
**ICANN Transcription
RPM Sub Group B
Thursday, 11 June 2020 at 17:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on the agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/dgcdC>

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 Subgroup B call being held on Thursday the 11th of June at 17:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no rollcall. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom 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 transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Paul McGrady. Please begin.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. I get to be the chair for today's call. We thought we would just jump right in. We're going to review the agenda, check for updates to statements of interest, and then we are going to move on from there.

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.

So, reviewing the agenda. We'll do a quick wrap-up. That's number two on the list. Staff will do a quick wrap-up of our last call. And then, we'll get into this call's work, reviewing public comments, specifically URS recommendation number four and URS question number two.

Question number two has a couple of different parts, so it's almost three or four things, today, but I think we'll get through it. And then, lastly, any other business. So, to kick us off, I'll put out there, is there anybody out there with an update to statement of interest?

All right. Seeing no hands and hearing no one, let's move on. Ariel, I think you are going to do a wrap-up from last week, so if you could jump in and do that, that would be great.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Paul. I'm just sharing screen to show folks the public comment analysis document that staff circulated on the mailing list a couple of days ago. I trust many of you already have reviewed it but, just for the complete record, we are going to provide a very quick introduction to this document and you are aware how it is structured.

So, just to give you an example of URS Recommendation 2, which was discussed in last week's call, we have provided the original language of the preliminary recommendation on the top, and the title of the recommendation is linked to the Wiki page, where the complete contextual language is also published.

Following that box is the section of public comment referred to the working group. So, in this case, there is one comment that is being

referred to the working group. It's row 31 from the public comment review tool. That's something the subgroup has agreed to, so we have captured it here.

And then, the public comment deliberation summary, that's to capture the main points of the subgroup's discussion of all the public comments it has reviewed. So, we have captured the essence, here.

And then, just to summarize that, the subgroup has agreed that the recommendation be maintained as-is, but noted that there are some points that are supposed to be flagged for the working group for further consideration. So, that's where we capture the discussion, here.

And then, there's another sub-section for capturing working group deliberation summary. That's TBD at the moment, but once the working group has reviewed the summary of deliberation by the subgroup, and also reviewed the flagged public comment, we will populate the content here.

And the last section, proposed final recommendation language, because the subgroup's agreement is to maintain the recommendation language as-is, that's why we just repeated the original, preliminary language here.

But if the working group has made any determination to change the language, for example, this section will be updated, as well. So, the document is sort of organized in this fashion and, just to have a quick recap of last week's call, there are no outstanding action items and, basically, the sub-group has agreed to flag several public

comments for both Recommendation 2 and Recommendation 3 for the full working group to further deliberate. So, we have reflected this conclusion here. So, that's pretty much it for staff's summary. Back to you, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Ariel. So, we're going to jump into the work of today's call. Before I do that, I just want to remind everybody in this subgroup that Julie from staff circulated the final remit parameters for subgroups A and B. I just wanted to make sure that you guys saw that.

I don't think we need to read through them. It's pretty consistent with how we've been operating and the vision set forth by Phil Corwin on our very first call, but if you do have questions I encourage you to bring those to the list. All right.

So, if we could jump into today's call, I'm still messing around with what to call this thing on the left. We've been calling it a "donut." I feel with "donuts" having an industry meaning, maybe we should call it the "inner tube."

But any event, let's get started with URS recommendation number four. And I'll just give it a quick read. "The working group recommends that the ICANN Org establishes a compliance mechanism to ensure that URS providers, registries, and registrars operate in accordance with the URS rules and requirements and to fill their role and obligations in the URS process."

"The working group recommends that such compliance mechanisms should include an avenue for any party in the URS

process, to file complaints and seek resolution of non-compliance issues.”

“As an implementation guidance, the working group recommends that the Implementation Review Team considers investigating different options for a potential compliance mechanism, such as ICANN Compliance, other relevant departments in ICANN Org, a URS commissioner at ICANN Org, a URS Standing Committee, etc., and developing metrics for measuring performance of URS providers, registries, and registrars, in the URS process.”

