

**ICANN Transcription
RPM-TMCH Sub Team Working Group
Friday, 30 September 2016 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of RPM-TMCH Sub Team Working Group on the Friday, 30 September 2016 at 15:00 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. Attendance may be also found at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/Xga4Aw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-30sep16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings are started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Fantastic. Thanks again. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the RPM TMCH Sub Team call on the 30th of September at 1500 UTC.

On the call today we do have Edward Morris, Kathy Kleiman and Kurt Pritz. We do have apologies from Vaibhav Aggarwal and Susan Payne. From staff we have Mary Wong, David Tait, Berry Cobb, Antonietta Mangiacotti and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And I will turn the call over to David Tait Thanks so much.

Mary Wong: Hi, everyone. I think David is still having microphone problems so he's going to re-dial back in. And so in the meantime I'll try and step in in his stead. So welcome, everybody, to this TMCH Sub Team call. As you know, we've had some discussion on the list as well as some updated documents.

What David and I have done is with respect to the list of questions to the Registrars, which is the most recent topic of discussion amongst the subteam, we've taken those questions that Kurt, that you have suggested based on Kathy's prior list and put that into a separate document. But we've also kept the other document that has the fuller list of questions.

So unless anyone objects, especially Kathy and Kurt, would you like to start with the list of registrar questions?

Kathy Kleiman: That sounds good to me. This is Kathy.

Mary Wong: All right, great. So let me just locate it and then put it up on the screen. And you'll see here that this document is in two parts. It is the first of all the more streamlined list from Kurt and then the latter part is the fuller list that Kurt has also kindly referenced in his email. So thanks very much, Kurt. It was a very easy cut and paste job for us.

The only other thing that we will add from the staff side before turning it over to you all is that you'll see in this page, and I'm going to unsync the document right now, that with respect to the question of (cart) abandonment, we've put in – something in square brackets based on Kristine Dorrain's question and Kurt's response.

So on that note, Kathy, Kurt and everyone, I don't know how you want to do this, it might be helpful to go through the list of questions but I will leave it to you, Kathy, and Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: Hi, this is Kurt. Can you hear me?

Mary Wong: We can hear you, Kurt, although you're a little bit soft I think.

Kurt Pritz: Okay. So, Kathy, what do you think?

Kathy Kleiman: I'm trying to cross reference...

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, I'll just say that I took a lot of the words out to make it more focused on data rather than opinion. But in, you know, in fact we're still asking for quite a bit even in this short list.

Kathy Kleiman: We still are. This is Kathy. So let me ask a question, Kurt, for some reason I thought what's labeled here as the pervious list was the current list? So it's been revised again? Did I miss – I was looking at something from 9-29 at 1:00 am, which the last time I looked at it, and I don't know about other people, I was looking at a set of questions that are currently here listed as previous list. Did I miss...

Mary Wong: Kathy? Kathy, this is Mary. No, you did not. And maybe our attempt to minimize confusion has caused more confusion. You are correct, this is exactly the list of questions that in the email chain was listed as current list. In putting them into the document, we thought it might be clearer to relabel them from current to previous, but essentially they're exactly the same questions.

Kathy Kleiman: But where does the reduce list come from, Mary?

Mary Wong: That was from Kurt in his email. And, Kurt, maybe you can explain better than I can?

Kurt Pritz: Sure, well so, Kathy, I was responding to your email that said you thought we were asking the registrars for too much. And my first email back to you was

that I agree. And then so then I thought about it a bit and got some time and so I created that list of questions that's briefer. So that's the shorter – that's the shorter list. That was in response to your opinion that the questions to registrars was too long.

So I didn't – I didn't change any questions except for the ones to registrars. And then who came in, Kristine came in, and, you know, had a question about one of the questions. And so I made a clarification there. So that's sort of the calendar of events. What's – what's your question, Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: That – Kurt, have we cutout questions like how is the trademark claims notice displayed in front of a potential registrant? And are there potential registrants who would not see a trademark claims notice in real time? Is that now out of the questions? Sorry, am I on mute? Can anybody hear me?

David Tait: Hi, Kathy. We can hear you, yes.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, I was on mute.

