

**Attendance - 42 Members**

Brian Beckham	Louise Marie Hurel
Claudio DiGangi	Marie Pattullo
Collin Kurre	Martin Silva Valent
Cyntia King	Maxim Alzoba
David McAuley	Michael Karanicolas
Diana Arredondo	Michael R Graham
Farzaneh Badii	Paul McGrady
Gary Saposnik	Petter Rindforth
George Kirikos	Philip S. Corwin
Georges Nahitchevansky	Rebecca Tushnet
Gerald M. Levine	Renee Fossen
Greg Shatan	Roger Carney
Jay Chapman	Salvador Camacho Hernandez
Jeff Neuman	Sara Bockey
John McElwaine	Sean Martin McDonald
Jon Nevett	Steven M. Levy
Justine Chew	Susan Payne
Kathy Kleiman	Thomas Brackey
Khouloud Dawahi	Zak Muscovitch
Kristine Dorrain	Zhou Heng
Lillian Fosteris	

**Audio Only:** Scott R. Austin

**Apologies:** Colin O'Brien

**Staff:** Antonietta Mangiacotti, Mary Wong, Ariel Liang, Julie hedlund, Berry Cobb, Julie Bisland

**Webex Chat:**

May 2, 2018	11:47:24 AM	from George Kirikos to all participants:	Hi folks.
May 2, 2018	11:48:13 AM	from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants:	Hello George! Good day to you :)
May 2, 2018	11:48:30 AM	from George Kirikos to all participants:	Hi Nathalie.
May 2, 2018	11:48:42 AM	from George Kirikos to all participants:	Is it just me, or is there some buzzing on the audio?

May 2, 2018 11:50:53 AM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: I thought it was coming from feedback from your line, George, but maybe we should test it, do you want to test audio again, or do you think it's gone now?

May 2, 2018 11:51:58 AM from George Kirikos to all participants: It seems ok now.

May 2, 2018 11:52:55 AM from George Kirikos to all participants: Were we going to switch back to Adobe Connect at some point?

May 2, 2018 11:54:37 AM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: it does sound very promising! It's now more a question of when, I believe!

May 2, 2018 11:55:40 AM from George Kirikos to all participants: Great.

May 2, 2018 11:59:07 AM from zhou heng to all participants: hi all

May 2, 2018 12:00:18 PM from zhou heng to all participants: It's there anyone who know how to raise hand with iOS webex app?

May 2, 2018 12:00:32 PM from David McAuley to all participants: ah, the dreaded webex platform, nostalgic for adobe

May 2, 2018 12:01:08 PM from David McAuley to all participants: there is a small hand icon on lower part of participants pane

May 2, 2018 12:01:21 PM from Renee Fossen to all participants: I saw the timeline...

May 2, 2018 12:01:42 PM from zhou heng to all participants: I mean mobile phone webex app

May 2, 2018 12:02:28 PM from zhou heng to all participants: Thanks anyway

May 2, 2018 12:03:26 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: hello all

May 2, 2018 12:03:56 PM from Louise Marie Hurel to all participants: Hi all

May 2, 2018 12:05:43 PM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: Julie H and Brian B you are both panelists

May 2, 2018 12:05:58 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: Hi all

May 2, 2018 12:06:12 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: I am not seeing any agenda on screen. Just white.

May 2, 2018 12:06:26 PM from David McAuley to all participants: i see agenda

May 2, 2018 12:06:34 PM from David McAuley to all participants: i miss adobe

May 2, 2018 12:06:45 PM from Louise Marie Hurel to all participants: Same as Greg here

May 2, 2018 12:06:50 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: I see the agenda

May 2, 2018 12:07:01 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Hand

May 2, 2018 12:07:02 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Try clicking "Event Info" and then "slide RPM 2May18".

May 2, 2018 12:07:10 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: (that might force it to refresh)

May 2, 2018 12:07:12 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @Phil, all - for the Providers questions, the aim is to send them out to all three providers by Friday at the latest.

