Adobe Connect chat transcript for 05 April 2017:

  Terri Agnew:Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Wednesday, 05 April 2017 at 17:00 UTC for 90 minutes
  Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_b8bRAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=9Askb1nx2rVZt_Cm6n323MbSsZ7X2nprqbMlaBbf0sE&s=kG_4fQvu8jnqS0zd5VG-nUPHq6Gzs3W4dxTbvd22oaE&e=
  George Kirikos:Hi folks!
  George Kirikos:Perhaps blasting out an email reminder will help attendance?
  Yuri Chumak:greetings !
  George Kirikos:Welcome, Yuri.
  Terri Agnew:@George, will send reminder email out
  Martin Silva Valent:Hi all
  Paul Tattersfield:I don't think swithcing between this time and an hour earlier is a good move for attendance numbers it may be better to choose one and stick to it
  George Kirikos:Hi Martin and Paul.
  Paul Tattersfield:Hi George
  Mary Wong:@Paul T, the one hour time change for this 2nd rotational week is to accommodate the RySG standing call, I believe.
  Philip Corwin:Hello all
  George Kirikos:Welcome, Phil.
  J. Scott Evans:I am here. I am here.
  Paul Tattersfield:are ok thanks Mary, it just makes ti more diffcult to schedule especially now the calls are longer
  Mary Wong:Document is unsync'ed
  Terri Agnew:finding the line causing noise
  Michael R Graham:Morning all.
  George Kirikos:Welcome Michael.
  Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I was off the list this week due to obligations, but I will be volunteerings.
  Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:All/any. :)
  Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:OK, good, I'll reply by email, thanks.
  Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I have no voice today.
  Amr Elsadr:Thanks Kristine.
  George Kirikos:Donuts, Rightside, etc.
  George Kirikos:(blocking lists)
  Mary Wong:@Brian, basically the additional voluntary protections that are being offered by some new gTLD registry operators.
  Mary Wong:(ooops just realized Brian B isn't on AC!)
  George Kirikos:He can read the transcript later. :-)
  Mary Wong:The consolidated Sunrise and Claims Charter questions (unedited, from the Charter) have been distributed twice to the list :)
  George Kirikos:https://community.icann.org/display/RARPMRIAGPWG/2017-04-05+Review+of+all+Rights+Protection+Mechanisms+%28RPMs%29+in+all+gTLDs+PDP+WG if anyone needs the link.
  Martin Silva Valent:thkns
  George Kirikos:On to #6 next steps?

George Kirikos:(or #3)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

George Kirikos:Hi Maxim.

George Kirikos:Subgroups are more organizational, I think.

George Kirikos:Subgroups shouldn't be doing the actual policy work, in my view.

Jeff Neuman:i defer to Phil

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Mary, sorry for being a bit late, I have an update to my SOI (added SSC to .12.)

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Maxim. Will note that.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):thanks

George Kirikos:Data gathering and organization only.

J. Scott Evans:The two meeting limintations was only on the refining issue. I felt the sub-groups would continue to work throughout our work on Sunrise and TM Claims.

J. Scott Evans:See my response above regarding the two meetings. I meant the First Two Meetings for questions refinement and then further meetings crafting recommend answers to these questions.

J. Scott Evans:Michael. EXACTLY!!!!

J. Scott Evans:Mary: EXACTLY.

Michael R Graham:I also think that if we do agree and change the working groups to begin analyzing/answering questions and identifying data that will be necessary, more members will volunteer to participate.

Mary Wong:@George, yes they do (all meetings recorded and drafts published)

Michael R Graham:@George: Agree, subgroups not to do policy-making, but also not to merely rehash Charter Questions. Good comment on use of list.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I think if they are substantive, the groups will fill.

George Kirikos:We already increased our time from 1 hour to 90 mins/week. If there are 3 subteams, that means 5 or 6 hours per week, for those who want to participate in all three?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):do we know numbers reached so far for sub-groups ?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the other week meeting idea is great

George Kirikos:If the subteams are going to be deciding policy recommendations, membership will certainly rise.

