

**IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group  
TRANSCRIPT**

**Wednesday 19th November 2014 at 17:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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. <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-crp-access-20141119-en.mp3>

Attendees:

George Kirikos - Individual  
Jim Bikoff – IPC  
Petter Rindforth – IPC  
Val Sherman – IPC  
Phil Corwin – BC  
Mason Cole – RySG  
Gary Campbell – GAC  
David Healsley - IPC  
Kristine Dorrain- Individual  
Paul Tattersfield – Individual  
David Maher – RySG  
Paul Keating – NCUC  
Imran Ahmed Shah – NCUC  
Kathy Kleiman - NCUC

Apologies:

Oswaldo Novoa – ISPCP  
Lori Schulman – NPOC

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong  
Berry Cobb  
Amy Bivins  
Terri Agnew  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator:       Okay, the recordings have started. I'd like to inform participants today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.  
Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Lisa). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. Welcome to the IGO INGO Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group call on the 19 of November, 2014.

On the call today we have Petter Rindforth, Gary Campbell, Mason Cole, George Kirikos, Paul Tattersfield, Val Sherman, David Maher, Jim Bikoff, Kristine Dorrain, Paul Keating, David Heasley and Phil Corwin.

We have received apologies from Osvaldo Novoa and Laurie Schulman. From staff we have Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, Amy Bivins, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

Coordinator: Excuse me.

Nathalie Peregrine: I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Mr. Philip Corwin has joined.

Petter Rindforth: Okay then, Petter Rindforth here. Any statement of interest updates? I see no hands up. Good so let's proceed to the next point, update on action items from the last working group call.

And I see notes there on the screen, I'll leave it to the staff first.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Petter. This is Mary Wong from ICANN staff. And on behalf of my other colleagues supporting this working group, some of whom are on this call, we just wanted to give you folks an update on some of the matters arising from the call last week. And you see that that into action items document up on the screen that was also sent to everybody a few days ago.

So pleased to report that the proposed IGO small-group that was discussed by the Board and the GNSO at the Los Angeles meeting, we are told, has been formed.

And as a result action item number two, a specific questions to be sent to the IGO small-group, we have started coordinating with our colleagues who support the Board and the new gTLD program committee to make sure that these are sent to the IGO small-group in such a way that we would hopefully get a fairly quick and productive response.

Action item number three I think was a question more for the working group because, as was noted last week, several working group members do have contacts with individual IGOs who may or may not be members - observers of the GAC for example. So this may be an action item that working group members may want to take further or discuss at some point.

On action item number four and five actually we've also proceeded to speak to our legal department to make sure that the research that was done for the last working group is something that they can provide an update on with regard to their usefulness to our working group of the 6ter protections and how those are translated or implemented in the different jurisdictions they studied.

We've also talked to them about coordinating this with some of the research output coming out of our Subgroup B which is to do the individual trademark searches for the IGOs on the GAC list. And we want to make sure that those jurisdictions correspond to the ones that were on the previous survey.

Finally, on our end we have asked for the updates to the GNSO Council to be on the next meeting agenda. And we have also written to the GAC chair, in part of our invitation to the GAC member of this group to participate in our face-to-face meeting on action item number five.

So we've done as much as we could in the week that's gone past on the action items. We will come back to the group as soon as we get responses. And of course we'll continue coordinating with our colleagues in the other departments.

The only other update that we have on the staff side for now, before I headed over to Mason, is to let everyone know that our working group as a liaison to the GNSO Council that was appointed at the last Council meeting, and it is Susan Kawaguchi, who is the new councilor from that Business Constituency. And I believe Susan will be joining some of our calls as well as our face-to-face meeting in Singapore in February.

So that's it from the staff end and over to you, Mason.

Mason Cole: Thanks, Mary. Mason Cole speaking. Can everybody hear me?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah.

Ma: Okay good. Well good morning. I don't have much of an update except on the issue of the questions to the GAC that were posed by this working group. I have those questions in hand and, excuse me, they'll be pushed to the GAC.

One of the issues that has been - I'm sorry, I'm getting some feedback on my line. Just a moment. One of the issues that I've had in my role as the liaison is finding someone on the GAC side to receive the comments and coordinate with the GAC to help get the questions answered.