May 2, 2018 12:08:20 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: 30-45 days, but some will take longer, yes

May 2, 2018 12:09:46 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: I am on tablet. Maybe that's the problem (though it shouldn't be).

May 2, 2018 12:10:59 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: The Summary Report has now magically appeared on my screen.

May 2, 2018 12:12:24 PM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: glad it synced up, Greg, someone else had the same issue.

May 2, 2018 12:13:36 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: Brian is discussing the two sub points (1) & (2) now on screen under the bullet point starting "Two suggestions ... "

May 2, 2018 12:13:38 PM from Louise Marie Hurel to all participants: All set here, the doc finally appeared on screen

May 2, 2018 12:14:00 PM from David McAuley to all participants: yes, Berry quite helpful to the team

May 2, 2018 12:14:50 PM from David McAuley to all participants: I was on subteam, have nothing to add to Brian's good update

May 2, 2018 12:18:00 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: For Rebecca, is it intended that her research will be published in a peer-reviewed academic journal at some point?

May 2, 2018 12:18:13 PM from David McAuley to all participants: Agree with Phil and Rebecca - a guide for examiners sounds like an idea of merit -a brief one, to the point

May 2, 2018 12:18:13 PM from Brian Beckham to all participants: @Rebecca, as to the subteam synopsis I apologize if you feel the summary that "things were working as intended" nwas inaccurate, but this actually appears twice in the subteam report, and was discussed on a few calls and on the email list - but would be happy to hear your additional overview

May 2, 2018 12:18:45 PM from Susan Payne to all participants: yes english is the primary language for yoyo

May 2, 2018 12:18:48 PM from Berry Cobb to all participants: The bottom of page 2 contains the summary of findings.

May 2, 2018 12:20:07 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: Tx Brian!

May 2, 2018 12:20:37 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: FYI, there is no hand icon in the tablet version of WebEx.

May 2, 2018 12:21:06 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: There have been UDRP proceedings and court cases involving yoyo.email as well.

May 2, 2018 12:21:37 PM from Susan Payne to all participants: my recollection is that the yoyo respondent has a uk address

May 2, 2018 12:21:51 PM from Sean McDonald to all participants: Is it possible that to include a greater diversity (or volume of cases) in the sample size? It seems like this isn't a large enough group or diversity of cases to draw meaningful conclusions about the process?

May 2, 2018 12:22:03 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: Giovanni Laporta is his name

May 2, 2018 12:22:13 PM from David McAuley to all participants: hard to hear Berry

May 2, 2018 12:22:16 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @Sean, there were only 14 appeals

May 2, 2018 12:22:27 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: @Sean: I believe this is the entire universe of cases, not a "sample".

May 2, 2018 12:23:35 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: Berry and I went through all 14 appeals, and Berry's spreadsheet has all the data entered and organized.

May 2, 2018 12:24:26 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: I think we should use more cases, we have them!

May 2, 2018 12:24:56 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @Martin, do you have specific suggestions as to what cases (other than the 14 appeals)?

May 2, 2018 12:24:58 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Who is speaking?

May 2, 2018 12:25:07 PM from Susan Payne to all participants: brian beckham

May 2, 2018 12:25:12 PM from Sean McDonald to all participants: @George - understood - wondering if Harvard's research is more informative/worth including more in the overall analysis

May 2, 2018 12:25:27 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: the wider range like Rebecca cpould provide, only the 14 appelas seem to little

May 2, 2018 12:25:31 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Thanks Susan.

May 2, 2018 12:25:53 PM from Louise Marie Hurel to all participants: Also agree we need a greater sample to be able to infer conclusions from the appeals.

May 2, 2018 12:26:19 PM from Farzaneh Badii to all participants: support the need for a greater sample

May 2, 2018 12:26:44 PM from Rebecca Tushnet to all participants: We looked at the entire universe

May 2, 2018 12:26:47 PM from Rebecca Tushnet to all participants: Over 800

May 2, 2018 12:27:06 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: Yes, we should!

May 2, 2018 12:27:07 PM from Berry Cobb to all participants: For the responses was to determine whether the response occurred w/in 14 days or w/in 6 months to determine whether a Denovo Review was performed.

