

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Review of all Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for  
Sunrise Registrations call  
Friday, 14 April 2017 at 14:00 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. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-rpm-review-14apr17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6xjpehyfc7/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/dM7RAw>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the Sub Team for Sunrise Registration on the 14th of April, 2017. In the interest time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are only the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, Kristine Dorrain only on the audio for a little bit. I should be on Adobe in about a half hour.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Kristine. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all 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. With this I'll turn it back over to – is it J. Scott who will kick us off today? Please begin.

J. Scott Evans: Well hello, everyone. This is J. Scott Evans for the record. I didn't know I'd get anointed with being our first chair for the first call but I'm happy to do so. It's 7:00 am where I am so pardon me if I'm fuzzy-headed.

I think the first call of action is for us to decide if we can get a volunteer to agree to sort of spearhead and chair the calls. And so with that I would ask, do we have any volunteers that are willing to sort of be the leader of this group and, you know, chair calls for us?

I see that Lori Schulman has happily volunteered. I say "happy" because she said "happy" in the chat. So, Lori, if everyone is fine with that I certainly think that's wonderful and would like to thank you for agreeing to do that for us. I see that Phil Corwin has joined us as well. With that, Lori, since you volunteered, if you can speak, if you'll unmute, I'm going to allow you to take over and guide us through today's agenda.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me?

J. Scott Evans: We can.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me? Oh good, okay.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, ma'am.

Lori Schulman: I'm not always sure. So I'm kind of with you, J. Scott, I spur of the moment did this because I understand that we need some clear leadership and I could provide that to the team, no problem.

So to lead the call, I would imagine now we have to start talking about what we have to do. And based on the proposed agenda, we have to begin refinement of the charter questions for sunrise registrations with three specific questions in mind. Which of the questions, based on the consolidated list that's posted, to be consolidated further? What questions, if any, may need to

be clarified and how? What questions, if any, should be deleted either because they're duplicates or because they have been discussed or resolved by the working group? What, if any, data might be needed to address questions fully? Are there existing or identifiable sources from which data can be requested?

So we have our work cut out for us here. I think we're a small group but looking at the composition of the group everybody here is very experienced and understands the issue so I think we should actually be able to get through this fairly quickly.

I'm happy to take suggestions from anybody else if you feel how we should begin, maybe just say what questions can be consolidated, go through the list that's on the – that's been put up and just start to think out loud, brainstorm. I want to know if anybody feels that that might be a way to start, just get started instead of just talking about it. Susan. I'm sorry, I thought Susan had her hand – Susan is typing. Okay. J. Scott. J. Scott? And J. Scott's got a yes.

Okay so I think we should just get started. I think we should go through the questions, figure out if any of these are related enough that we can consolidate them. If we can consolidate them make note which ones they are. Redraft them for the next meeting. I do want to ask some clarification from staff, because I was not clear about this even though I volunteered for the group.

Is the suggestion that this group meets hourly weekly until these issues are solved? Or are we meeting every other week in a meeting with the full working group? I'm a little fuzzy on timing. And I want to make sure if I'm leading the group I understand the frequency and the length of the calls. J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: The initial decision was that this group would meet hourly for a couple of weeks to go through these questions and find this information and we would

be reporting this back to the main group. We will not be having a call for the main group next Wednesday, if I'm correct, so they could take that time slot to have some additional time to work. And then on the – on the following week they would present. And I think if, Mary, correct me if I'm incorrect.

Mary Wong: If I may, Lori? This is Mary from staff.

Lori Schulman: Yes, sure.

Mary Wong: And, J. Scott, you're absolutely correct. So we have a fairly clear plan for the two sub teams for the next two weeks, as J. Scott has said. And I think the other point to note here is that besides going through the list of questions, refining, suggesting and editing, what the cochairs would like to see when we come back to the full working group is if possible, you know, a kind of mini-work plan if you like, because having run through these questions and thought about them, the sub team ought to be in a decent or more decent than the full working group's position in trying to figure out how much time you think we're going to need so that, you know, we can allocate the work accordingly between sunrise and claims for the full working group.

Then I think at that point the decision is going to be taken by the full working group as to whether the sub teams keep going to at least do an initial run through the questions and suggest some thoughts and proposals for the full working group. Does that help?