So, Griffin points out in the chat that it’s just a pie chart with no middle, or it’s a ring ... “Bundt cake,” thank you, Ariel. So, we will refer this, I think, to a Bundt cake from now on. All right.

So for URS Recommendation 4, taking a look at the Bundt cake, at first glance it appears to have support as written, 38.2%. Support conceptually at 25.5%, 9% saying significant changes are needed, 7% saying do not support, and then another around 20% with no response or no opinion.

So, I’m not seeing any hands, and so I think what might make sense is to walk through some of the comment highlights. Oh, I see a hand. Griffin, please go ahead.

GRIFFIN BARNETT:

Yeah. Thanks, Paul. Sorry, I was considering whether it was appropriate to raise my hand now or wait, but I think I may as well jump in now. Yeah. No. I mean, I think you pointed out that, obviously, this recommendation has pretty strong support, either as written or with some, potentially, relatively minor changes.

And earlier this week, I did review the comments, here, and I did a little bit of additional research because I had recalled that there was an existing compliance mechanism under the ICANN Compliance umbrella that was specifically related to the URS.

And I don't recall—and again, this is another one where, maybe, staff can help refresh our recollection—whether we identified this as a working group in our earlier conversations about this issue, but there is an existing ICANN Compliance mechanism that relates to certain aspects of the URS.

And so, there's a form that ICANN Compliance provides to report issues where a registry operator doesn't properly lock a domain name subject to the URS within the appropriate time.

And there's also the form that exists can also be used to submit a compliance complaint where a registry operator has not suspended a domain name or taken any other actions required under the URS procedure and the high-level technical requirements for registries and registrars.

So, I did want to point that out, and I apologize if that is, indeed, captured somewhere. I don't remember seeing that, but I did want to flag that because I think that's something that we'll certainly want to take a look at, at least in the context of potentially moving this recommendation forward for implementation purposes. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Griffin. David, you're up next.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Okay. I think I'm unmuted. I hope you can hear me. Thank you, Paul. Thanks. I would just like to comment that it looks like our job may be very clear on this one, but I suspect that when that gets to the full working group and gets to consensus call, this one may have a bit of hard-going to get consensus.

And there was a comment that Michael Karanicolas in Subgroup A this week that I thought had some merit to it, and I thought I'd mention it here. That is, should we flag ICANN Org comments? Just flag them to the full working group for consideration when it comes up for consensus call.

ICANN Org has got a lot of comments where they're not necessarily in support or non-support, or anything like that. It's just making comments about the way things currently work. And in this one, they mentioned that Compliance really has no role with respect to providers.

So I think they were asking, does the working group envision that ICANN Org should try and change the MOUs with providers? And they also asked whether current agreements with contracted parties should be amended to conclude performance records for URS, and they note that .Org has the power to investigate complaints against URS providers on a case-by-case basis, and they've done that in the past.

And other parties have said it's premature, etc., etc. So, there are things, I guess, that the working group will take up when it gets there, but I thought it would be worthwhile to mention Michael's comment about ICANN Org. I thought it had some merit, something we might want to consider to the subgroup. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, David. Any other commenters on this? Susan Payne, please go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to react to what David had said. And I realize we're probably not supposed to be getting into the kind of merits of the recommendation, here, but I think it's important to note that the recommendation here is saying that we recommend that they establish a compliance mechanism.

We're not saying that ICANN Compliance, the so-named department that sits within ICANN, is necessarily the place. I think some of us feel that it's entirely appropriate that that should be the place.

But what we're saying is, if there's a contract that appoints URS providers and gives them some obligations, well then there needs to be some mechanism, somewhere, to ensure that that's followed.

