

### **Adobe Connect: 43 Members**

Brian Beckham - WIPO

Brian J Winterfeldt

Claudio DiGangi

Colin O'Brien

Cyntia King

David McAuley

Diana Arredondo

Elisa Cooper

Elizabeth Featherman

Gary Saposnik

George Kirikos

Georges Nahitchevansky

Gerald M. Levine

Greg Shatan

Griffin Barnett

Heather Forrest

Ivett Paulovics

J. Scott Evans

Jeff Neuman

John McElwaine

Jon Nevett

Justine Chew

Kathy Kleiman

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services

Lillian Fosteris

Marie Pattullo

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)

Michael Karanicolas

Michael R Graham

Monica Mitchell

Paul Keating

Paul Tattersfield

Petter Rindforth

Phil Marano

Philip Corwin

Rebecca L Tushnet

Renee Fossen (Forum)

Sara Bockey

Steve Levy

Susan Payne

Thomas Brackey

Zak Muscovitch

Zhou Heng

**On audio only:** none

**Apologies:** Jonathan Agmon, David Maher

### **Staff:**

Mary Wong

Julie Hedlund

Antonietta Mangiacotti

Ariel Liang

Berry Cobb

Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Wednesday, 20 December 2017 at 18:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Terri Agnew: agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_qwxyB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=ab8Pe-hNwfnLoLbfhok9r8HooEnbc7zJuKbQvKM3IX4&s=9YTrAAo97f1Nyvo2hOZXRn-cnPxWir8w8f7I8hwalRo&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_qwxyB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=ab8Pe-hNwfnLoLbfhok9r8HooEnbc7zJuKbQvKM3IX4&s=9YTrAAo97f1Nyvo2hOZXRn-cnPxWir8w8f7I8hwalRo&e=)

George Kirikos: Hi folks.

George Kirikos:Perhaps green is a better font this week, for the holidays.

Paul Tattersfield:Hi everyone

George Kirikos>Welcome, Paul.

George Kirikos:Audio cut out there for a sec?

Paul Tattersfield:Thanks George

Zhou Heng:hi, George

George Kirikos>Welcome, Zhou.

J. Scott Evans:A littel red to compliment George's green.

George Kirikos:That's the spirit, J. Scott. :-)

David McAuley:very nice holiday colors

Terri Agnew:everyone can scroll themselves

claudio:icann in the red :)

Heather Forrest:Hi everyone, warm wishes from summer in Australia

George Kirikos>Welcome Heather.

J. Scott Evans:Yes. This is a staff document designed to capture and synthesize our discussion from 11/30.

J. Scott Evans:It was circulated by Staff.

Terri Agnew:@George, I see you are on the telephone for audio. Let us know if audio continues to cut out for you.

George Kirikos:So, the substance is entirely the same, just the form has been modified?

George Kirikos:@Terri: it's been stable since that one hiccup.

Terri Agnew:good to hear, thanks George

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

claudio:"In light of experience, should the original purpose be maintained or modified" - that's the only other high level question I can think of.  
Not sure if we want to go down that road, just mentioning it for consideration.

George Kirikos:Are all the questions in the document? I couldn't find the issue I raised re: cause of action (e.g. the Yoyo.email stuff) in the UK courts, i.e. underlying assumption of de novo review availability. Or is this just the initial charter questions, and not the newer ones that were added?

Heather Forrest:Only comment from me Phil is that my intention in the suggestion was to get us to a more concise form of question to prevent getting bogged down in disagreement on slightly varied versions of these questions

J. Scott Evans:@Claudio. I would suspect that if the answer to Q2 is "no", then we would make recommendation of how to modify the point to correct any defects.

J. Scott Evans:I heard Heather

George Kirikos:Thanks Mary. So, up to October something?

George Kirikos:(my post was Nov 19 -- <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-November/002585.html> )

Mary Wong:@George, yes, sorry I can't remember the exact date but I believe it was up to the time of the ICANN meeting.

J. Scott Evans:I think we'd have to have consensus to add any questions to the list. Am I mistaken on this point?

Mary Wong:@J Scott, that was what staff thought might be more prudent.

J. Scott Evans:Audio issues.

David McAuley:lost audio

George Kirikos:Did she get cut off?