Lori Schulman: Okay, so basically we're trying to boil down two weeks what essentially it might take the working group longer just giving its size and the (unintelligible) on the list at the moment, correct?

J. Scott Evans: Correct. This is J. Scott for the record. What you're designed to do is to present a mini work plan so let's go through these questions, decide where they need – what needs to be consolidated and everything today. Then on our next call the thing is to look at the full work plan and then decide how that

work will continue within that full work plan, what will be done on what time slots within the full work plan. Understanding that if you need any data or additional data for any of these questions or any clarification for these questions from someone outside the working group, that you put that towards the end of the discussion so you give yourself time to collect that information.

So basically it's just – it's making like Mary said, to create a mini work plan on the, you know, because all our work plan says is we'll discuss sunrise today. Well what this work plan will say on X, Y Z date we will consider Questions 1 and 2, right?

Lori Schulman: I get it.

J. Scott Evans: And then...

Lori Schulman: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...it would say Questions 4 and 6 need additional information. We will send that information out for – on this date. We hope to have it back by this date and the discussion will be July 30.

Lori Schulman: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So what we're trying...

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: We can do these things.

J. Scott Evans: ...milestones that we can hold ourselves accountable for. Okay?

Lori Schulman: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry for talking over you. My familiarity with mute, I forget and I tend to be conversational so my apologies to the group, I will be more

mindful moving forward. So, yes, I think, yes, let's get active and start talking about the questions and see where there are some similarities and where we can consolidate ideas or themes.

So question Number 1, "Should the availability of sunrise registrations only for identical matches, without (unintelligible) test, be reviewed?" So my understanding is we're not to answer this question today but we're to see whether or not this question makes sense to be consolidated with any other questions that are on the list.

All right, secondly, "Is the notion of premium names relevant..." Oh, I'm sorry, Amr had his hand up. Amr, I apologize for not seeing you.

Amr Elsadr: That's okay, Lori. Thanks. This is Amr.

Lori Schulman: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: We kind of moved past this now but I just also wanted to add to what Mary and J. Scott said a little earlier in terms of when we're planning what and when this sub team will be delivering to the full working group. So I'll still be mindful of the updated work plan which is a version 4, I believe, that Mary circulated to the working group list.

And so in that work plan the full working group meeting is April 26. The working group will be going through the – what this sub team as well as the Claims Sub Teams provide to it in terms of refined charter questions. And the schedule is also predicting that the working group will continue this on May 3. And by May 10 the Sunrise, Claims and Private Protection questions should be done and up for review by the full working group. So I just thought that this timeline might help you sort of understand what the sub team should be delivering and sort of like the dates when – by when these should be done. Thanks.

Lori Schulman: Thank you, Amr. Does anybody else have any comments they'd like to add at this time? Okay, then again let's start through the questions. And if people see where questions could be consolidated just raise your hands. I'll be very mindful of watching the queue.

So the first question is, "Should the availability of sunrise registrations only for identical matches," in other words, without any extra generic test, "be reviewed?" Question 2, "Is the notion of premium names relevant to review of RPMs? And if so, should it be defined across all gTLDs?" Following from Question 2, so here are two questions we can certainly consolidate. "Should there be a mechanism to challenge whether a domain is a premium name?"

Question 4, "Should there be a specific policy about the reservation and release of reserve names? i.e. the modification of Section 1.2.3 of Specification 1 of the current Registry Agreement." I'm not familiar with that Spec so that's something we should absolutely look at before the next call.

Question 5, "Should there be a public, centralized list of all reserve names for any given sunrise period?" Question 6, "Should holders of Trademark Clearinghouse verified trademarks be given first refusal once a reserve name is released?" I think that the reserve names and the premium names issue – my own opinion is these are very closely tied. I could speak from a brand owner perspective where some of my members, in the International Trademark Association have felt that some of their names have been held hostage, for lack of a better word. So I think that's something to think about, you know, is, you know, is that what was intended by the sunrise period? Is – is having a reserve list part of an RPM or not? I think that's something interesting to discuss.

