

Adobe Connect chat transcript for 04 October 2017:

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Wednesday, 04 October 2017 at 17:00UTC for 90 minute duration.

Terri Agnew:agneda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_U4ZEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIn-H4xR2EBk&m=IxRfeIQYw2MKzNfQKxJL_tWlScVL81j2Ofv281stKLE&s=JivR7hcJRMJ4dkQEQu2FNUew-iVB2gJzjAj8l9Q6a14&e=

George Kirikos:Hi folks.

George Kirikos:We've got Berry, Merry, and Terry. It seems ICANN only hires people with the "-airy" sound at the end of their name, based on these 3 observations. :-)

George Kirikos:Oops, I meant *Mary.

George Kirikos:OOps, and Terri.

George Kirikos:lol

Mary Wong:It's ok George, Starbucks baristas are even more creative with spelling!

Philip Corwin:Hello all (and noting that Mary is almost always merry ;-)

J. Scot EVans:I am dialing in.

Mary Wong:Kathy, J. Scott, Phil - please let us know which version of the document you'd like us to upload. We have the version that staff circulated about 12 hours ago, and the one Kathy just circulated to the mailing list about 30 minutes ago.

Paul Tattersfield:Hi everyone

J. Scot EVans:Let's put up the document Staff circulated earlier.

Paul McGrady:Hey fellow nerds.

Mary Wong:Amr has resigned from ICANN staff.

Colin O'Brien:Was this capture based on a review of the transcript?

George Kirikos:@Colin: maybe it was from the "Notes" pod? (bottom right) [from last week]

Mary Wong:Yes we have both

Colin O'Brien:I'm a little confused Kathy is implying that Amr might not have been taking the best notes and she tried to capture the comments. Was this capture based on a review of last week's transcript?

Mary Wong:The AC room is displaying the version circulated by staff.

Lori Schulman:Hello. Sorry to be late.

susan payne:Yes - why don't we stick with the version Mary circulated, rather than something none of us have looked at and agreed to as it came around less than an hour ago

Bradley Silver:+1 Susan

Sara Bockey:Just wanted to note that I will need to drop at the top of the hour for another meeting.

Marie Pattullo:+1 Susan too

Lori Schulman: Agree with Susan Payne.

Terri Agnew: thank you for this notice Sara

Mary Wong: We have circulated the summary and links to the different RO's Additional Marketplace RPMs information, and posted it to the wiki.

Louise Marie Hurel: However, we also have to critically assess the quality of the data we are going to gather. Noting that there might be challenges to having more info from registries, we should consider incorporating registrants and other sources. Its not only about increase in costs but about the whole.

Lori Schulman: Per the notes from last year, my understanding is that Martin's suggestions had not been agreed to from the group. I think reflecting suggestions in meeting minutes is one thing. Changing the discussion document is another.

Cyntai King: +1 Lori

Lori Schulman: I meant last week. Not last year. My apologies for the typo.

susan payne: +1 Lori

Greg Shatan: +1 Lori.

George Kirikos: Conceivably a DIDP request could be made, to receive a copy of the contract (perhaps redacted).

George Kirikos: That would set out any restrictions, in writing.

George Kirikos: Loud and clear, Louise.

susan payne: to what purpose George. surely ICANN has an incentive to enforce if the TMCH provider were in breach

Greg Shatan: I have not looked at Kathy's notes. Was my suggestion that certain questions should be directed to consumers/end-users?

Greg Shatan: captured in the notes?

Mary Wong: I can explain the cost issue if appropriate.

George Kirikos: See question 2(b), Susan. It helps answer not just what arrangements exist, but what *could* exist.

Mary Wong: @Greg, all - here are the notes from the call that Kathy is reading from:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_o4BEB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=IxRfelQYw2MKzNfQKxJL_tWIScVL81j2Ofv281stKLE&s=OjJcefkHY1L55GDAIrlOF30A8B7dS5jOIH_hB_D_yC8&e=

Lori Schulman: How will registrants be identified?