Kathy Kleiman: So that was a question for Kurt. Is that one now out?

Kurt Pritz: Right, so I took that out based on some – yes, so I took that out based – yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, because that one should be a quick and dirty one. We displayed the trademark claims notice...

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: ...based on somebody saying when – okay. I mean, I (unintelligible) responded to that some time ago and said that when a name is registered then the registrant gets a notice back with a notice and then has to register the name after reading the trademark notice. So there were questions on the list about, you know, they were wondering what that question was about

clearly. So and maybe we either need to clarify or just put it back in. I don't care.

Kathy Kleiman: Still have questions for – Freida raised them. I think it was – this is two different questions that came in at two different times but they combined into the same bullet point. There is a question about how quickly the claims notice, you know, what's the timing for the claims notice. I would think it could sit in front of somebody for a long time until they either decide to abandon the registration or click through it. But there seems to be some question about that which is very legitimate.

I think we should be asking about the language of the claims notice. And then there was an issue that was raised, I don't know if it was offline or online, that some registrants are not seeing the trademark claims notice in real time. I know it sounds odd because we all thought they were but apparently there are people who are not. And so it's – this was – I don't think these are – the objection I raised was that some of these questions seem very time consuming and so I appreciate your streamlining them.

In the process, we may have streamlined out some of the discussion that would help provide some context for this too. I wish we had – one of the suggestions I made was that we run this by some registrars. Are there any registrars on the call today that can provide some input from a registrar perspective about whether the previous list with more annotation and context is good not for the extensive collection? So I really appreciate you're going through it, Kurt, and pulling it down to more concrete requests. But still, you know, do we have – has anybody run it by a registrar or do we have any registrars on the call? I'll wait for a second. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: I think there's you, me and Ed on the call so I don't think there's any registrars. So why don't we do this, why don't we put that question or two questions about timing back in and why don't we just contact some registrars and run it by them? Why don't we contact Go Daddy or somebody else?

Kathy Kleiman: Actually, Kurt, can we just go through the previous list and just see...

Kurt Pritz: Sure.

Kathy Kleiman: ...whether – and the question here is whether it's a quick – fairly quick question. I think that was my concern at least was not taking anything out because of other reasons but, you know, are we asking for too much data? So let's just go through the previous list real fast and see if we think it's quick and dirty and if it is then I think maybe we can add it back to the list.

So are you accessing – I'm looking at previous list first bullet point. "Are you accessing data and records in the TMCH for purposes other than obtaining information necessary for the provision of sunrise and claims services in accordance with ICANN's user manuals and technical requirements?"

That seems to be a yes or no question. In fact, we might want to ask, you know, could you provide some details? Has that – Kurt, is that – I didn't see that on the list. Am I missing – on the reduced list.

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: Well I think that's a tough question to ask registrars, are you downloading SMD files when you're not supposed to be downloading them and explain how you're doing that. Because there was a suspicion that came up from the data analysis report when the abandonment rate was so high that really we thought that registrars must be downloading the SMD files, you know, without sending out a real claims notice or without an attempted registration.

So I just – what I think we want to get at is how much are claims notices discouraging registrations? Are they – at what percentage rate? So to me there's two problems with this question. One is it's kind of hard for registrars to answer if they're actually downloading files in a way they're not supposed

to. And if they are we should get at that at some other means. And, two is, it's not terribly germane to what we're trying to figure out. What we're trying to figure out is the abandonment rate.

We're trying to figure out to the extent that, you know, you can call it chilling or whatever you want to do but we're trying to figure out how or – when somebody gets a claims notice how do they react?

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: ...that question as relevant to that fact.

Kathy Kleiman: Kurt, is there another way to interpret the question which is, private purposes, that's something we've been getting into more recently, which is are there – are you downloading an SMD file for purposes other than sunrise claims? And so it's...

Kurt Pritz: Is that allowed?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, of course. We think it's happening all the time. So this may not be a trap. I wouldn't open with it, I mean, it's a silly question I think as a first question. But as a last question, I think it may run to, you know, private purposes. You know, the Donuts protected marks list and other things. And so I'm not sure I'd delete this...