I think that problem has now been solved so today in fact I'll be posting those questions for clarification by the GAC. And hopefully we'll receive a response in a timely way. But I will be working with the GAC to elicit a response. And I think that's pretty much all I have for an update for this group.

Jim Bikoff: Mason, and I ask a question? This is Jim Bikoff.

Ma: Sure, Jim.

Jim Bikoff: Who are the questions going to?

Ma: We're going to start with Peter Nettlefold from Australia and see if he can coordinate a small group to work with. He's pretty responsive.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Bikoff: Okay, I was only going to suggest perhaps you think about also about Mark Carvell in London who I know is pretty much up to date on these issues.

Ma: Yes thank you. That's a good suggestion.

Petter Rindforth: Petter here...

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Yeah...

Ma: I'm sorry, go ahead, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: ...want to say that seems to be a good start. And also good initiative to start the contact of setting up even if it's not a formal group, at least an informal group to discuss in a fairly early stage so that's very good.

Did anyone want to comment on this?

Jim Bikoff: Petter, could I ask a question to Mary? It's Jim Bikoff again.

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Jim Bikoff: Mary, who are the IGOs who are going to be in the small group? Is it information that may be you could circulate on that so we don't - if we contact other members we're not going to have any conflict with the group that you're going to be sending things to.

Mary Wong: Thanks Jim. This is Mary. That's a great question. I'm afraid I don't have the exact information on hand but I will find out. I would imagine that a number of the IGO participants from the last working group would be in that small group. And the reason I say that is because Jim and others, as you know, the small group was set up not specifically just as a resource for our current working group but primarily to continue to work out the outstanding issues to be reconciled between the GAC and the GNSO on the prior working group's recommendations.

So I would think that some of the IGO participants from that phase, which would include WIPO and a couple of others would likely be on that group as well. So like I said I will find out.

That said though, I don't know what they were actually, you know, be difficult for folks like Jim and others to speak to IGOs with whom they have contacts. And so I will try and provide that information. But, Jim, I think that would be good for you and others to continue those conversations you've been having. Thanks.

Jim Bikoff: Thanks, Mary.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Petter here again. Then I - oh yes, Mary, I see your hand is up.

Mary Wong: Yes, Petter. And I'm sorry, I think we just had a question or comment from Imran in the Adobe Connect. So I thought maybe I'd take the opportunity - and, Mason, jump in if I'm, you know, not saying it as completely or as correctly as you would.

I think what you are talking about is not so much a formal GAC representative but that while we have a liaison, which is yourself, between the GAC and the GNSO the difficulty because this is the first time that we are using this liaison function is that you don't have a counterpart on the GAC side.

So in speaking to Peter and maybe to Mark Carvel I would assume that it's not so much that they are the official GAC representatives that serve the same function as you do but simply your initial contact points with the GAC.

Petter Rindforth: Petter here again. Also as said I think it's a good start. There was a couple of us that discussed with Peter Nettlefold at the last ICANN meeting and he actually said that he appreciated to work close together with us and to discuss even if it's no formal official decisions but to discuss specific points and that they have actually a group that deals with these kind of issues already.

So this is accepted by GAC and it's also a good way to continue and to have, as I said, to have early input that we can work around - work with.

Okay then I'll move forward to the main issue of today's call, the request for input from GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies and also from other SO ACs.

And well I hope you have all seen it already, get some comments. And Phil offered to collect notes from the meeting today. And I just wanted to say initially that I saw George Kirikos comments and you're perfectly right, we need to add some comments on how we come to this conclusion. So that's definitely something that will be added to this document.

What I'm talking about, Berry, is before we reach the first question what's right now in this draft just briefly said that first we wish to inform you that the working group has reached a majority decision but there is no principle

reason to consider INGOs as a special category or protected organization for purposes of this specific task for which is was chartered in this PDP.

And the question from that is what is the view of your stakeholder group, constituency on excluding INGOs from further consideration in this PDP? So I think we - if I initially go through just the questions here and see if there are any further proposals you want to be - question as such. And the initial presentation of the question.