George Kirikos: @Lori: perhaps like the WHOIS study, a random sample of domains?

Cyntai King: @George - why would we need to know what arrangements could exist? This isn't a theoretical exercise; this is an assessment of the mechanisms. We are not tasked to assess mechanisms that don't exist.

George Kirikos: (statistically significant in size, of course)

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:First, I think we're already proposing to ask Registrants about their interactions with claims (regardless of pre- or post- 90 days).

Lori Schulman:ok, I would want to understand the pool and a way to cost effectively identify willing registrants

Cyntai King:Last week we briefly discussed Registrant surveys, at which time it was noted that to do a statistically relevant survey would increase the budget by an order of magnitude

Lori Schulman:Yes, I also had raised the point of prioritizing the date that we need and we don't seem to be doing that.

Mary Wong:@Lori, the cost issue relates to the scope of the target group. Reaching out to registry operators, brand owners and service providers is a relatively closed universe, the broader, bigger and less defined the group means that there is a massive increase in cost that we may not have the budget for.

George Kirikos:I already posted a link to a registrant study ICANN had already done, last week.

Martin:I think we SHOULD ask registrants because if we don't we might lose a very different, and relevant perspective, maybe we don't find something useful, but the point of view is, and that's what neutral data collection is about

Mary Wong:@George, if that is the CCT global survey, that survey alone cost about 200,000 dollars

Lori Schulman:@George, do you happen to know how the pool was identified?

Cyntai King:Yes, @George, you did. At which point I noted that the study was conducted by Nielsen at significant cost.

George Kirikos:@Greg: It's already been done, see: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_news_announcement-2D2-2D2016-2D09-2D15-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIGN-H4xR2EBk&m=IxRfelQYw2MKzNfQKxJL_tWIScVL81j2Ofv281stKLE&s=nb8GkyLMaQ2nugV1NCxuev1cGe6fja0hFeQXB1rVtYg&e=

George Kirikos:"The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) today published [PDF, 2.85 MB] findings of its Phase Two Global Registrant Survey. The study, conducted by Nielsen, examines domain name registrants' perceived sense of trust, choice and experience in the current domain name landscape."

susan payne:my point is not that we shouldn't ask a registrant anything, necessarily, but why are we asking them THIS question. Read it, it's irrelevant

George Kirikos:@Mary: doesn't ICANN have roughly \$500 million in the bank?

George Kirikos:\$200K is how many days of bank interest? :-)

Michael R Graham:Agree with Susan. Both the universe and scope of the questions would be nebulous and would only enable us to identify new questions/areas of inquiry, rather than answering the question. We are trying to identify Ancillary Services and their utility I think, but asking registrants or others these questions would be far too open-ended and (as noted) expensive to be truly valuable or provide useful information -- and no metrics.

Lori Schulman:Perhaps we need to agree to certain principles and then focus on a narrow and prioritized set of

questions be developed by a subteam after we understand cost parameters?

Cyntai King:@George Enough. No matter how much money ICANN has/doesn't have, we've been given a budget

Martin:additional RPMs are VERY relevant to registrants since they can become blocks for the civil use

Lori Schulman:That is how I view subteam questions: principles but we need to be practical as to how we get objective data

Martin:or non-com

Martin:And what's the cost of NOT asking Registrants about Ancillary Services, if we DO have information!

George Kirikos:Well said, Martin.

Lori Schulman:Agree, we have to trust the work product of the sub teams or why have sub teams?

Mary Wong:Please note that staff is NOT taking a position on who, how or what should be asked. We are only noting some feasibility issues.

George Kirikos:@Lori: actually, we decided very early on in this PDP that subteams would NOT be making final decisions on anything. It's always to go through the entire membership.

