

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Thursday, 27 April 2017 at 03:00 UTC for 90 minute duration

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_NtHRAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfga0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=fgktUprWQ1R8zNpEFV0h06NgM9kkDrNmO0g4y3NMJIE&s=aWeu0PZUkvIPCDTVI5G7FQ2ZNYdDW-OSQYKiuuMFGBs&e=

Jeff Neuman:Small crowd :) I am not yet on audio

Amr Elsadr:Hi Terri. Not on audio yet.

Amr Elsadr:Hi Jeff.

Jeff Neuman:Hi Amr....hoping you like your new gig :)

Amr Elsadr:No complaints so far. :-)

Amr Elsadr:Thanks.

Jeff Neuman:you joined a great team

Philip Corwin:Hello all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

George Kirikos:Hi folks.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):6am here

George Kirikos:They're unapologetic. :-)

George Kirikos:Anyone here from Asia/Pacific?

Mary Wong:Do I count, George, since I'm there much of the time, though not tonight? :)

George Kirikos:If Asia/Pacific doesn't show up, we should drop this time slot.

Mary Wong:Justine is here

Steve Levy:Hello all. Hope this is a good call time for at least some of you!

Jeff Neuman:@Mary - True, but since we have a number of proposals to discuss, we should at least have the proponents of the proposals on here

Paul McGrady:Calls are nice. It gives us a break from our 24/7 Listserv!

George Kirikos:Plus the subteam people should be here, for #2.

George Kirikos:It looks like 1 out of those 3 are here, so far.

Mary Wong:@Jeff, Paul and Greg had said they will be on, and they are. Michael G had said he might not, but the co-chairs had noted that it might be possible to hold his proposal over till next week. Michael had also noted for the co-chairs and staff that his proposal seems pretty self explanatory.

Martin Silva:Hi all

Mary Wong:Kristine from Claims Sub Team as co-chair is here

Paul McGrady:@Phil - thanks!

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I was on the Sunrise call with Lori. We had a good discussion there as well. Those questions have been substantially "bundled" and we're also suggesting language changes as I recall. (If I may be so bold as to speak up for that group).

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):from #Sunrise , questions are being put in batches (having the same idea in each one) , collected input from sub-group members, next call tomorrow

Brian Cimboric:thanks, Paul - was wondering the same thing

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):can not use mic - too early

George Kirikos:Isn't the 2nd question from Greg Shatan?

George Kirikos:(I mean 2nd proposal)

George Kirikos:*2nd

Mary Wong:Yes, two proposals on Q7 - from Kathy and Greg. And two on Q8 - from Kathy and Paul.

George Kirikos:Page 2 has Greg's.

Jeff Neuman:page 2 :)

David McAuley:isn't #2 from Greg

George Kirikos:Page 2.

Amr Elsadr:Greg's proposal is on page 2. Rationale for all proposals are in a separate table starting on page 3.

Paul McGrady:My only objection to this late night call, is that due to unforeseen circumstances I don't also have an unreasonably early morning time ICANN call tomorrow. Poor planning on my part.

Amr Elsadr:Apologies, rationale for proposals start on page 7.

Mary Wong:@Paul, we can fix that :)

Paul McGrady:@Mary: ha!

Jeff Neuman:@Paul - I wish i could say the same :)

Paul McGrady:@Jeff - you are just better at this than me.

Jeff Neuman:better? No, more of a glutton for punishment than you

Kathy Kleiman:I'm happy to let Greg do first

David McAuley:flip a virtual coin?

David McAuley:a bit coin?

Jeff Neuman:Alphabetical by last name (which is the same)

Mary Wong:The proposal Kathy withdrew is NOT on the table

David McAuley:Thanks Mary

Jeff Neuman:Or you can just describe the proposal without reading the words?

George Kirikos:Expanded discussion on page 7?

George Kirikos:I was shocked that they accepted each and every one of those examples.

Paul McGrady:Hard to understand the proposal since it lumps design marks in with other kinds of marks. Are these proposals supposed to be limited to design marks? Looks like it is.

Jeff Neuman:They should be posted on the wiki as opposed to redistributed on email

Colin O'Brien:We need clarification terms.