Mary Wong:@Maxim, about 3-4 for Sunrise and Private Protections, about 7 for Claims (not counting the co-chairs). However, as Kristine and others noted, if Sub Teams are charged to do initial analysis to bring back to the full WG, it's likely we will get more volunteers

Philip Corwin:@Kristine--that's my concern-- that if subgroups go beyond organizing the Qs and identifying data needs and go on to making substantice policy recommendations that their ranks will swell to the point where we lose the efficiency we are seeking

Michael R Graham:@Maxim +1

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Phil, didn't Sub Pro PDP handle this appropriately?

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:They have work tracks that report in.

Mary Wong:Our WG currently has 158 members ...

Mary Wong:@Kristine, yes - and I think that's what Jeff has his hand up for.

Martin Silva Valent:I just submiited to be volunteer for the Sunrise Sub-group yesterday. I think that the idea is not to overload us with was is supposed to be the work of dozen of people. I agree that our goal should be, for this first stage, just to investigate and clarify the questions.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Apologies to all - I will be on and off the call because i'm getting in a cab. Will be off Adobe and review the parts I missed.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):those items are important (sunrise , claims, private protection) ... it is reflection of Rights Protection from operational perspective in ICANN ecosystem

Michael R Graham:@J.Scott -- Thanks for "2 meeting" clarification. Makes sense.

Mary Wong:Welcome Greg Rafert and Stacey Chan from the Analysis Group.

George Kirikos:Perhaps have a more organized set of discussion on the mailing lists?

Mary Wong:Greg, Stacey - we are just running through some admin/planning discussions.

George Kirikos:e.g. have multiple organized threads/topics, and kept on topic.

George Kirikos:Otherwise, it'll be volunteer burnout for the subteams.

J. Scott Evans:We are not PASSING anything off. All decisions and consensus is being made at the full WG

George Kirikos:But, there will be de facto deference, since they'll say "we spent 30 hours on this, so we're expert on the topic".

George Kirikos:Better to have that all out before the entire group, in my opinion.

J. Scott Evans:George. I disagree. If you are concerned, sign up and participate.

Greg Rafert and Stacey Chan, Analysis Group:Analysis Group (Greg Rafert and Stacey Chan) has joined the call.

Greg Rafert and Stacey Chan, Analysis Group:Apologies for the delay in joining.

Kathy Kleiman:Welcome Analysis Group!

Michael R Graham:@George: I would hope groups wouldn't take that "I'm expert" position -- but they would hopefully refine issues to enable entire group to discuss meaningfully.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I am not sure that is will be possible to be on two of those subgroups the same time (overlaps and time)

Michael R Graham:@Jeff -- Agree.

Jeff Neuman:If people in this WG have any views, please express them

Jeff Neuman:If people in this WG have any views, please express them

J. Scott Evans:@Maxim. We can change that and make them not overlap.

Paul Tattersfield:I'm not so sure, in the last subgroup there was at least one member looking to remove questions that were eventually included, had the sub group been snaller those discussions may have been missed

Jeff Neuman:But hopefully we can get added participation with other leaders of the subgroups

George Kirikos:+1 Paul

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure what that means Paul?

George Kirikos:Draft Report is at https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__newgtlds.icann.org_en_reviews_tmch_revised-2Dservices-2Dreview-2D22feb17-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=9Askb1nx2rVZt_Cm6n323MbSsZ7X2nprqbMlaBbf0sE&s=ypmWkQysmmw3ckXufTQZUvjzUaE3vtEUZJC0uTDWo1w&e= in case anyone wants to see it outside Adobe.

Paul Tattersfield:Some members have a business interest Jeff, if they can get subjects removed the status quo persists and that may benefit their employer

J. Scott Evans:@Paul. Given that the sub-teams have to get full WG approval. I don't see your concern here.

George Kirikos:@JScott: it assumes that others are closely following the work of the subteams.