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: ...I would try to word it – okay, I'd try to word it really clearly so, you know, people aren't interpreting it one way or the other. You know, when you said there's another way to interpret that question we should attempt to write the question so that there's not multiple interpretations. So my recommendations or just a recommendation it's fine to put this stuff back in.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. David, Mary, can we put that question back in maybe with the addition of, you know, please provide some detail. And that way they can say, no, we're not trying to, you know, harvest the whole TMCH database, we're doing X, Y and Z for certain registry. I think that could be really, really useful. So because the chilling effect is just one thing.

Other than that I think you've captured the other questions, Kurt, does that make sense? I think you've streamlined them a lot but I think...

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: I think so. I saw that you already took out a couple questions because there were redundancies there. So that was good. And, you know, yes, so I think it's fine.

David Tait: Kathy, it's David Tait here.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes.

David Tait: Could Mary and I, perhaps just before we move on from this question, I'm just being conscious of the point that Kurt has raised there about rephrasing and trying to make this question on accessing data clearer. Would it be possible for staff to ask for really a quite a clear steer from the – from this sub team as to how you would like us to reword that and just so that we get it really nailed down for you and we don't have to keep coming back to you.

Kathy Kleiman: I don't think that's something we can do on the fly. If you guys wanted to take a first crack at it and we can take a look.

David Tait: Okay, yes, that's – we'd be happy to do that, of course.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. But, yes, we're not trying to trap anybody into admitting anything. But there may be some more information to get there. So let's ask Ed and Sara

and Berry and Antonietta whether they like the reduced list, whether it provides context. And how do we find some registrars to run this by? Let me ask Mary and David, do we have a list of all the registrars who are members of the working group?

Mary Wong: Hi, everyone. This is Mary from staff. We do have a list in the sense that if working group members identify themselves as being in the Registrar Stakeholder Group then, you know, we would know that that – their affiliation. So what we were going to suggest is that before this list gets sent out as part of the report back to the full working group that this list also be circulated to the working group for comments.

That may create a slight delay, we acknowledge, but as we've noted on this sub team's work it is necessary for us to report back. So that may be a useful and easy way to get feedback from the registrars.

Kathy Kleiman: Oh then we're going to have run all the questions by the full working group, guys. I think we either do the quick and dirty way or we do the long way but I'm not sure. I'm open to either one, but introducing one set of questions right now and people are immediately going to raise the question why they can't see the provider questions, why they can't see everything.

Mary Wong: Hi, Kathy. This is Mary again.

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: Sorry, go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Kurt, I assume you're going to suggest that we contact the registrar members. I think our concern with that, and it's something that if the sub team feels otherwise we're happy to go with a different route, is that, you know, we have always said that the sub team would report back to the full working

group so it seemed to us that any set of questions to the community ought to at least be passed through the working group.

With respect to the provider and registry questions, one question that we had for the team here is whether we're able to finalize those as well either this week or in the following couple of weeks. So I suppose the question for the sub team is whether or not any or none of these questions need to go through the full working group and can just be sent out as-is.

And if so, then possibly for both the registrars and registries questions, we might then need to reach out to individual working group members who belong to the stakeholder groups for their feedback before sending out. So any guidance on that would be much appreciated.

Kurt Pritz: So this is Kurt. I'll defer to Kathy. But, you know, I kind of think this working group was formed to put together – the role was somewhat expanded but when it was it was expanded to put together a list of questions and send them out. So I don't think we need to consult with the full working group. I think Kathy's idea to check with – especially with registrars before sending this group of questions out to all registrars, so we don't, you know, get negative feedback right away, is because we messed up in some way in their eyes, is a good one.

And so we could either just pick a couple registrars ourselves or, you know, like you say, pick a couple registrars that are part of the bigger working group and say, hey, we're going to send this list of questions out to registrars, but we want to see how it's going to play in Peoria so and we say can you guys take a look at it first? I think that's perfectly reasonable without going back to the full working group. But I really want to hear what Kathy said.