George Kirikos:Here's Deloitte's response (starting on page 4 for the examples):

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/attachments/20170414/4591dc7c/DeloitteResponsestoFollowUpQuestions-0001.pdf>

Mary Wong:@Jeff, we posted them with notes from a WG meeting, but thank you - we will post them to the TMCH documents sub page as well.

Paul McGrady:@Kathy - so that quotes you gave address text marks and design marks, but not stylized marks. Would be nice if your proposal unpacked those. It is over inclusive as written.

Paul McGrady:@Kathy - your lumping in stylized marks within the quote you gave is trying to change the rules.

Colin O'Brien:+1 Paul

Jeff Neuman:@kathy - I believe we should stay away from terms like "breach" or "violation", etc. I think that implies a certain intent that is most likely not there

Paul McGrady:+1 Jeff. We are not the Compliance Department. The rhetoric in the proposal isn't helpful.

Brian Cimboric:@Jeff +1

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):impressive

George Kirikos:Well done, Kathy.

Brian Cimboric:"does not adhere to" something like that

Jeff Neuman:Have we asked Deloitte for an explanation as to why they are accepting those marks and their interpretation of the rule?

George Kirikos:"is inconsistent with"

Jeff Neuman:They may believe they are operating within the rules and it is possible there is a gray area.

Jeff Neuman:I am not saying what they are doing is necessarily consistent or inconsistent with the rules....just trying to see if there is a gray area or other interpretations of the rules that are possible

George Kirikos:There's a financial incentive for them to accept more than they should -- they get more \$\$\$ over time, if a mark is accepted.

Paul McGrady:Ther word "stylized" is not in the Applicant Guidebook.

Paul McGrady:@Mary - agree. We need to keep using the trademark definiitions common to trademark practice. By lumping all of these together, we are confusing the process, not helping it by creating new language and then attempting to evaluate Deloitte's performance based on definitions that do not exist outside of this working group.

Jeff Neuman:I agree with Mary.....we can always clarify things going forward, but to state that what they have done in the past is inconsistent, or a violation, or breach is not fair at this point

George Kirikos:There seems to be some noise on Greg's line?

Mary Wong:@Jeff, we have not asked specifically, but I suppose our assumption thus far is that Deloitte was merely trying to implement what is in the AGB.

Jeff Neuman:@mary - we probably sshould just ask them outright. There may be something that they see that some of us do not in the wording of the AGB (and their contract with ICANN, which they also need to follow)

Mary Wong:Maybe the basic question is, when the AGB says "word mark", does that include stylized text marks and marks comprising a graphical element alongside a text element?

Jeff Neuman:We could spend a long time trying to figure out intentions and why things are being done.....but our job is to decide what we want the rules to be on a go forward basis on this issue and clarify accordingly

Kathy Kleiman:@Mary, the AGB can't ccontradict the rules adopted by the ICANN Community...

Mary Wong:@Jeff, that's true

Mary Wong:@Kathy, the various iterations of the AGB were developed through community consultations and public comment, similar to the IRT and STI recommendations.

Jeff Neuman:@Kathy - I think you are making some assumptions as to what the ICANN Community believes were the rules. But regardless, we have an opportunity now to clarify on a going forward basis

Kathy Kleiman:I disagree Mary - implemenation can intepret but not contradict the accepted Community policy

Kathy Kleiman:Only one set of rules went through the GNSO Council...

Jeff Neuman:@Kathy - but you are automatically jumping to the conclusion that there is a contradiction. Giving Deloitte the benefit of the doubt, they may not believe it contradicts and we should hear them out as to why.

Mary Wong:@Kathy, one challenge here is that neither the IRT nor STI recommendations were made through a PDP, so they are technically not consensus policy, but rather part of implementation of the 2007 policy reommendations for the new gTLD program. As was the AGB.

Kathy Kleiman:@Jeff, I'm agree.

Kathy Kleiman:with you...

Kathy Kleiman:But we have tried many times to get Deloitte to explain.

Jeff Neuman:@Kathy - I know. Most of them are not trademark lawyers, but are accountants and the ones that come to ICANN meetings are not necessarily the best ones to explain

Colin O'Brien:+1 Greg a disclaimed term should not be allowed in the TMCH but source identifiers should be allowed.