And I'll leave it to you, yes, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Petter, can you hear me okay?

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, are we at the stage now to offer specific comments on the letter?

Petter Rindforth: Sorry, what did you meant?

Phil Corwin: Are we - well are we now at the point in this discussion where individuals can indicate how they would like the letter to be amended? And, again, I've offered to take notes on ideas from others but if we're at that point I want to lead off with a few comments on...

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: ...I would like to make.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah. It's our plan so go ahead.



Phil Corwin: Okay. Yeah, first of all going down to the, you know, the openings fine but going down to the third paragraph we need - and we need to decide whether it's in the body of the letter or in an attachment, explain how we reached the majority decision that there's no need to give further consideration to INGOs.

And I think rather than asking an open-ended question what's your view, I think we should be more specific saying do you have any - does your stakeholder group or constituency have any objections to this decision where if we don't get something back the implication is that they haven't replied they don't have a problem.

I think we want to, you know, use this as an opportunity to both explain and get some kind of consent moving forward. I don't want people to be silent and then show up two or three months from now informing us they have a problem with it so I'd like to be a little more specific with the question.

And two more paragraphs down where it starts off, "One of the requirements under the UDRP and URS," and then it says, "What would be the basis?" I think we need to add in Article 6ter because, I mean, we haven't found anything else that would be the basis for rights other than trademark rights for INGOs. So I think we need to mention that in there.

And then on the next one, on 7, immunity, at least based on the telegram that George found for how the URS - I mean, how the US treats protection of Article 6ter rights in the United States I think like the language say this may prejudice the status of an INGOs enjoying sovereign immunity.

I think we need to be more open ended and say we're exploring whether there is in fact widespread sovereign immunity and, you know, and that we're looking at how other countries treat protection of Article 6ter rights in their own jurisdictions.

Petter Rindforth: Sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Which one was that?

Phil Corwin: That is the paragraph that starts, "One of the requirements under the UDRP and URS," and then - no, no it's the one afterwards, excuse me. So next one, "A specific problem facing IGOs with requirement to agree to submit to jurisdiction." I think this paragraph too much presumes that we've accepted the validity of the sovereign immunity issue. I think our inquiry is more open ended at this point.

You know, we found that in the United States at least the US does not recognize any sovereign immunity, in fact it requires IGOs who want to protect their Paris Convention rights to register with Patent and Trademark office and to bring a private civil action in US court if they believe infringement has occurred in the US and that because of that we're exploring how other nations do it.

I think the way it's worded accepts the sovereign immunity claim and actually that's something we're actively exploring. We haven't made a decision yet because that would be the major reason for looking at an entirely new curative rights process.

Nominal - the next paragraph - nominal cost, I think we need to note that it's, yeah, we want their input on whether they view the current UDRP and URS fees as nominal but we also want to note in the letter that we neither have been asked to under the resolution nor do we have the power to create any subsidy mechanism if the cost is not bearable by certain IGOs.

And I'll stop there. The rest goes into the other issues that are in the charter that we're charged with looking at. I think an idea of the kind of changes and changes and tone and additional background information that I think need to

be in this letter to make it fully informative - two of the other SOs and ACs and to get better feedback from them.

And I'll stop talking at that point and see if others have comments on this.

Jim Bikoff: Phil, it's Jim Bikoff. I would like to make a comment if I may?

Phil Corwin: Go ahead.

Petter Rindforth: Sure.

Jim Bikoff: Thanks, Petter. I agree with George's comment earlier this morning and also with some of what Phil has proposed. So I think what I'd like to suggest is since I haven't had a chance really to make my comments if somebody - if Phil maybe, because he has some major changes, would like to maybe send around a draft with his changes which I think also will address George's changes, and maybe we could set a deadline for folks providing written comments so that we could get this thing moving along.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, Petter here. I think that's a good thing to deal with it. And that's also what we plan to do is to get some initial comments today and just to come to that point briefly on the agenda that we've - I presume that we'll decide not to have a meeting next week so instead I urge you to all to study this topics and the questions and to send us comments for that.