Kathy Kleiman: Actually I agree. And I agree largely because of the streamlining that you've done, Kurt. You know, we're not asking for a lot. We're not asking for interpretation; we're asking for data. And that really was – that really was the

purpose of the subgroup. At this point, I'm hoping that we wrap up our work son and get these questions out so that we can have the data back for the full working group.

But now that we've moved much more towards data collection rather than opinion collection, I think that will be the working group's purview. But here – yes, I'd run it by a few registrars and see what they think. Does anybody disagree? And of course run it by the cochairs, but they're also on the sub group call – I mean, sub group list, the TMCH Sub Group list.

Okay, Mary, any – does that make sense? Oh, it looks like Christine Farley has joined us. Thank you. And I just wanted to make sure that Mary and David that we're adding back in the timing, the bullet point about the timing of the claims notice display and whether there are registrants who don't see it. So we're adding back in two questions and then Kurt's streamlined questions.

So I think we should be able to get...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: ...this out by the middle of next week. Thanks, Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Not at all. Thank you. So this is Mary from staff again. And you see that we are going to put – you know, we're putting a list of the questions together in the notes and action items question.

One point that we wanted to raise with respect to the duration of the display is that there's – I believe there is a requirement – and I do not recall off the top of my head if that's in the functional specifications or the TMCH requirements, and that there is a 48-hour period after which, and I'm going to get this all wrong because I don't know the technical explanation for this, after which the notice information expires so that for the registrar in question having first gotten the claims notice information for sending onto the prospective

registrant, there is a 48-hour window and if that expires, the registrar then needs to go back and inquire for a fresh set of information.

I'm not sure if I'm explaining it clearly but that's the information that we recall is in one of the requirements. And so to the extent that that 48-hour period is helpful in shedding some light on this notice duration issue we thought we would raise it.

Kathy Kleiman: Mary, this is Kathy. I have to admit, I've never heard of this 48-hour period. So it sounds like something we should know more about. But does it replace the idea of the questions?

Mary Wong: Hi, Kathy, it's...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Go ahead, Kurt, please.

Kurt Pritz: Oh so my take on it was that we just wanted to check with that requirement to make sure that the question we asked was in concert with whatever the requirement was.

Mary Wong: Right, in other words, you know, we wouldn't want the registrars to come back and say well of course it's 48 hours and it's in the requirement so didn't you guys know that? We can double check on that but I just thought I would raise it in case there's folks on the call that know this requirement a little better than we do or in case that's something that's relevant.

Kathy Kleiman: I think you've given everybody a new piece of information. But I'm not sure it answers – I don't – I don't know if there's some text that we could use. I'm not sure it answers the question. I'm not sure it doesn't. It's a new piece of information. Mary, do you want to provide us with information about the full – let's put the questions back in, I would think. But do you want to share some

information about that 48-hours and circulate it and maybe we can make a final call, you know, by Monday as to whether the 48-hour period and whatever it's for bypasses these questions? But I don't think it does. But go ahead, Mary. Thanks.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. Yes, we will certainly back the question for now and in sending it out we can also provide the link that I've now put in the chat window. I believe that is the latest version of the functional specifications for the TMCH that registries and registrars have to comply with.

And like I said earlier, I believe the 48-hour window is referenced in that specification. So we'll provide that information so that if sub team members feel the need to rephrase or clarify something about that question to make sure that, you know, we're not just looking for an answers, it's in the specs, look there. We'll do that, thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay so this is Kathy again. A general question for everyone, does anyone object to a notice either at the beginning or the end of all of our questions noting that these come from, you know, a subgroup of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group, that we're engaged in data gathering and that these may not be the only questions.

I'm sure Mary and David or – can think of a more tactful way to say it. But that this is, you know, we're just engaged in data gathering, you know, we certainly hope that everyone will be receptive to more questions coming from the working group later. And I just want to flag that this may not be the only time they'll hear from us. Would anybody object to a preface or closing to that end?

Go ahead, Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: So I think that's good. And I also think we need to be sensitive to the fact that some of this information might be confidential. So, you know, registrars might

not want to share their cart abandonment rates, you know, publicly with others. So, you know, we need to think, you know, and maybe the ICANN staff can think of a way to introduce this and – or either that or with our preliminary conversations with a couple registrars.