Lori Schulman:BTW, registrants includes everyone including TM owners which is why I have difficulty with that term

Lori Schulman:@George, agree that plenary needs to agree but it seems that we are spending too much time on reworking

susan payne:not harsh at all Paul

Brian Cimbolic (PIR):+1 Paul

George Kirikos:LOL @ PaulM; Straw man.

Cyntia King:GNSO is already unhappy we are so far behind in our task. We will never move forward if we continue to re-litigate the work of each sub-group

Greg Shatan:The job was to inform ourselves of how the marketplace protections work, not to evaluate their efficacy, etc.

George Kirikos:No one suggested surveying 7 Billion people.

Lori Schulman:@Mary, understand about staff role. Keeping us in our lanes on the logistics not substance. Thank you.

George Kirikos:It's always a statistically significant SAMPLE.

George Kirikos:@PaulM: who, other than yourself, is suggesting surveying 7 billion people????!???

George Kirikos:(classic strawman faulty argument)

Kurt Pritz:I am NOT for changing the direction now. But a sample size of 1300 will give you a +/- 5% error on a population of billions

Michael R Graham:@George -- And entire group did agree on these questions upon the report by the subcommittees.

Paul McGrady:@George, if it is a survey to registrants or potential registrants, that would be anyone over 18 years old.

George Kirikos:@PaulM: are you serious? We do statistical sampling so that we don't have to survey everyone.

George Kirikos:That's the entire reason we sample.

susan payne:louise please explain what benefit you get from asking this Q 2

Paul McGrady:@George - imagine the cost of survey sampling in 200+ jurisdictions.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:We're getting so far away from the purpose of these questions....we want to find out how SUNRISE REGISTRATIONS were impacted.

Lori Schulman:are we surveying SGs?

George Kirikos:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Straw_man "A straw man is a common form of argument and is an informal fallacy based on giving the impression of refuting an opponent's argument, while refuting an argument that was not presented by that opponent.[1] One who engages in this fallacy is said to be "attacking a straw man".

Lori Schulman:Now I am confused.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Digging into the impact of Additional Mechanisms on registrants is WHOLLY UNRELATED to how many Sunrise Registrations were impacted.

Cyntia King:Agreed Kristine

Brian Cimboric (PIR):+1 Kristine

susan payne:totally Kristine

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:We are rapidly falling down a rabbit hole here.

Marie Pattullo:Agreed also - I'm not sure what the point of this is?

Lori Schulman:Paul was using rhetoric to make a point about scope.

Greg Shatan:What Kathy said now was not what was suggested on the call last week regarding reaching "registrants".

Lori Schulman:That is all.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:there are proposed survey questions for claims subteam that target registrants...

Kiran Malancharuvil:Obviously Paul's comments were hyperbole with a purpose of demonstrating the ridiculousness of the sample size arguments that have been made.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:It's not appropriate for THIS subteam.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:For these questions.

George Kirikos:Maybe we should survey 33 registrants, given INTA claims that is good enough. :-)

George Kirikos:(that was a joke, for the humour-impaired)

Greg Shatan:There must be a name for mischaracterizing hyperbole for rhetorical purposes.

Martin:straw man fallacy

Kurt Pritz:Isn't hyperbole already mischaracterization?

Greg Shatan:George, a lot more than 33 trademark owners were surveyed. You seem to be confusing survey size and response size.

Georges Nahitchevansky:Or maybe George K we can speculate with anecdotal evidence given some prior claims

made by others with no real evidence

Greg Shatan:@Kurt, no it is a rhetorical device. Pretending that a hyperbolic statement is a literal statement is a nice tactic for needling your opposite number.

Kathy Kleiman:There were no data gathering questions discussed in subteam

Kathy Kleiman:J. Scott, it did not

Greg Shatan:If we weren't discussing data gathering what were we discussing?

Cyntia King:My connection has been reset twice now. We must be working REALLY hard today.

Michael R Graham:+1 Kristine

Greg Shatan:Maybe we should send this back to the Subgroup.

