

Locking of the Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Drafting Team Meeting

TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 07 June 2012 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Locking of the Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Drafting Team Meeting on Thursday 07 June 2012 at 1400 UTC. 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:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-locking-domain-name-20120607-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

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

Attendees:

Randy Ferguson, IPC
Sheri Falco, RySG
Alan Greenberg, ALAC (Vice-Chair)
David Roache-Turner, WIPO
Michele Neylon, RrSG (Chair)
Luc Seufer, RrSG
Faisal Shah, individual
Jonathan D. Tenenbaum, RrSG

Apologies:

John Berryhill, RrSG
David Maher, RySG
Laurie Anderson, RrSG
Matt Schneller - IPC
Gabriela Szlak, CBUC
Juan Manuel Rojas, At-Large
Celia Lerman Friedman, CBUC (standing apology until July 2012)

Staff Support:

Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: ...is being recorded and all lines are open. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. On today's UDRP Domain Name Lock Workgroup on Tuesday the 7th of June we have Randy Ferguson, Sheri Falco, Alan Greenberg, David Roache-Turner, Michele Neylon, Luc Seufer, Faisal Shah, Jonathan Tenenbaum. From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Apologies noted today from John Berryhill, David Maher, Laurie Anderson, Matt Schneller, Gabriella Szlak, Juan Manuel Rojas and Celia Lerman-Freedman. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Michele.

Michele Neylon: All right, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good - what other times are left? As usual does anybody have any updates to their SOI? Going once. Going twice. Sold. Okay next.

Today's call we're just going to do a couple of quick - a couple of things which hopefully won't take up too much time. The agenda, as you can see, is up on the Adobe Connect and was circulated to you via email.

As so we want to finalize, make any last adjustments, to the survey that's going out to registrars; the other version of the survey that is going out to UDRP providers. We then want to look at next steps and we're then going to have a little chat with Luc about the scope of the working group. Not picking on you, Luc, particularly but, hey, you did send the email. And then also a couple of other items including planning for the meeting in Prague.

And if there's anything else anybody wants to raise, you know, please do let us know. I have a dial out to me where I am at the moment. I'm on a rather flaky Wi-Fi connection so I might end up getting completely disconnected at which point Alan will take over running everything on Adobe.

Okay the first item here is the survey for registrars and the survey for UDRP providers. Has everybody had a chance to look at the latest draft? Does anyone have any comments either positive, negative or otherwise?

Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to confirm that as far as I recall there were no further comments on the mailing list made by anyone. I did receive a couple of comments saying people that, you know, they were happy as it looked but there was nothing substantial that I saw on the mailing list at least.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Marika. Working on the - if nobody has any comments on this at this time can we all just have a show of hands on the Adobe Connect that we are happy with the survey?

((Crosstalk))

David Roache-Turner: This is David...

Michele Neylon: Okay maybe I should rephrase that on the show of hands; what I mean to say - what's that thing, sorry, it's seven o'clock in the morning for me and we all know how good I am in the morning. A green tick is what I was looking for rather.

David Roache-Turner: Michele, David speaking. Just a question if I could?

Michele Neylon: Yeah, sure.

David Roache-Turner: Perhaps for Marika. Just wondering why the - in the current version the opportunity to comment on the charter questions appears to be removed?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That shouldn't have been removed. That is a next page. If you see on the screen - which version are you talking about, the registrars or the UDRP providers?

David Roache-Turner: Both of them.

Marika Konings: Because if you look here you'll see there that the Page 3 those are the charter questions - it's here - the one on the screen. So maybe it's because you need to click one page further that you didn't get there? Because it should be there. Because if you look at the version on the screen where it starts I think on Page 3 - Page 4 that is - it starts out with the working group charter questions and has a list that goes all the way to Page 5. And that should be the same for the survey for UDRP providers.

Michele Neylon: But, David, I'm seeing here working group charter questions and it's Questions 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and each one has a space for a comment.

David Roache-Turner: Yeah, I can see them here on the posted version. I'm not sure why they weren't in the version that I was looking at previously but I can see that they're here now so I'll retract that question. Thank you, Marika, for the clarification.

Marika Konings: Yeah and I'll double check in Zoomerang that they're really there and that there's not a mix up so I'll make sure those questions are there.