May 2, 2018 12:27:09 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: Yes, I think it would be useful.

May 2, 2018 12:27:43 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: @Rebecca: my question scrolled off, but was it your plan to submit the research to a peer-reviewed academic journal at some point?

May 2, 2018 12:28:07 PM from Berry Cobb to all participants: The 58 cases where the Respondent prevailed, is to understand on what basis they prevailed (per whats outlined in the rules or procedures or by some other basis).

May 2, 2018 12:28:34 PM from Rebecca Tushnet to all participants: Probably some of the conclusions coming out of it, and I will make the tables available for anyone who wants to review them.

May 2, 2018 12:28:46 PM from Berry Cobb to all participants: @George and All - staff is working with the Chairs in formulating future agendas and find a slot she can do such.

May 2, 2018 12:29:13 PM from Michael R. GRAHAM to all participants: I think the Research and Analysis should be shared with the PDP.

May 2, 2018 12:29:16 PM from Brian Beckham to all participants: One practical question is: we looked at 14 cases, and (notwithstanding discussions in the WG about whether "substantively reveiwing" cases is appropriate) it could be useful or necessary to look at some kind of random sampling vs looking at hundreds of cases.

May 2, 2018 12:29:45 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: I think we should go for the 256

May 2, 2018 12:30:04 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Creates statistical issues if it's just a small sample, rather than the entire universe.

May 2, 2018 12:30:24 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: Agree. If Rebecca wants to share her research, she should share it and not the Staff. All inputs are welcome, so long as they are timely. The research should be shared early enough for the other WG members to have a chance to review it and consider it substantively, not just react on a knee-jerk basis on the very next call.

May 2, 2018 12:30:37 PM from David McAuley to all participants: Thanks Mary, makes good sense

May 2, 2018 12:31:15 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: in any case, 14 sound too litle to scope things to move forward

May 2, 2018 12:32:41 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: I agree with Michael Graham that the underlying research and analysis should be shared with the WG.

May 2, 2018 12:32:44 PM from collin kurre to all participants: Great feedback from staff, thanks Mary. A comprehensive study would certainly be useful to inform conversations. Rebecca, do you have any ideas about when you might be able to share your research with the group beyond staff? Would the tables you mentioned be comprehensive?

May 2, 2018 12:33:00 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: We do have to keep in mind that we have to stay on our timeline. The more cases we bite off to review, the more the timeline

may slip. Not saying we shouldn't, we just need to be aware that the broader community is very concerned about our timeline.

May 2, 2018	12:33:06 PM	from Rebecca Tushnet to all participants:	I have just emailed the list with the full dataset.
May 2, 2018	12:33:18 PM	from Paul McGrady to all participants:	@Rebecca, thank you.
May 2, 2018	12:33:20 PM	from Farzaneh Badii to all participants:	Thanks
May 2, 2018	12:33:22 PM	from collin kurre to all participants:	Great!
May 2, 2018	12:33:28 PM	from Brian Beckham to all participants:	Thanks @ Paul - this was what I was getting at
May 2, 2018	12:33:30 PM	from Greg Shatan to all participants:	Thank you, Rebecca!
May 2, 2018	12:33:59 PM	from Rebecca Tushnet to all participants:	Questions and comments are welcome.
May 2, 2018	12:34:12 PM	from Sean McDonald to all participants:	Thanks, Rebecca!
May 2, 2018	12:34:15 PM	from Rebecca Tushnet to all participants:	Some of the things we coded are specific to questions I had, and others are not.
May 2, 2018	12:34:33 PM	from Paul McGrady to all participants:	@Kathy - how long does each bucket take?
May 2, 2018	12:35:15 PM	from Paul McGrady to all participants:	We need to keep our buckets to timeline ration in mind.
May 2, 2018	12:35:17 PM	from Kathy Kleiman to all participants:	That was a question for Brian and the Docs Subteam, Phil.
May 2, 2018	12:35:20 PM	from Kathy Kleiman to all participants:	Phil
May 2, 2018	12:35:36 PM	from Paul McGrady to all participants:	(I meant ratio, but ration makes sense too in this case!)
May 2, 2018	12:36:10 PM	from Martin Silva to all participants:	jejeje I get that
May 2, 2018	12:36:10 PM	from Kathy Kleiman to all participants:	Another subteam?

