
ICANN Transcription

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

Wednesday 27 February 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-registrations-27feb19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p74a70cion/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/_Z8WBg

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

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

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RPM Sub Team for Sunrise Registration call held on Wednesday, 27 February 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn it over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

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

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks very much, Andrea. Just to quickly review the agenda, the first item is the updates to statements of interest. Agenda Item 2 including items 2.1 and 2.2 is the review of previously collected data source documents against the charter questions.

And just to note that in the interest of efficiency, we will combine 2.1 and 2.2. That is, we will look at each of the questions against the data in 2.1 and 2.2 rather than going through all questions 1-12 in 2.1 and then revisiting all questions 1-12 in 2.2. I'm sorry 2.2 and 2.3. So we'll follow that for 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

And then in Agenda Item 3, we'll be looking at the additional data sources and noting where comments have already been provided in the Google doc and then just noting also that if people have not had a chance to enter comments into the Google doc, the document will be reopened briefly until midnight EST today. But that would just be for people to add comments as to whether or not they think that the data source answers or does not answer, helps answer or does not help answer the Sunrise charter questions.

And then Agenda Item 4 is Any Other Business. Staff will just very briefly remind everyone of the upcoming meetings, in particular in Kobe. And that's relating to an e-mail that you all should have seen a little bit earlier today.

And with that, let me go ahead and [hand] things over to David McAuley.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Julie. Hello, everybody. As Julie said, we have a full slate of work to do today to get through the 12 documents with respect to the resource documents that Ariel mentioned in our homework and then go to the additional data, and so that's the plan.

Let me reiterate that the hope is to finish this analysis. What we're doing is creating good research tools for those who are interested in developing preliminary recommendations to be considered by the group.

And so we're going to turn in to doing that right now. I'm going to be toggling between the document and the Adobe room, and so apologies if I don't see a hand up for a lag period. But maybe someone can help me with that respect.

First document I'm going to turn to is the Sunrise Preamble questions. Along the way I will mention, if I noticed it, that additional comments have been added to these charter question documents from previous sources that we've reviewed in the previous weeks. And I'll notice in the preamble document that George has entered some comments with respect to the usefulness or not of the INTA survey data. And so I would note that for your attention, ask you to take a look at that.

And then scrolling down in that document for the preamble questions, I entered my feeling on that document that the three data sources for this week were really not particularly helpful with respect to these specific questions. And so that's really the sum total of it.

I am going to shift over to the next question, but first I see a hand up. George, your hand is up. Please go ahead and take the floor.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, on Page 6 of this document I actually had additional input for this week's homework. I decided I'd save the time and just put it in this week and not wait for others to make a contribution. On Page 20 of the ICANN....

DAVID MCAULEY: George, can I ask you a question? Did I miss that?

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, you skipped by it. It's on Page [inaudible].

DAVID MCAULEY: Okay, my apologies. Sorry about that.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: On the rightmost column, it says ICANN 61 transcript.

DAVID MCAULEY: Right. Go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: So there were a couple of little points. Namely, that with regards to abuse Jon Nevett mentioned they had to deal with some of the trademarks that "people tried to get through the system." And on

Page 22, he mentions the countermeasure, namely that they made some of those terms premium. So that would affect our work on this charter question. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you. Apologies. I was going down that document too quickly.

So I am now over on Sunrise Charter Question 1. That's the question dealing with availability of Sunrise registrations only for identical matches.

Going through the document, I have entered some comments at the bottom that I thought that it was not particularly helpful with respect to the three new data sources. I'm going to go back up in that document just to double check that I didn't miss something in green. And I don't believe that I did. And so that's the sum total were mine, that the sources were not particularly helpful at least in my opinion.

So now going back to Adobe, I'm seeing no new hands.

Which means we can move to the next document, Sunrise Charter Question 2. This is the question dealing with does registry Sunrise premium name pricing practices unfairly limit the ability of trademark owners to participate and related question.