David Roache-Turner: Great, thanks very much.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other comments, questions? Going once. Going twice. Okay then based on that we will then take that the surveys are finalized. On that we will then take it that the surveys are finalized.

Now the next thing is in terms of the distribution - distribution of the surveys, deadlines for responses, etcetera. Marika, what - in terms of timelines here, I

mean, I presume if we send something out now how long would we normally have to give for replies? What's the minimum?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That's actually really a question for you. And I think it would be good, you know, to get David's input but also from the registrars on the call, you know, what you think is a reasonable time to give your, you know, colleagues to respond.

You know, maybe also noting that, you know, the ICANN meeting is coming up. We know a lot of people are also focused on what's happening in the new gTLD program. So I would really look there to you what you think is reasonable. I know in previous surveys, you know, we have given people timelines that vary from, you know, two weeks to a month to even longer. So it all depends a bit what you think is reasonable.

I think from a working group perspective I'm assuming that people would like this information as soon as possible but I don't know how much time it will take people as well to gather the kind of information we're looking for.

Michele Neylon: Okay, fair enough. And the question, I suppose, better framed, Marika, was is this - are there any parameters with respect to the work, you know, PDP guidelines that we need to respect for this kind of survey or is it something that is more open to our discretion?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. That's completely open because a survey is not a required step in the PDP process so the working group is completely free. I mean, you might want to take into account if you want to try and have some kind of initial review of the results you might want to set a deadline that's just prior to the Prague meeting so during the working group meeting there you have a chance to look at what has come in.

And if not - if there's not sufficient data yet that might be an opportunity to, you know, go out to some of the people you want to have input from to

encourage them to complete it and extend the deadline. That would be one option. But I think that, you know, would give people a little bit more than two weeks. I don't know if that's enough or if that's too short.

Michele Neylon: Okay then I'm going to pick on people. Gentlemen from WIPO, how long do you think it would take UDRP providers to respond to the questionnaire?

David Roache-Turner: From the WIPO perspective noting that we have the ICANN meeting just around the corner and we have some prep that we need to do for that on a number of files, of which the UDRP working group is one, we would say that a month would be a reasonable period to collect this data.

I also make that comment being aware that although, because we've been involved in the discussions, it will come as more of a surprise to the other providers that they might need a little bit more lead time to prepare the data that they would be contributing.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Registrars, I'm going to pick on Jonathan since he's still got a green tick up. Jonathan, how long do you think you would need to reply to this?

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Unfortunately I was multitasking a bit so I...

Michele Neylon: Okay, I'll come back to you a second. Think about it and I'll come back to you. Luc, how long would you need to answer this do you think?

Luc Seufer: Considering right now I believe all our group, the registrar, are focusing on the (unintelligible) I'm not sure; I would say one month or two.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Jonathan, I'm coming back to you.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: What's the question?

Michele Neylon: How long do you think it would take you to reply to the questionnaire?

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Oh, yeah, I mean, I think 30 days is reasonable.

Michele Neylon: Okay then. Does anybody have any objection - does anybody have any strong feelings towards having a shorter period than 30 days? Does anybody - okay, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think less than 30 days is unreasonable.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, it depends to some extent when we're doing this but, you know, depending on when we start it it either includes an ICANN meeting or it includes July vacation time. I think we have to be reasonable given the time of the year we're in.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. That's fine, that's fine. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. One suggestion could be that indeed we set a deadline of 30 days and, you know, somewhat towards the end of that timeframe we'll have a look and see how many responses we've received. And if the group feels and, you know, we can reach out to the different parties, I mean, from a UDRP provider's perspective it's easy to, you know, target those that haven't responded and ask them whether they're still planning to or if they need more time.

And we can extend - from the registrar's side I think we just need to see how many responses we've received to see if that's, you know, sufficient to have, you know, a broad enough set of data available or whether, you know, further outreach would need to be done and extend the deadline, you know, following the 30 days. So that might be a suggestion to consider.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Marika. Jonathan.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Yeah and just to clarify too, I mean, it's not that the questionnaire takes that, you know, will take that long to fill out or get the information for but I think that, you know, I think it's a good point to say that, you know, based on, you know, whether it's an ICANN meeting or just the time of year, I mean, just getting the, you know, just getting people to sit down and actually open it up and focus on it.