George Kirikos:Unless one actually follows their work, one isn't going to catch all those things.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):as I understand SubGroups will report to WG each meeting

Jeff Neuman:@Paul and @George - based on the actual evidence of having implemented subteams who are comprised of many with business interests, that has not been the case

Amr Elsadr:@Maxim: I believe the suggestion was that the sub groups would report to the full WG every other meeting.

Mary Wong:Our understanding is that Sub Teams will have their calls recorded and documents distributed for the rest of the WG to review, in addition to regular reporting to and discussion with the full WG.

Jeff Neuman:@mary - correct

J. Scott Evans:@Mary. Correct.

George Kirikos:Can we assume everyone has read this report?

George Kirikos:(we only have 43 mins left)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):transcripts?

Jeff Neuman:@George we should assume everyone has, yes and only discuss the changes

Mary Wong:@Maxim, yes - exactly like a WG meeting

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):good

George Kirikos:Good, Jeff. That way we can jump to changes, and Q&A.

Mary Wong:While waiting for the slides to upload, we've put back up the actual report

George Kirikos:It looks like the redline version of the report, rather than the clean one (clean one is on the wiki).

Paul Tattersfield:@J. Scott in the last subgroup there were questions from the community that would have been removed or substantially amended had there not been objections from other group members and the full working group may never have been aware of those community unless the had reviewed all of the original documents concerned.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):is it possible to provide us with the URL to this particular slide deck?

George Kirikos:Page 18: 93.7%.

Mary Wong:@Maxim, we just received the slides. We will circulate and upload to the wiki after this call.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):thanks

Griffin Barnett:Ultimately, though, there are those caveats: the data was inconclusive as to any abandonment causation vis-a-vis claims notice

Kathy Kleiman:@All - we have individual control now.

Poncelet Ileleji:Thanks for the update

Martin Silva Valent:thkns!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):was technical testing included into possible reasons?

Jeff Neuman:I am not confident at all that each ping is an "attempted registration"

Martin Silva Valent:Is that a Chilling effect in moiton?

Colin O'Brien:Jeff I agree

Griffin Barnett:+1 Jeff

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Jeff

Mary Wong:@Jeff, I suppose the clearest indication of what is an "attempted registration" is only when something actually triggers a Claims Notice.

George Kirikos:We'd need to get an (anonymized) analysis of the abandonment rate for non-claims notice domains, e.g. .com/net/org, or new gTLDs after the 90 days (where there's no claims notice).

Phil Marano (Mayer Brown):The revised report indicates in several areas that conclusions could not be reached because various parties failed to respond to requests from Analysis Group for additional data. It would be great to recieve additional context from Analysis Group on the specific requests it made, to whom, and any reasons given for failure to respond or provide the requested data.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@George, some Registries have no-ending claims ... I think it might be a good idea to check those too

George Kirikos:Perhaps one can get different percentages for different registrars, instead of aggregating, to see if there are outliers.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):to see patterns /if any

George Kirikos:(e.g. if 20 registrars are at 95%, and 200 registrars are at 70%, that would show more colour)

Philip Corwin:Observation--the abandonment rate is so high that even if a high % of initial registration attempts are for technical or "gaming" reasons, a very high % of authentic attempted registrations are being abandonned -- and we don't know what the disvision between infringing and non-infringing registaraions would have been if the registrations had been completed.

George Kirikos:@Phil: slicing the data by date would help reveal that.

George Kirikos:e.g. abandonment rate in first 10 days, next 10 days, ... 81st - 90th day.

George Kirikos:(i.e. measured from GA)

Beth Allegretti:I have to go to a meeting so am leaving the call.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also 90+ data might be required for forever-claims registries

George Kirikos:Cleaning up "noisy" data is a major part of statistical analysis.

Michael R Graham:Question: So if the registration application was abandoned AG could not see the DOMAIN applied for, so there's no way of tracing duplicate pings, etc.?

Kristine Dorrain:do we know if a user who got a claims notice and abandoned their attempt to register then subsequently decided later to go back and register the domain despite the claims notice?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):what I heard a lot - some potential registrants were freaked out by the claims notice, due to contents of the message

Michael R Graham:Question: In analysis, doesn't high abandonment rate also evidence the effectiveness of the Claims Service?