So maybe we can – if registrars think this data is confidential maybe it can be, you know, just viewed by some people, maybe by just staff people and then combined in some way so it becomes anonymized. And it – some of the information. So anyway I just us to be sensitive to that.

Kathy Kleiman: That's interesting, Kurt. This is Kathy. Is – would we want them to then flag a particular response that they consider to be confidential? Because we don't want to treat the whole response as confidential particularly since a lot of this data probably isn't. But so that we're on notice, you know, would we want them to flag it, you know, so that we could know which fields they're concerned about and offer some kind of combination where staff can create a combination so we have a full result but not broken down by registrar.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, I think this is going to be a little bit of a conversation where especially if we ask a couple registrars first we'll learn if any of this information is thought to be confidential by registrars. And then if it is then we'll, you know, we can make an offer in how it'll be handled and collected and see if that's satisfactory. So there might be, you know, a little bit of a discussion or some iterations back and forth to find a way that's acceptable to enough registrars that we get...

Kathy Kleiman: Makes sense. So back to the question that I asked earlier to David and Mary, do we know who – I'm sure we could go through the list but is there – is there a list now that you happen to have of all the registrars in the working group?

Mary Wong: Hi, Kathy and everyone. This is Mary again. Like I mentioned earlier, we can go through the list of working group members and where those members

have indicated in their statement of interest that they're registrars then that would be the list that we would work from for this purpose.

Kathy Kleiman: That would be great. And does it make sense for us, Kurt, everyone, to create a sub group of the sub group that would reach out to the registrars? And if so, who wants to volunteer to be on the sub group of the sub group? Kurt, would it make sense for you and I to take this forward?

Kurt Pritz: Why yes, Kathy, it certainly would make sense.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Good. If anybody objects or wants to join us it sounds like we'll be waiting for David and Mary adding a postscript or an intro or an ending looking at 48 hours and then going to talk to some of the registrars in our working group. Great, does that wrap up this – go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. So just to clarify what David and I will do is update this list of questions per the discussion today. Add in that clarifying initial paragraph and then send the list to the subteam mailing list and if there are no further questions or comments then you and Kurt will take this forward with the registrar members of the working group and we will provide those names to you as well. Is that right?

Kathy Kleiman: That sounds right to me.

Mary Wong: Thank you. So this is Mary again. And unless anyone has anything else or a different suggestion we're putting up now the document that I believe had edits from Kurt from the 15th. And then, Kathy, I think you and others had sent in further edits as well. And the latest date I believe may be the 22nd of September.

These would include the questions for the providers as well as the registries. And so we're wondering if this would be an opportune moment for the

subteam to discuss those questions as well? Or if there's anything else you'd like to discuss on a separate topic?

Kathy Kleiman: Okay one of the issues here has to do with the questions for new gTLD registries. And someone changed some of the protected marks list questions to blocking mechanism services. Just thought I'd ask if we can put it back. At least for the – now, the question is what's the term that's used by registries but also what's the term in our working group? And so far, we haven't used the term blocking mechanism services. But let me – we've used private purposes, we've used protected marks list. Does anybody have an opinion on this?

Or does blocking mechanism services mean something different than protected marks list? That would be really interesting.

Kurt Pritz: So I think that the objection to the – there was an objection to creating a new acronym that the industry hadn't heard of. And maybe just avoid creating a new acronym on principle for which I support. So, you know, to me blocking mechanism was also suggested by somebody else, but I kind of like that because you can spell it in small letters, you don't have to spell it in big letters which means it's not a term of ours, just describing something rather than, you know, DPML is the Donuts one and the one we developed was I think the PTML, which is a new acronym that rhymes with DPML but nobody had ever heard of before.

So to me we should always strive to use, you know, dictionary terms in lower case to describe things so it's understandable. So I think using the blocking mechanism (unintelligible) especially if you take the first time you refer to it you say blocking service mechanism such as DPML to make it really clear and then, you know, just blocking service mechanism. You know, this is one of the (unintelligible) things that, you know, aren't that important.