J. Scott, I see your hand, and then Phil and then Maxim.

J. Scott Evans: Hi, this is J. Scott Evans for the record. I'm not sure if the questions of premium names is necessarily relevant for this working group. This working

group is considering RPMs. And premium names aren't RPMs. So I think that if we want to say and discussing sunrise somehow mention premium names, and I think – but I don't think we need to be considering premium names in this particular – as part of an RPM because I don't think that that's really part of the advent of this group or the, you know, I just – that's – we can talk about how sunrise allows, you know, people in the Clearinghouse to obtain, you know, registrations prior to land rush if they qualify and they're validated and that stuff.

But there's also a situation with regards to some of the criticism is that, you know, names aren't available and there's a dearth of names and all this is impacted by the fact that many of the registries have taken names that some would argue are the ones that most people want, I mean, the whole thing ICANN, to me as a trademark owner involved in this since 1998, kept telling me was, we need all these new gTLD strings because small and medium businesses can't find quick names smart, easy to understand names, in dotCom because they're all gone.

So we need to open up all these other TLDs so these small businesses can get these, because the only way they can get them now is buying them on the secondary market at inflated prices.

Lori Schulman: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So then we open up all these TLDs and they allow premium names to be taken in, and so all the smart, short, quick names that are relevant to the TLDs are now premium names, and they're sold for prices equal to or greater than the dotCom names on the secondary market. So they didn't solve the problem they told me they were trying to solve when they allowed premium names. And we could make that note in here, but I don't think it's necessarily an RPM.

Lori Schulman: Thank you, J. Scott. Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Phil Corwin, yes.

Phil Corwin: Can you hear me ok?

Lori Schulman: Yes.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Yes, Phil for the record. I think I'm going to differ a little from J. Scott. Let me say prefatory, the two complaints I've heard the most from trademark owners about sunrise is that, one, that they'll go there to buy the match of their registered trademark in the Clearinghouse and it's been, you know, designated as a premium name and it's – they're being asked to pay thousands or tens of thousands of dollars to register it. And I think we're going to need more information.

It's not clear to me from what I've heard whether that only applies to descriptive dictionary terms or whether some trademark owners have actually found their unique trademark names, let's say not, you know, Windows would be in the first category, Microsoft would be in the second category where unique company or product name is designated premium.

So I think we want at least some inquiry to understand what's happening with that, although I think well recognizing that pricing is probably not within our remit, but within the Subsequent Procedures where if we identify – if we find that pricing is interfering with effective exercise of the right for sunrise registration or at least making it economically nonviable, we could convey that information to Subsequent Procedures.

In that regard, I think Questions 2, 3 and 8 ought to be consolidated in some way. They all relate to the issue of sunrise pricing practices and which would be a premium name.

And then other concern I've heard is that a trademark name will be on the reserve list and not available for anyone to register in the sunrise period. And then it's released later on post-sunrise and the trademark owner has no first dibs on registering in that regard, Questions 4, 5 and 6 all seem to be questions that could be consolidated into one overall question about designation of reserve names and their treatment once released.

So that's what I had to say on this – in regard to the working group charter questions. Thank you.

Lori Schulman: Thank you, Phil. Thank you for the helpful suggestions about which we could immediately consolidate. Maxim, you're next.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we could group these questions by operational side of things. For example, everything related to reserve names could be grouped to one separate bunch. Things which have only the relation to the trademarks and (unintelligible) sunrise and which do not say – they don't have something with the reserve names, could go into the other bunch. I see that (unintelligible) so most probably they will need to be (unintelligible) reserve names, that bunch.

And also I'd like (unintelligible) that in situations where reserve names are released (unintelligible) design of the current notice, for example, for gTLDs where the only TLD (unintelligible) is dotMadrid, actually it's not there. And

Lori Schulman: Maxim.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes.

Lori Schulman: May I interrupt? And I'm wondering if it would be helpful if you typed into the chat? Thank you. Thank you for understanding, Maxim. As Maxim is typing, I recognize Susan, Susan Payne.

Susan Payne: Thanks. Hi. Yes, and I think my first point might be one that Maxim was making although I also found it a little difficult to hear him so apologies if I'm am repeating something that he was saying. But in terms of the idea of consolidation, I'd been envisaging consolidation as being where, you know, if we looked at Question 1 and Question 4 and they were basically asking the same question we'd all acknowledge that 1 and 4 were the same and need to be, you know, made a single question rather than having duplication.