Kristine Dorrain:Maxim, is there any data about if registrants went away to research then came back and weren't scared away?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I do not think so, it is offline process mostly (when the potential registrant makes a decision)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):or at least not known to registries

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in terms of logs

Terri Agnew:@Martin, we are unable to hear you. Your mic is ative but we are not hearing you, please let me know if assistance is needed

Greg Shatan:Why do we say that this is "high"? What are we comparing it to?

Jeff Neuman:Phil - I am not sure we can make that assumption

J. Scott Evans:Deterent is not a bad thing.

J. Scott Evans:Correct Phil. A great deal of "assumptions:

Griffin Barnett:We don't know if the Notice was actually the cause of abandonment - it could be any number of other factors, such as registration price, etc.

Greg Shatan:We have no data on intent.

Kathy Kleiman:@Martin: are you reading to speak?

George Kirikos:In case we run out of time, here are the questions I had. (A) On page 9, it says the median TMs registered in the TMCH was 1. Can we get more detail in buckets? (e.g. # that reg'd 2-5, 6-10, 11-50, 51-100, etc). (B) On page 9, the top 10 most popular strings (e.g. SMART, FOREX, HOTEL, etc) were listed. Can we get the top 500? (C) Report said costs were too high. ICANN has the right to audit Deloiite, to determine if costs are reasonable. Is The Analysis Group qualified to do such an audit? (my back of the envelope calculations suggest $10 - $15/yr is possible).

George Kirikos:(C) Costs too high via Survey Data, to clarify.

Griffin Barnett:I think someone may have suggested this earlier, but is there data on abandonment of registrations where there is no Claims Notice (e.g. legacy TLDs)?

Mary Wong:@Griffin, I don't know but I would think that kind of data would reside with registrars individually.

George Kirikos:(page 64 discusses costs, via the survey)

Martin Silva Valent:Ok, her eI fix my mic

George Kirikos:@Griffin: probably registrars have it, but it's a matter of convincing them to provide it, and anonymize it.

Philip Corwin:@Griffin--maybe they have data on abandonment vrate between registries with high registration prices ($50+) and very low (>$1)

Greg Shatan:I don't think the logic on the second bullet point works.

Griffin Barnett:@Phil, that could be of interest. Anything to help establish a baseline of registration abandonment might be useful

Griffin Barnett:Without that, it seems a lot of asusmptions are being drawn around correlation/causation of the notice and its impact on abandonment

Paul Tattersfield:The abandonment is probably a good thing for would be registrants, trying to promote a product or service which has the same name as a huge brand even in a totally unrelated category of good and services is a never ending headache even if you have absolutely no intention or way to infringe the larger brand.

Philip Corwin:But I agree that we have conclusive data that there is a high correlation between receipt of a Claims Notice and registration abandonment, but not necessarily causation (observing further that if there is no causation then it would not be achieving its goal of deterring cybersquatters)

George Kirikos:@Paul: but we know from page 9 that the most commonly searched terms were common words like SMART, HOTEL, etc.

George Kirikos:Page 9 didn't have terms like "Verizon", "Google", "Yahoo", etc.

Greg Shatan:Do we have any data on abandonment during the same periods. for those starting the registration process but not receiving a claims notice?

Jeff Neuman:Plus, there were A LOT of registrars that did not participate in selling a TLD until after the Claims period was over

Michael R Graham:The "cost" analysis is something else I think we should drill into -- what ARE the costs? Merely narrative?

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure how you measure those costs

George Kirikos:Sound went off there.

George Kirikos:Breaking up.

Salvador Camacho:Martin, your audio is not working

Kristine Dorrain:cutting out

George Kirikos:I don't think they had data on the prospective registrant.

Michael R Graham:@Jeff: I think your point is right on: We can conclude from the data that the TM Claims Notice results in a high number of abandonments. however, we cannot conclude whether the abandonments are of bad faith, good faith or no faith applications.