Kathy Kleiman: Does anyone know if there are uses of the TMCH database for purposes other than claims notices, sunrise and blocking mechanisms? Looking through the slides that Mary and David put together, there are the – there is the appearance of the possibility of other types of services including the ability to put into the trademark clearinghouse types of marks that appear – that are directly related to the top level domain.

Mary, can you remind us of that? This is I think limited – some kind of limited purpose use of the clearinghouse. And I think it had to do with things that might not be trademarks but might be known and associated with the particular gTLD that was involved in the trademark clearinghouse as a possibility for using that. And I'm not sure it would fall under blocking mechanisms. Mary, can you shed some more light on this limited purposes registration?

Mary Wong: Hi, everyone. This is Mary. Kathy, I'm afraid that I don't, at this moment, recall that. And maybe I will need to go back and look at the slides and the documentation. We know that there are additional possibilities from the registry operator side. For example, the qualified launch programs and the limited registration periods, which would be additional to sunrise and claims. And in – depending on what program it is it would run either prior to or following sunrise but in either case before general availability. I assume you're not talking about those programs so I'm afraid I'm a little bit at a loss at the moment about any additional mechanisms.

Kathy Kleiman: Then that might be – do we have any questions about the limited launch periods and the use of SMD files? Those two special periods you just mentioned? There may be a positive use of the SMD file, not a negative, not just a block, you know, negative as in a moral sense but negative as in blocking but there may be a positive sense where certain things in SMD file are actually let through.

How about a general question that just says are there any other – do you make any other uses of the SMD file or registries? Does anybody object to that? Kurt, is that any kind of capturing – is that any kind of trap that I'm not seeing?

Kurt Pritz: I think we have a question similar to that for the trademark clearinghouse don't we?

Kathy Kleiman: I was thinking for the registries.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, I'm looking at my phone and everything is really tiny.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Kurt Pritz: I can't really see the document. But I think – I think we have a question for the TMCH, you know, whether the clearinghouse is being put to any other uses besides trademark claims or, you know, the blocking services.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, let's wait until we get the trademark claims notice back and it may be a follow up question for registries. Mary, just checking that the questions for registrars here have now been replaced so those would all be deleted and replaced with the more streamlined version we discussed earlier today, right?

Mary Wong: Hi, everyone. This is Mary. And yes, Kathy, that is correct. So what you see on this document is actually an old list of registrar questions. We just didn't think that we should be replacing them until the discussion today and so following the discussion today we will certainly update the list of registrar questions.

And then on the point about the providers, and Kurt, I'm sorry that you have to squint at your phone, we've looked – well I've looked at the list of provider questions and it seems that there are – or at least there is a question about

PPMLs, I guess that's private protected marks list or blocking mechanisms as we're now calling them.

And if I may read the question, there's actually three interrelated questions. One is how many contracts are there for private uses of the TMCH and how many involve the PPML? Secondly, are there contracts for other uses? If so, how many? Thirdly, if there are no such contracts is the TMCH aware of other uses?

Kurt, is that the question or the set of questions you had in mind?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, it was. Yes, it was.

Kathy Kleiman: So let's – I'd like to recommend we expand that to include specifically the two periods that – the two special periods of possible use of the TMCH database that Mary mentioned earlier, the – the limited launch period and I forget the other one. And specifically ask an addition, you know, are these – are SMD files being used or is the TMCH database being used for these periods? I'm trying to find the slides but I don't have them in front of me right now.

Mary Wong: Hi, everyone. This is Mary again. So David is capturing that question. But in relation to that, I guess for the qualified launch program and the limited registration periods, because those are offered by individual registries, there is a list, and I think we've sent the page around to the full working group, of which registries maintain either one of these periods and programs or both.

So I think the question here for the subteam from staff is what would be the specific information we would be seeking from the TMCH providers in this regard? Or is this a question only for the gTLD registries? In which case there is that page that I mentioned.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, this is Kurt. I don't think the TMCH has much to do with the qualified launch period or the other period so I don't see – I really see a question for the TMCH in that.