I, personally, don't feel that there are massive issues, but it can't be disputed that, during the course of the work in this subgroup, there were various areas where we identified issues with the following of the rules, either areas where people felt that one or more of the providers wasn't, perhaps, following the rules as strictly as they should, or one of the other parties to the dispute wasn't following the rules as they should.

And so, I don't think there's any dispute that we made all sorts of recommendations because we felt that there were areas where things were not being done as the rules said they should be.

And whether it's the ICANN Compliance department or some other mechanism is kind of irrelevant. What this recommendation is saying is that if you enter into a contract with someone then you've got to be willing to enforce it.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Susan. Next, I see Cyntia. Cyntia, please go ahead.

CYNTIA KING: Hi. I would actually ... When I read the comments, I actually had a slightly different thought process, which was that the differences of opinions expressed by the various organizations who are contracted parties and registrars and registries mean that we should, absolutely, have a mechanism for compliance.

Not because I think anybody purposefully is going to do something wrong, but because there is obviously a difference of opinion between the parties about what the responsibilities are. And in the event that there continues to be disputes between registrars, registries, contracted parties, about who has what specific tasks, there has to be a mechanism for saying, "You had this task and you must perform it. You cannot float this responsibility onto someone else because you don't think that you should have to do that."

In my opinion, the fact that there is any confusion between the parties about who has what responsibility means that a compliance mechanism of some kind is required. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Cyntia. Any further comments on this issue? I see Phil Corwin's hand. Phil, please go ahead.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. Can you hear me now?

PAUL MCGRADY: We can.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay, good. Yeah. The overall top-line recommendation is a compliance mechanism to ensure that providers, registries, and registrars operate in accordance with the URS rules and fulfill their roles and obligations in the URS process.

I don't think anyone would argue that there has got to be some mechanism to ensure that these different parties do what they're supposed to do, but they stand in different positions.

The registries are the main provider/actors in the contracted party side on URS. Registrars have a very secondary and occasional role. Compliance department, vis-à-vis contracted parties, is enforcing specific contracts/agreements between ICANN and them, and they stand in a somewhat different position, I think, from

contractual enforcement from the URS providers, who are not traditional contracted parties but do have an MOU with ICANN.

So, it might be that ICANN Compliance is the party that enforces against traditional contracted parties, but ICANN legal might be the one for the URS providers bound by the MOU. So, I think that's the gist of what ICANN is saying.

They're saying we have some process for looking into complaints against providers, but we would need an entirely new mechanism if it's going to be compliance. So, this may need some parsing between the parties and their different legal relationships with ICANN. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Phil. I have a follow-up question for you, and if staff can go, please, back up to the recommendation itself? Based on that, I see the recommendation. And I hate to be a lawyer but the recommendation says that ICANN Org establishes "a compliance mechanism to ensure," and then it ropes in providers, registries, and registrars.

But if we have three different kinds of parties under the same compliance mechanism, then if there are different parties within ICANN that may be doing the compliance ... Are we missing an S, Phil? Should the recommendation read, "Recommends that ICANN Org establishes compliance mechanisms to ensure"? Is that what you were getting at, that one size may not fit all?

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes, Paul. That is what I was suggested, that enforcement against the URS providers might proceed differently than enforcement against contracted parties because of the different nature of the documents that bind them to ICANN as a counter-party, a contractual counter-party, as well as the fact that we have to be careful as a working group not to cross the picket fence that's referred to so often.

So, I wasn't suggesting doing away with this recommendation, but that we might recommend to the full working group that it be a little bit more differentiating between the different parties and what an appropriate compliance/enforcement approach might be for them. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Phil. I appreciate that. It's an interesting clarification. Griffin, I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

GRIFFIN BARNETT: Yeah. Thanks, Paul. I almost didn't put my hand up. I'm just thinking through a little bit of what Phil has said, and I take Phil's point. I don't think anything in the recommendation as it's currently drafted necessarily dictates that there be a single, solitary mechanism that treats each of these different parties differently.