J. Scott Evans:Susan. We have lost you.

Terri Agnew:@Susan, I see you are still connected on telephone. Let us know if the op should dial out to get a better connection

George Kirikos:Maybe she can type the rest of her question,if she's still on Adobe Connect.

Susan Payne:sorry - useless phone system. dialling back in

George Kirikos:+1 Rebecca

George Kirikos:Seems we have some cross-talk.

Terri Agnew:getting cross talk, please remember to mute when not speaking

J. Scott Evans:yes. Please mute your lines.

George Kirikos:\*6 to mute/unmute

Greg Shatan:Please mute if you are chortling in the background.

Terri Agnew:We are trying to find the line

Griffin Barnett:I tend to take the opposite view - seems like these questions relate to a holistic consideration of all the RPMs taken together....something we would only want to think about once we have completed individual review/evaluation of the RPM-specific questions

Griffin Barnett:just my 2 cents

Susan Payne:im back on call

Heather Forrest:+1 Griffin

Griffin Barnett:That said, I see how we might apply them to individual RPMs...still thinking through what might be the best approach

Mary Wong:The Charter is divided into overarching, specific (to each RPM), and more general questions - again, unedited from all the community feedback received to date. Staff included these general questions for completeness - so it is up to the WG to decide how they wish to deal with these overarching and general questions.

Rebecca L Tushnet:These are "overarching" with respect to the URS.

Brian Beckham - WIPO:Agree with Susan here - we want to be clear on our path forward (i.e., that we will NOT come back to the charter questions if we move to this new approach).

Mary Wong:For all the overarching and general questions, the WG can also consider asking them of ALL the Phase One RPMs at the appropriate time, perhaps after concluding each specific review.

Heather Forrest:Quite rght J Scott- the intention is to avoid those previous articulations, which were unnecessarily complicated and were subjective in nature

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):we still have no mentioning of moving legal requirements from URS Tech requirements to URS Rules (reason: there were multiple cases of ICANN Complianace vs. Registries caused by confusion : nobody looks into Tech docs for Legal requirements, including Compliantants)

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Agree with J. Scott. These are the conclusions we need to draw, not the objective data gathering questions.

Zhou Heng:@Maxim, would you specify your point~pardon if I don't get it

Mary Wong:@Maxim, as staff has explained, we noted your suggestion but, like George's, have not added them yet to this list pending WG decision on the approach.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Mary, is it going to be done in the future?

George Kirikos:Time pressures have existed from the beginning. I've been waiting on the top 500 terms from The Analysis Group report since March 2017.....

Heather Forrest:Exsctly my thinking J Scott

Susan Payne:correct J Scott

Mary Wong:Correct, J Scott. They are all unedited text from previous community feedback. The GNSO Council did not review them.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Zhou, for example , only one extension of registration period for Complainant, who won is hidden there

Griffin Barnett:+1 J. Scott

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and only 1 year

George Kirikos:I'm even contemplating a DIDP request, as a last resort, to get the data.

Zhou Heng:@ Maxim thanks, I will check it

George Kirikos:We know similar chilling effects exist in the DMCA.

Greg Shatan:Kathy, are you speaking in your personal capacity or as Chair? I may have missed you clarifying that.

J. Scott Evans:I disagree. If the charter questions are "sacred" we then cannot amend them or add to them.

Steve Levy:Sorry for joining late!

Heather Forrest:The wording doesn't assume that a mechanism had only one intended purpose

claudio:@julie/mary, for inclusion on our list of questions, here is a question that I sent to the list after ICANN60 on tuesday, Dec 5: (1) to what extent does the URS permit renewal and/or continued use of a previously suspended domain, and 2) to what extent is renewal and/or continued use of a previously suspended domain consistent with the intended purpose of the URS; and 3) to the extent it is inconsistent, whether any policy recommendations should be implemented to address the inconsistency

J. Scott Evans:I think we have the freedom to think outside the box so that we can approach these issues in a timely manner.

Greg Shatan:Objective would mean not slanted, leading, loaded, biased phrasing's of the question.

Julie Hedlund:@Claudio: Staff has captured your question in the notes.

Mary Wong:If it helps, the Charter is explicit that the community questions are to be a starting point for the WG.

claudio:@julie, thxs!

Michael Karanicolas:I agree with Kathy and with Rebecca. It think it's important to keep a consideration of freedom of expression as part of that.