Paul McGrady:@Kathy - the GNSO Policy didn't mention the

TMCH. https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_gnso.icann.org_en_issues_new-

[2Dgtlds_pdp-2Ddec05-2Dfr-2Dparta-2D08aug07.htm&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=fgktUprWQ1R8zNpEFV0h06NgM9kkDrNmO0g4y3NMJIE&s=BJLQ5ZyAZHSTtueG-fzMGWJm2X_McyY7gsnr_ZdlbE0&e=](https://www.icann.org/en/issues/sti/sti-wt-recommendations-11dec09-en.pdf)

John McElwaine 2:the under representation is related to the rule on predominant terms.

Kathy Kleiman:@Paul: STI final report

Kathy Kleiman:<https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/sti/sti-wt-recommendations-11dec09-en.pdf>

Mary Wong:@Paul, the 2007 GNSO policy recommendations basically just say strings should not infringe existing legal rights. That's in part why the Board requested the formation of the IRT, following which the Board requested the GNSO to evaluate the IRT recommendations, which led to the formation of the STI. As you noted, the PDP recommendations date from 2007.

Paul McGrady:@Phil - I don't think we can advise Deloitte to do anything. I think we can make a policy recommendation to the GNSO Council who can then pass it to the Board for approval; but we have no remit to engage in quasi-compliance work vis a vis Deloitte

Kathy Kleiman:@Mary: Implementation teams don't have power to change adopted policy rules - the Community would go ballistic if that were happening.

Mary Wong:@Kathy, yes - that's why it's important to note that the only GNSO policy recommendations on this date from 2007.

Mark Massey:A contract was issued that included certain terms that either were or were not followed. Give GNSO approved 1 set of guidelines that one should expect is the base purpose of the contract. unless that contract was properly modified,not by someones comment or as an attempt to increase the breadth of the project. A formal contract mod changes a contract. Everything else is just talk.

Jeff Neuman:If we had more time (at that time), it would have been nice to have done explanations in the Final STI report. It was good in recommending certain things, but documenting the rationale for those rules from the STI was a little lackin....and that can be a source of gray areas

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):formally the parties gaining sunrise rights are in business of selling such domains

Paul McGrady:@Mary - yep. I remember it well. Kathy's point seemed to be that the GNSO Council spoke directly on the topic of what marks go in the TMCH, but they didn't.

Mary Wong:@Paul, @Kathy, basically there is NO GNSO consensus policy on the TMCH.

Kathy Kleiman:@Mary: I think staff is taking sides

George Kirikos:That would be easily gamed, actually. If the "challenger" is a partner with the bogus TM holder, the "challenger" would issue a challenge, and the "team" still owns the domain, after going through the challenge.

Mary Wong:@Kathy, sorry that you think so. From my perspective staff is merely pointing out what went through a PDP consensus process and what did not.

George Kirikos:In some jurisdictions, though, it's clear that they take a less rigorous approach to granting those marks (even without a disclaimer), outside "tougher" places like the USA.

John McElwaine 2:@Phil I don't believe that the disclaimer issue means that Deloitte is violating any rules. it simply was not considered.

Greg Shatan:Are the chairs taking I don't think exploring facts is taking sides.

Greg Shatan:I don't think a discussion of who is taking sides is going to be productive or positive.

Greg Shatan:Drafters don't own their words....

John McElwaine 2:they would still need to be disclaimed.

Mark Massey:What was approved by GNSO Council and the board is the basis for a contract. Not some ephemeral idea developed by thpughts along the way. That would require a contract mod

Paul McGrady:Sorry about the background noise!

Greg Shatan:Any text would need to be disclaimed.

Greg Shatan:No matter how embedded in the overall mark it is.

Greg Shatan:The Board did not approve the exact text, and we have no idea what the Board thought it was approving.

Greg Shatan:It only "supported" the "substantive content".

Paul McGrady:Did the GNSO Council vote on the STI one way or another? If so, can we post the motion somewhere?

Greg Shatan:The STI report should not be treated as the One True Text.

Kathy Kleiman:@Greg: Any text would need to be disclaimed - could you clarify.

Kathy Kleiman:@All: Will you feel the same way when we get to the UDRP?

Greg Shatan:You stated that there were marks where the text was so embedded in the design that it would not need to be disclaimed. I don

Colin O'Brien:@Kathy no.

Greg Shatan:I don't believe that's the case.

