From: Karen.Lentz@icann.org
To: Karen Lentz
Subject: Adobe Connect - Chat Transcript from Trademark Clearinghouse
Date: Friday, January 13, 2012 2:01:40 AM

Karen Lentz:Hello everyone
Karen Lentz:Starting in a few minutes
Tom Barrett:happy new year everyone
Jonathan Robinson:Hi. Jonathan on audio and conect
Francisco Arias:@Tom: I think that would be covered under "Authentication and Validation history" class
Tom Barrett:ok. it is always good to be as explicit as possible
Tom Barrett:it helps to make it clear that we're talking about more than timestamps
Francisco Arias:ok
Tom Barrett:i also think we should list sunrise and claims history as an explciti class
Tom Barrett:claims as an explicit class
Tom Barrett:more parties I just mentioned: dispute providers
Hong Xue:Yes, DRP providers who receive TM information from TMCH should be able to access and verify the information.
Tom Barrett:it might be helpful to describe internal users..authenticators, validators
Hong Xue:In the process of TM claim, after being notified.
Tom Barrett:chris, applicants might want to research a claim
Hong Xue:well not all applicants/ registrants but only the relevant ones; the others are just like the general public.
Chris Wright:@Karen: that presuppose the technical solution
Chris Wright:if we are to talk in terms of business requirements, is it a business requirement that a domain name applicant can interact with the clearing house? or put another way would they do anythign different to what a public user would do ?
Karen Lentz:Chris, yes, I agree that is a good way of putting it
Tom Barrett:do we want public users to be able to input a query with the tmch and generate the same claims notice they would see if they were at a registrar trying to register a domain name?
Chris Wright:@Tom, yet another way to put it :)... essentially we need to define the business objects and the properties of those objects then define who and under what conditions can those attributes be accesses
Will Shorter:I would think at the very least a public user or applicant would need a Yes/No on whether a mark exists
Chris Wright:This sounds like classic agile or use case modelling, who are the actors and what can they do
Karen Lentz:Also, any comments on this framework generally? Do the distinctions make sense?
Chris Wright:the difference between "partner" and "restricted" could be clarified more?
Hong Xue:Is a domain name applicant partner or public?
Hong Xue:Applicant has not yet been bound by contratual terms.
Chris Wright:I believe a domain name applicant is public if they are interacting with the clearing house directlyu
Chris Wright:but
Hong Xue:Oops, we just said applicants are different from the public.
Tom Barrett:what about the requirement to license the tmch data to third parties? what data fields does this cover?
Karen Lentz:Tom, yes, good question on this topic
Tom Barrett:we also want to make sure there are measures to avoid data mining of the public data
Tom Barrett:@chris, this is about trademark data not registrant data
Will Shorter:Agree with Chris' current point about the need for detailed trademark data in managing sunrise applications
Chris Wright:I have lots of comments on this (surprised?) :) but brb one sec
Francisco Arias:@Jonathan: yes the ultimate objective is to help performance and availability
Francisco Arias:@Chris: we discussed that issue last time and it seemed there is no issue there
Tom Barrett:the concern that trademark owners have is when the data is provided in bulk..as in a "zone file". this is prone to data mining

Francisco Arias:@Chris: the AGB has a template for the TM Notice
Tom Barrett:an example of how a registrar can mine the data...take the zone file of the first new gtld that launches and then run it through the tmch to see which ones triggered trademark claims
Tom Barrett:future registries would be interested in this data too
Tom Barrett:fute registries ==dotbrand
Francisco Arias:@Tom: actually no need to use any zone file, just a list of the (potential) trademarks you are interested in knowing about
Francisco Arias:@Tom: it doesn't really matter that there is a dotbrand, does it?
Tom Barrett:no
Francisco Arias:why?
Tom Barrett:the dotbrand has been cited as a reason why the data should not be distributed to registries
Tom Barrett:tm owners seem to prefer data not be distributed if performance can be satisified without distribution
Tom Barrett:@chris...the approach you're describing is a discussion that as part of a design discussion the tmch vendor has. it goes beyond business requirements
Chris Wright:@Tom: that is my concern... the trademark clearing house shouldnt be able to design the "technical" solution on its own... (I mistakenly thought this was the point of the technical group)
Jonathan Robinson:TMCH could decide to licence data from PTO's
Francisco Arias:what's a PTO?
Jonathan Robinson:Patent & TM Office
Hong Xue:Yes, trademark registration info is public at TM offices.
Hong Xue:US Patent and Trademark Office+ PTO
Hong Xue:What could be an issue is that a TM owner has 100 registrations from 100 jurisdictions. TMCH aggregates the information of all the jurisdications. That's different from publication by a singel TMoffice
Karen Lentz:Hong, you are next in the queue to clarify
Chris Wright:basically this is a data mining issue for the TMCH to resolve
Jonathan Robinson:What happened to the call at 21h00 UTC today?
Karen Lentz:@Jonathan, that is later today
Karen Lentz:next tech-track call is 27 Jan
Francisco Arias:the issue could happen without having a .brand
Jonathan Robinson:Thansk
Francisco Arias:for example, if the registrars are allowed to query the TMCH
Francisco Arias:or simply posing as potential registrant
Karen Lentz:Thank you everyone
Karen Lentz:Especially those who joined at very difficult hours