Paul Tattersfield:greg +1

Brian Cimboric (PIR):very well said, Susan

Rebecca L Tushnet:I appreciate the clarification, J. Scott.

Greg Shatan:Some s/ in that point....

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Thanks for making that point on audio Susan!

Michael R Graham:@Kathy -- I do believe we did discuss data gathering questions in the Claims subteam. Am I right, Kristine?

Rebecca L Tushnet:I can't stay in Adobe long but I didn't want to interrupt the main discussion w/my thanks.

Cyntia King:@Susan agree on analysis of Q2

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Yes, Michael. I've said it twice in the chat....we do propose gathering data on claims.

Philip Corwin:Noting that only about 3 billion, not 7 billion, currently have Internet access

Rebecca L Tushnet:So wait, are you opposing surveying registrants/potential registrants in assessing the claims process?

David McAuley:sorry to be so late

Brian Cimboric (PIR):this exercise seems like running down a rabbit hole intentionally, simply for the fun of it. The information gathered seems to fall well outside the scope of the review of the additional marketplace RPMs

George Kirikos:<https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2016-09-15-en> "In Phase Two, Nielsen surveyed 3,349 domain name registrants aged 18+. The survey was administered in 18 languages in June 20-July 11, 2016. Participants were drawn from 24 countries across Africa, Asia, Europe, North America and South America. Domain name registrants were selected based on their having registered at least one domain name and being a decision maker in domain name registration. Significance testing was performed at a 95 percent confidence level throughout the report."

Greg Shatan:How many unique registrants are there across all gTLDs?

Cyntia King:@Rebecca - the purpose would be to survey registrants w/ questions taht pertain to them

Mary Wong:@George, I think that was the survey that cost 200,000 dollars, I think

Paul McGrady:Unique registrants AND potential registrants.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Cyntia, I agree. But the objection "there are 7 billion potential survey respondents" seems to go to whether we will survey them at all

Lori Schulman:@Georges humor noted. INTA survey 1000 participants. Nearly 100 responded. 33 completed. Feedback was that questions were complex and took too much time to prepare for and answer. We need to take lessons from this as survey was developed in close consultation with CCTRT team. We need a reality check about what we ask and how we ask it.

Lori Schulman:I meant @George K. Humor noted.

Paul McGrady:@Mary - Yikes! \$\$\$\$\$\$

George Kirikos:@Lori: The ICANN survey above had responses from 3349.

George Kirikos:INTA's survey had 33 responses. QED

John McElwaine:This is under the Section "Questions Directed to the TMCH Providers"

Cyntia King:@Rebecca Thinking 7B would blow our budget for sure.....

Greg Shatan:@Brian C., I agree with you completely.

Lori Schulman:Did we get a final number from ICANN org for survey budget?

Mary Wong:We have more work to do on the Sunrise and Claims data request, bearing in mind the Council's direction for us to maximize the value of the responses that we expect to get. Some of that work will be to refine and define exactly what we need to ask so that we can instruct the professional survey designer accordingly. This may involve being more specific in identifying the target groups of respondents.

George Kirikos:@Lori: It was asked publicly for INTA to have Nielsen provide the margin of error behind the INTA survey. No response so far.

Paul McGrady:+1 - Mission drift! We have lots to get done to get the full Phase 1 done before the launch of Round 2. We still have the URS to tackle.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:+ 1 to mission drift

Brian Cimboric (PIR):+1, Cyntia

Greg Shatan:I think that saying "you are hearing X from the Working Group" when talking about a particular viewpoint within the WG is neither accurate nor is useful.

Paul McGrady:@Greg - +1

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Mission: what is the impact on participation in ICANN RPMs?

Mary Wong:@Lori, we will need to do that work I just referenced before getting a final number. Realistically, though, I do not know where in the budget we will be able to find a substantially larger amount than what the Council approved.