J. Scott Evans:@Greg. Correct. I believe we worked hard on that wrt the TMCH,

Paul Tattersfield:Greg +1

George Kirikos:I don't disagree with the approach, as long as it's preserving all the substance in the questions/issues that have been raised in the charter (and in subsequent posts on the list).

George Kirikos:If topics are "lost" because they don't fit the approach, then the approach is limiting us.

Susan Payne:Honestly I wish we had taken this proposed approach for the work on TMCH, Sunrise, Claims, etc. I think it would have allowed us to get out of the weeds of the precise wording of individual charter Qs, which we spent months arguing over, without ignoring the issues and concerns raised in them when beginning our substantive work

Mary Wong:Correct, J Scott. And then, if there are gaps (i.e. topics that should be on the list but aren't) it is up to the WG to agree to add them. Just as if some of the topics are agreed to be superfluous, they can be dropped. This is consistent with what the Council approved in the Charter.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:+1 J Scott, that was my understanding

Michael R Graham:+1 to J Scott's understanding

Mary Wong:Perhaps the due process suggestion can be added to the "Abuse of Process" topic, where staff has added an "other documented abuses" bullet point; or it can be added as a separate suggested topic to the draft list?

Rebecca L Tushnet:My issue is that I could join a consensus if and only if the "additional reference questions" were accepted as high-level questions or overarching questions that the bolded five questions were being used to help answer.

Michael Karanicolas:How are considerations like "due process" creating bias? It's a fundamental consideration. I would say that editing that out as a consideration would be introducing bias, insofar as it would be guiding the conversation away from areas intended as factors at the outset.

Rebecca L Tushnet:I could not join a consensus that we should go forward with these (or even edited) as the "high level questions"

Kathy Kleiman:@Mary: due Process is an overarching question. It applies to everything.

Mary Wong:@Michael, I believe the concern was not that due process is NOT an appropriate topic to be added (it may indeed be), but the specific text of the Charter question.

Jeff Neuman:In the real world, there is no discussion of a major overhaul of the judicial system. It is studying whether the existing system has evidence based problems and then seeks to address those problems. I see us being able to do that here under this new approach. I fear that the approach that Kathy may be looking to is more of a starting from scratch lets dissect everything

Mary Wong:@Kathy, yes, which is why these questions are overarching/general - and the staff suggestion is to consider them ALL for ALL the RPMs once the specific review of each RPM is done.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Jeff, that's what the proposal looks like to me! A sort of free-floating inquiry into "how is each part working and should it be changed?"

Rebecca L Tushnet:Kathy's point as I understand it is that the Charter questions point us to what might or might not be working/deserve attention.

Jeff Neuman:We got to the URS through a series of compromises, studies, etc. We cannot forget what went into the development of these new RPMs. We can only look forward to see whether there were issues that are now evident from the compromises we struck

Heather Forrest:+1 Jeff= that

Heather Forrest:that's precisely what I understood our "review of all RPMs" to be

David McAuley:Thanks Phil - think that is important consideration that we need to understand and address

J. Scott Evans:Query if these 5 "overarching question to all RPMS" shouldn't be asked at the end of phase 1 wrt ALL the RPMs we have considered

Griffin Barnett:that was sorta my suggestion J. Scott

Mary Wong:@J Scott, that was the staff suggestion as well. But of course it is for the WG to decide.

George Kirikos:When one does a budget review, some believe in zero-based budgeting, others just want to tweak the status quo.

George Kirikos:(I'm more in the zero-based budgeting camp)

Rebecca L Tushnet:J. Scott, sure, but we should also keep them in mind as we proceed rather than only coming back to them (when we might not have asked the right questions to answer them) when we're done.

J. Scott Evans:@Rebecca. Then they would be considered and answered wrt to the URS after we have worked through the consideration of the URS

Jeff Neuman:ok, wo where are we now?

Rebecca L Tushnet:Right, so we should put them front and center so we know what's guiding our inquiry. I'm not saying they need to be answered before we proceed, I'm saying they need to be presented as the core questions we are trying to answer with our more detailed inquiries.

Jeff Neuman:@george - this is not a case where starting at zero is appropriate

Jeff Neuman:starting at point zero would mean starting at the initial question of "What is a domain name?" "What can a domain name be used for"? "Should the registration of a domain name require proof of identity"? etc. Obviously we cant start there.....