Kathy Kleiman:@Greg - still confused

Kathy Kleiman:1213.02 "Composite" MarksA "composite" mark may consist of a word or words combined with a design or designs; it may consist solely of words, when there are separable word elements; or it may consist solely of separable design elements. An unregistrable component of a composite mark is subject to disclaimer. However, if a composite mark (or portion thereof) is "unitary," an individual component of the mark (or of the unitary portion) that would otherwise be unregistrable need not be disclaimed. See TMEP §§1213.05–1213.05(g)(iv).

John McElwaine:@kathy if a mark is generic and it is in a design mark it still must be disclaimed under USPTO rules

Paul McGrady:+1 Greg - the "Board document" is the AGB.

Kathy Kleiman:Huh?

Jeff Neuman:@john - is there a way to take that principle from the US and come up with a global principle

David McAuley:Sort of underscores the importance of periodic reviews

Mark Massey:+1 on Periodic reviews

Paul McGrady:@Kathy - what was the purpose of that last comment? Was that some warning about how Phase 2 affects Phase 1? If so, we need to reconsider the arbitrary division between the two Phases...

Mary Wong:@Paul, one difference may be that the UDRP is Consensus Policy.

Jeff Neuman:@Kathy - but what we never solved in the STI was the notion of something being descriptive in one industry, but arbitrary in other industries and therefore registerable in TM offices and acceptable for the TMCH.

George Kirikos:Bottom of page 3.

Mark Massey:Cotractors ALWAYS try to expand their statements of work . It's hw they grow their business, Contractors must bewell managed.

Paul McGrady:@Mary - correct, but I don't think that was Kathy's point. I think Kathy was saying that since folks are consenting to the IRT Report being the final word (as opposed to the AGB) that some how the UDRP - as consensus policy - should be treated as if it isn't the current last word on its topic. Obviously, a troubling notion and one that tends to support the idea that the Council should not have split this into Phases.

George Kirikos:+1 Mark

Jeff Neuman:@Mark - I think that is a gross overgeneralization.

George Kirikos:@Jeff: Verisign and Sitefinder? :-)

Mary Wong:OK Phil, staff will take that as an Action Item.

Jeff Neuman:@Paul - Can we create a glossary of these terms for this group?

Mary Wong:@Paul, staff agrees. If it wasn't clear, our suggestion was merely to have a consensus on the terminology.

Mark Massey:@Jeff I will be very happy to discuss this at length but this is not the venue; after managing a number of these things, you are safe to assume in IT related contracting it is axiomatic.

Greg Shatan:I think it's fair to say that a stylized mark is a word mark.

John McElwaine:@greg. completely agree

Paul McGrady:@Mary - I agree a glossary based on current definitions in trademark law would be helpful. I don't agree that creating new definitions would be helpful.

Paul McGrady:+1 Greg.

Mary Wong:Staff will try to compile a glossary and see if there is consensus on the terms included in it.

Jeff Neuman:@Mark - You are not the only one to have managed these types of things :) But overgeneralizations and reading malintent in any actor in this ecosystem is not (in my view) appropriate.

Mark Massey:@Jeff I never said anything about malintent!! It's just common business practice.

Jeff Neuman:Another good term to define - "GI" or "Geographic Indicator".....

George Kirikos:TMCH has more than just TMs, though (e.g. Article 6ter stuff is supposed to be put into the TMCH now (or at some point)).

George Kirikos:(Article 6ter = IGO treaty 'marks')

Mary Wong:@Jeff, staff will include GI in the glossary. Thankfully, there is a definition for it :)

Jeff Neuman:@Mary - thanks. If we can distinguish GIs from "Geographic terms" that would be helpful as well...but for other working groups :)

Mary Wong:@Jeff, yes, and from what staff has researched there does seem to be a distinction.

Mary Wong:Definition of GI from WIPO: "A geographical indication (GI) is a sign used on products that have a specific geographical origin and possess qualities or a reputation that are due to that origin. In order to function as a GI, a sign must identify a product as originating in a given place. In addition, the qualities, characteristics or reputation of the product should be essentially due to the place of origin. Since the qualities depend on the geographical place of production, there is a clear link between the product and its original place of production."

Greg Shatan:Article 6ter names absolutely do not equal marks protected by statute or treaty.