I think I can understand why it's potentially being interpreted that way, so I would have no objection, I suppose, to clarifying that to say that something like, "ICANN Org establishes a compliance mechanism or mechanisms to ensure," etc., etc., just in case we feel like that distinction is needed.

I don't think it's necessarily needed because I think there can be a compliance mechanism as a unitary concept, but that, in implementation, recognizes that there may be a slightly different treatment of the different types of parties, based on the nature of the party and their role in the URS. But, yeah. So, that's a bit rambling, but sort of my on-the-fly reactions to that. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Griffin. Appreciate that. Okay. So, I want to make sure that we give enough time to everybody to raise any issues. I can read through the comment highlights if the subgroup thinks that's a good idea. I'll watch for a comment in the chat that says "good idea." And if so, I will read through those.

But I suspect that a lot of subgroup members have already read them in preparation for today's call. So, I think I'll just jump to, really, our primary question, which is ... Well, let me back up and say I do think it makes sense. I don't think we need to tinker, necessarily, with the specific language, here, but I do think it makes sense to capture Phil's idea.

And I saw there was some support for it in the chat, the idea of "compliance mechanism or mechanisms," as Griffin put it, so that when this is implemented there is some ... Assuming it becomes a final recommendation, when it comes to implementation time, that gives a little more breathing room and, I think, tends to address some of the concerns raised by ICANN Org and their comments.

But other than that, I'll just go ahead and ask: did anyone see, here, any new ideas or new solutions that haven't already been

considered by the full working group that we need to talk about or flag?

Any hands? Anybody in the chat? All right. Cyntia says, "I believe the comments support the recommendation." That was my take, as well, and I do appreciate Phil and Griffin's addition. Hopefully, staff can capture that.

So, unless I see hands up or comments in the chat, what I think we should do is to send this one back to the working group, noting that the recommendation remains as-is, but that we do want to draw their attention to the mechanism/mechanisms issue, and then we can move onto our questions, which may be a little more exciting.

All right. Well, seeing no hands and no chat, let's do that. Congratulations, us. All right. Now, let's move onto URS question two. Question 2a, what compliance issues have registries and registrars discovered in URS processes, if any? And then, 2b, do you have suggestions for how to enhance compliance of URS providers, registries, and registrars in the URS process?

And so, my understanding of the questions is that we are digging around here, again, for new ideas, new solutions, things that may result in our recommending additional recommendations or tweaks for those kinds of things to the full working group.

And so, I am happy to read through these, if that will get conversation going. However, if anybody has read through these in preparation for the call and have specific things they would like to pull out from the answers, I think that would be great. Okay, Griffin. I see your hand. Please, go ahead.

GRIFFIN BARNETT: Yeah. Thanks, Pat. Yeah. So, I did review these earlier this week, again, in preparation for this call. It seemed like many of the comments here can be put into a few different buckets in terms of compliance issues that were identified in relation to the URS process.

So, the first, as you can probably see here from what's on the screen, is that one of them is disclosure of underlying WHOIS data. And I know we've talked about this in connection with one of the earlier URS recommendations and questions that relate to the obligation to disclose registrant information in the context of a URS.

And so, I won't go into more detail because I think we've discussed that before, but I think that has been raised as one where, if that's not being done consistently or by certain parties that are required to potentially do that, I think that's one area of non-compliance that has been expressed.

And I think another that's kind of borne out in some of the comments is properly suspending a domain, and also, potentially, extending the suspension as permitted by the URS [remedial] requirements, and I think locking would be the other one.

So, I think two of those three are ones that are sort of addressed by that existing URS compliance form that has been noted. I noted it, and I think it was also referenced, as I mentioned, in chat in the ICANN Org comments on the previous issue. But those seem like, to me, to be the main areas of compliance issues relating to the URS process.