Jeff Neuman:so we have to start in the real world, where real compromises were made, where actors have been shown to squat without regulation, etc.

paul Keating:Hello. Sorry I am late

George Kirikos:@Jeff: it's a spectrum, obviously I didn't mean zero literally.

George Kirikos:Welcome Paul.

Jeff Neuman:@George - no, you mean zero as you define it

Jeff Neuman:which is not zero at all

Mary Wong:Questions 1-4 were suggested on the 30 Nov call to align with the approach taken for TM Claims (especially); and in the context of the Charter questions concerning response periods. The fifth was suggested as aspecific question for that Charter topic

Jeff Neuman:My point is that we need to recognize the compromises in the past, the 25+ years of history of domain name availability, etc.

George Kirikos:@Jeff: we shouldn't accept bad compromises, that were done by people in a rush to launch new gTLDs. We can look at things now in a more thorough manner than those who created the policies.

Heather Forrest:We are reviewing existing policy, so I believe it is entirely appropriate that we ask whether the existing policy is working as agreed/intended.

Jeff Neuman:@George - your assume that the compromises were bad and that they were rushed

Susan Payne:could you please state clearly what "this approach" is because I now have absolutely no idea what you're proposing

Mary Wong:@Susan, I believe it is still the same - go with a list of agreed topics, and for each topic ask an agreed set of high-level questions.

Jeff Neuman:@George, I would hardly state that the process of coming up with RPMs was rushed. It started in 2009 and ended in 2013 I think

Susan Payne:@Mary, I'd like to believe that but I don't have any confidence that it is

Heather Forrest:We are reviewing existing policy, so I believe it is necessary and appropriate to ask if the existing policy is working as intended/agreed

Kathy Kleiman:good point - a new section of the table.

George Kirikos:@Heather: one has to be careful that folks don't redefine what was "intended", or "agreed", though. e.g. the Yoyo.email stuff, cause of action. TM folks can't start to say "well, we intended that domain name registrants not have any avenue to appeal URS/UDRP in court", etc.

George Kirikos:i.e. "that's not a bug --- that's a feature"

Jeff Neuman:@George - we cant control how an external court views a URS or UDRP decision.....

Jeff Neuman:We can only work with what we can control

George Kirikos:@Jeff: but, we can control the URS/UDRP process, so that if the intended appeal right which was assumed to exist doesn't happen, then the process needs to change.

Mary Wong:@Kristine, that is the staff understanding as well.

Jeff Neuman:@George - which then again could be ignored by a court or not

George Kirikos:Because, the 'grand bargain' behind many of these policies was that they didn't interfere with underlying legal rights. But, it's turning out that isn't always true.

David McAuley:that's what I thought as well

Terri Agnew:find the back ground chatter

Jeff Neuman:@George - According to whom? THAT is your subjective determination of what the "grand bargain" was/

J. Scott Evans:@George. I was involved in creation of the both the Addtional RPMs and the UDRP. It is virtually impossible to create a system that takes into account of every nuance in every fora.

J. Scott Evans:It just can't be one. So, you hit the high points and have to move on.

J. Scott Evans:\*done\*

George Kirikos:Disagree, especially if one is located outside the USA. Tell the Chinese registrant/TM holder why everything is in English for the URS. Was that "ht the high points" and "move on" Done?

George Kirikos:Metinks not.

David McAuley:I also see them useful, "as applicabl;e" maybe we should state

Michael Karanicolas:Echoing Phil and others - I think that the part II table needs to be kept as part of our basis for going forward. Scrapping that would be very problematic in my opinion.

Mary Wong:@Michael, the Part 2 table was explicitly stated as accompanying the list of topics, so it will continue to serve as a reference point and check.

Heather Forrest:I believe that the gap that Phil is highlighting can be filled by adding another nuanced high-level question

J. Scott Evans:@ WG. No one is suggesting we "scrap" part 2. What we are suggesting is that we ask the high-level questions against all issues and then use the information to answer the questions in the Part 2.

Mary Wong:@Heather, that's also why staff are keeping notes on the two separate strands (types) of questions - those that flesh out the high-level questions to be asked of all topics, and those that are specific suggestions to be added to the Charter questions themselves.