I mean, that would be concern I think this - (would) shortening the period would just be, you know, limiting the amount of responses due to the fact that people just wouldn't get to it. And so - and I think it's a good idea to follow up if we, you know, do 30 days or - do 30 days and then, you know, if we're not happy with the response then, you know, we need more feedback we could either extend the deadline or just be more proactive about getting people's individual feedback on the questionnaire.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So with that in mind based on the feedback if we can circulate it for an initial 30 days and then see if we need to extend it further or encourage registrars and UDRP providers to respond so everybody is happy with that?

Okay. In terms of distributing it to the UDRP providers ICANN would have a list of the contacts for those, Marika, is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I assume so. I know that there was also a survey conducted as part of the issue report and the review of the UDRP so I'll check with my colleagues because presumably that was sent to, you know, the different contacts at the UDRP providers. So I don't think that should be an issue.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, maybe for the registrars obviously you can send it through to - it can be sent through the stakeholder group so that shouldn't be an issue plus there's several...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Michele Neylon: ...registrars on this working group as well.

Marika Konings: Okay. We'll get that out and that way - I know there's, as well, and it's something we've done for previous working groups but I need to check with my colleagues if we can use that mailing list, again, because the previous time they allowed me to do that they said it was a - only if it wouldn't happen too often because ICANN also has a mailing list that goes out to all accredited registrars.

And, you know, the last time we actually got really good responses by sending it out on that mailing list. So I'll ask my colleagues if there would be a chance that we can use that as well for distribution to the registrar community to get, you know, as much feedback as we can.

Michele Neylon: Okay but that might be considered a nuclear option. The gentleman from WIPO.

David Roache-Turner: Just a question. Being conscious that we're adopting an anonymous approach with respect to the responses received back from the registrars is there some mechanism that we could utilize informally within the group to track somehow the registrars from which responses are received so that we ourselves have some idea of this?

Michele Neylon: Sorry, could you explain what you mean by that? Do you - because if you're saying it's - I'm a bit confused bearing in mind also it's early in the morning for me so my brain isn't working too well.

Do you mean you want it to be anonymous but you want to also identify the registrars? Or do you mean you accept that it's anonymous and you want to make sure that the people aren't replying to it twice?

David Roache-Turner: Well both, I suppose. I mean, I appreciate that we don't want to publish or we don't want to require the - the responding registrars to identify themselves in the record because we're concerned that that might discourage full and frank replies. But if it comes to, for example, you know, checking that the data is not being double-submitted, for example, if we've got some way to ensure that that does not happen that would be useful.

And also if we're going to be looking at targeted follow ups to ask those registrars that haven't responded if they would respond if we don't know who's responded in the first place how would we go about following up with those that haven't?

Michele Neylon: Okay I'll let Marika - Marika has got her hand up; I'll let her speak first.
Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. With regards to making sure that people only respond once I think there is a setting in the survey that you can restrict that only, you know, from one IP address one response is received. And, you know, I'm sure there are ways around that but that's one restriction that can be set up as a part of the survey.

On the, you know, anonymous and whether people will fill in their names based on past experience on recent surveys we've done actually people do tend to fill in their name or at least their affiliation, you know, quite often; I think in the majority of cases.

So we might have that information so, you know, one way to try to encourage people to provide that information would be instead of saying, you know, optional it is strongly encouraged basically saying like you don't have to but we would really like to know who you are so we can indeed see who has responded and maybe, you know, either follow up with those registrars that, you know, maybe from certain (sizes) that are not covered in the survey yet

to really make sure that we have a wide range of data on different, you know, different setups.

Michele Neylon: Luc is suggesting that we give an ICANN t-shirt to every UDRP provider or registrar that replies to the survey. I'm not sure whether Marika can okay a budget for that, can you, Marika?

Marika Konings: I'm afraid not but I'm sure there's some other people that have that authority that you can talk to at Prague.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Marika.

Luc Seufer: Only if it comes with a free set of steak knives.

Michele Neylon: Sorry?

Luc Seufer: Only if it comes with a free set of steak knives.