And I will note at a higher level that question 2a seems to be addressed to registries and registrars in terms of what compliance issues they've discovered in the URS process, but a lot of the comments, I think, were really broader and said what kind of compliance issues might have been captured by other parties to the process, like compliance or what have you, in addition to just registries and registrars. So, I think that's important to know, too. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Griffin. Yeah. That is interesting, that 2a was formulated that way. Thank you for pointing that out. Cyntia, I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

CYNTIA KING:

Hi. Thank you. I just wanted to note that, when reading the comments in response to the Recommendation 4 and the question two, both parts, it appears that, overall, there is a very common sense by multiple parties that there needs to be a compliance mechanism, it needs to be in a contextual form, and implementable form, and that it needs to be ... They're looking for this for consistency from all perspectives.

So, I think that, in general, we can say that, yes, the comments support. Like, if we're just talking about what the comments support, the comments for Recommendation 4 in combination with the two questions is all a big support for a compliance mechanism that's specific. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Cyntia. Griffin puts into the chat that he also meant to note that some comments here also seem to relate to the MOU issue and whether it is enforceable. I think we have answered this before in the affirmative, so I think that's a good comment, too.

Any other comments on this? Cyntia, I see your hand is still up. Do you want to make a follow-up? Oh, hand is down. All right. So, it seems to me that the answers we got for 2a were issues related to disclosure, locking, and properly suspending.

Did I miss anything else that anyone has raised? Okay. So, hopefully, staff can capture those three. I don't think that there's anything surprising in there that may not have already been talked about, but those were the answers to 2a. So, let's capture that.

And let's go onto 2b. All right. 2b asks, "Do you have suggestions for how to enhance compliance of URS providers, registries, and registrars in the URS process?" And so, I'm going to just read a few of these, here. I thought they were really interesting.

Uniform supplemental rules, comprehensive contract, review and recertification. Access to accurate data, there were 12 contributors that said that, which amounts to 22% of the contributors. We had eight contributors, and 15%, say sanction mechanisms, and then we had 7%, four contributors, consistent compliance mechanism with UDRP, compliance reporting/enforcing existing ICANN Compliance mechanisms.

We kind of talked about that in the recommendation already, in terms of compliance mechanism. I will note, though, that these

comments seem to very much tie it along with UDRP, which is Phase 2 stuff, but interesting. I don't know what to do with that.

And then, there other comments and no responses. So, I will see if there are any hands, here. [Hold on] a second. I saw some chats. Let's do that. Ariel says, "In the original contextual language for 2.4, it has been noted that some registries delayed in fulfilling or did not fulfill their obligations related to locking/unlocking and suspension of domain names. Some URS providers reported their non-compliance to ICANN, just an FYI."

And then, also, I see some hands are up. But let me read ... Oh, I apologize. I've got a dog with me. Hold on. Okay. Off they go. I think they've seen a squirrel. It's exciting. Brian Beckham says, "With respect to the BC comment, universal supplemental rules undermines the point of having such rules." And Cyntia King says, "Squirrel!" Yes, indeed. All right.

So, let me quit talking, and let's go to the hands. Let's start with ... I see Renee, Cyntia, and then ... Ariel, I'm not sure whether or not your hand is back up. But if it is, then if you could follow Cyntia, that would be great. Renee, please go ahead. Renee, if you're speaking, we can't hear you. You may be on double-mute.

RENEE FOSSEN: Yes. It was a triple-mute situation.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay.

RENEE FOSSEN: If there is such a thing, that's where I think I was. I did want to second what Brian was saying, and that was something that struck me with the comments, the uniform supplemental rules. If they're uniform then they should just be the rules, and not supplemental. The supplemental rules are, of course, intended to be specific to filing.

And I did take a look at all the URS provider supplemental rules when this process started, and they seemed pretty consistent and they seemed to be more specific as to the way you file, and certain requirements with the specifics of filing.

So, I don't know where those are coming from, those statements, and what we would possibly even do with them, and I just wanted to raise that as an issue. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Renee. Cyntia, if you can please go ahead?