Here we have again from George some information from the INTA survey with specific references to the INTA survey final report and specific pages therein. And scrolling down in the document, there is an entry that says this is not particularly helpful, the staff

compilation and TLD startup information. And then a comment by me saying there's possibly some indirect help here from the data sub team meeting with Jon Nevett, only in the sense that it gets into premium pricing. And so that is the sum total of the comments with respect to Question 2.

Toggling back to the Adobe, I see two hands. George, your hand is up first as I see it. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, on Page 2, I actually did have something for the ICANN 61 document.

DAVID MCAULEY: On Page 2?

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, on Page 2.

DAVID MCAULEY: Okay, apologies again.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: On Page 21 of the ICANN 61 transcript, John Nevett mentioned that 98% of the time, they're standard price names." This is in the context of the premium names. So that might be an interesting data point, although that's only one registry obviously. Well, one

registry that offers a lot of different TLDs, the biggest registry of new TLDs. Thanks.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, George. And I see what I'm doing. Okay, my apologies. I've just noticed how I'm reading this and how it's not working. Maxim, your hand was up next. Why don't you please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a question. Have we checked the percentage of the [inaudible] which answered these questions to the number of [inaudible]? Thanks.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Maxim. I have to say I'm getting some static on my line, so I'm not sure I caught all that. Could I ask you, Maxim, to repeat that? And my hope is that it won't be quite as staticky. Maxim, could you repeat that please? When you were speaking, it was either muffled or it was staticky. I had a hard time hearing that.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me?

DAVID MCAULEY: I hear you, but there's some static when you speak too. It's not the easiest.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Okay, I will use chat.

DAVID MCAULEY: Okay. All right, well, thank you, Maxim. Let me double check and see if there are any other hands. There are not. I'm going to go now to Sunrise Charter Question 3. In this document, I'm going to go a little bit more slowly since I've [muffed] it on two of them. I don't see any comment here with respect to the new data sources except my own which says this perhaps is not direct help with respect to the management team's discussion with Jon Nevett talking about analogous situation. But if I'm not mistaken, that is the only new comment.

So I'm going to toggle back to Adobe to see if there's any hands on Number 3. I don't see any.

So I'm going to switch over now to Sunrise Charter Question 4. You can read what these questions are. There's really no need for me to repeat the question. Going slowly through that, I say that the staff compiled summary is not helpful nor the others, and so I came up with a no. And I'm double checking again. I don't see any new comments, and so that would be the treatment of Sunrise Charter Question 4.

I'm going back now to Adobe and don't see hands.

And I have not – Maxim, I'm going to look for your chat. "Have we checked the number of TLDs that were questioned to the total number of TLDs?" I, Maxim, am unable to answer that. I will be

happy, as I scroll over to the next question, to ask if staff or anyone else knows the answer to that question. I don't see a hand up. Mary's hand is up. Mary, why don't you go ahead and take the floor.

MARY WONG:

Thank you, David. Actually, I just wanted to clarify the context in which Maxim asked his question. Because I think he may have raised it when you were discussing the responses from Jon Nevett of Donuts. As I put in the chat, that discussion took place between Jon and a previous sub team that was looking at the additional voluntary RPMs, and that was the reason why that conversation was just with Donuts. If he's talking about the surveys, then I think George has answered that in the chat because there was no identifiable information as such in the surveys. But if he's talking about something else, we can try and find the answer for him. And that's correct, Maxim. Jon was specifically not speaking for the Registry Stakeholder Group or any other registry operator except Donuts, and it was for the specific purpose of a discussion over the additional voluntary RPMs that Donuts was offering with the sub team that was looking at them. Thank you, David.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Mary. I would recommend that transcript. It's an interesting discussion. But as Mary said, it's just Jon speaking with the data sub team.

So I am going to move over to Sunrise Charter Question 5a dealing with the 30-day minimum. George has added some

information from the INTA study specifically with respect to Page 59 as having useful information. I have put an entry in saying that the data sub team meeting with Jon, that transcript, gets into time periods only with respect to claims, not so much with Sunrise. And that's in the latter third.