I don't know what kind of final date we should set up but it would of course be good to have something by let's say Friday next week. It should give us enough time to send in our comments or even earlier if you think that would be decent. Yes, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, thank you so much. Thank you, Petter. My concern here is the response date overall, not the response for our comments which I think makes sense some time next week. But January 2 is a horrible time. Most people's offices

are closed for a week, stakeholder groups are largely offline and silent at that time.

I really think it should be at least a week later, otherwise I think we're just going to get people asking for extensions that we'll have to grant anyway. January 2 is just a tough time; everybody in the world on vacation then. So my proposal would be January 9. Does that screw anything up? Thanks.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Kathy. Yeah, just counting on local vacation times here in Scandinavia but, I mean, from December 13 when we celebrate the Santa Lucia and then pass on to Christmas and New Year, I think you're fully right that there will be some weeks where we cannot actually get any input. So I don't know if, Mary, do you have any good proposal of more specific new date for this?

Mary Wong: Petter, this is Mary. Thanks for the question. I was just about to respond to George's question in the chat. The PDP manual prescribes a minimum of 35 days so we looked at that period and we considered the holiday period and the fact that as George mentioned that we may have a meeting in early January. So we understand that 2 January is difficult but we just put it in there just to try to get the feedback as we've gotten from Kathy and others.

So from the staff perspective there's no issue with extending it to the 9th or whenever, it's just the understanding that clearly that would impact what we discuss and when. But if, as Kathy noted, more likely than not we wouldn't have anything back much by the 2nd anyway that's probably a reason to extend and then decide whether we want to have a meeting on the 7th or to discuss something else at that meeting.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Petter again. I think we - it's too early to cancel January some meeting; it's good to have it on the agenda and to, I presume that there are other at least loose traps that we could follow up and decide upon. And

hopefully we'll have got some comments that may - we may the possibility to discuss.

But if we can make the deadline - extend it by another week I think that would be good. Yes, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, yeah, I think I'm at - the two choices really boil down to extend - the 2nd is a Friday, I mean, New Years Day is Thursday so I think most people are just going to take Friday off. The 2nd is not going to work.

The question is whether we extend it to the 6th, which is the following Tuesday assuming we'll probably have a call on Wednesday the 7th or extend it to the 9th and then that gives us a few more days to consider that for a call the following week on the 14th. So it's not a big difference either way. I'm willing to go with whatever the group consensus is on this. But the 2nd definitely doesn't work.

Jim Bikoff: Phil. Jim Bikoff. I'd go for the 9th.

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, Petter here. I agree. Anybody that thinks that the 9th is not a good idea? So then let's change it to the 9th and then perhaps we can - Mary, yes, I see your hand is up. Just wanted to get to you before your reply. If there is a possibility of maybe to send out a reminder early in January so at least there will be a few days behind that to - for those groups that may have follow up to find out if there are comments. Yes, Mary.

Mary Wong: Actually, Petter, that was exactly what I was going to suggest that...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: ...if we extend the deadline to the 9th what staff will do is send a brief email reminder to all the chairs maybe five days or a week before that noting that ICANN actually is officially closed for business the week after Christmas. But

there is such a thing as email so the staff will make sure that that reminder is sent out. Thanks.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Mary. Petter here again. Now we have decided on that. I had just one more comment on the phase that starts with a specific problem facing IGOs is the requirement on the UDRP and URS. I think it may be better for us to not, in that phase, already consider it as a problem but maybe reword it as something that is the comment on the conclusion from IGOs that this is a problem. And then have - still have the question as it is.

I don't have the specific wording on that yet in my head but what do you say about that? Any comments? Okay I see no hands up there so I'll send out my proposed changes to that and during the next phase.

Okay well done. Any other comments on these topics? Yes, Mary.

Mary Wong: Hi, Petter. Sorry, but me again, Mary. And looking at Paul and Kathy's comments in the Adobe chat, we don't know how many IGOs have complained or to who including to ICANN. I think what we need to bear in mind is that this specific issue was called out by the GAC in at least one if not more of its communiqués.

