

NOTES FROM RPM WORKING GROUP CALL ON 16 AUGUST 2017

(These high-level notes are designed to help WG members navigate through the content of the call and are not a substitute for the chat room or the recording. For the full record, please refer to the chat room record, call transcript and recording on the meetings pages at <https://community.icann.org/x/ShMhB>).

1. SUNRISE DISCUSSION

General Question/Discussion:

- Where the Sunrise Charter questions refers to the "ability of TM owners to participate in Sunrise", should the word "ability" be more appropriately replaced with the word "willingness"?
- General agreement that professional survey designer should be engaged to assist with creating all the surveys needed

Discussion of the INTA Cost Impact Survey results (for Section 1 #1):

- Staff are currently compiling the results into a collated summary form for the WG's review. The WG will discuss the staff compilation on 30 August (as Lori Schulman (INTA) will not be available on 23 August). In the meantime, WG members are encouraged to review the full set of results (posted on the WG wiki page and to be recirculated by staff).
- Note from Lori Schulman (AC chat) - INTA survey was "too detailed, took hours to prep and complete. We should learn from that. Questions should be straightforward and absolutely ranked"

Discussion of Sampling of Registrar Retail Pricing (for Section I #2):

- Staff noted that this may be of limited utility given the variation in retail pricing across registrars; it will also be helpful for WG members to provide more direction and guidance as to who to sample, and for which gTLDs
- Noted that the data on pricing can include also post-Sunrise (i.e. General Availability) pricing
- Question: Should registration volume in Sunrise and post-Sunrise be included in the sampling as well?
- Follow up question on registration volume: What was the original Charter question for which the retail pricing suggestion was developed? Are we straying from the purpose?

Discussion on Section I #3:

- Suggestion to add data for Sunrise costs and benefits for reseller and other business partners of registrars (NOTE: may not be timely to do so - possibly something to discuss after the outreach letter is drafted and decision as to how to do surveys is made)
- This item is not complete; its inclusion in this section is simply to note that it is an effort that can be started.

Discussion on Section I #4:

- This specific task is limited to staff collection of actual dates – there is additional data gathering (e.g. survey of registry operators) to come
- When circulating the compiled data, staff to add relevant definitions and the additional anecdotal evidence from ICANN59

Discussion on Section I #5:

- As with ALP, QLP, LRP, the specific task noted here as an immediate one for staff is to compile the data only (i.e. which IDN registries ran Sunrise, and in what numbers), not to perform analysis

Discussion on Section I #6:

- In relation to additional blog sources, suggestion that staff send an initial list of suggestions of sources to WG for comment
- Question whether non-DNS industry blogs should be included, e.g. blogs focused on trademark law or brand owner issues
- Staff assumption is that staff will compile only the sources and provide the content (e.g. via links or downloads) to the WG; WG to decide how to proceed with analysis of the sources

Discussion of Section II:

- General agreement to use professional survey designer for all the proposed surveys (it should not be about just sending the Charter questions to SO/AC/SG/Cs)

Discussion of Section II #2:

- Purpose of question needs to be clarified
- In terms of approach, just add this as another question to the registry survey (note: be clear this is about new gTLDs, not ccTLDs)

Discussion of Section II #3:

- Defer decision for now; WG to first review INTA survey results, then evaluate what is needed for this survey scope and target group(s) (note that there are other IP-focused trade associations and brand owner groups, e.g. AIPLA, ECTA, MARQUES, ASIPI, CTMA)

Discussion of Section II #4:

- Again, as this is a broad subject (especially regarding the methodology and targets), discussion will be deferred. WG will return to this after dealing with all the other suggestions

Discussion of Section II #5:

- This topic is currently in a very preliminary stage and needs a lot more detail before moving forward Consider including these target groups into the survey for #4?

2. TRADEMARK CLAIMS DISCUSSION

Data collection for Question 1:

- Should UDRP cases (just for new gTLDs be included)? Consider also what other use we can make of the URS (and UDRP, if collected) case compilation

NEXT MEETING: 23 August, 1700 UTC