guess the question is whether folks have comments on these comments. Since we're starting preamble charter questions for the first time in this process, just quickly, we're looking at, is the sunrise period serving its intended purpose? Is it having unintended effects, is the TMCH provider requiring appropriate forms of [use?] Have abuses been

documented, either abuses by registrants, by trademark owners, by registries, or registrars?

So those are the preamble questions. George notes that there is [considerable] overlap between that – or at least there's overlap between [Q5 A1] and preamble A and B. So I think obviously, George [would] put the same comment in in full, but thankfully, it's cross-referenced. As George [inaudible] that for C through F, the forms of use and the abuses didn't find anything of use in the survey.

Kristine notes we got a few anecdotes about how registries had to contort business plans to comply with sunrise, noting that registry/registrar tab [S52].

Any further comments on that? We don't have Kristine, so she can't amplify her comment. Oh, no, we do, and her hand is up. Perfect. Kristine, please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. Thanks [inaudible]. Apologize for joining late, I had a weird kind of crossover both of these calls today. I actually had a note in, and I'll stop doing this, I'd basically written in a comment on top of George's that said I essentially agreed with what he had to say. I think that a lot of information copied over – so having been on all of the teams that drafted the survey questions, there was really no good way to get sort of anecdotal "tell us about abuses" data in there. We tried to have as many open-ended questions as possible, but we were discouraged from that because it just kept

making the survey longer and more cumbersome, and we wanted people to actually answer it.

So, I think – and I mentioned this in a couple of other places, but I wanted to highlight two things here. One is, have you looked down the left side of your panel? [I see] the industry experts we have on each of these calls, we have all of the sort of constituencies pretty well-represented. Registries – generally, we have registrars [on.] I'm not seeing so many today. We have the brands side, we have the noncommercial, the users side. We have just a really big variety of lived experiences, and we can bring that to bear.

The purpose of the survey really was to try to document some of that stuff but reach out beyond ourselves to the extent we could. But that doesn't mean our own lived experiences can't be shared, because we're the people participating and we're the people who have a lot of those experiences to share.

So, that will segue into my next point. And I'm not trying to put Maxim on the spot, but it may be at some point we wanted to talk a little bit more about this. But some registry operators – and I can tell you that Amazon was kind of one of them – were in a position where, yes, the sunrise was there, it was fine, not so much of an objection to doing that, but the way that the original guidebook implemented the sunrise looked kind of very cut and dry. You do it this way, you do it in this order, end of story.

So some TLDs – and I think maybe some of the geos, and certainly some of the things that Amazon's been trying to do, have a little different way of going about things. So it wasn't that the sunrise wouldn't be an option, but when you're trying to cater to a

specific geographic region or you're trying to cater to a specific type of audience and really trying to target those people, having a broad, general, open sunrise for people just as a pure preventative measure maybe wasn't the best way to launch your TLD or maybe it prevented some people from getting really important city internal names that they needed to get for some reason.

So, I think it would be really useful to hear some of these storied at some point, maybe not today, about how it is that registries did sort of have to get creative about how to work with their startup periods in order to accommodate. Again, not that registries are saying, "Oh my gosh, sunrise is so awful and burdensome," because, as George pointed out, the data doesn't really bear that out. But I think that there is stuff to be learned about unintentional effects, even if it wasn't all bad. And so that's one of the things that I think I want to highlight, because I think it brings more to the story than just the couple of sentences we got in the survey. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Kristine. I have some response to that, but Maxim has his hand up, so we'll go to Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, during one of our face-to-face meetings, the special guest, Amadeu Abril was invited when we discussed [AOB] and etc. And I believe [inaudible] are here, so basically, there was

[inaudible] speech about what happened and why sunrise wasn't the perfect fit for geos.

But if we need it, I will add it again. [Thank you.]

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Maxim. George Kirikos, you're up next. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: If you look at the questions D, E and F where it says for example, "have abuses of the sunrise period been documented by registrants or by trademark owners or by registries and registrars?" I'm still a little bit confused by the phrasing. Are we looking for generally all kinds of abuses with the source of data being trademark owners, the source of data being registrants, the source of data being registries and registrars? Or are we looking for abuses committed by trademark owners, abuses committed by registrants, abuses committed by registries and registrars with general sources? You kind of look at the questions in two different ways, so I'm just curious what the intended phrasing of those questions is, if anybody else might be confused. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, George. I was thinking the same thing. [I'm looking at this, I think they're syntactically challenged.] I am expecting – though I'm speculating, I should say – that the latter was expected, that we're looking for, A, abuses by trademark owners, B, abuses by registrants, and C, abuses by registries and registrars, and to looking for the source of documentation.