Alan Greenberg: We can make it conditional on coming to the ICANN meeting; we can be pretty sure they'll get a t-shirt.

Michele Neylon: Alan, do you have any comments on this?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I do. In the past we haven't had a lot of problem asking the people to identify themselves especially if we say that, you know, the identities will not be tied to the answers but are for staff use only. You know, in PDNR we did a registrar survey and even the people on the workgroup didn't know who gave which answer unless it was obvious from the content. But - so I'm presuming they will trust staff enough to fill that in in most cases.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Alan. Any other comments, thoughts? And if WIPO does want to give a steak set - steak knife set to everybody who answers the survey we

wouldn't have any issue with that. Well you're basically in Switzerland so it should be a box of chocolates or something surely.

David Roache-Turner: (Unintelligible) we'll look into it.

Michele Neylon: I'll hold you to that. Be careful. Okay then the next - I'm actually going to come - okay the next item on the agenda we have there is the email from Luc. And Luc's email, which I had open here - okay - was in relation to the working group's scope. And I think - are you sharing that? Oh yes she is. Perfect. And that's now up on the Adobe Connect.

So Luc's basic concern is that the working group is self-limiting the scope of its mission without any valid reason. And, so, Luc, would you like to talk us through this briefly?

Luc Seufer: Yes, okay. Yes, so as I said the last time and I believe I tried to transfer more clearly here is the fact that we are just addressing the locking of the domain name not the unlocking part which to me is problematic around I know for other registrars is as well. And I would like to have your feedback on that and we are (unintelligible) or not to include the unlocking and the condition to unlock the domain in the scope of the UDRP.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you, Luc. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, as a representative of users I would consider it completely unreasonable if we had the mandate to look at when to lock and when a registrar must lock a domain but not include the unlocking half of it also.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I can't separate the two.

Michele Neylon: Jonathan.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Yeah, I would agree. I think that they're just so intertwined that I think that it seems, you know, it's incomplete or, you know, to only address the one piece and, you know, pay no mind to the other side of it so I would agree.

Michele Neylon: Marika, I'll get to you in a second. Anybody else have any thoughts on this before we go to Marika? Okay Marika, you have the floor.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. Just to - trying to recall the discussions that we had at the time of, you know, drafting the charter and also the Council discussions relating to that. I don't recall either. And, you know, my memory might be wrong but I don't recall either specifically or people specifically wanting to exclude the unlocking of the domain name.

So it might be one of those things where indeed the charter is written in such a way that you might - the (doc) from it that may be unlocking is excluded but I'm not really sure that that was really the intention.

So my suggestion might be if indeed there is, you know, broad working group support then the unlocking part should also be considered. But this is maybe an issue that the working group might want to raise with the GNSO Council when you meet with them in Prague.

Just clarify that it's the working group's understanding that as part of these deliberations, the working group will also consider the unlocking of domain names, you know, once this (grid) has been resolved just to make sure that that's also in the line of thinking with the GNSO Council. And if there are any objections there that, you know, then it can be worked out as part of that discussion.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele with take kind of with my chair had slightly askew or off to one side. I remember from the conversations in the - when we were doing the

drafting of the charter and, you know, from other conversations around the entire UDRP reform and everything else.

I don't particularly specifically recall anyone even inferring that we couldn't look at anything to do with unlocking because as Alan says, the two are (ripped). The two go hand in hand and (Jonathan) backed that up.

So, you know, from personally I don't see any issue with that. I will - I'll actually be meeting with the - what's Jeff Neuman's official title with the GNSO. Is he co-Chair of the GNSO or Vice Chair?

Man: Vice Chair.

Woman: Vice Chair.

Michele Neylon: Vice Chair. Well I'll be meeting with him informally today anyways so I'll - I might actually just ask him that informally whether he has any issue with it. And then of course we can raise it formally at the session in Prague. But - and to (Luke), thank you very much for going to the trouble of pointing this out so clearly.

Man: Sounds like a plan.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

(David): This is (David). Can I just make a suggestion that if we do go down this road of also looking at the question of how they and when and what circumstances the domain name can be unlocked that we could clarify in the charter that that is part of the working group's mandate. Because I think you do have to look at bit at the moment to see it in there.