Greg Shatan:Whether a GI is important or not, it is not a "mark."

Greg Shatan:The bathroom is also within the Trademark Office. :-)

George Kirikos:@Greg: I agree about Article 6ter. It's more of a blocking right, but it's "close enough", in the eyes of many.

Greg Shatan:Common mistakes are still mistakes.

Jeff Neuman:+1 Paul

Greg Shatan:A separate GICH is a plausible concept, but in service of what RPM? The TMCH is just a tool.

John McElwaine:GIs always have the option of "becoming" registered trademarks, no?

Jeff Neuman:Since the TMCH is not a rights protection mechanism in and of itself, the real question becomes if it is allowed in to the TMCH, what are the rights given to the GIs once in (eg., the right to participate in claims and/or the right to participate in Sunrise, etc)

Paul McGrady:@Mary - lots of things are protected by statute or treaty (water, borders, etc.) but that doesn't make them trademarks. The AGB doesn't even mention GIs.

Greg Shatan:I think we need to discuss what RPMs if any should be created for GIs, and then come back to the Clearinghouse discussion. This puts the cart before the horse.

Paul McGrady:@Mary - there is no international law norms on GIs. It is a highly debated topic.

Justine Chew:+1 Greg

Jeff Neuman:@Paul - agree....It is why we call the service (the Trademark Claims service and the Trademark Clearinghouse). It was originally called IP Claims and the IP Clearinghouse but was changed because we really only wanted to deal with Trademarks and not any other forms of IP

Paul McGrady:GIs aren't design marks...

Greg Shatan:@Phil :-)

Mary Wong:@Paul, thanks and yes - I was using shorthand to try to summarize the varieties of protective regimes for GIs that currently exist.

Jeff Neuman:So, GIs may be a form of IP, but they are expressly not "trademarks"

Greg Shatan:+1 Jeff.

Mary Wong:@Jeff, yes, unless they are protected as certification marks under national TM laws.

Greg Shatan:Kumbaya Moment!!!

Paul McGrady:@Kathy - just like old times!

Greg Shatan:(Cue them from "The Odd Couple")

Greg Shatan:*theme*

George Kirikos:Interesting domain dispute for Champagne.co, which the French organization lost:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_www.wipo.int_amc_en_domains_search_text.jsp-3Fcase-3DDCO2011-2D0026&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIGN-H4xR2EBk&m=fgktUprWQ1R8zNpEFV0h06NgM9kkDrNmO0g4y3NMJIE&s=uEw-tsM2ok3htPMR4_KQ6O42BTGMHFryscsbS5zXC7Y&e=

Greg Shatan:I think we need to shine a light into the black hole and see how these words came to be.

George Kirikos:"More fundamentally still, this Panel finds it apparent from the WIPO Reports referred to above that the framers of the Policy did not intend that geographical indications or "protected designations of origin" should provide a basis as such for a "right" under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy."

George Kirikos:So, if the GI wasn't intended to be covered by the UDRP, it shouldn't be in the TMCH, by that logic.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Jonathan, is it fair to say that one consequence of the "not a TM" position, from your point of view, is that GIs registered as collective/certification marks in jurisdictions like the US get (perhaps oddly) better treatment than the same GIs protected under GI-specific regimes? Also, you mentioned that the TM offices in some jurisdictions are also in charge of GIs--did I get that right?

Mary Wong:If it helps, WIPO has a publication that explains the basics of GIs, and on Page 13 it tries to explain the similarities and differences between TMs and GIs:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_www.wipo.int_edocs_pubdocs_en_geographical_952_wipo-5Fpub-5F952.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIGN-H4xR2EBk&m=fgktUprWQ1R8zNpEFV0h06NgM9kkDrNmO0g4y3NMJIE&s=mKOIrgfoST_A2Mt55XG3Zs-TVuxCWJLZeMCgtq7zQ74&e=

Jonathan Agmon:@Greg, I don't think you need a different RPM for GIs. And if they are not marks how come they can be registered (even with the USPTO) as trademarks?

Paul McGrady:@Kathy - I agreed with most everything you said until you said the TMCH creates rights.

Greg Shatan:And we were doing so well....

Greg Shatan:I always thought "marks = trademarks".