CYNTIA KING: Hi. I just wanted to specifically address the comment by ICANN relating to this recommendation in the questions, because it appears that ICANN is saying that they don't have a current mechanism and that it might require some effort to go through and redo MOUs or whatever.

Clearly, based on what we're reading from the public, the comments, that is what the public wants. That is what the

constituents are asking for. They're asking for clear contracts that have compliance mechanisms attached.

So, while I understand that ICANN is kind of pushing back a little bit as an organization and saying, "Hey, this isn't really what we have or what we do," it is very clear from the public comments that that is what the public wants.

So, I think it might be incumbent upon, maybe not the subgroup but the working group, to kind of make clear that, while ICANN is saying that this isn't currently kind of in their bailiwick, it's what the public is looking for. So, we might actually have to make a statement about that. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Cynthia. Next up is Ariel. Please, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Paul. I just have a quick clarification for the Bundt cake that you're looking at. So, if you see the header, for example, the first slice, uniform supplemental rules, comprehensive contract review, recertification, access to accurate data, it doesn't mean, all of the 12 commenters, they have touched on every single point of this particular bucket.

It's just some of them may mention one or more these points in the bucket. So, I just want to clarify it's not every single point was touched by all of these 12 commenters, and that applies to the other buckets, as well. Hopefully, that doesn't confuse people.

PAUL MCGRADY: Ariel, no. Thank you for that. I appreciate that. It's an important clarification, because, the way that I was reading this, the way that I read it certainly made it sound more like everybody, all those 12, were on the same page, and they may in fact not be. That's an important thing to know.

Any other hands or comments on 2b? Okay. So, it seems to me that we've touched on a couple of things. So, we've touched on the issue of uniform supplemental rules and whether or not that might be oxymoronic.

But the underlying desire from some of the respondents to this question seems to be a level of consistency. As Cyntia mentioned, there does seem to be a level of desire for enforceable contracts. And ultimately, I think that is something that provides some consistency and some predictability, so I think that's probably where some folks are coming from.

Are there other concepts that we need to capture from these answers to pass them along to the main working group? I'll plant that question and I'll go to Phil Corwin, whose hand is up. Phil, please go ahead.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yeah. Thank you, Paul. In thinking about how the diverse answers we've received to these two sub-part questions relate to the recommendation we discussed a few minutes ago, it's my personal view that they can help.

I think we reached agreement on the recommendation that it needs a bit of additional parsing and clarification, and I think probably the best use of the answers we've received to these questions would be to inform the full working group when it's engaged in that revision process.

It seems that when you look across the board at the different answers to 2a and 2b, the commenters want something that's clear, whether it's an MOU or a contract that's enforceable through some reliable mechanism and where statistics are kept to judge the overall compliance of the different parties involved.

And I think all of that, rather than leading to a new recommendation, can be taken into consideration by the full working group when it's thinking about any revision of the language of the recommendation we discussed today. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Phil. Can I ask if anybody has any other concepts to add to Phil's collection of issues? I think he has put together a very succinct and useful group of concepts that I hope staff will capture, and that we can pass along. Anything we should be adding to that? Looking for hands. Okay.

Great. I'll read a little bit in chat. Susan says, "Agree. People seem to be calling for enforceable contracts. We have previously discussed in the working group that MOU is enforceable." It took everything I could not to say "M-O-U-S-E," but that's because of my North American programming, so I apologize.

“But the working group identified areas where non-compliance did not seem to be acted upon by ICANN, and hence Recommendation 4.” We got some plus-one-Susans for that.

Griffin says, “Seems like everyone agrees that we want accountability for all parties in the URS process and that additional compliance mechanisms are needed per Recommendation 4 to accomplish this,” and I think that’s where we came out on Recommendation 4.

And I think that the suggestions from these answers that Phil summarized are helpful to the working group as they go back and tinker with Recommendation 4 to get it where ... Or maybe not tinker with the recommendation so much as develop additional implementation ideas. I'm not sure quite what the working group will want to do with it when they read what we send them, but that’s up to them.