Kathy Kleiman: Actually, Kurt, this is Kathy. I disagree. I think we should do a little, I mean, Mary and David put a whole slide together on early phase registration mechanisms that use the TMCH. The approved launch program and the qualified launch program, the AOP and the QOP because I'm looking at the slide now.

So, yes, I think it would be good to ask about this. Probably the registries, can you talk about your use of the SMD file and the approved launch program had the qualified launch program? Gather some initial data and report back and then combine it with some of the other materials that might be out there. Because we're getting a lot of questions about premium names and this may tie into that as well. Thanks, Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: No, so apologies for thinking out loud here. And David is trying to put in a question sort of on the fly. I guess our assumption is that whether it's a QOP or LRP or anything similar to that, that those would also use SMD files because those would only be available to trademark owners who have had their records, you know, registered and verified by the TMCH and then they get the SMD file token.

So again, Kathy, I guess we're a little thick today because we're not sure what is the information that we're looking for. If we already have a list of which registries are offering which programs and if those programs are based on usages of SMD files.

Kathy Kleiman: I think we're dealing with a big blank here about how they're using these SMD files. And it may or may not be a trademark but it may be other – if I remember correctly it could be other words that have been added that are not necessarily trademarks because I think that flexibility was there.

And given that we're all drawing such a big blank on these two programs, the approved launch program and the qualified launch program, I think beginning to dig into these early phase registration mechanisms a little bit would be useful because we're all drawing a big blank and I'd hate to see us overlook something that is within our purview, which, you know, based on the slides that we shared with everyone, this is part of the rules that we're reviewing and part of the programs that we're reviewing.

So, Mary, I think it would be a general question can you tell us a little bit about your use of the approved launch program and the qualified launch program by way of background for the working group? And my guess – this is Kathy again – that that would – that at least wraps up the questions that I have. Do other people have anything additional that they'd like to look through or do they need extra time to look through the questions – we're talking about the questions for registries. And we've already looked at the questions for registrars. And so – and then the questions also going out for providers.

Would it make sense for a final version to go out? Go ahead, Mary. So I guess we should talk about the – what the next, you know, few days or weeks might look like.

Mary Wong: Hi, Kathy and everyone. Sorry, I think I jumped the gun a bit because what you just said was what we were going to ask. So it seems to us that we can update both these documents, the list basically – these we're talking about the list of questions to the registrars, to new gTLD registries and to the TMCH providers and then we would circulate the updated list to the subteam for basically final review and then in respect of the registrar list there would be the added action item for us and for you and Kurt.

So then we can presumably get sign off or at least no objections to that by sometime next week and then we can proceed to send those out accordingly.

Would that make sense? And then maybe we need to figure out what this group would like to report back to the full working group. And, Kathy, I don't believe that the cochairs have had a discussion as to the agenda for the full working group meetings for next week or the week after. But our presumption is that either in one of those meetings or certainly before Hyderabad that the full working group would want to hear back from the sub team.

Kathy Kleiman: That is correct. We haven't planned the meeting for next week. It will be the first one after the in depth overviews. Yes, let's ask everybody. How long do we think, especially with these now streamlined questions, how long do we think – what response time do we think we should be asking for? I like the idea of before India.

Okay so let's ask maybe, let's see, Mary, David, what do you think a good time would be that would also give you some time to work with the data? We'll have to put it together in some kind of form to present it to the working group. And we may be doing, you know, the response to different questions at different times so we may have all the provider responses first and all the registry responses second. What do we think is a good deadline to ask for this? And then I definitely like the idea of presenting it to the full working group.

David Tait: Kathy, this is David just coming in here. Just to raise a further issue, because we do – speaking to our colleague Antonietta, and in relation to the information that the independent review group, if you're looking at the TMCH they are in the process of going back to the providers with further questions in relation to the – and to the registrars in relation to the initial draft of the report.

So we've suggested to Antonietta that it might be sensible to combine the questions that are coming from this sub team with those which would be coming from the – any additional questions that would be coming from the independent assessors and so really what we're going to (unintelligible) the registrars is just one request for more information.