And the reason I've been kind of approaching this or assuming that that was what we were meeting by consolidation, and I may be wrong, but that sort of stems from what – from what we worked on the TMCH charter questions where there really was quite a lot of duplicates or duplication in the questions that we were being asked in the charter.

And I think there is a slightly different notion, which might also consider consolidation about, you know, are a certain number of questions asking about the same topic and are likely to all come up in the context of the same conversation and therefore should be dealt with at the same time?

And in that sense, then yes I would agree with what Phil's been saying about, you know, all of the questions about reserve names, we ought to consolidate. I mean, maybe we could use, you know, maybe the term we could use is sort of grouped together or something like that so that, you know, when we're on the call and we're dealing with reserve names, we deal with all of those questions and we don't suddenly find that Question 8 also is about reserve names and we forgot to do it.

I hope that made sense. And then I just did have one response to Phil, in relation to Question 8 in fact around the – whether there is a mechanism to challenge pricing, that's like the purpose of the sunrise. And I don't entirely think that that is a question for Subsequent Procedures because I don't think that's exactly the same thing as the idea of premium names which Phil was also talking about, you know, probably being something that Subsequent Procedures ought to be tasked to deal with.

There is – there is a slight distinction in that, you know, there are or there have been circumstances where, you know, the price general availability is – I'm using exaggerated examples – pricing general availability is \$10, but during the limited period when the sunrise names were being registered if you wanted a sunrise registration you had to pay \$2000.

You know, that at its most extreme examples is about, you know, business practice which is designed to circumvent the protection that was meant to be granted by having an opportunity to participate in sunrise because if it's \$2000 or \$4000 in sunrise, then you end up not having, you know, the sunrise becomes economically unavailable to you and you may as well wait until it's \$10 in general availability.

Lori Schulman: Thank you, Susan. I'm going to make a comment and then I see Mary has her hand up, and then I see Kristine has her hand up. So I think I would tend to agree that we have to do both, that we would, Number 1, of course cut repetition, nobody wants to repeat; and Number 2, to bunch – I would call bunch by theme, for lack of a better word. I hate the word "chunking" which some people say or – either bunch or bundle by theme.

If we could do both of those things I think we would, you know, be way ahead of the game. And I'll recognize Mary and then Kristine.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Lori. This is Mary from staff. You and Susan made one of the points that staff was going to make. And I think that typing is still going on so I will

just wait. Oh no problem. And we would advise doing that because it probably will make it easier for the full working group to proceed through the work plan.

Another point that we were going to make from the staff side is that for the TMCH charter questions, and some folks in this sub team were part of that sub team, we found that there were some questions for the sub team thought it would be actually easier to do the review if they knew the context within which that question arose.

So for example, whether the question that quite a lot of community members raised in two or three public comment periods versus wasn't a single committee member that raised a one-time, because then going back to the original question sometimes allows us to understand, you know, use a particular usage, a particular word whether that meant what we think it means.

So if that's something that the sub team would like staff to do, we can go back and take a look at these questions and go back to where they originated from and see how much – how many comments there were about that.

Then the third point that I wanted to make for now is that with respect to any overlaps with Subsequent Procedures, I think the good news is that we do have members who participate in both groups, and in fact we have committee liaisons, and Susan is one of them. So our advice on this is that maybe we can, as a sub team, just go through the questions, try and make them into a list that makes sense for us to review, and at that point any overlaps with Subsequent Procedures can be discussed potentially with the Subsequent Procedures chairs or liaisons. Thank you, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Thank you, Mary. I appreciate those suggestions. And from my point of view, yes, for staff to go back what we mean by certain words, if that can be ascertained or whether we need to provide further clarification into two or three weeks this group will be meeting, that I think would be super helpful.

And I see Kristine has her hand up.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. New headset, can you hear me?

Lori Schulman: Yes.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay great, thanks. So I wanted to echo Susan but just with a slight variation, maybe because I know she mentioned the work we did on the Trademark Clearinghouse, you know, refinement questions. In the interest of time, I love the idea of the bundling or bunching, but where we have questions that are duplicates, I just suggest we sort of leave them all in the bucket (unintelligible) talk about them at the same time. I heard somebody say earlier -- when I was only on the phone -- you know, that we might be redrafting a question or whatever. And I don't know if that's a good use of our time. I just want to throw that out there. And then secondly I think (there) should be really careful talking about premium names because then we're really talking about price regulation.