Mary Wong:@Greg, trademarks are probably a specific type of mark, but not all marks are TMs (to the extent that marks designate source, for instance)

Jeff Neuman:Its a complicated issue as you said

Greg Shatan: Since GIs are not trademarks they should not be in the same RPMs as trademarks. The fact that there's a Venn diagram where certification marks overlap with GIs does not make all GIs trademarks. If a particular GI functions as a certification mark, then it is also a trademark.

Jonathan Agmon: @Greg - I think "marks" are wider - they don't have the word "trade" next to the word "mark" :)

Greg Shatan: Okay, it includes service marks as well.

Jeff Neuman: Other terms for the Glossary: i) mark, ii) trademark or service mark

Mary Wong: @Jonathan, yes, that's what I was speaking to.

John McElwaine: and for the glossary... certification marks and collective marks

Mary Wong: Additionally (building on the WIPO note I mentioned above) there is an obligation under WTO/TRIPS for member states to protect GIs: "In respect of geographical indications, Members shall provide the legal means for interested parties to prevent: (a) the use of any means in the designation or presentation of a good that indicates or suggests that the good in question originates in a geographical area other than the true place of origin in a manner which misleads the public as to the geographical origin of the good; (b) any use which constitutes an act of unfair competition within the meaning of Article 10bis of the Paris Convention (1967)."

Paul McGrady: Champaign is a town in Illinois

Jeff Neuman: @George - way too complicated.....

Jeff Neuman: Geo-targeting is a hugely imperfect science

Paul McGrady: Champaign is the home of the University of Illinois.

John McElwaine: @paul. how is there sparkling wine?

Jeff Neuman: The less complicated thing would be for the TMCH to serve up a different notice for GIs vs. Trademarks

Jeff Neuman: since registrars pull the notice from the TMCH

Jonathan Agmon: @Paul, but you have to associate the indication of origin with certain goods or services for the "trademark" function to kick in - I would think (but not sure) that Champaign is not associated with educational services?

Jeff Neuman: (I am not advocating that by the way)

David McAuley: Paul's proposal addresses sui generis protection for GIs by suggesting another forum, no?

George Kirikos: @Jeff: even easier is to eliminate the TMCH, but have the registrar post a link to the national TM databases, to let the registrant do their own searches.

Mary Wong: @David, I believe so - in the sense that Paul's proposal doesn't say don't protect GIs at all, just investigate if there is a parallel avenue to do so, if warranted.

George Kirikos: WIPO keeps a list of TM offices. https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_www.wipo.int_directory_en_urls.jsp&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0A1gn-H4xR2EBk&m=fgktUprWQ1R8zNpEFV0h06NgM9kkDrNmO0g4y3NMJIE&s=dcpHr82qEbWkQeFrNkXGyPdAuuSGrzYd08xqCm8B4Ac&e= (just have registrars link to this, and be done)

David McAuley: That is how I read it also Mary, thanks

Greg Shatan: Putting GIs in the TMCH would be taking a position.

Mary Wong: @Jonathan, yes, that is so (re practices outside the US).

Greg Shatan: If a GI meets the criteria for being a Certification Mark, then it can be registered in the USPTO.

David McAuley: Interesting points, thanks Jonathan

Jeff Neuman: Another term for the glossary: "Certification Mark"

George Kirikos: Do we need to resubmit the questions we already submitted? (e.g. 500 top terms, buckets for the number of marks per organization, etc?)

Paul McGrady:@John M - how dare you accuse me of folding laundry while on this call!

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Was there a no laundry rule? How about dishes?

Paul McGrady:@Kristine - Ha!

Kathy Kleiman::-)

George Kirikos:Thanks Mary.

Jeff Neuman:Are we meeting the week of the GDD Summit?

Terri Agnew:the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group is scheduled for Wednesday, 03 May 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minute duration

George Kirikos:And we'll be getting the agendas on Fridays now. Wow.

George Kirikos:Goodnight, folks!

Steve Levy:Ciao all

David McAuley:interesting discussion tonight, thanks all

Paul McGrady:Great call Phil!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Colin O'Brien:good night sleep tight!

Kathy Kleiman:Good night, All

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Thanks, g'night.

Greg Shatan:Good night all. Good call.

Jonathan Agmon:Thanks

Kathy Kleiman:and good morning

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.