So I'm going to move to Question 5b, but toggle back quickly to Adobe. Thank you for bearing with me. I don't see any hands. Sunrise Charter Question 5b, let's see if there's new information in there. I notice George has added some information from the transcript with Jon Nevett on Page 11 as having useful information and would recommend that to you. Going down in that document, I made the observation that it's possibly helpful. I suggested that maybe Chart 7 in the staff compiled data would be helpful by looking at the total numbers and what inferences can be drawn therefrom.

I'm going to toggle back to Adobe. No hands at this point. Thank you all for bearing with my toggling. I'm going to go now to Sunrise Charter Question 6. I'm going to go back up to the top because I've been missing a little bit of the new information. I just want to double check, and I don't see anything that's germane until my comment that the homework assignment for this week is not much helpful. I did say how the startup information could be used, but not so much that it's helpful with respect to SDRPs, etc.

Sunrise Charter Question 7 I will get to in a second. I don't see any hands up. Getting to SMD files. And so I'm going to go back up and double check. And I see that I believe that's George has entered new information with respect to Jon Nevett's transcript again, specifically pointing to Page 18 and Kristine's mention of a

tricky little situation. And then later I also point and say it's only inferentially helpful. I point to the same transcript and point out that there was a discussion of SMD between Pages 3-6 and 16-18 that are not directly helpful but are inferentially helpful. And that's it.

I shall now move to Sunrise Charter Question 8, but I'm going back to Adobe. Okay, I don't see any hands. Julie, I'm not really checking chat very well. Julie and Greg, if you can help if something comes up that needs to be mentioned, just let me know.

On Sunrise Charter Question 8, I will double check and go back up, see if I missed anything. This is on LRP, ALP, and QLP question. I entered new information from this week's homework assignment saying there's indirect help here in the ICANN org maintained list of relevant dates by registry operators possibly, and only possibly, being helpful.

I will move to Sunrise Charter Question 9. Coming back to Adobe very quickly. I don't see anything, so Sunrise Charter Question 9 talks about the scope of Sunrise registrations. Again, I'm going to go back up and double check. Coming down through the document, I made a comment that the new sources for this week are not that helpful. I did sort of describe something about it but basically came to the conclusion it was not helpful.

I'm going over to the next question, Number 10. Quickly come back to Adobe. I don't see any questions. On Question 10, double checking to see if I missed a contribution. Let's see. My conclusion was that the three new sources were not helpful with respect to this question, and that's it.

So next question, Number 11. With a quick look at the queue. Question 11 gets into the subject of IDNs and non-English speakers. And looking for new information. I came to the conclusion that the new homework assignment this week could be inferentially helpful and pointed out that there's – I clicked on several IDNs, but it's only inferentially helpful because it wasn't clear to me in the ICANN org TLD startup document that it had all of the information. It's possible IDNs have additional information they're making available to people that might be speaking non-English languages.

So that said, I'll go to Question 12, but first I'm going to double back to Adobe. Still no questions. I'm probably putting people to sleep. I apologize. Up to the top to double check for new comments.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Just on that last one.

DAVID MCAULEY: Yeah, George, go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: On Number 11, did you say that the Sunrise policy itself was in English, and so you're saying if it's a foreign trademark holder, they might not have understood the Sunrise policy?

DAVID MCAULEY: No. Some of it depended. I only clicked on less than five, probably four or five, something in that neighborhood. And, yeah, some had a Sunrise policy in English but that doesn't mean they didn't have one in another language. At least that's the conclusion I came to when I looked at the documents. I didn't [note] that it was comprehensive. And some of them did not even have that. That's what I recall.

So let me go back to Adobe. And I see Maxim's hand is up. Go ahead, Maxim. You have the floor.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Is this any better?

DAVID MCAULEY: Yes. There's no static this time. At least there wasn't. It's a little muffled, but go ahead please, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just [note] for clarity, if you look at the [startup] page where you can check all the dates for Sunrises, etc., some [the] registries they publish their Sunrise [inaudible] there. But registries were asked to [inaudible] in this documentation. In [another set], for example, Chinese or Russian or German [inaudible], they could be found on their own website [inaudible]. Because the [startup] page it is not intended to have them to [add] other languages than English basically. Thanks. It doesn't mean that they [are not existing] or something. It means that that particular [inaudible] has [inaudible] version. Thanks.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Maxim. As Julie mentioned, this document is going to be among others open for another ten hours following this call. So I would encourage you to make that kind of an observation to counterbalance or to balance out what I was saying. Because when I review things, I'm just one person's review and I might be getting things wrong. So what you've just said is helpful to people to understand where they might be able to get information in this respect. So I would encourage you to do that. But thanks very much. Susan, your hand was up but now down.