May 2, 2018 12:37:38 PM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: @All: someone has joined named only 'john'. For attendance purposes, please provide a last name :)

May 2, 2018 12:38:10 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: I think rebecca's work is a time saving event for us

May 2, 2018 12:38:13 PM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: thank you! noted!

May 2, 2018 12:38:16 PM from Ariel Liang to all participants: You may also review the Phase II proposal document via this google doc:  
[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1apbVrFayn\\_vbPfhKDpjYs66iBWjvwhWFGZbuGpQnOgl/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1apbVrFayn_vbPfhKDpjYs66iBWjvwhWFGZbuGpQnOgl/edit?usp=sharing)

May 2, 2018 12:38:28 PM from Louise Marie Hurel to all participants: Agree with Martin

May 2, 2018 12:40:55 PM from Michael R. GRAHAM to all participants: @Martin -- I agree that -- without seeing the research/analysis -- it sounds as though the analysis and metrics could be very helpful. Whether this is the case I need to reserve until able to review the materials from the team.

May 2, 2018 12:41:01 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: Given the significance of the shift, and the fact that we're talking about shifting the charter of a working group in midstream, I would think that a very strong consensus would be required to move us away from the status quo?

May 2, 2018 12:45:14 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: John M represented the City of Myrtle Beach going after MyrtleBeach.com in a losing UDRP:  
<http://www.adrforum.com/domaindecisions/103367.htm> Very puzzled as to why he proposed removing the topic about geographic places as being 'out of scope'.

May 2, 2018 12:45:19 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: I will have to drop the call on the top of the hour due to an overlap with another meeting

May 2, 2018 12:45:30 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @John, all - yes, there will be a paper to follow up on the GNSO's discussions on what the Council is calling "PDP 3.0" from San Juan.

May 2, 2018 12:45:45 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: yes, id is going as a request to the council it has to be a very very strong consensus, minum having all constituencies in it

May 2, 2018 12:46:29 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: For the recrod the GNSO's discussions of the PDP 3.0 were a brainstorming session on future PDP. Nothing to do with actual PDP going on, much less this one.

May 2, 2018 12:47:02 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: So the proposals, like the one from Kathy, was not to this WG, but to future possible ideas to look into for the future PDP

May 2, 2018 12:49:00 PM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Martin, I don't really think that is the case. we were talking generally in that session about how to improve effectiveness of the PDP process. Which need not be just future pDPs but would be expected to include eexisting ones where relevant/applicable

May 2, 2018 12:49:06 PM from Louise Marie Hurel to all participants: I think it fundamental to have strong consensus on any charter changes. Especially, as Michael noted, in the middle of its review process

May 2, 2018 12:50:57 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: @susan, we were not talking about how to modify any specific current PDPs, but general ideas

May 2, 2018 12:51:08 PM from collin kurre to all participants: Not to mention the fact that this particular process has the potential to impact the rights of end users

May 2, 2018 12:51:32 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: we never said: RPMs should go or might need, we were thinking in any and all of them, and just invited to brainstorm ideas

May 2, 2018 12:53:10 PM from Philip Corwin to all participants: I am stepping away one moment

May 2, 2018 12:54:47 PM from Philip Corwin to all participants: Back

May 2, 2018 12:55:15 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @John - thank you for your presentation.

May 2, 2018 12:55:26 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Jeff - thank you for these very detailed comments.

May 2, 2018 12:56:26 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: there are a lot of similarity yes

May 2, 2018 12:56:46 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: David, George, Kathy, Kurt

May 2, 2018 12:57:13 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: Maritn too now

May 2, 2018 12:57:29 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: Unfortunately, the WebEx interface does not allow you to see the order in which hands go up (it keeps people in alphabetical order).