And if that's what we're going to be discussing also and investing our time in it, it might be useful to have that clarified at the level of the charter itself if it moves forward.

Michele Neylon: Any thoughts from anybody? (David) if you could take - if you get a - let (Jonathan) go in a sec. And (David), if you could just send that some kind of - your thoughts on that back to the mailing list and reply to (Luke)'s email, it would be helpful just to - so we can clearly see exactly what you're saying.

(David): Sure.

Michele Neylon: (Jonathan) go ahead please.

(Jonathan): Yeah. No, I was just going to say that I agree. I think that makes sense to include it in the mandate if possible just to clarify that it's within the scope of this group and, you know, it helps to better outline the purpose and include that in there (unintelligible). But essentially you can bring it up probably to the (unintelligible) by way of the green checkmark.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. The one thing though that we - you should be aware of is that if we - if there is a substantive change or - well if there's a substantive change to the charter, then that will mean yet another GNSO vote, which Marika is going to just double check that.

Marika, if we're just seeking clarity on something, then would that require an actual vote?

Marika Konings: No. This is Marika. I think if the GNSO confirms and, you know, can be possibly incorporated in the minutes or, you know, will be in the transcript of that meeting, you know, it might be sufficient. But if you're specifically looking for adding something to the charter and it, you know, requires a change of the charter, I think that requires another GNSO Council vote on that to those changes.

But I'll - I'm just looking in the (unintelligible) documents to exactly find because I think it's a simple majority vote that applies then. But I'll - when I find it, I'll post it in the chat.

Michele Neylon: The next - there's a GNSO Council meeting today...

Man: Today.

Michele Neylon: ...in a couple of hours - (and call in) about six hours time. When's the next one after that? Is it Prague?

Man: Yeah.

Woman: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Alan you have you had up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I would phrase the question there if we want to make it a question saying our interpretation of the charter is that we can consider unlocking as well as locking since it's a natural extension. Is there any objection to that? That would - that doesn't require a vote. If we actually want the words to be change or they feel the words need to be changed, it will require a vote.

But I can't imagine Council refusing regardless of whether it requires a change in the actual wording of the charter or just a confirmation that our interpretation is reasonable. So I don't think we need to worry about it. It can go on in parallel while we're doing the work...

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Alan.

Alan Greenberg: ...regardless. But I would phrase it asking - saying this is our interpretation. Do you - does anyone have a problem with that? So the simple way out is for

them to simply no one have a problem and our interpretation will, you know, be logged in the minutes.

And - but if someone decides that that's ridiculous, it has to be changed, so be it. They've added a piece of work onto the Council list and go ahead. As I said, I can't imagine them refusing. So it's just a matter of what mechanism do we use. And we should opt for the simplest one and let them make it complicated if they want to.

Michele Neylon: And based on what I've seen from a couple of sources over the last few days, I suspect that several of the GNSO Councilors would not be in favor of adding to their workload.

Alan Greenberg: Well.

Michele Neylon: Just from the chat and for the purposes of the transcript, Marika has put from the PDP manual approved charters may be modified or amended by simple majority vote of each house. So that's if we want to - if they decide - were to decide that an actual modification or amendment to the charter was required that as has been noted by a couple of people clarification, which would be (minisus) would probably suffice.

Gentlemen - the WIPO gentlemen, do you have an issue with a clarification - request for clarification as posited by Alan?

Man: No (Thomas) so long as the clarification is clear that, you know, it's something that the GNSO is prepared to have us do. I think what we would want to avoid is invest, you know, a significant amount of time and resources in examining the issue only to be told after the fact that it's beyond mandate.

So I think our principle purpose is to ensure that from the point that we start considering it if we make recommendations these are recommendations that are going to feed into a process.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other comments on this, other thoughts? No. Okay. Moving on. Actually just in - with - it's a simple process question. Marika, would it be simplest if we were to formally email the GNSO Chair and co-Chair, just ask them this or should I wait until the meeting in Prague?

Alan Greenberg: Who's our liaison?

Woman: It's (Joy).

Michele Neylon: (Joy), yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Then I would ask (Joy) to present it - to present the question. She is the contact. She's the interface.