So I will move on and get to Sunrise Charter Question 12 dealing with priority issues. So doubling up to the top, the only thing new I see is a comment I said where I came to the conclusion that the three new sources were not helpful in respect to this question.

So we've gone through the 12 questions fairly quickly. I'm going to come back to Adobe. I'm looking for hands. And feel free to on any of the 1-12 before we are now going to launch into the Additional Data document. I don't see any hands.

So this is an important document too. This is an additional document. It's a little bit different Google document that we've been going through. But there are suggestions in here, and so we're going to go from the top.

The first was a suggestion by Zak for additional data, and he was referring to a blog Kevin Murphy wrote in DomainIncite in April 2014 and gives a link to Kevin's article. Very nice. And Zak explains how he thinks that's relevant. George entered a comment

about that and also mentioned that it's not just the article but the commentary below the article was helpful or was informative.

I have to admit not having completed assignment. I went through this document with respect to several at the top, and I intend to add comments to the document and to go through the remainder. But on this, my comment would have been and is and what I'll put in is I agree that this block is informative, especially on Preamble Questions A-C, possibly on Charter Questions 9 and 10. And I also believe that it would be worth reading the blog commentary below the actual article by Kevin.

So that's the first matter on the additional data. I'm going to go back to Adobe and look for hands. I don't see any.

So back to the additional data document. We're just going down. The next one is also from Zak. He's referring to a blog entitled "Fake Trademarks Stealing Generic Domains in New gTLD Sunrises." George again has a comment here talking in addition to how Zak did about how this might be helpful and where it would have an impact. And I will add that my take on this was this would be possibly helpful. I thought this was not as balanced as the one that we just saw from Kevin Murphy but it is helpful and would be worth a read.

And I'm going to go back to Adobe looking for hands. I don't see any.

So we're heading back to the additional data document. The next one is also from Zak referencing an article entitled "The Trademark Clearinghouse Worked So Well One Company Got 24

new gTLD using The Famous Trademark 'The.'" Zak explains why he believes that it's helpful. George adds commentary there as well. And my take on this one was, yes, possibly this would be helpful on the "the issue."

Let me skip back to Adobe very quickly. I don't see any hands, but I do encourage folks to take a good look at this document.

Heading back down, Zak is next with an article "Is The Trademark Clearinghouse Causing New gTLD's To Lose 6X The Number Of Registrations?" Again, I'll just mention Zak explains how this is helpful. George again adds similar commentary, including as he has in the others the specific questions which he believes this will be helpful. So this is another one that's worthy of attention as we turn our thoughts to developing preliminary recommendations.

Quickly back to Adobe. I still don't see hands.

So I'm going to move down the document. The next entry in this document is from Michael Karanicolas. How common words like "pizza," "money," and "shopping" ended up in the Trademark Clearinghouse for new TLDs. Michael explains there his views on how this has an impact, and George agrees and also points to not just agreeing with Michael but another couple of questions that this might be helpful with.

I'm going to quickly come back. I don't see any hands.

Next entry on this document is also from Michael. "The numbers are in! Donuts Sunrises typically get 100+ domains, but they also get gamed." That's the name of an article and a link. By the way, there's links in here to these articles. Same scenario: Michael

makes a comment; George agrees and adds some context from his perspective on top of that.

Quick look back into the queue. Don't see any.

Next entry, again from Michael, "Digging in on Donuts' Sunrise: Amazon tops the list, gaming, and top registrars." Another article with a link and Michael's explanation of how this is informative to our work on what we're doing here with Sunrise. George adds his commentary as well. By the way, this document as you see just has three columns. It's very easily read, and you can see it's very helpful. So George puts his commentary on that as to how he agrees with Michael's analysis and goes a little bit beyond that.