But the way the words are arranged, the order in which they're arranged, makes that ambiguous at best, and leans toward the first, which both you and I think is probably the incorrect, or at least is a rather odd way of looking at this particular question. So, I don't know if anybody has any comments who may have worked on the preamble to be more definitive than that, but I think we should look at those questions the second way, that we1re looking for abuses by three different categories and the documentation.

And the question now is we just want to have some documentation of those, although frankly, [probably, we'll] end up with anecdotes rather than true documentation. Kristine, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. As a member of the subteam, I can confirm that the second meaning was the intended meaning. Although to Griffin's point, I think either way – what we were trying to do is the reason we called it out separately is we wanted to make sure that we covered – originally, the question was, have abuses been documented? And [inaudible] thinking everybody came at it from their five people approach the elephant sort of story, and so we thought, well, really, I might be thinking that would be abuses by registrants or abuses by registrars or something because I'm a registry. I wouldn't even consider could a registry have abused it.

And so we wanted to really itemize out, like, let's make sure that we seek out anecdotes or stories from different parts of the community. So yes, we were looking for abuses by these people, but to Griffin's point, obviously, those reports would also be from

many of these same people. So, I think you get there either way, but the point was to seek out some anecdotes and learn about some of these specific unintended effects such as how did people figure out how to game the system. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Kristine. I guess maybe the way I would have phrased it might be more, have abuses of the sunrise period by trademark owners been documented? And also, if so, please provide – because a yes or no answer probably isn't going to be very helpful unless it's "no." But in any case, thank you for clarifying that. I agree, [we'd] want to break out the different types, but not in terms of buckets. The buckets shouldn't be who documented it, but rather by who did the abuse.

So, any other comments on the preamble questions? Oh, and Kristine, I did want to just briefly say you were probably not on the call yet – of course, [we'd like to know] who documented it. we should know where the information came from. And I think the use of the word "documented" points towards the idea of trying to actually have some level of documentation or formal write-up as opposed to, "A friend of a friend told me about an abuse but I don't know what it is and I can't show you anywhere that it was studied," thinking back to my happy times on the jurisdiction subgroup of the CCWG, we were looking for anecdotal information and we wanted the anecdotes to not be merely war stories but something that could be tied down to a source for documentation. So, I think we do want to know about who committed the abuse, who documented it, ideally where it was documented, what the documentation is. Let's take a look at it, whether it's in Domain

Name Wire or wherever it may be. You want to have a source of documentation.

Anyway, I see Kathy's hand is up, and we're also approaching the last five-minute mark. Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Hi. Hi, everybody. So, coming in midway through this discussion, but I've been here for a bit. To tie Kristine and Maxim's comments together, it sounds like we're looking for some more information. We've got a little bit of it on sunrise and intended effects, concerns that we've got some of it in the survey results but not a lot, but certainly, as Maxime mentioned, Amadeu Abril came at the co-chairs' request to – I don't remember which face-to-face meeting, but talked about geo issues and sunrise, and some of the concerns. And he was very eloquent on that and had prepared extensively.

So, to Maxim's comment, maybe we could have staff to pull that out. There should be some transcript of that somewhere that could be very useful to fleshing out more details as Christine was mentioning, and to the extent that it would be helpful to do it now rather than kind of other date or later on, it might be really good to have that for next week. I don't know if that's something staff could give us, but Amadeu did prepare extensively, I do remember, on that issue, and might be really timely to see that. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Kathy. I would actually encourage us no to have it for next week, because as George and I discussed at the beginning

of this call – and I think this was before Kristine was on – our assignment at this particular point in the workplan is to primarily just answer the question, how do the survey results assist the answering the questions? And not what are the recommendations and what other documentation is there and what could people have done, and there was an anecdote about this.

We're really just trying to mine one document, one survey, and I think if we just stick to that, we'll go a lot faster through these remaining 12 questions, and I think if we can keep some notes on the side about other things that we want to get to – but I'd rather do this serially, because I find that side discussions of things that should be discussed later slow down the discussion you're supposed to be having now, and often don't get raised later or leave less time for them to be discussed at the time that they're actually supposed to be discussed.

So, I want us to try to narrow our discussion to what our topic is here. I know that's not always how the multi-stakeholder process works, but I think we'll actually do better in the end if we try to exercise some scope discipline on these next couple of calls. I see hands from David and Kathy, and we have staff wanting to discuss – [we'll just extend time length,] so please be brief. Go ahead. Whoever's first.

DAVID MCAULEY: Kathy's first. Kathy's hand is down.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sorry, old hand.

DAVID MCAULEY: And I did want to get to AOB, but I wanted to give Julie a chance to talk about what she's [keyed up] first.

GREG SHATAN: Why don't we go to Julie? And length of calls and stuff like that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Great. Thanks very much. So, one of the things that we discussed with the subteam co-chairs, David and Greg, was that according to the current timeline, we have only two meetings left to complete the discussion of the survey results as they apply to the charter questions. We have 12 charter questions left to cover after today, and the sense was that seems like that's probably not enough time, and the suggestion is to do possibly two things.