Kathy Kleiman:Kristine's high-level question is the one that guided our work throughout earlier Phase 1: "Is it working, or not? If not, why not?" That's our job as a Review WG

George Kirikos:We have 2+ weeks until the next call, so lots of opportunity to discuss on the list.

Susan Payne:@JSE provided that when we do so we are answering, for example NOT "Should the Response Fee applicable to complainants listing 15 or more disputed domain names by the same registrant be eliminated?", BUT "should we change the fees"

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:+1 to Susan. I support this approach and want to make sure we do eventually answer neutral questions.

J. Scott Evans:@Susan. If answer the high-level questions, we could answer the specific question with the information we gathered. I think.

J. Scott Evans:The high-level is "should we change the fees", the information conclusion we come to would then answer the specific question.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Could you quickly summarize your first question again?

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, it's been captured in the notes on the right side. "Is the separation of questions into topics useful?"

Jeff Neuman:Thans JScott. Questions need to be stated succinctly to get feedback from us

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:@JSE: what if the conclusion was, we should raise the fees for 15+ DN responses? Would that be appended or would there be a new line in Part 2?

Susan Payne:@JSE, indeed, but the question then isn't just should we scrap the response fee for more than 15 names, but should we keep it, should it apply for fewer than 15 names, etc etc

Heather Forrest:J Scott's articulation of the current question is less confusing (sorry Phil - I feel like your 2 questions are potentially interpreted as conflicting each other)

David McAuley:maybe question adaptation rather than modification

Jeff Neuman:ok.....i am now officially lost and gone

J. Scott Evans:@Kathy. You are TOTALLY mistating the proposal.

J. Scott Evans:The proposal is to use the Charter questions to define the list of Topics, ask a set of stanard objective questions against those topice and the answer the question.

George Kirikos:+1 Rebecca

Griffin Barnett:No one is suggesting putting aside the overall high-level questions



Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I differentiate between "core questions" and "conclusory questions" - the charter questions are crap. We need to get at the core. IMO.

Susan Payne:+1000 Kristine

George Kirikos:I agree with Kristine that they're a jumble that can benefit from organization.

Michael R Graham:+1 Kristine and J Scott

Mary Wong:@Griffin, that's the staff understanding too, and is why staff made sure to include those overarching/general questions in Part One as well as Part Two.

J. Scott Evans:@Phil. That is NOT what we are asking. The question to the group is: Do you want to move forward with this approach?

Jeff Neuman:It sounds like we all agree with J Scott on the methodology....the big objectors are two of the co-chairs

J. Scott Evans:If the answer is yes, then we can consider the details into which questions and what wording we should use.

Jeff Neuman:Which is a little mind boggling

Kathy Kleiman:JSE: "this approach" is now defined many different ways.

Michael R Graham:@Jeff -- And I do not understand what they are objecting to

J. Scott Evans:@Kathy. I have used the same definition three separate time in the call. I have been clear. I am not sure where you keep getting a different understanding of what is being expressed here.

Mary Wong:Can we separate the question of whether the WG agrees with the approach summarized by J Scott (agree on a list of topics based on the Charter questions, and ask the same high level questions for each topic) with the question whether the topics are complete/accurate, and whether the current list of high-level questions is the correct/final list?

David McAuley:Thanks Mary, well asked

Cyntia King:@Mary - Yes

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Yes

Griffin Barnett:Well said Susan

Michael R Graham:@Mary -- Yes

Steve Levy:Jumping to audio only...

J. Scott Evans:@Mary. Correct.

Griffin Barnett:agree Mary

J. Scott Evans:That is what I tried to say earlier. Thanks for clarifying.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Jeff: I guess I'm a small objector?

David McAuley:I like the approach and think Phil makes a decent point that in actual application w may need to enhance the five questions - either by adaptation or even addition as circumstances make clear

J. Scott Evans:After the approach is approved, we should the dive into thsi proposal and make sure we have consensus around the questions and topics in part 1

Cyntia King:Thanks for clarifying Phil

Cyntia King:+1 - J Scott

George Kirikos:I'd propose changing the layout of the chat to 11" wide by 8.5" (landscape) instead of "portrait".....very thin columns make it a hard document to read.