All right. I don't want to belabor us for the sake of belaboring us. If we have any other questions, comments, things that we need to think about for these two questions, I'll do a last call, here. Ariel says, “Hand up.” Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Paul. Just a quick question from staff. Is there any specific comment for Q2a and 2b, and also Rec 4, that the subgroup would like to flag to the full working group, or just simply flag the entire two tabs for the full working group to review? We just want to clarify that.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Ariel. So, for the recommendation itself, I think we were going to flag that the working group may want to consider making it “enforcement mechanism” or “enforcement mechanisms,” because of the three different categories, provider, registry, registrar, there.

And then, for things to flag, for URS questions 2a and 2b, Phil gave a wonderful summary. I didn’t write it down, so I’m not going to be able to give it again. Well, it was certainly captured in the recording. And so, if we can pull those things out and flag those for the full working group, that would be great. Ariel, I think your hand may be up again.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, sorry for taking more time. I think I didn’t ask very clearly. The intent is to ask whether there is a specific comment within the table that you would like to flag, that we can call out the row number for detailed comment, to the full working group, or would you just like the full working group to review the entire tab? And I note that, in the chat, Brian has mentioned that he’d like to flag WIPO’s comments. So, sorry. I just want to clarify my question.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes. Thank you, Ariel. So, I’ll ask that question of the group, which is ... In addition, I think Brian has asked that WIPO comments be flagged for the working group. Are there others that folks on this call believe should be specifically flagged for the working group that will help them understand the comments that we’re sending back up to them on Recommendation 4 and URS question 2a and 2b? Cyntia,

I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead, and then followed by David.

CYNTIA KING: Just a quick comment that I don't really see any disagreement. It looks like we're pretty much all on the same accord that we should put through what we have as it's written. The comments support it. There's no real, measurable dissension now, so I think it goes forward as presented. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Cyntia. David, please go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Paul. I think I agree with Cyntia and Brian. I just was concerned with the phrase that Griffin used, "everyone agrees." I think what we're agreeing to is to send these forward in the way that we've discussed, but I don't know the wording would say that everybody in the sub-team agrees with these comments. I was just confused by the way that phrase was used, but I think I agree with what Cyntia just said. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. I'll let Griffin respond if he'd like, but I suspect that ... Oh, his hand is up. Griffin, please go ahead.

GRIFFIN BARNETT: Yeah. I mean, just to respond, yeah. No, my point was not ... So, when we're talking about Recommendation 4, my point was there was, generally, a fair amount of support for the recommendation, with a few clarifying tweaks that, I think, Phil mentioned, and that I think others agreed with, including myself.

That was my only point. I don't know that I was saying that in terms of these question 2a or 2b, because these questions are looking for additional, I think, information that would help kind of speak to what might be needed in terms of Recommendation 4.

They're not, in and of themselves, something that we agree or disagree about. I think it's more of they are collecting various thoughts and information that can help inform whether we want to further refine Rec 4 or for purposes of implementation, etc. So then, hopefully, that clarifies. But I think, yeah, if my saying there's agreement on something was misconstrued, that was not my intention. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Griffin. All right. Well, unless we see other hands up, I think that we do what we've been talking about, which is we send Recommendation 4 back with a suggestion for the working group to look at the possible pluralization of "enforcement mechanism," and we will capture Phil's summary of the issues raised by various answers to the questions. Staff will get that out of the recording for us. Thank you, staff. And we will specifically flag WIPO's comment, at Brian's request, and we will send this good stuff back to the working group.

I have a little piece of “any other business,” which I'm hoping staff can help me with here in a second. But before I do this, I'm going to just call a last call for hands. Otherwise, I'm going to declare us done on the substantive work for the day. All right. Phil Corwin, I see your hand. Please, go ahead.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Yeah. Thank you, Paul. This is not on what we've just discussed, it's just procedural. As you're aware, on Tuesday Subgroup A also finished quite a bit early, before the first hour was done, and agreed that it would add one or two additional items for review to better use the full 90 minutes allocated, and I'd suggest that, in view of the fact that we're only 50 minutes into a 90-minute call, for next week we do the same.

