Julie Bisland:Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Sub Team for Trademark Claims on Friday, 05 May 2017 at 16:00UTC for 60 minute duration.

Julie Bisland:Agenda Wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_PwTfAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=RCdEQi9PHAOG5cS7yoRypcxcUZ1BtWWSn6XPt0zae3M&s=ZFy5juLwFCc49-jy_tGHpwzKsNwx2MfwT1S4uzEYPS8&e=

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:HI everyone, we're waiting just a moment for folks to join

Michael R Graham:I am calling in for audio

Michael R Graham:I'm on now

Mary Wong:Thanks, Michael.

Philip Corwin:Hello all

Mary Wong:It's not much changed from the last version, if that helps .... and we anticipate further changes as the Sub Teams complete their work.

Amr Elsadr:The document on the screen was extracted from this google doc: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_document_d_13u5h6Wh6QUqW0vzT5q0zCTEmjMQ8-5FiCat6ZehLHQC7Q_edit&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=RCdEQi9PHAOG5cS7yoRypcxcUZ1BtWWSn6XPt0zae3M&s=I-mUS3dTbFRXqVkz7n8B9ybtRJhpymM6plcoCuQXqLk&e=

Mary Wong:@Kristine, wihat about "such as deterring good faith registrations" rather than "such as a chilling effect"?

Michael R Graham:@Mary +1 on this revision

Roger Carney:Thanks Mary, that is why my hand ws up

Beth Allegretti:Agree

Alison Simpson:@mary +1

Mary Wong:Wow everyone is so amenable!

Roger Carney:Do we assume b is the intended purpose?

Rebecca L Tushnet:One question: should we add a specific reference to translation to other languages?

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, as in does the current requirement for languages sufficient?

Rebecca L Tushnet:Yes, translatoins of the claims notice

Rebecca L Tushnet:translatoins

Rebecca L Tushnet:I can't spell this morning

Rebecca L Tushnet:Mary, that would also get at my question

Mary Wong:@Roger, that's a good point. There was little stated rationale in the IRT and STI reports, so this effect was based on Sub Team discussions to date. Perhaps there are other reasons, and perhaps we can consider saying something like "its primary purpose".

Griffin Barnett:Agree with your description if the intended purpose of Claims Notice Kristine

Mary Wong:Should we add a footnote to clarify what we mean by "intended purpose", possibly noting that there are other secondary purposes?

Griffin Barnett:maybe purpose versus consequence?

Griffin Barnett:or effect

Rebecca L Tushnet:I would want to be very careful with the wording of that purpose--"a right to the domain name" seems unlikely in the abstract

Roger Carney:@Phil, agreed

Rebecca L Tushnet:I think the breadth of that indicates "what's going on with translations?"

Kathy Kleiman:Sorry to be joining late. Hi All!

Kathy Kleiman:Wow!

Mary Wong:@Kristine, will Q2 in the left column now be unnecessary, assuming the Sub team approves the changes to Q1

Kathy Kleiman:Makes sense

Kathy Kleiman:Good point!

Kathy Kleiman:Tx

Amr Elsadr:So we've managed to nicely bunch those questions, then. :-)

Amr Elsadr:They could potentially be addressed together?

Rebecca L Tushnet:+1

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Thanks Mary

Griffin Barnett:Agree with Michael's analysis re these questions

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Proposal: Q1, then Q2, then (a) and (i0)-(iv)

Kathy Kleiman:"In light of the results... Should the Claims Period be extended... or shortened?..."

Kathy Kleiman:Balance!

Kathy Kleiman:Agreeed!

Michael R Graham:Agreed

Michael R Graham:I think First step is: What information do we need to answer these questions. Second step: Answer the questions Third step: How do we think "issues" should be addressed?

Mary Wong:@Michael, maybe add, in addition to what the Analysis Group has provided?

Michael R Graham:Sorry -- not so much "we" as "the PDP"

Michael R Graham:@Mary: There may be other sources of info from the CCT RT, etc.

Mary Wong:Yes, like the INTA survey. Just noting that we want to specifically note the sources we already know are there.

Rebecca L Tushnet:URS claims data for exact matches, as discussed on the list

Mary Wong:We havent seen it - it won't be released till 10 May at the earliest, I think

Roger Carney:+1 Rebecca

Rebecca L Tushnet:Consumer survey data--as I mentioned, if ICANN can't fund it I may be able to study some issues, including ordinary applicant understanding of the wording of the claims notice

Kathy Kleiman:@Rebecca, that would be very valuable.

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, once the Sub Teams are done and we can see all the data requests, staff will follow up with the co-chairs and the WG on whether (and on which reuquests) to proceed with a request to the GNSO Council to get budget allocation from ICANN for studies.

Kathy Kleiman:Analysis Group, URS, Anecdotal evidence registries, registrars, registrants

Mary Wong:@Kristine, question - does the Sub Team want to ask the WG if the initial analysis of the existing, identifed sources should be done by the Sub Team?

Michael R Graham:I'm sure my concern is shared that the collection and review of useful data does not seem to have been anticipated in the Working Plan -- which focuses on discussion and determination.

Michael R Graham:I think we should be able to derive DIRECT MATCH and "not" data for URS and UDRP.

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, the paucity of data and metrics is something that was recognized recently by the GNSO, that's why there's now a process for requesting these. The problem is, of course, it's hard to anticipate at the outset of a PDP what type and scope of data may be needed, and the cost of getting it.

Mary Wong:@Michael, the difficulty with identifying whether and what type of data and metrics may be needed at the beginning of a PDP is why the Work Plan can't take it into account until the need has been identified.

Mary Wong:@Kathy, yes they did.

Michael R Graham:Rebecca: Don't you have a few students who would profit from counting and categorizing URS/UDRP Decisions ?

Michael R Graham:;-)

Rebecca L Tushnet:I would have to direct an RA towards it; might need separate funding but it is definitely possible.

Amr Elsadr:Will fwd this email from Mary to the Sub Team list on requesting data: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-April/001689.html

Justine Chew:Yes, agree with Mary of type of data, metrics needed for PDP work. There is also a recommendation in the CCT-RT report for ICANN to engage a data scientist as a means to overcome this deficiency.

Rebecca L Tushnet:All UDRP would be a heavy lift.

Michael R Graham:@Mary -- Understood.

Kathy Kleiman:Did someone recommend a focus group for the TM Claims notice - maybe current and certainly a future wording?

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, in my previous life I always wished to do it but quailed at the scope!

Kathy Kleiman:Also, is language an issue for registrants...?

Rebecca L Tushnet:I'm willing to dig in

Kathy Kleiman:Hmmm....

Mary Wong:We could keep the Sub Team alive and ask for new recruits if need be

Michael R Graham:I'm willing to "dig in"

Mary Wong:Thanks, Kristine - just don't want us to go out of scope but didn't want also to let the momentum drop.

Kathy Kleiman:Good meeting, tx you!!

Mary Wong:We'll send this version of the Work Plan around as well.

Roger Carney:Thanks everyone!

Justine Chew:Same time next week?

Beth Allegretti:Nicely run meeting, kristine.

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.

Michael R Graham:Thanks Kristine! Great progress!

Mary Wong:@Justine, yes

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Thanks everyone,

Justine Chew:Thanks, Mary.

Kathy Kleiman:To Kristine's question, were all the TM Claims focus group questions captured?