And so I think to the extent I that agree completely with what J. Scott said. I do agree -- to the extent that those mentioning that -- there are maybe some names that have become added to some registries' premium lists simply because of their value as a trademark. I think it's worth looking into the number of instances in which people are saying that this is happening and determining if that is a significant problem. And if indeed there's anything that can be done to resolve that.

But I don't think it meshes clearly with RPM's grant. Because the two aren't really necessarily related. So I think we just have to be real careful -- when we talk about premium names -- that we only consider the affect to which a name has been designated premium by virtue of its nature as a trademark. Thanks.

Lori Schulman: Thank you Kristine. Susan?

Susan Payne: Sorry. That took a while to get off mute.

Lori Schulman: It's okay.

Susan Payne: Sorry about that. Yes, I am - as Kristine was speaking it occurred to me that staff gathered in -- when we were talking about the PDDRP -- staff gathered some examples of practices or problems that had been encountered. And I think some of those may go to this. Because -- although that list was sort of characterized as problems which would qualify for the sort of - for bringing a claim under the PDDRP -- I think, in fact, the problems identified generally weren't ones that would have founded a claim under the PDDRP.

But were other things. Like some examples of brands that had been - appeared to have been targeted for premium pricing purely because they were a brand in the context of the registry in question. So I'm not quite sure where that list lives but I think we do have some examples.

Lori Schulman: Thank you Susan. I want to go back to a comment that Kristine made about redrafting. I believe I was one of those who mentioned redrafting. I certainly don't suggest reinventing the wheel, but I do suggest that if we find redundancy where redrafting a question could provide clarification that we consider that.

Or at least make some sort of footnote to the question about how we would think the question ought to be asked in a way to clarify for the entire community. And I'm curious to hear more about that. Susan is that a new hand or old hand that I see?

Susan Payne: It is an old one, sorry.

Lori Schulman: Okay, that's okay. So I see that Kristine says in the chat that you would agree with that about premium names being a marketing share? Or a footnote? Oh, she likes the footnote idea. Okay, I think that maybe Mary we could put that in the notes. That if we see that there is language that may be ambiguous or redundant -- or somehow not conveying the meaning that we intend -- that we put notes to that effect with suggested changes rather than actually redraft it.

That way it would give the entire work group an opportunity to look at - we discuss internally. Do people agree with this approach generally? You can just hit that little "I agree" if you think that will work. Well we've got Kristine, we have J. Scott, Susan. I agree. Oh. Well, we've got four. Four out of how many? Thirteen? Actually we don't have a majority on that.

If there's somebody who thinks this is not a good idea, I would appreciate if you would speak up as to why you think it may not be a good idea. Otherwise perhaps - oh we've got five now. And mine is six. So we need one more yes to make it a majority. All right I think (that's sensible) given that about half the group agrees that we should try this approach. And if the approach doesn't work then can certainly abandon the approach.

But I agree in the interest of time we don't want to get stuck on word-smithing. But we certainly should raise issues that we think are going to create ambiguity or a problem worth responding. I'm also going to ask the group at this point, it seems to me the we could have further discussion about these specific questions. Or -- given the conversation that we've just had -- assign a little homework where we each individually -- as contributors -- look at these with the idea of bunching and identifying redundancy.

Send our ideas out to the list -- I am strong believer in using the list for time management purposes -- and if people would be willing to do that, I would certainly step up and take what suggestions come out on the list and

consolidate them for the next call. Does anybody have any ideas about this approach?

Oh, Maxim has typed are we against Google doc sheets? I don't know. Mary, do you want to address that? My thought was people would post their ideas to the list in whatever format they're comfortable with. And that -- with the help of staff -- I would consolidate them into a standard format, either Word or Google Docs. And I see Mary posts a PDF to the list. Whatever format works.

Susan I see your hand? Or did that just come down? Mary, I see your hand.

Mary Wong: Yes, thanks Lori. So from the staff side -- in terms of Google Docs -- our answer is it's really up to the group. How they feel they can work most effectively. Obviously one advantage of Google Docs is that everyone is editing the same document. So we can put what you have into a Google Docs sheet as easy as we can do into a Word document.