Paul Tattersfield:@Greg https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_ntldstats.com_registrant&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIGN-H4xR2EBk&m=lxRfeIQYw2MKzNfQKxJL_tWIScVL81j2Ofv281stKLE&s=3ABZHOT_-Ni8x6Oin4LNfkAuKhuZ71sOqlxXijheZnk&e= might be less than 330 million Verisign have mentioned

Lori Schulman:@George: thank you for reminder about questions for Nielsen. Will follow up.

Greg Shatan:Especially when coming from a Co-Chair. (Unless I missed a hat-change.)

Georges Nahitchevansky:Agree that mission drift is becoming a major issue and impediment to our work. We need to move forward Kathy, Jay and Phil

Greg Shatan:Mission veer is probably more accurate....

Georges Nahitchevansky:I meant J Scott not Jay

Cyntia King:*** Can staff & the co-chairs create/provide a timeline our work w/ major milestones identified? I believe our group needs to have deadlines & a view of our objectives to keep from wandering off as we are.

Paul McGrady:"Hit by URS" isn't very neutral. :)

Paul McGrady:Smily face Phil.

Sara Bockey:Excellent idea @Cyntia

Brian Cimboric (PIR):Cyntia - that is a very helpful request. The voluntary marketplace RPM group does not and cannot say which RPMs are "

Mary Wong:@Cyntia, we need to figure out the extent and timeline for the data effort first. Hopefully by ICANN60 we will have a better idea.

Brian Cimboric (PIR):"proper or not" and it feels like thats where this is going

susan payne:+100 Cyntia

Brian Cimboric (PIR):we need to move on

George Kirikos:Subgroups don't decide anything, though. It doesn't matter if "the battle" took place in a subgroup.

Cyntia King:@George Respectfully, you are mistaken. Sub-groups do the work we approve/disapprove. If necessary we remand back to the sub-group.

George Kirikos:@Cyntia: no, it all goes through the "plenary".

Lori Schulman:Document was created by working group

Cyntia King:@Kathy - the changes you proposed were debated last week & again this week. Please let's move forward w/ the Staff doc.

Brian Cimboric (PIR):we're at that point J Scott, IMO

Lori Schulman:I recall voting on certain changes last week with buttons. Is that not right?

Kathy Kleiman:We did not vote last week with buttons.

Mary Wong:Staff has attempted to explain why we made the limited edits we did this week by email. We are happy to correct any mistakes we made, but we really cannot tell what the WG's directions to us are.

Brian Cimboric (PIR):we have the green agree, red disagree - this process is inexplicably long. It's like we're in the 6th unnecessary cog in a Rube Goldberg machine

Michael R Graham:Cyntia +1 -- Accept Staff doc and move forward or Redline plus vote on each change separately.

Cyntia King:If the plenary disagrees w/ teh sub-groups work they should remand back, not have unending whole-group debate over every item.

Brian Cimboric (PIR):+1 Cyntia

Greg Shatan:A number of ideas were thrown around. I don

Lori Schulman:My apologies about faulty memory re: buttons. Maybe that was another call?

Paul McGrady:Let's vote up or down on Kathy's proposal to survey "registrants". With an up or down on that, we can look at non-substantive edits through that lense.

Greg Shatan:I don't recall adopting any of them.

Terri Agnew:reminder, transcripts are posted on the GNSO Calendar:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_gnso.icann.org_en_group-2Dactivities_calendar-23sep&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=IxRfelQYw2MKzNfQKxJL_tWlScVL81j2Ofv281stKLE&s=5X4pctgbtpGWvdCH0kcwrrSv68k-KzBa9KT_KUoW1p4&e= and agenda wiki pages

Brian Cimboric (PIR):+1 Paul

Greg Shatan:+1 Paul

Lori Schulman:Paul's suggestion makes sense.

Georges Nahitchevansky:We discussed all this in the past, we voted last week and yet we keep coming back to things already discussed and voted on. Agree that we move with the staff document. Maybe have anotehr vote to bring this to a close once and for all

Cyntia King:@George - Sub-groups are supposed to be well-informed in the subject matter They discuss, advise then make recommendations based on their considered discussion.