The next entry – before I start on the next entry, let me circle back. I don't see any hands.

The next entry is also from Michael. ".Build Registry Using Questionable Swiss Trademark Registration To Grab 'Build' Domains In Sunrise" with link. It sounds like this – I didn't get this far as this one – but it sounds like this is related to the subject of the first two entries in the blog. I may be wrong about that. I shouldn't speculate. But Michael again goes through his analysis of how this is helpful and George again adds a green commentary.

Okay, I'll come back to Adobe very quickly.

Next entry is also from Michael. "How Did RetailMeNot Get 849 .Codes Domains In Sunrise Without Any Trademarks?" Good question, with link. Again, same exercise: Michael goes through

his explanation, and George agrees with a little bit more context from his perspective.

I'm scrolling.

KATHY KLEIMAN: If I might.

DAVID MCAULEY: Yes, I'm sorry, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I just want [to note George said] something interesting. He appears to have looked at the same article and perhaps expanded. Not perhaps; he did. And added additional Sunrise questions that we're looking at. He added additional questions to Michael's analysis, so you put them all together and they collectively – same with the prior article – they collectively seem to think that this article applies to a wide array of Sunrise questions that we're looking at. So I just wanted to note that.

DAVID MCAULEY: Excellent. Thank you, Kathy, for putting that on there that I didn't see. So I take it that – Kathy, your hand is still up, but I don't see any others, so I'm going to move on.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sorry, old hand.

DAVID MCAULEY: Right. Thank you. I'm going to move on to the next entry which is from Professor Tushnet. "Are We Running Out of Trademarks?" with link. The extent to which common words are already subject to trademark registration is apparently the subject. George agrees with Rebecca Tushnet's analysis and indicates from his opinion how it helps to inform our work.

I'll come back here real quick. No more hands.

Kathy, I see that you have the next entry in this document, and that's the transcript of the face-to-face meeting of the RPM Working Group from June 2017 in Johannesburg. Thank you for the links. Very helpful. And you comment on how Amadeu came and made certain points that are worthy of consideration. George agrees, and George added comments in the third column agreeing with you and giving specific pages, etc., that would help us to get the gist of this. So thank you both.

Hand up, Kathy. Go ahead please. Kathy, if you're speaking, we're not hearing.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you. I should take myself off mute. Thanks. I just wanted to say I appreciate George adding the page numbers and showing that there are additional questions it applies to. I just wanted to encourage people, especially anybody who's interested in the Section 8 questions about LRP, ARP, QRP, to read the transcript from Johannesburg. There are two links because it was a long

session and it goes on. They divided it up. I think at the break they brought in a new transcriber and so we have two.

But even if you look at part one, I just want to read a fast note. Amadeu Abril i Abril with CORE was very, very involved. He kind of came in as an expert to brief us on GEOs and specialized domain names. He says amazing things like that the QLP in general worked but that the ALP was a complete failure and ICANN staff was not willing to approve anything other than [inaudible] a complete failure. So our expert comes in and tells us that this is really important for Question 8, how someone who had to live through it does it.

I also wanted to point out it probably is relevant to Sunrise Questions 5a and 5b, whether this should be mandatory or optional because of unintended effects both of GEOs as well as other types of names. I just wanted to share – and I'll post this – that Lori Schulman and Amadeu are back to back so it must have been part of our conversation where they're talking about things like police.nyc, windows.construction, and also the order. So should Sunrise be mandatory for everything, or are there certain categories or certain top-level domains it just doesn't fit very well? So that runs to the mandatory or optional.

And then Amadeu is talking about timing. Should Sunrise have absolute priority in every TLD? I think he's referring to GEOs. Or would it make sense for it to come after? And I think he's referring to more local trademarks.

So I just wanted to share that. That this is just a really rich transcript from a really rich discussion. Thanks.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Kathy. Excellent comments. I also wanted to mention that Maxim had added some information with respect to this comment in addition to George. So again, and as Kathy just said, this is a good one to go to and take a good look. Not that the others aren't, but a rich discussion, as she said.