So it would be in the form of a table or a spreadsheet of sorts. And the one disadvantage of Google Docs is that it is not always accessible to participants in some countries. But I don't believe we have that problem on this sub-team. So just let us know which format works best for all of you.

Lori Schulman: Is there people who have - I generally don't have a preference. I think what we would have to work on is what would that format look like, to make it easy for people to post their ideas? And then - so I was thinking maybe people post to the list in whatever format that we choose.

Let's say give them five days -- I know this weekend's Easter -- but I think five days should be enough. Real days, not business days. And then when we get the post then we can -- based on what we get in the post -- we can figure out a format and an approach. But if people have other suggestions about whether they think getting some kind of chart up immediately on Google Docs

would work I'm open to that. I tend to be one of those people who - I mean, sorry. Let's pause. I'm fine with Google Docs.

Okay. So (then what we ask) is people to put their ideas out on the list. Free form thoughts. They can be in the email, they can be already in a Google Doc, they can be in - I don't care what format they're in. Then I can collate them and with staff we can put up the Google Doc with all of the ideas before the next call. Okay, (Scott) and then Mary.

J. Scott Evans: That was going to be my suggestion is that we all take a look at the document that's presented before us. And I would ask if - that it gets circulated again if it hasn't. And then you do your ideas and make comments. I think one and two and five and six should be bunched. I think that one and 12 are duplicative so we need to eliminate one or both, be it one of those. And my suggestion is we eliminate one. Or whatever.

That all goes to the list and Lori you take all of that, you consolidate that into a document that takes all that into account, and that's the Google Doc. And we begin to work from that document that has everyone's first pass consolidated into a document. And that's what we do rather than putting all these questions up and having 10 people going in and you know, making all their comments to that.

I think it's - if we have a consolidated -- we take a first pass, put our first pass up as a Google Doc -- and the open it up for everyone then to work on refinements.

Lori Schulman: Right. J. Scott I agree. That is what my intention was when I made the suggestion. So that's a good way of articulating it. Thank you. Mary?

Mary Wong: Thanks everyone. So the first suggestion's going to be quite similar. We will start the Google Docs. And -- you know, Lori I think you said five days -- so in the course of the next five days what we will do is monitor the sub-team

mailing list and take whatever suggestions come in and put them in the Google Docs, which we will then circulate to the sub-team before the next meeting.

So that -- as J. Scott was noting -- at the next meeting you can work through it. And Lori we're happy to take that on if that will save you a little bit of trouble. And of course we'll keep you in the loop or if you have questions about where certain comments should go.

Lori Schulman: Mary I kiss your feet. Thank you. That would be super helpful and it would save time. I appreciate it. I don't literally kiss your feet, (Mary Wong), but my - I have a great respect for how you help us organize our voluminous amount of work. Does anybody else - Mary's laughing. We have to have some humor folks. This is hard work. We've all been through a slog.

The list has been quite animated. And I think if we can start putting some real discipline behind how we approach questions -- even if we have different ideas of how they might be resolved -- we can at least get this piece ticked off and back out for the main group to start thinking about solutions. I should wash your feet, thank you J. Scott. (Unintelligible), I agree. Kristine I see you have your hand up.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine from Amazon and I will also get in on the Mary feet washing party. That's all fine with me. (Unintelligible). I wanted to circle back to Mary's proposal and I don't know if that we -- from a bit ago -- and I don't know if we actually answered her question. I think she wanted to know -- wanted people -- if we wanted her and her team to go back and determine like what level of interest each question came with.

So did it come on behalf of the entire stakeholder group, was it one individual person? You know, was there, you know, 50 people that plus one'd it? And it may be that you answered it and I just zoned for a second but did we decide we wanted that? Because I think that would be super helpful in our

prioritization as well to know like what the community thinks. That there's, you know, a huge, you know, call for a particular question. Did we answer that? Did I miss that?

Lori Schulman: Yes, Kristine I thought we had. I thought we did agree that that would be helpful. So what I'm thinking is if Mary does that work she can put that into the Google Doc. She can put that information right into the spreadsheet that we're going -- or whatever it is, the table -- that we're going to be working with. She can put that right in there. And that would help (as) we go along.

(Cassie Conlan): Hi (Laura) this is (Cassie Conlan) I'm on audio only.

Lori Schulman: Oh, hi (Cassie). We have all three chairs on this call, I feel very honored. Okay, (Cassie), please speak.