Marika Konings: And I think - this is Marika. I think it might be helpful indeed, you know, to work with (Joy) on putting that in an email so that can be shared with the Council before the Prague meeting so the discussion can actually be had during that session instead of maybe, you know, us trying to explain what the issue is in the Council needing to think about it but you actually can have hopefully a decision at that stage.

Michele Neylon: That makes sense. And Alan just put in the chat as well, from the PR aspect not allow us to look at unlocking would be rather poor. Okay then. So let's - dealing with this issue, let's try to work on wording something with (Joy) to send through so that it can actually get to the Council list in advance of Prague so that I don't end up walking into and asking a question of them and then more kind of getting completely confused.

Next item on the agenda. We continue development of work plan approach. (Let me) just see if I got that window open here somewhere. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I said this is actually an item that is in two parts where first a work plan - I think we started looking at this at the start of the working group but we haven't really started filling in some of the dates here. And, you know, this is one of the required elements of, you know, working group is expected to do - to set out a kind of work plan with some of the milestones.

So will be just to try to put some, you know, stakes in the ground to try to see when the working group is thinking of, you know, delivering its initial report and when the different public comment periods might take place. You know, when a constituency and stakeholder group statements go out.

I think some of the dates I probably will be able to fill in based on, you know, discussions we had over the previous week is, you know, now we've set a deadline for the survey. So I would be assuming that thereafter the 30 days you have a certain period of time to review the data.

I think the idea was that after that we would open a public comment forum to, you know, get further input also based on the data received and also reach out to stakeholder group and constituency statements, continue deliberations and at some point I guess get to initial report.

So this would be more trying to get an idea of what the working group wants to set itself as a target for, you know, getting to the different steps that need to be - need to be achieved as part of the PDP process.

And then the second part is of course the mind map that we've done and I can pull it up in a second as well where we've tried to outline some of the different approaches and some of the questions that we need to address. And know the working group might want to spend some more time on looking at that.

And I think it also links a little bit into the question now that we've finalized the survey and that goes out and there will be a month for the different parties to

respond to that, you know, in that interim time does the group want to continue meeting and, you know, start discussing the different questions or, you know, would that not be very efficient as, you know, that we're trying to get data to help inform those discussions or are there other items the working group already wants to start working on.

So it's really trying to get the working group to think on, you know, what are the next steps and how we're going to, you know, organize the different meetings that are up and coming to make sure that we achieve the goals that the working group wants to set.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Marika. Just one possible thing to consider. Looking at the document as you've shared there in Adobe Connect, okay, we're now at - what is today, 7th of June. So next kind of things that you've got a variety of dates for working groups, the ICANN meeting in Prague; and then through to the 21st of September is the publication deadline for Toronto.

Based on what I've seen in several other areas, if we are intending to do anything prior to Toronto, not - but I'm saying prior to, not for Toronto. The - if we want to do something, we'd want to do it I would say looking at the dates here - I'm earlier in the month because what keeps on happening is that on the publication deadline ICANN and working groups and everything else do this massive document dump, which means that everybody's completely overwhelmed with documents.

So you get - everything kind of gets lost in there and people don't have a chance to read everything. So I would suggest that if we are thinking of doing anything prior to Toronto that we want to look at moving a deadline a couple of weeks prior to the publication deadline. That's just my own personal opinion. Does anybody have any thoughts, suggestions or comments? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. If my hand's up it's from before.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...sorry. I wasn't at my computer. No I don't think so. I think right now it's a bit early in our timeframe to say whether we're likely to really have something for publication at that point.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Looking at needed dates that are on there I'm not really sure either whether that's going to be a realistic timeline. Because if I'm just, you know, taking note that we're going to send out, you know, the survey maybe today, tomorrow or, you know, Monday, that will give people a month. So that already takes us to the beginning of July.

And it's not unlikely that we might need to extend if we haven't received enough responses. So that might take us to, you know, half July for example. And then the working group will need some time to review the responses and analyze the data, which might take another couple of meetings. Let's say, you know, till the beginning of August.

Then we still - the working group will still need to send out the constituency and stakeholder group statements, which is a minimum of 35 days. So that would already take you to the end of August. And also a public comment forum is currently a minimum of 42 days. So then you're already looking at, you know, being somewhere in September when you still need to evaluate comments and constituency and stakeholder group statements.