Moving down, next entry as I see it is from Kathy again on WIPO Frequently Asked Questions on Geo Indications. In that particular, as she says, shedding light on what a Geo Indicator is and what is a trademark. And George agrees.

Check Adobe real quick. No questions.

Kathy has the next one too which is another transcript from ICANN Copenhagen of this working group meeting on 11 March 2017. Discussion with Deloitte about the entry of GI into the database and questions raised. And George has indicated agreement with Kathy in this respect.

And we've gotten our way through this document. So what we're basically doing is pointing to tools. I think Kathy's last comment is an excellent illustration of just how useful this is and how these tools are to take us to the various places we want to go as we consider making preliminary recommendations.

So that said, I think we've gotten through the documents. I'm going to look for questions or comments. I see George's hand is up. George, why don't you go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I was just curious what the format will be of the future document. Now that we've compiled these separate data sources, will we be getting a document that has things organized by charter question and then have all of these previously compiled datasets in that one document? Maybe ICANN staff want to speak to that and how it's going to be organized for our efficiency in terms of the next steps of the sub team. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you for the question. I personally am not in a position to answer that right now. But I will look for hands from staff if they can. Julie has her hand up, so I'll turn to Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, thank you. I'll also call on my colleague Ariel, but all of the analysis of all of the data that the sub teams have done will be rolled up and has been rolled up thus far into a summary table or summary report. When the sub team completed the data analysis for the data from the Analysis Group surveys, for example, that summary table was produced, sent to the sub team for review, and then sent to the full working group. Staff will update the tables and pull everything from the various comments into a summary. And that will be provided to the sub team chairs to review and also to the sub team to review in advance of the presentation to be made to the full working group in Kobe.

But let me also turn to my colleague Ariel for some further details. Ariel please?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Julie. I just wanted to add that for the summary table, we will also include another column for the additional data so that we can include the summary of that and the sub team's comments into that additional column. But then I want to note that because it's a summary table, it doesn't mean to be we're going to capture everything word-by-word. We're going to provide a high-level summary overview of what is written in the Google docs, and then the link of the Google docs will be included in the summary table for further details. So it means to be a summary, not means to be reiterating everything already said in the Google docs.

And also as Julie mentioned earlier, we would encourage the sub team members to put in your comments into a Google doc by midnight EST today so that they can be put into consideration when we're drafting the summary table. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Julie and Ariel. There have been a couple questions in the chat about is this a spreadsheet or not. I take it, Julie, that you've answered that by saying it's a table basically. But if there are any other questions or comments on that, I'll look for hands. Otherwise – I saw that George had a hand up, but it's down now. Otherwise, as far as I can tell, we have run through the items on the agenda. And so, Julie, I would ask to turn it back to you for AOB at this time. But your hand is up too, so why don't you go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, David. So just I hope that you all saw a message earlier today about the upcoming schedule of calls, in particular the meetings at ICANN 64 in Kobe. Just as a reminder, the sub teams are not meeting next week because the meeting times would otherwise clash with travel for those who are traveling to ICANN 64. So the next sub team meetings will be at ICANN 64 on Sunday and Monday. And the Sunrise sub team will have Sessions 2 and 3 for the development of preliminary recommendations. And both the Sunrise and Trademark Claims sub teams will be making presentations at the full working group meeting which is Session 1 on Sunday. And the timing and links are in an e-mail sent previously.

In preparation for that and in what underpins the discussions we've had today is that the summary table that we've mentioned, or summary report in the form of a table, will be provided to the sub team co-chairs to review and then provided to the full working group to review. And as Ariel is noting, the document will be in PDF, but if there is something that is missing or is mischaracterized, we certainly would ask you to bring that to our attention. And then any changes will be incorporated, and the summary table will be sent to the full working group prior to the presentations in Kobe. And also, staff will produce a draft set of slides for those presentations. Those also will be provided to the sub team co-chairs and then subsequently to the full sub team.