George Kirikos:\*chat=chart

J. Scott Evans:First question.

Susan Payne:@Rebecca, but do you object, if the approach is as I expressed my understanding of it. we are not ditching the charter Qs we are just recognising they are non--neutral

George Kirikos:Actually, I guess it already is that format, hmmm.

Cynthia King:Thanx George. I also find this format less than optimal

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:What are we voting on again

Rebecca L Tushnet:I am agnostic about the approach; it all depends on implementation

George Kirikos:+1 Rebecca

George Kirikos:Form vs substance

John McElwaine:Provided that they are objective?

Rebecca L Tushnet:I have a question

Rebecca L Tushnet:About what you are asking

Mary Wong:By "questions", Phil means the high-level questions, not the Charter questions, I believe.

Heather Forrest:Agree provided we don't simply descend into argument for months about what the high-level questions should be

Michael R Graham:@Heather -- +1

Cynthia King:+1 - Heather

J. Scott Evans:@Mary. Correct.

David McAuley:I agree as well with Mary's observation

J. Scott Evans:@WG. These are suggested.

J. Scott Evans:The question is are these questions appropriate? Do they need to be altered? Do other questions need to be asked?

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, yes

Georges Nahitchevansky:I agree, We have to avoid spending 6 months arguing about the high-level questions. The flexibility we built into the high level question issues should hopefully help us move forward

David McAuley:agree with Phil's answer

Jeff Neuman:@J scott - I think the problem is that Phil's answers were confusing

George Kirikos:It'll need to be iterative, i.e. once we see all the topics, the 5 questions might change.

Georges Nahitchevansky:If we are going to review the questions and modify them, can we set a date certain for folks to put in their suggestions and then have a date where we take all those suggestions and finalize the questions once and for all -- so we can get on with the review

Cynthia King:So, we've simply agreed to come up w/ a few high-level questions

George Kirikos:i.e. can all topics fit into a matrix, where the columns are the standardized questions, and the rows are topics.

Susan Payne:Crystal (as you were before)

George Kirikos:topics/issues.

Mary Wong:@J Scott, that was exactly right.

David McAuley:I agree with J. Scott's summary and Phil's use of the term 'starting point'

Cyntia King:We will now develop teh high-level questions w/ those in Paragraph 2 as a starting point for deliberation

Mary Wong:@George, we can do so.

J. Scott Evans:@Cynita. yes ma'am

George Kirikos:Bye folks. Happy holidays and best wishes for the New Year.

Cyntia King:Whew! Not so complicated.

Mary Wong:Will do, Phil.

Greg Shatan:I thought we were not drafting answers to the t

Greg Shatan:charter questions under this approach, butis on

David McAuley:yes, happy holidays and good bye all. Thanks Phil, J. Scott, Kathy, staff and all

Greg Shatan:but only using them for reference.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Have good holidays

Cyntia King:Happy Holidays to All!!!

J. Scott Evans:happy holidays to all. Speak you all again in 2018.

George Kirikos:[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_community.icann.org\\_display\\_RARPMRIAGPWG\\_2018-2D01-2D03-2BReview-2Bof-2Ball-2BRights-2BProtection-2BMechanisms-2B-2528RPMs-2529-2Bin-2Ball-2BgTLDs-2BPDP-2BWG&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Align-H4xR2EBk&m=ab8Pe-hNwfNLoLbfhok9r8HooEnbc7zJuKbQvKM3IX4&s=i6TRYOUsAtoQ\\_d5iJdNQUuVqAnzq\\_c7\\_fY9S-Vave0U&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_display_RARPMRIAGPWG_2018-2D01-2D03-2BReview-2Bof-2Ball-2BRights-2BProtection-2BMechanisms-2B-2528RPMs-2529-2Bin-2Ball-2BgTLDs-2BPDP-2BWG&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Align-H4xR2EBk&m=ab8Pe-hNwfNLoLbfhok9r8HooEnbc7zJuKbQvKM3IX4&s=i6TRYOUsAtoQ_d5iJdNQUuVqAnzq_c7_fY9S-Vave0U&e=) January 3rd.

Terri Agnew:Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group is scheduled for Wednesday, 03 January 2018 at 18:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Griffin Barnett:happy holidays all....looking forward to moving ahead in 2018

Paul Tattersfield:Bye everyone happy holidays

Kathy Kleiman:Happy Holidays, All!

Zhou Heng:happy holiday!