Of course there are ways to speed that up or and you'd say well, you know, it's not likely at this stage or might have something for Toronto. Although, you know, you can as well produce another kind of document, which is not yet initial report.

If there are certain kind of, you know, questions or recommendations you want to have out for discussion for Toronto, that is something else you might want to look at. But I think from - if you look at the initial trying to set that as a target for the initial report, it might be a challenge looking at the different steps that you already know are going to be required as part of the process.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Marika. Any other - any comments or thoughts? Okay. Marika, do you have that mind map thing of yours?

Marika Konings: Yes. Hold on. Let me try to share my screen. Able to see that?

Michele Neylon: Yes. Possibly, though it's - well for me I can't speak for anybody else but I'm find the text very, very small. But that could just be that I'm blind.

Marika Konings: I can make it a big - bigger and otherwise you can also use your full screen setting although this might already a bit better.

Michele Neylon: If I do that, you see I'm going to lose the thing on the side aren't I.

Marika Konings: Yes. Is this already better? I've made it a bit bigger. What...

Alan Greenberg: I can see it on my full screen. But I've got a big screen.

Marika Konings: Move in a bit more.

Michele Neylon: That's better for me anyway.

Marika Konings: So basically what I've done on the top is basically outline some of the administrative items and the confirmation of the working group leadership. And just for those of you that might not be aware, the GNSO Council is having a meeting today and that's all on the agenda with a schedule for the

meetings, requests for the meetings. You know, it's going to be a working group session.

Then there's a second part that is the outreach part or we've spoken about, you know, requesting public input as part of, you know, two surveys we're doing. We're going to do public comments following the surveys. We'll have, you know, part of our session probably as a public session I think as we discussed before that might be a part, you know, people can ask questions and provide input.

And then there's also the request for stakeholder group constituency statements that will be done once the survey is completed. There's also the requesting the opinion of other ACs and SOs, which, you know, presumably will coincide with requesting input from the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituency statements.

And I think that we also said we would do some information gathering looking at URS locking requirements and the best practices paper that was discussed before.

And then what you see in the document as well is basically the charter questions and some of the other questions I think that we've identified in the meantime that we want to discuss and some of them we've already identified as well. So all the specific questions and the soft topics in there.

So that's what I have for now as, you know, the approach. So the question might be, you know, the working group wants to spend more time looking at each of these questions and, you know, starting to dig deeper on each of these or, you know, I said before whether it's really necessary to first have the data from the registrar and UDRP provider survey to, you know, do that.

So I think that's really a question for the working group what you think is possible at this stage or where we can already achieve or, you know, make

progress on certain items and not maybe lose, you know, valuable time that we currently have.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Marika. What format is that mind map thing in?

Marika Konings: I'm not really sure what I sent you but I can convert it to a PDF. So it's posted in that version as well on the working group Wiki. I made a couple of small changes based on live discussions. I post this latest version there as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have any thoughts or comments or other feedback? Okay. Looking towards Prague we have session there from 9:00 am to 10:30 am on Thursday, 28th of June. And the agenda details, there's a link for that as well.

Marika Konings: Yes. But there's nothing there.

Michele Neylon: Okay. (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: That's a new one of the issues that, you know, the working group might want to discuss as well. What agenda do you want to have for that meeting? What I provided now I think there's just a general description of what the working group is about, the working (results) expected to post an agenda as part of the schedule.

I mean of course part of it, you know, will be the standard where we're doing today as well but for example you might want to consider kicking off especially if there - you know, all the people in the room that are members of the working group just with a short recap where the working group is and what, you know, what (all) the approaches are and what we're working on and then maybe dive into some of the more substantial substantive issues.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any thoughts or comments on what these - what we should be discussing in that meeting? Deathly silence. Okay. Then I will try to fill the gap slightly.

I mean the kind of thing I suppose that would make some sense would be maybe just to give a brief overview of what the working group is about, what it's meant to be dealing with; possibly extrapolating something from this mind map thingy that Marika has put together.