We're in the happy circumstance of there's a good chance that these subgroups can finish up ahead of schedule, based on how we're proceeding. So, it would be good to do that going forward.

As for going forward today, I haven't looked at other items. We would have to give everybody time to review everything before we could have a meaningful discussion. But I'll leave that to the subgroup co-chairs. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Phil. So, I am not ready to take on whatever comes next, and I see in the chat that some aren't, as well. I do really like the idea of saying, “Here are our topics,” whatever was originally assigned, and then we can have an alternative topic that everybody can also be prepared for.

And if we have no time to get to it, then that will go back to its regularly scheduled time. That seems efficient and wise, especially if we are running into days like today where we're getting through things relatively quickly. So, that makes sense to me. Phil, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or a new hand? Old hand. Okay. All right. Well, great. Okay.

So, one piece of "any other business," and this is ... Staff, I hope I didn't catch you by surprise, but I wanted to put up our subgroup item, an image of a ... Let's see, here. Oh, Julie, it says your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Hi, Paul. Yes, we can assist you with this, if you'd like. If you wanted to show the image yourself, we can make you a host, and you would be able to do that. I don't think we actually have the image handy.

PAUL MCGRADY: Oh, darn.

JULIE HEDLUND: So, actually, if you've got it handy, though, we've now made you a co-host. So, all you have to do is you just need to have that image up, in whatever it is you have it, and then you can hit "share screen," and then you will see all the different screen options for you. There will be a number of different windows, and then you just pick the window. Oh. Actually, now I see that Ariel says she does have the image.

PAUL MCGRADY: Oh, good. Yes, because I—

JULIE HEDLUND: And in her usual way, she has worked very quickly behind the scenes while we've all been just talking away. So, let's go ahead and let her do.

PAUL MCGRADY: There we go. All right. So, sorry about all that excitement. Ariel, thank you for saving me. So, I would like to do a little team building. I think that these subgroups are a great opportunity to really get to know other people in the ICANN community that you do not sit in the same constituency with.

I found it's actually a wonderful way to walk away with new friends. I have someone on this call, now, who has become a very long-time friend of mine, simply because she and I participated together on a small group in IRT. Those kinds of friendships, over the years, can become very valuable and a real blessing.

So, I thought we would do something kind of funny, and I would like to sponsor us getting our own t-shirts. You can see the image there, "Subgroup B," with a funny little image of all of us holding hands around the world in harmony.

And again, this is just an idea that I had. It's obviously not mandatory, but I think that the t-shirts themselves could become

quite arcane and quite funny if we ever get to meet again together in person.

So, if you have an interest in a Subgroup B t-shirt, I will encourage you ... How should we do this? Could we appoint a staff person to collect sizes and addresses? And then, we'll get orders out and we'll figure out how to get them to people. We promise not to publish your contact information in any WHOIS record.

So, how could we do that? Could we appoint somebody on staff to collect those? I hate to ask. "Or we could do it in a Google Form," okay. Thanks, Julie. All right. Well, we'll work on the details of it, but we wanted to let you know there's an e-mail coming out, and that's what this is about.

I like Renee's comment, "It's funny because of the B; Subgroup B." But in any event, that's coming, an e-mail with the Google Form, and all that's coming to you shortly. I hope that everybody will take advantage of this.

It's kind of a fun team-building exercise and something that I am personally sponsoring. I'm not asking ICANN Org or anybody like that to pay for it, so that would be great. Okay.

So, that was my piece of "any other business." Absent any hands or anything else, I am going to go ahead and draw us to a close. We all get 35 minutes back. I hope we all use it very well. We will talk to you guys, all of us, next week. All right. Thanks so much. Take care.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]