Paul McGrady:It was approved by the subteam. Let's vote up or down on Kathy's proposal to survey "registrants". With an up or down on that, we can look at non-substantive edits through that lense.

Cyntia King:I feel your frustration, @J Scott

Brian Cimboric (PIR):Paul was chair of the subteam and his request makes perfect sense. Let's please vote up or down

Greg Shatan:Agree with Paul McG's suggestion as well.

Michael R Graham:+1 Paul -- Let us vote on proposal to also survey "registrants"

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:There are two "bubbles" on this doc. Paul's suggestion directly addresses the second bubble.

Mary Wong:As noted previously, staff suggests that some of the factual information that we believe is being sought by this question already exists via the information from the relevant ROs and the TMCH providers.

Cyntia King:+1 Paul

Mary Wong:I can clarify Rebecca's question, if appropriate.

Cyntia King:Thanks, @Mary. Very helpful.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:+1 Paul, and that goes directly to the second comment in the doc on the screen.

Georges Nahitchevansky>Please take a vote and get on with this as opposed to continuing down this unproductive

path

susan payne:exactly Phil

Greg Shatan:needle in a haystack

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:@Phil, Q5 is already included on the claims subteam recommendations....

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:*matching your trademark*

Greg Shatan:registrants don't receive notifications in the post-90 day period. Isn't this right?

Greg Shatan:By registrants I mean applicants.

Lori Schulman:Just want to point out that the numbering is out of whack if someone hasn't already. Questions should be numbered in order. We seem to be missing a "2". That appears to be a typo not a true omission of question.

Kathy Kleiman:+1 Lori

Mary Wong:@Greg, I may be wrong, but I think that is correct if you mean the extended service offered by Deloitte (which is the only Ancillary Service approved by ICANN so far).

Lori Schulman:I don't think we caught that last week. That's not substance just clarity.

Griffin Barnett:All of the questions here are already categorized by whom they are directed to...

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:+1 Griffin

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Q2 is on the last page, Lori. :)

Lori Schulman:oops...

Lori Schulman:Oh, I see. The grouping by staff including old numbering.

Paul McGrady:Needle in the haystack designed to make up for the fact that registrars did not collect this data while these things were occurring. This will add cost and burn time we don't have.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I suspect when staff sorted them, staff wanted to ensure that we understand all of our questions were included.

Lori Schulman:Got it.

Lori Schulman:So all text is here. Nothing is missing. Thanks for clarifying.

susan payne:why does it actually matter if blocked by a sunrise registration or a "block"

Mary Wong:@Lori, @Kristine, that is correct - we kept the Sub Team's numbering so that it is clear that nothing was omitted and no text was altered for the questions by staff.

susan payne:the "blocks" are no different to there being a prior registration. FCFS

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:a RO could have a claims notice to the applicant be for as long they want.

Paul McGrady:@Griffin - correct. The Staff labeling them was just for clarification. The questions themselves make it clear who they were meant for. That is why the "let's survey potential registrants" is so completely out of the blue.

Philip Corwin:Adding, BTW, I will be happy to share the post-90 day URS and DPML blocking questions with ICA

members to see if that subgroup of professional domain investors/registrants believes it can provide any useful data on those questions.

Griffin Barnett:right Susan - except within the first 90 days of claims, there doesn't seem to be any way a prospective registrant could distinguish a situation where they could not obtain a registration because it was subject to a DPML/block, a Sunrise registration, or any other kind of prior registration

Paul Tattersfield:You could just the question on a domain forum, though it would be a subset of a certain type of registrant

Kathy Kleiman:@Phil is your question preempted by the vote taking place?