One would be to lengthen the time of the calls to 90 minutes from 60 minutes, and the question would be then if we did that, whether or not this particular time of 18:00 UTC on Wednesdays is still a time that works, or should we seek a different time given that we have back to back calls?

The second question is, can we then extend the discussion of the charter questions against the survey results into the January 30th call? This will have an effect on the timeline. Staff would redo the timeline accordingly, but it seems that it would be quite difficult at this rate to get through 12 charter questions in two calls.

EN

So, two questions for the group, and certainly, welcome any thoughts.

GREG SHATAN: I'll note in the chat George says – and I agree with this. I'm agreeing with George so much on this call. This is great. It's a new year. "Ultimately, I think most of the work is in the homework, i.e. folks going through the materials between the live calls."

I agree. I was going to say we need more miners to mine the Analysis Group survey for nuggets or for lumps of coal, [and come to it,] because we've only had two or three people, George the most industrious among them, go through this.

And my second comment would be that if we actually stick to what I said to, which is let's just discuss the mining, we might actually get through all those questions. But I would not want that to be because nobody actually did the mining and therefore we didn't have much stuff in our worksheets to discuss.

But I do think we should migrate to 90-minute calls. Maybe we'll get through it in two calls in that case. But I think, clearly – and I offend as much as anyone else, I did not fill these out, so I think we need to do the work.

I think Kristine is opposed to longer calls unless we have people doing the homework [and it runs out] we have that much to discuss. I think that's true. So, we're [good on the horns of the dilemma.] Do we call a 90-minute call for next week? Or the other possibility is to have 60 minutes, plus 30 minutes to use if we feel like it. But that's difficult for people to plan, and I do actually prefer

EN

calls that have a scheduled end time. David, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Greg. I'll be brief since the time is up, but one of the things I want to do as co-chair is encourage more aggressive and focused use of the list, and so I'll take my own advice and do that on the list.

I agree with you that we ought to schedule a 90-minute call next week with the understanding that we have confirmed 60 and we'll have 30 there we can hope to use it. It might be a good way to migrate. I think we will need to migrate to 90 minutes, and I will say the rest on list. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Any other comments? I think we would have to keep the same starting time. We couldn't move earlier because we have people participating in the claims work as well.

So, I would say let's try to have a 90-minute call next week, or let's have a 90-minute scheduled call, but that's dependent on enough homework being done on the next several questions, and staff and co-chairs will decide which questions are being assigned for the next group. And hopefully – it is dependent on us having the work of the group to discuss, so this is somewhat Socratic method in the sense that we're only going to be as good as the contributions of the group members, because that's really what we're discussing at this point, or at least the group members are

bringing forward the parts of the data from the analysis group study that need to be brought forward.

Any objections to that? I note Kristine is not a fan of the longer calls, and Griffin says the same. And George, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah. I'm looking at the questions. I haven't reviewed them in a while. And I think some of them are going to be like the charter question, the second document that we reviewed today where there's no applicable results. So, optimistically, we might be able to get through them very quickly, just a matter of double checking that there's nothing relevant in the survey. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, George. Well, why don't we do this? We'll try a 90-minute call next week. If we find that we run out of material before the end of the 90 minutes, clearly, we'll stop. If people do focus just on the data extraction, we'll get through more calls faster, more questions faster, and we'll see where we stand. And we can see how far we get in 60 minutes or 90 minutes and kind a work from there.

So I'd like to get through this part of the project quickly, because clearly, there's a great itch in the group to discuss both the other data and also kind of conclusions, recommendations, and the other topics that cropped up a great deal so far. And this was supposed to be a single-minded effort.

I see Jason also agreeing with Kristine on the length of the call. The alternative is to try just the 60-minute call next week, but let's try the 90-minute call and let's see where we come out between 60 minutes and 90 minutes. I'm not a fan of the 90-miute calls, but if we need to do it, we need to do it in terms of sticking to our plan.

And so I think, yeah, staff will certainly look to send out the homework assignment today if possible, and that's been, I think, the general drumbeat. So if there's Any Other Business – does anybody have any AOB?

I don't see any AOB. George asks if the – yes, I see Julie saying all documents will be unlocked, so if people want to steam ahead, then they can go through as many of these worksheets as humanly possible.

I see Jason suggesting 75 minutes. Always the spirit of compromise. Again, I think we'll let the amount of material justify the length of the call, and I'll also try not to make the calls longer by yammering on, as I've just done.

So, with that, unless anybody – and nobody has any AOB, I think we can call this call adjourned at 2:06 PM eastern standard time. Thank you all, and goodbye.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks everyone. Today's meeting is [over.] You can disconnect your lines, and have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]