(Cassie Conlan): Where (are these) people going to go through questions from the -- and I apologize I came in late and I'm on the road -- but were going through the questions to try to evaluate which ones from the council are higher priority than other questions from the council?

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: No, that's not exact - yes, that's not exactly right. What we're trying to do is gauge how much interest there is. I don't think priority's the right word. But Mary says that there is information about which particular questions might be considered higher interest. I would say interest rather than priority because I don't think right now we're talking about priority.

Right now (talking) about -- I'm not sure where you came in on the call -- but the approach that we decided to take is we were going to do two things. That -- as individuals -- we're going to look at all of the questions and we're going to answer two questions. If there's any repetitiveness or redundancy to flag it. Not necessarily delete it, but flag it. Note that there's a redundancy.

Secondarily that we would bunch the questions by theme. If we see uniform themes in particular questions put them all in the same bucket. So we're looking for redundancy and we're looking for themes. Once we have that done then we're going to make some decisions about what the questions might look like. Looking - moving forward in terms of how we put them in particular order, how we group them together.

We also made a decision that we would not redraft necessarily, but if we felt that a question needed some clarification -- or redrafting or some other tweak -- that we would put them in the form of a footnote. So we would not change questions but we would put suggestions about where questions could be changed where we feel that a clarification is warranted.

I see that Susan has her hand up but (Cassie) I want to make sure that I've answered your questions before I call on Susan.

(Cassie): Absolutely, thank you. Appreciate it Lori. It sounds like a very good way to go through. But just the thought that anything that came in from the council is probably something they want (to be answered). Thank you.

Lori Schulman: You're welcome. Susan, you're next.

Susan Payne: Yes, I was just going to add that I think one of the things that Mary had flagged was also sort of context of the question, where that's sort of readily available. And sort of - I'm not sure that actually any of these questions are particularly sort of unclear in terms of what their meaning is.

But for those of us -- and I know (Cassie) was -- who worked on the TMCH (to ask) questions, some of them, you know, when we read them we honestly didn't really quite understand what the question was getting at. And then we had this conversation about, you know, how helpful it would be to understand where the questions come from. And, you know, was there sort of some

context around the question that got asked that would might help us understand what was - what we were actually being asked to answer?

So in this particular case I'm -- you know, with a quick skim through the questions -- I'm not so sure that the context isn't clear, you know, on the face of the questions. But that was the other idea that might get captured in this exercise.

Lori Schulman: Susan thank you. Mary, perhaps you can clarify once more for the group exactly what you can determine. What you had offered. Perhaps I didn't reiterate it correctly. Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi Lori. It's Mary. I actually think you did. I also think that Susan's comment was very helpful, as was Kristine's. And it really is up to the sub-team. And I note Susan's point that maybe for this set of questions there isn't the kind of head scratching that some of the TMCH questions presented to that sub-team from the phrasing. I note that (Phil) has said that maybe it doesn't make sense to research where the charter question came from.

So I think that's really two things we're talking about. One is the meaning of the question. If the question on the face is not that clear to members of the sub-team, then it may help for you to know where that came from. For example, was it in a public comment period to the issue report? Or was that in a comment to a different paper?

That's slightly different from the point that Kristine also raised, which is if there's a question that either has been a problem identified by several sectors of the community for some time versus is it a problem that's been identified once by one commentator? So we basically see two purposes for that kind of contextual information.

Lori Schulman: Okay. I think context can be helpful. I think definitely -- and you, you know, discussing premium names, you know, whether the questions are here -- so

whether or not they should be or how they came to be I think would be really helpful for the group. (In terms of what we) recommend moving forward. Because that definitely sounded like that was an area where we might have some discussion.

You know, a premium name is not in RPM per se. But if a premium name is being used to make an end run around an RPM, the fair game (is) to discuss this in the group. I have a personal feeling about that. I feel like if a premium name is making an end run around an RPM -- and we can prove it -- that is worthwhile for the group to look at. Or to J. Scott's point -- if we can't find a solution -- at least mention that it's a (problem) that needs to be looked at if not by this group then some other group.