So as Petter was rephrasing, this is certainly an issue that has been brought up via the GAC by the IGOs and in addition this was one of the issues that was scoped in the issue report prior to the initiation of our PDP. So it's been under discussion for some time. So while I can't answer the specific question I would say that this is clearly an issue that has occupied the GAC as well as one of the factors that lets the GNSO Council to agree to initiate this PDP a few months ago.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Mary, for that clarification. Petter here. So, yeah, I take that as support to rephrase this question and the presentation of the problem as such. But of course it's also important for us to get input on it. But perhaps

not stating as it is a problem but that it is something that IGOs have raised as a possible problem and, as said, still keep the question so that we can get something further.

Okay, and well as you see apart from this specific questions we also of course welcomes input on data topics and we have a short list of some specific ones. Are there any other topics or questions anyone of you consider good to add in order to get the input for proceeding work or shall we stick with this draft as it is?

You know, a suggestion about that. Yes, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Petter, if others don't have specific suggestions for edits to the draft right now I will work on a revision and I would ask that anyone, you know, I'll get that to the group before the end of the week and we'll have until the end of next week to get feedback on the revised draft and make it - adopt the final version so we'd be sending it out early the week following the coming week, next week.

But if anyone has - if no one has specific comments now but has things they would like to change or wording they'd like to add I'd ask that people just email those to me so that I can incorporate as much as possible in the revision that I circulate so it's not just my ideas but ideas from you and other members of the working group on how this letter should be edited.

And so I just wanted to note that and hope that folks will - if they don't have suggestions now will get them to me in the next day or so so we can circulate a revised draft that's as comprehensive as possible by the end of the week.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. That sounds good. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Petter and thanks, Phil. So I'll email you these notes just so you have them at hand, a few edits. But what I did want to bring up to the group is

once we send out this letter which has currently been drafted as directed to GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, as I noted previously, this is a mandatory step in the PDP, it's in the PDP manual that we have to reach out to GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies at an early stage.

It is not mandatory that we do the same for the other supporting organizations and advisory committees, you know, like the ccNSO, the GAC, the ALAC and so forth. However, it is fairly common practice and so the question I had for this group was whether and when you would like to do the same for the other SOs and ACs.

The staff suggestion would be that you might as well knowing that obviously whether or not we get any responses does depend a lot on the nature of the issue and whether that is something that another ICANN supporting organization or advisory committee feels is within its remit or within its interest to respond. So that's the first general question.

I did have a more specific question about the GAC. And this is because we are reaching out to the GAC as well as individual observers and members of the GAC in multiple ways at the moment. You know, we have Mason trying to advance the discussion on the GAC's Los Angeles communiqué for one thing; and we have questions to the IGO small group which necessarily will also involve discussion with some GAC members on the other hand.

So where the GAC is concerned specifically it may be that we might want to hold off on sending them this request or at least rephrasing in a different way so as to avoid, you know, confusion or deluge. But that's two separate questions so first a general one on reaching out to all the other SOs and ACs and secondly, more specifically, how we should deal with the GAC in that case. Thanks.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Mary. Phil.



Phil Corwin: Yes, I think I'm providing a courtesy copy to the other SOs and ACs excluding the GAC just to let them know that this group is moving forward and where the direction we're heading. I don't have a problem with that particular, that's kind of the practice even though it's not required.

I don't think - I think the way to get this letter to the GAC is kind of hand delivered through Mason with whoever he's liaising with over there. I'm afraid this letter hits the whole GAC particularly with the communiqué they put out in LA that it's going to be counterproductive that it should be handled in a more personal way than just dropping a letter on the GAC and having it circulate among members.

So those are my thoughts on proceeding going forward. Welcome others' views.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Phil. Yeah, Petter here. I agree that I don't see any problem to extend the group as suggested to get comments. And I think we - I suggest we do it with the same timelines just in order to get so many inputs as possible. Okay then I see no...

Jim Bikoff: Petter.

Petter Rindforth: ...hands up. Yeah.

Jim Bikoff: Jim Bikoff again. On the GAC approach, I understand that Mason's going to contact Peter Nettlefold and possibly Mark Carvell. Is it - I mean, from the perspective of procedure would it be important to copy in the new head of the GAC, the chair of the GAC, Thomas Schneider, from Switzerland?