Martin Silva Valent:I will type it here

Jeff Neuman:@Michael - exactly

J. Scott Evans:@Michael. Exactly.

Martin Silva Valent:My concer is that if these abandonments shows an asymetry in the stakeholders, usually non.commercial are the first ones being marginsed with chilling effect when this happend

Martin Silva Valent:I feel the reeview falls short in identifying this issue

Martin Silva Valent:I don't know if my concner makes total sense, but is going around my head

Mary Wong:@Martin, the data does not show who is not proceeding to register. Just as it doesn't show why they do.

Michael R Graham:Perhaps address Public Comments on Claims Service and Matching for next time?

Jeff Neuman:@Martin - that type of data is not able to be obtained

Jeff Neuman:No information is or can be known about the perspective registrant, registrar, botnet, human or other animal on the other side of the request

Michael R Graham:@Martin -- I'd be very concerned if good faith noncommercial applicants are being marginilized by the Claims Service. Where can I find evidence of this marginalization?

Martin Silva Valent:an exact match to be a TM can be a common name or word. How do we know that tons of good fatih applicants are not being turned back?

George Kirikos:Typosquatting in new gTLDs, which already get little type-in traffic, would be a very poor cybersquatting strategy, since it'd be tough to monetize, except for perhaps the largest brands (Google, Facebook, and a handful of others).

Martin Silva Valent:Of course, I am also looking to see if there is strong data on this

Greg Shatan:Typosquatting is also used in phishing and malware attacks.

Salvador Camacho:Totally agree with Greg Shatan

Greg Shatan:vv makes a very nice w....

Michael R Graham:@Martin -- My concern exactly. Without support, isn't the concern theoretical? This is the sort of data it would be essential to gather.

Greg Shatan:@Martin, how do we know any good faith applicants are being turned back?

Philip Corwin:Anti-Phishing WG data shows that most phishing is accomplished via hacked servers, not registered domains, and that where domains are used they generally have a nonsense name with no relation to a TM

George Kirikos:THanks.

J. Scott Evans:@Mary. Are you all going to circulate the slides?

Mary Wong:@J. Scott, yes we will, together with the notes from the call.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it might be "natural fenomena ... like ICANN"

George Kirikos:ICANN can audit Deloitte to see if the profit is reasonable.

George Kirikos:If it shows Deloitte has an 80%+ margin, conclusions would be clear.

Michael R Graham:@Phil -- Actually, phishing of online businesses is utilizing a combination of typosquatts, cybersquats, and counterfeit pages. I'd be interested in where your data can be found.

Paul Tattersfield:Very good questions George

Michael R Graham:@George: Good question.

George Kirikos:Costs === FEES OF THE TMCH service, and the $5,000 per registrar.

Philip Corwin:We don't "know "anything from this data, other than a 94% abandonment rate. Any opinions on what that number means are just educated guesses based upon certain assumptions.

George Kirikos:FEES OF THE TMCH to TM HOLDERS.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 Jeff

George Kirikos:(sorry for the all caps)

Michael R Graham:@Phil as to abandonment data -- Agree.

Jeff Neuman:@George - why are you focusing on that

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure where you are going?

J. Scott Evans:I

J. Scott Evans:for one want to have them back in a couple of weeks.

Terri Agnew:Next Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group is scheduled for Wednesday, 12 April 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes

George Kirikos:@Jeff: ICANN shouldn't be creating monopolies that price gouge.

Jeff Neuman:@George - you are still referring to the TMCH or registries.....just want to make sure we are clear

Poncelet Ileleji:Noted Terri

George Kirikos:@Jeff: TMCH, for now. :-)

Michael R Graham:+1 having them back.

Jeff Neuman:@George - Thanks

David McAuley (RySG):not here for all of it but what I did hear was good, thanks

George Kirikos:Bye folks.
Paul Tattersfield:Very informative call today - thank you for the presentation
Poncelet Ileleji:Bye All
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all
Paul Tattersfield:bye all
Philip Corwin:Noting that ICANN has monoply control on entry into the domain name business ;-)
George Kirikos:(obviously I was in favour of regular tender processes for registries, too)
George Kirikos:Bye.