I mean the other thing I suppose as well is possibly we can use the meeting in Prague to do a couple of things. First off reminding people that there is - there are questionnaires that have been sent out to both UDRP providers and registrars and also that we will be opening a public comment period - just not sure of the timing of that. But we will be opening a comment - public comment period on the topic hopefully not too far after that.

And we may be also if people have any (unintelligible) anybody - I suppose the other thing as well as people wish to join the working group as (unintelligible) contributors I think we can't actually stop people from joining. They can join at anytime during the working group as far as I know.

And what else? Other feedback from people. I mean do we want to make this slightly more interactive? Do we want to have - to get a - to have a short presentation from somebody just to explain some of the issues that they face practically? I don't know. I'm just throwing that out there. What do - what would people like to do considering this is going to be the first opportunity to interact with the public?

However, bearing in mind that it is a meeting early in the morning, 9:00 am, I wouldn't get too excited about the number of people who would actually turn up. But just bear that in mind. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. And maybe to make another (unintelligible) interesting I think also, you know, looking at the working group with some of the discussions we've had, I think there's still quite a lot of learning to do within the working group but also in the - if others come and then there's, as Michele said, you know, there might not be many but still it might be of interest to have, you know, on the one side someone from WIPO, you know, talking about the issues they face and on the other side registrars issues, you know, they have with this to really make clear to those (all working).

But it's the audience there why we're addressing this issue and why it's, you know, posing problems. So maybe having indeed two kind of little case studies from the two perspectives that might help indeed inform the discussions and maybe get it a bit more interactive and interesting.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Marika. Personally I think that's a good approach. Does anybody disagree with that? And secondly, who would be willing to volunteer themselves to do so - to provide these short little case study type things? (Luke), could I volunteer you?

(Luke): Yes you can. Nine am you said.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

(Luke): Just...

Michele Neylon: And the gentleman from WIPO.

Man: Yes. So this would be what a brief presentation to illustrate a case study in where there's been an issue that's come up in (UDR) paper stating yeah sure, we can do that.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. I mean the thing is I mean for both parties. You know, remember the audience at a public meeting is quite mixed. So while some people might be -

have a huge amount of - have a huge amount of experience in the area, others don't. I mean the thing just speaking personally, don't - if you can make this - anything you're doing there make it very - in terms of the slides, I would recommend you look at the current guide to a (soki) type approach.

Less is more. And just a - just speaking from basic experience explaining in simple terms what the issue is that - what the issues is that you face and just, you know, to illustrate it. So let's move on. We can follow up on this after the call.

In terms of meetings and everything else moving forward, do we want to meet again before the Prague meeting or are we happy to meet again in Prague to, you know, if we're sending out these questionnaires and everything within the next couple of days. Does anybody have any strong feelings?

(Sherry) is saying on the chat that she can't see any reason for us to meet before Prague again. And also on the chat we have (Luke) asking have we - has anybody been in contact with CAC, the UDRP provider based in the Czech Republic. And if needed, he can reach out to them.

It would be good - personally speaking, you know, I think it would be good if they were made aware of the fact that we were having that meeting at least. Any other thoughts? Okay.

Then let's - can - okay, let us work on the basis that we're going to follow what's been done on a couple of the other working groups. That our next meeting will be in Prague. And then again after that that we'll be meeting on the 12th of July. Does anybody have any strong feelings against doing that? Anybody have any feelings that this is a good idea? (Sherry) thinks it's a good idea. Thank you (Sherry).

You can all use your green checkboxes by the way rather - if you don't want to actually say something. Oh I'm seeing lots of green. Perfect. Well two bits of green. I'll give myself a green. And nobody opposed to this? Okay then.

Does anybody have any other issues they wish to raise at this juncture? Am I the only person left on this call?

Woman: No Michele. Gisella here.

Alan Greenberg: You are not.

Michele Neylon: The silence is lovely and everything else, you know, but it's just a little bit kind of (discouraging). You think, you know, is the phone - is the phone still working? Okay then. If nobody has any other matters they wish to raise, I will give you back a couple of minutes and see you all in Prague. And let us continue discussions about those case studies and everything else via the list. And will then call this meeting adjourned.

Man: All right. Thanks everybody.

Man: Thank you Michele.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thanks all. Bye.

END