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, Petter here. I think so. It'd be good to - so that he's well aware of what's going on and also can assist in asking other GAC members to work on this and also maybe good to do it just on a formality reasons. There is - also have all the information on what's going on.

Okay then we're talking about the next steps. We'll see a new draft and get all of our inputs during next week. We have already discussed this but I think we can formally decide that we cancel the next week's meeting and instead working on finalizing our comments.

And then perhaps again if - Mary if you could give us just a short update on our full day in Singapore, the status of that?

Mary Wong: Sure. And thanks to everyone who have responded one way or the other. It would be good to get further responses, again, one way or the other as to whether or not you're planning to participate in that full day session. I wanted to repeat again that this is not the same as the normal or regular community session that many GNSO working groups would hold during the ICANN meeting.

We would probably schedule one of those during the ICANN week after consulting with the co-chairs. So this is a separate meeting and as was noted before it's scheduled to take place on Friday, February 13 for a full day.

We have already written to the different GNSO stakeholder groups to ask them to select or nominate participants from amongst the working group members to participate and we're getting some responses back. So as of now I think we are going to have a group of at least 10 people and hopefully more on the ground in Singapore from various different groups and representatives and interests.

We will also have, as I noted previously, full remote participation activities. And thank you for those who aren't able to join us in Singapore but have confirmed that they will be participating remotely.

In discussions with the working group chairs earlier this morning, and as a reminder, this is a pilot project started by the GNSO Council. We are the

second working group to be selected for this project. And the idea is to facilitate effective outcomes of working group discussions especially for the more sticky issues.

So one of the options is to use a professional facilitator and that was supposed to be done in the first pilot in LA but unfortunately the professional facilitator we had fell ill so Petter and Phil think that it would be a very good idea for our working group to go ahead using a professional facilitator.

So all this was to say thank you for letting us know you're coming. Please do continue to let us know if you are able to decide. And, thirdly, this is going to be a different meeting in terms of format as well from the regular working group meetings. And we will keep you further updated with details to come. Thanks, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Thank you, Mary. And I saw Edmon's question about will working group members will be supported for this face to face meeting. I think you got a reply for that from Mary.

Mary Wong: Just to reiterate, Petter, the only funding that we have for this pilot project, because this is a special budget request. I think many people are familiar with the ICANN procedure where if you want a trial - if you have a specific project you have to apply under a special budget funding request. And this is what the Council did last year.

So there's only a fixed sum available spread across the three ICANN meetings. And as I said, we are one of the groups selected. So the only funding available is for hotel nights, one or two depending on the number of participants per stakeholder group.

So two things, is a working group member wishes to attend and needs support that support that we can provide out of this budget is only limited to hotel nights. That has to be allocated through your stakeholder group.

Secondly, if we need additional funding on top of that that is not something that comes out of our budget; you would have to, again, apply to your stakeholder group because each stakeholder group does have travel allocations for each ICANN meeting.

So it really is an individual stakeholder group's decision as to whether and who to nominate as well as the level of support they would get whether it would be limited to the hotel nights for this project or whether the group can kick in something else as well. So I hope that's clear.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Mary. Just final question, I know we have - what you formed initially there was a specific number of - as I understood it - physical participants that was needed in order to actually keep this full day on the agenda.

So 10 people so far, is that enough or are we still unsure it will be still at - the Friday directly after ICANN?

Mary Wong: Petter, this is Mary again. And that's a good question. In fact, that was one of the reasons why we wanted to get the numbers in early. We talked about it, you know, amongst the organizers and so forth and we realized that it really does depend not on numbers, as in how many people on the ground or remotely but on the quality of the discussion.

And we, as staff, feel that as long as there is an adequacy of the different groups that are represented, physically or remotely, and as long as the participants are ones who have been active for the most part in the substantive discussions leading up to that face to face that it can be a very productive meeting.