May 2, 2018 12:57:44 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: Martin\*

May 2, 2018 12:58:39 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: @David - it is only the URS that could apply to legacy providers. The TMCH, Sunrise and TM CLaims could never apply to legacy operators

May 2, 2018 12:58:55 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Phil - you mention that you think that the GDPR issues will be resolved soon. What timeframes are you hearing regarding accredited/gated/tiered access to WHOIS data being available after May 25? If it ends up moving on the same timeframe as the PPSAI, isn't that years from now? Thanks in advance for your thoughts.

May 2, 2018 12:59:50 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: I have expressed my view that Registries and Registrars will continue to provide the data to dispute providers come May 25th as they do today

May 2, 2018 12:59:50 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: I think David raises good points.

May 2, 2018 1:00:36 PM from collin kurre to all participants: I also agree with David, particularly highlighting the risk of the group getting detailed in the process of adding an amendment to the charter

May 2, 2018 1:01:05 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: I dont understand how moving the UDRP and URS together negatively impacts any of the concerns expressed by David/George

May 2, 2018 1:01:09 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: Maybe I am just missing something

May 2, 2018 1:02:00 PM from Philip Corwin to all participants: @Paul M -- my impression from email posts by Jeff Neuman and Brian Beckham was that they both thought there was a high likelihood that DRPs would still be able to get the registrant data as of May 25 and beyond. But we shall know soon

May 2, 2018 1:03:36 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: I think Kathy raises an important contextual point. It's a bit misleading to frame the San Juan discussions as support for reframing our own charter. I, also, understood those conversations as applying going forward, not to justifying re-examining charters for existing working groups.

May 2, 2018 1:05:05 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: Thanks Kurt!

May 2, 2018 1:05:58 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: I am muted

May 2, 2018 1:06:01 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: I can't

May 2, 2018 1:06:03 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: That's a very registry-specific perspective, though. How about registrants of new gTLD domain names who want the URS reviewed sooner, rather than later?

May 2, 2018 1:06:19 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Kurt's points all seem very reasonable.

May 2, 2018 1:06:49 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: (I don't own any new gTLDs, so am unaffected). Plus, ICANN staff has been trying to inject the URS into legacy gTLDs, when they come up for renewal.

May 2, 2018 1:07:17 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: @George, no one is saying that reviewing the URS has to be delayed

May 2, 2018 1:07:29 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: It is just saying that we can do 2 different reports

May 2, 2018 1:08:02 PM from Michael R. GRAHAM to all participants: To register my support without further discussion -- I support moving the URS review to Phase II. The substantive review and analysis is considerably different from the other New RPMs, will require considerable time, effort, and discussion -- not to mention deter,omomg amd discussing specific points of inquiry -- and more closely related to our Phase 2 analysis of UDRP. I also agree with Jeff that I do not understand how moving URS consideration will adversely affect our work going forward.

May 2, 2018 1:09:09 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: Without commenting on the actual topic, staff notes that there is no specific threshold requirement in the GNSO rules about proposing a charter amendment to the GNSO Council. The consensus levels apply to policy recommendations, not procedural changes.

May 2, 2018 1:09:23 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: I would only support moving the URS to Phase II (not the changing of the topics that are in scope/out of scope) if and only if it's agreed that ICANN stops trying to put the URS into .com/net/org etc.

May 2, 2018 1:09:27 PM from Michael R. GRAHAM to all participants: @Kathy: I have to wonder whether the Charter drafting contemplated the complexity of the Phase 1 analyses, and whether the present process has become more complex than the Charter team anticipated?

May 2, 2018 1:09:56 PM from David McAuley to all participants: @Jeff, when you say two reports are you referring to Jon'compromise idea to review admin/operational URS issues in phase 1 and substance in phase 2?

May 2, 2018 1:10:07 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: I have lost my ability to speak. I have one more point. That is that the Subsequent Procedures working group delegated thier work to this group to address RPM issues for the next round. I believe it is our obligation to deliver that input in a timely manner. Now that our work has taken longer than anticipated, we should act in a responsible way and arrange our priorities to meet our obligations.