And we haven't heard back yet as to whether or not that's something that they would be comfortable with and obviously that's something that the sub team would have (unintelligible) but just in terms of timing and ensuring we're not overloading respondents with lots of requests for information about related topics. We wondered if that was something you'd be comfortable with us taking forward.

Kathy Kleiman: Wait, David, let me summarize. This is Kathy. You're saying the Analysis Group is going back for a deeper dive based on public comments I would assume. And they want to combine – there's an interest in combining our working group data gathering, and I say that in quotes, data gathering request with the deeper dive that the Analysis Group is looking for?

David Tait: Yes, Kathy, that was just our suggestion here from staff. It's not a suggestion from me, myself. It's not a suggestion from Antonietta. It's just our suggestion that in order not to overload registrars with lots of separate requests for information on the same – similar topic, it might be useful to combine them into one request. But if you're not – if the subteam isn't comfortable with that of course we'll keep that as a separate request from us.

Kathy Kleiman: So are you talking about requests to registrars or registrars, registries, providers? For some reason I was thinking the Analysis Group was talking to providers. But, sorry, which group of questions is involved here?

David Tait: Yes, Kathy. It's questions that are going to registrars from the Analysis Group. And our proposal is that perhaps we might be – it might be sensible so that there's just one – effectively one request for further information that we combine their request with our request in one email. But...

Kathy Kleiman: I wouldn't do it. I wouldn't do it. Does anybody – I wouldn't do it. I'd separate it out. I'd flag each of these requests separately because they're coming from two different groups for two different purposes.

Mary Wong: Thanks for that, Kathy. So what we can do then is indicate to our colleagues supporting that exercise that we would prefer or rather that the subteam would prefer to send out its own survey separately. That said, I guess, you know, to point out the obvious, we may obviously get some pushback from the registrars in terms of willingness to provide information but that can't be helped, I assume.

But perhaps more importantly then in terms of timing, assuming that we can get the initial feedback from the registrars on the registrar questions within the next couple of weeks or so, that will put us within two weeks of the Hyderabad meeting. And we also want to send out the registry and provider questions within that timeframe.

Bearing in mind that we have a working group meeting requested for Hyderabad, we don't, at the moment, know when that meeting will take place. But we have put in a meeting request, David and I. Would it make sense to have the response period open through the Hyderabad meeting so that interested registrars, registries and other members can attend our working group meeting in Hyderabad and either discuss or actually do both, discuss any initial response to this we may have gotten and then maybe provide us some oral and formal feedback as well?

We can then close the survey or whatever we're doing after Hyderabad and then we can review the full set of responses received. Would that make sense? And, Kathy, I note that we've lost a couple of people and we're one-minute past. Sorry that it was my rambling on. But perhaps we can take this question to the list together with the updated questions that David and I will prepare and then we'll see what we see.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, and let me just remind everybody, the initial goal was kind of quick and dirty data gathering, and so that's what we were supposed to be doing. So I'd love – the longer we drag it out I think the more we're displacing the ability of

the working group to work with the data. So if we could get it before India – my thought would be if we could get it before India that would be great if we could send it out early. That would give us something to talk about and then still invite the registries, registrars and providers. But since we haven't planned India it's hard to know what we're talking about there.

Mary, how long will our meeting be in India? Do we know at least a timeframe?

Mary Wong: I'm afraid I do not at this point. I think normally it's at least 60 minutes and potentially 90 minutes. But we'll have to see what the schedule looks like. I believe our meetings team is trying to collate all the requests into a schedule that may be workable right now. So, you know, as soon as possible but it would be no shorter than 60 minutes for sure.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. My guess for this group 90 minutes would be great. We should talk with the other cochairs about that. But a longer meeting especially if we're talking about discussing data, interesting. I think we have to talk and talk with the cochairs about how to do this. But I would say the earlier the data can come back the better especially if we think some of these are quick questions. But anyway, thank you, sorry for keeping everybody a few minutes late.

Mary, David, anyone on the call, is there anything else we should be talking about? Great. Thank you. Thanks, everyone. Have a good weekend.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Kathy. Thanks, everybody. You too.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right, thank you. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect the remaining lines. Have a great day, everyone. Bye-bye.

END