And from what we've seen it does look like it's lining up to be something like that. So chances are we'll have more than 10 folks in the room and a few remotely. And from what I can see a lot of the participants are people who

have been active contributors as well as regular attendees. So from the staff side we're very hopeful that this will be a successful day because we do recognize that it is an extra day for everybody whether you're in Singapore or not.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Mary. Also see the chat room, George question will any of those in the IGO subgroup be at the Singapore F2F? Do we know that?

Mary Wong: Actually, Petter, that's a really good question. Well first of all I don't know the answer to that and I'm not sure that I will know the answer to that until much closer to the time if at all. But more broadly, George and everybody, I think here's a question for the chairs and the group as well, and we don't have to decide it today but the idea behind this pilot project was, like I said, facilitate effective outcomes.

And I think the assumption was that this would be limited to working group participants discussing their work. So for example, this type of face to face meeting is not listed on the public meeting schedule as an open meeting, which is what almost all ICANN sessions are because otherwise that would turn into the normal community-facing feedback type of session.

I'm not sure how the chairs and the group feel about inviting the IGO subgroup if any of them actually happen to be at that ICANN meeting and have that extra day available. It would certainly add a different dimension. It may or may not be helpful so it may be something to think about as we continue with the planning.

I just wanted to say that this was not something that was within the assumption when this project was created. And this particular case if the group feels it would be helpful it may be something to explore.

Petter Rindforth: My initial personal point of view is that let's come a bit more closely to our agenda for that day and then see if we can mix it so that we can have the

main part with our events that already working with this topic. And maybe either on that Friday or at least during the ICANN meeting as such get inputs and hopefully have the possibility to sit down for a while with any IGO representatives.

Because I fully agree that it's good to have their inputs then it's up to them also to decide on whether they will do it physically or more informally by written issues to us.

Okay. Yes, Mary.

Mary Wong: Yes, Petter, it's me again. Sorry, folks. But just to continue that thought from George and you. One option that may be helpful in ensuring that our group has a productive ICANN meeting generally, not just the face to face, is to design our community facing session during the ICANN meeting and invite - in such a way as to invite the IGO group or any of them who might be there or on the phone to come to that community session so that we can take into account that discussion when we meet a couple of days later on Friday.

And as we go into the planning for the meeting in Singapore, and as most folks know, the staff is asked to put in meeting requests actually pretty much in advance. We can bear that in mind and speak to Petter and Phil about how we can best do that. So just an option to consider as well.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Mary. Yes, that's - maybe the best and more practical way to do it. And then we hopefully also have getting some inputs that we can further discuss on the follow-up Friday.

Okay, then I think we are close to a full hour. I don't have any other points on the next steps but, Phil, yes please.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Petter. As we close out the call I just again we're not meeting next week because of - it's the day before Thanksgiving in the United States. Many

people are traveling that day. But let's not let things drop for two weeks. Number one, again, anyone with suggested edits or additions to the letter that we've discussed today should get them to me as soon as possible so that I can circulate a revised draft that incorporates as many suggestions as possible by the end of the week.

And then I plan to use the time between now and the next meeting in two weeks to review all the documents in the community space with a specific focus on - I think we need to start engaging on okay we've decided - we're just focusing on IGOs. There's two key issues, there's standing, do we need different standings and trademark rights? If that's to be used.

And this issue of sovereign immunity on appeals which is being - we know the US position and legal staff is trying to find out if there's any more. But I'd urge everyone just to review the document so that we can really hit the ground running in two weeks and start to talk about the specifics of making the UDRP and the URS work for IGOs or whether to explore if that can be done because if it can't be done then we are facing a much more arduous task of creating a new completely standalone curative rights process just for them.

So I'm just saying I'm planning to use the time to study up and dig deep for the future discussions and I hope everyone else will carve out a few hours to do the same for our next call. That's all I had to say.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks, Phil. And I echo what you said about don't forget. And I said it also to myself, don't forget to send out comments to - a bit about that. And thanks for giving this analyzing and changes of the document so we can have something clear for our next meeting.

Okay, friends, then it seems that we have gone through the agenda of today and although it's four minutes left I think we can say thank you and looking

forward to your further comments and suggestions during the week. And we'll meet again within two weeks from now.

Thanks.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Petter, Phil, everybody.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Lisa), you may now stop the recordings. Thank you.

END