We cannot have – to Kathy's question – there really is not going to be time for the gathering of comments in a Google doc. As we just noted, we will submit the report, the summary table, in PDF. And we do ask if you see that anything is missing or mischaracterized,

that you do let us know. This is the format that we followed when the summary table was previously sent to the sub team when we finished the analysis of the Analysis Group survey data. So we're following that same format and providing the table in the form of a PDF on the list and asking if there are any comments. But really just comments to whether or not something has been mischaracterized or might be missing as we're not able to reopen discussions or gather extensive comments.

And so, yes, Maxim to your question, if you're talking about reopening the Google docs for any comments on the data that was the homework for today, we will be sending that out after this call and noting that the deadline will be midnight EST today. And then if you're talking about the summary table, once the sub team co-chairs have reviewed the summary table, then we'll send it to the sub team. I think we'll probably ask for comments no later than by COB next Thursday the 7th so that we can make any final changes on the 8th to get the documents out to the full working group in advance of Sunday's meeting.

And, yes. Thank you. That's correct, David. Midnight is indeed 5:00 UTC as some of us know from a meeting last night/this morning.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Julie. I know Greg and I are very grateful to staff for the work they've done on this. We're grateful to the people that have entered comments in the documents as well as on the phone.

We're turning to the development of preliminary recommendations in Kobe. So between today already and Kobe, it's time to be thinking of it with these good tools that we've developed with some very insightful comments. So the tools are there, and thanks.

And, Julie, as far as I'm concerned, I believe I'm done. Whoops! There's a hand from George. George, why don't you go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

In terms of our next steps, are we going to be first answering those charter questions and then developing the recommendations? At what point do we actually answer the charter questions that we were assigned?

In terms of sub team recommendations, I was thinking about this and there's probably going to be some overlap in terms of the recommendations between the different sub teams, especially as some of the choices are tradeoffs between or at least possible tradeoffs between trademark claims and sub teams. So I'm just going to toss this out, but at some point we might want to consider merging the sub teams perhaps later on in the sub team work in order that those possible tradeoffs can be discussed.

For example, a sub team on its own might not recommend eliminating trademark claims. A sub team on its own might not recommendation eliminating Sunrise. But when both sub teams are combined and we look at all the stakeholder groups, there might be a tradeoff where one is eliminated and one is kept and so on.

So there are these interactions between the possible recommendations when we're doing tradeoffs which I think probably requires a broader group either of the sub teams or the entire working group. So we might want to think about that. There's already an overlap. I think ten of the members of each of the sub teams are on both sub teams. So that could also be helpful in terms of efficiency. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, George. There are two hands up. Mary and Phil, and I didn't see who went up first. So I'm going to ask Phil to speak first as one of the co-chairs of the full working group.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you, David. I'll be brief because I'll be interested in Mary's response. But I'm just addressing this off the top of my head in response to the question George just raised. But I think it was already understood that the sub team work, including any recommendations, would be reviewed by the full working group. And if there's overlapping recommendations from different sub teams, that can be reconciled when we prepare the initial report which will contain recommendations for community feedback and comments. So I'll stop there, and I'm sure Mary can enlighten us further on [process]. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Phil. Mary?

MARVIN WOO: Thank you, David. And thank you, Phil. Not much to add [inaudible] except to say that this is where we hope Kobe sessions will be really useful for determining next steps. So as Julie has circulated, the plan is for sub teams to report to the full working group and then for the remaining three sessions at ICANN 64 there will be two Sunrise sessions and one for the Claims sub team. And again, the hope is that as working group members attend and listen to these sessions, some of these ideas and possibilities that are being raised at this stage in both of the sub teams as to possible overlaps and what to do, that those can start to percolate and really inform the next steps discussion. So hopefully, that will be a good thing, and thank you all.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Mary. And Phil's hand just went down, so I don't see any other hands. And I might therefore hand it back to Julie to close the call or if there's any other business.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, David. Thank you so much for chairing today. I don't think we have any other business, but you will see some action items coming out from us. And as noted, we'll reopen the Google docs. And again, you'll see a summary table and draft and also some slides. And then we will wish those of you who are traveling safe travels to Kobe. And we look forward to seeing some of you there as well.

Thank you so much, everyone. And today's call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]