Okay, so it appears that we have a bit of a work plan. So I feel like we've gotten a lot done in 48 minutes. Does anybody else have anything they'd like to add or suggest or point out at all? (Use) the last few minutes for sort of a free-form? If not, I'm happy to give 10 minutes back to the group. Please let me know. Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi, and I'm sorry that I'm talking so much. But -- and Lori you may already be preparing to do this -- I think from the staff side we are fairly clear what our homework is. So our questions for the group is, you know, first of all we're talking about five days which counts the Easter weekend. And we're looking at getting you guys the Google Doc by say next Wednesday.

A, is that a reasonable amount for folks? At least to get started. Obviously Lori I think we're not cutting our comments at the five-day period. But we hope to get some so that we can at least have some additional information to start the next call with. And then B, the second question is the next call. And we may want to take this to the list where all the members are, because a few are not here.

But as J. Scott noted earlier, there's basically two slots available next week. One is the Wednesday slot that's normally used by the full working group. And the other is a Friday slot, presumably say at this time. So I don't know if anyone has any preference for that that they want to voice or we can just take it to the list. I just didn't want these points to be lost, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I - Mary I actually have a preference. My preference would be the Friday. The reason being it would give us time to really get this doc in shape. I feel like Wednesday -- with the Easter holiday being what it is -- and you know, I know there are other people working on the budget comments, the CCTRT comments, that are due in two weeks. So there's a lot of other projects going on at the same time.

My comfort level would be to give us a full week to get the kind of document that we envision. I think if we try to push it to Wednesday we might not have what we need. And I'm interested in hearing other people's thoughts about this. Or at least agree or disagree. If you would disagree with the nice little buttons. Or (plus) lines or whatever. So Susan agrees. Kristine agrees.

Need - so can I repeat J. Scott? What I was saying is I have a higher comfort level with doing a next Friday call so that we have the document we want to really work from. Rather than a Wednesday call where we're kind of rushing the gun. Particularly, I know some people actually take Easter Monday off. So I don't want to interfere. I really respect the holiday and I want to respect people's time.

All right, looks like we have a lot of plus ones for Friday. Maxim notes there's an overlap with the RISG call. Yes, he's described it way better. So yes, it looks like we pretty much have consensus about Friday. So I would rather just schedule it Friday than put it out to the list, to be honest. We've got 12 participants here, they've been active, and we need to move. And that way people can set their schedules.

(Cassie Conlan): And Lori -- this is (Cassie) -- sorry for the interruption. Will that be Friday at the same time, 1400 UTC?

Lori Schulman: Yes. That seems to work. The question is 90 or 60? I hate 90 minute calls. I'm fairly efficient. I would vote for 60, but let's hear what the group thinks. Can we do this, can we schedule for 60, if we need the extra 30 make a spontaneous decision? Or is that not typically done? I would rather not - I think we can do it in 60 with good time management. Oh I see Terri's hand. Terri did you want to add something else?

Terri Agnew: No, I was just lowering that actually. But just for your information if we schedule it for 60 and you decide to stay over there's no harm done there. You can stay on.

Lori Schulman: Okay. Okay, so let's do 60. If we have to extend it to 90 we can make an adjustment call on the day. You know, if we're really getting through and getting a lot of work done and feel the extra 30 is going to make a difference I'm all for it.

But we're - sometimes I find on these calls if you're in a slog and you're not getting work done, (wouldn't) it better just to end them and start again. So let's agree to do 60 and then plus 30 if we need to. All right then. Does anybody have any other comments, suggestions? Yes, I personally prefer homework because with homework you can gauge your own time. With calls you're pretty stuck.

So I'm a grateful (leader). We all got to where we are because we all did our homework. So we can keep doing our homework. Yes, okay Mary said can we aim for additional comments on the questions by Wednesday? And document (pressed) and circulated by staff before Friday. I'm comfortable with that. I think that would work well. And J. Scott agrees.

All right then. So I think we have a plan. And I want to thank you for all of your really hard work today. I have to say, I started on the fly a little bit. I think some of us - our list that didn't. And now I feel like we have a clear path. So I just want to congratulate everybody for some solid work in 55 minutes' time. So have a nice holiday -- whatever you celebrate -- and we'll talk next week. And on the list. Call can be ended, thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. (Note) the operator if you could please stop all recording. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

Mary Wong: Thank you, that concludes today's call. Thank you all for participating. You may now disconnect.

END