Philip Corwin:@Paul T - agreed/and it is a subset that might have a more sophisticated and knowledgeable response than a general registrant

Jay Chapman:Agree, Phil

Philip Corwin:I checked green but it is only for the two narrow questions I just discussed, not all the questions

Cynthia King:Specific to the TMCH,/sunrise questions on-screen

Mary Wong:I think there are about 21 crosses and 7 checks

Philip Corwin:Most of the questions are factual or otherwise so narrow that registrants would not have relevant data

Mary Wong:Apologies, 25 crosses

David McAuley:you must have cross-checked Mary

Paul Tattersfield:(Yes - along Phil's lines too)

Mary Wong:25 crosses, 9 checks (counting Claudio and Rebecca)

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Exactly Rebecca....we're ALREADY asking. It's not in scope for THIS sub team.

Griffin Barnett:+1 Kristine

Paul McGrady:+1 Kristine

George Kirikos:26% believe there should be.

susan payne:@Rebecca, and as you rightly point out, the registrant almost certainly doesn't know the cause of the block, so they can't inform this discussion

Kiran Malancharuvil:+1 Kristine

George Kirikos:What's the level for "divergence" vs. "consensus"?

Michael R Graham:25 votes Disagree -- 9 Agree

Greg Shatan:I think Rebecca's point shows that we'll get useful information related to this in another way.

Michael R Graham:With Kristine -- I would agree to serve

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I agree to serve

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:serve

susan payne:happy to volunteer

Lori Schulman:Ok. I am a glutton for punishment.

Kurt Pritz:I can work on this

Griffin Barnett:Exactly Greg - I don't think we are foreclosing asking "registrants" certain questions, just not in connection with the questions relating to voluntary RPMs that are reflected in this particular doc

Mary Wong:Will do, J Scott

Lori Schulman:+1 Griffin. That is exactly how I see it.

Mary Wong:We have Susan and Kurt joining Lori, Kristine and Michael G

Lori Schulman:I have no problems asking whomever we define as registrants relevant questions

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Well, it's a small list, I guess.

Martin Silva Valent:voluntary RPMs are dangerous for noncom users and small business, they are usually the one that suffer the abuse of these obscure mechanisms

Kurt Pritz:Kurt does volunteer

Kiran Malancharuvil:I can help where I can

Mary Wong:Done

Philip Corwin:Co-Chairs are Ex Officio members of all subteams, so we receive constant punishment ;-)

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:@Martin, we aren't reviewing "voluntary mechanisms" that's outside the scope - that the key issue

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:We're reviewing ICANN mechanisms and getting relevant data about the voluntary ones.

Martin Silva Valent:We could discuss if ICANN should work to regulate them

Martin Silva Valent:because they are contracted parties

Lori Schulman:I think we all agree that ICANN is not a regulator.

Greg Shatan:@George: Divergence is where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Maybe, but that's outside the scope of this PDP

susan payne:@Martin out of scope for this PDP.

Martin Silva Valent:if a voluntary action goes against the policy we do here, it frustrates our policy, then we should enforce them by contract tools

George Kirikos:Bye folks.

Martin Silva Valent:no ALL voluntary actions of registrar are out of scope

Martin Silva Valent:any how

Brian Cimboric (PIR):martin that's a question for ICANN Compliance

Greg Shatan:yes ALL are out of scope.

Brian Cimboric (PIR):this PDP is not a contract enforcement body

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:+1 Brian

Paul Tattersfield:thanks all, bye

Terri Agnew:next call: Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group is

scheduled for Wednesday, 11 October 2017 at 17:00 UTC for 90 minute duration.

Kiran Malancharuvil:Thanks J. Scott!

Colin O'Brien:bye all

Philip Corwin:Bye all

Griffin Barnett:thank you J. Scott, all....until next time...

Martin Silva Valent:let's pick it up :-P

Louise Marie Hurel:thanks all, bye

Steve Levy:Thanks all

Martin Silva Valent:bya all

susan payne:thanks all.

David McAuley:Thanks J. Scoot and all, good bye

Lori Schulman:ciao

Lori Schulman:ciao