May 2, 2018 1:10:08 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: i.e. it becomes a preliminary recommendation that no new RPM be imposed on registrants, pending the PDP's completion.

May 2, 2018 1:10:29 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: URS and UDRP are far more similar than they are different. URS is completely different from PDDRP, Claims or Sunrise.

May 2, 2018 1:10:56 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: The proposal called for Vice Chairs. This never seems to be acknowledged by those speaking against.

May 2, 2018 1:11:24 PM from Jon Nevett to all participants: we seem to be only focused on the next round of TLDs in this debate per Kurt's comments

May 2, 2018 1:11:32 PM from Kristine Dorrain to all participants: I am concerned that the URS will be "swallowed up" by the UDRP and we will be headed toward an inevitable marrying of the two, rather than giving each a full analysis on their own merits.

May 2, 2018 1:11:36 PM from Michael R. GRAHAM to all participants: @George Kirikos -- I do not understand why the possibility of extending URS to legacy TLDs should affect the advisability of moving URS to Phase II?

May 2, 2018 1:11:42 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: Some think the URS and UDRP should be considered separately, some together. I think this is irrelevant to the decision to postpone the URS discussion to Phase 2. Even if moved to Phase 2, the topics could still be considered separately.

May 2, 2018 1:11:58 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Agree with Kurt.

May 2, 2018 1:12:13 PM from Jon Nevett to all participants: there are some fixes to the URS that apply now

May 2, 2018 1:12:16 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: @Michael: if one sees this as an attempt to defer review of the URS, it might make more sense to you.

May 2, 2018 1:12:30 PM from David McAuley to all participants: agree with Jon

May 2, 2018 1:12:30 PM from Michael R. GRAHAM to all participants: @Kristine -- I agree with your concern -- but I think it can and should be addressed in the working plan.

May 2, 2018 1:12:45 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: May staff also comment on the background to the decision to do a two-phased PDP, Phil?

May 2, 2018 1:12:54 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: i.e if there's a risk to registrants that a delay in the review of the URS might mean that the URS might be imposed on them as is.

May 2, 2018 1:13:02 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: @Michael, it doesn't. And it's not within our purview to deal with the Registry Agreement renewals.

May 2, 2018 1:14:39 PM from Philip Corwin to all participants: @Mary--yes, staff can comment. I'll put you after Cyntia and before me

May 2, 2018 1:14:56 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: There's also a "risk" to Complainants that the URS will be imposed on them as is, until it isn't.

May 2, 2018 1:15:03 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: I have a procedural comment i would like to make from a subpro perspective with another option

May 2, 2018 1:15:20 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: yeap

May 2, 2018 1:15:22 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: So if you can let me speak without putting people ahead of me :)

May 2, 2018 1:15:24 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: thanks Paul

May 2, 2018 1:15:25 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Any delays in this PDP have been due to \*data\* availability. That's driven the timelines. I've been waiting for the TMCH top 500 terms for over a year (despite the fact it would take The Analysis Group little time to provide it)

May 2, 2018 1:15:36 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: with regards to George's comments, I share his concerns about modifying the charter. Then again, I don't see those as a reason to bar moving URS to Phase 2

May 2, 2018 1:16:04 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: When I speak i can provide an option that does not require a change to the charter

May 2, 2018 1:16:05 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: exactly! thanks Paul on the conensus clarification

May 2, 2018 1:16:18 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: The charter does not have to change

May 2, 2018 1:16:20 PM from Farzaneh Badii to all participants: you might not need consensus but surely if you go ahead with suggesting the amendment with no consensus you will of course lose at the council

May 2, 2018 1:16:44 PM from Jon Nevett to all participants: The applicant guidebook says that "a review of the URS procedure will be initiated one year after the first Examiner Determination is issued. Upon completion of the review, a report shall be published regarding the usage of the

procedure, including statistical information, and posted for public comment on the usefulness and effectiveness of the procedure."

May 2, 2018 1:17:13 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Jon - we are well past that timeframe.

May 2, 2018 1:17:28 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Right, I think the URS review was already deferred.

May 2, 2018 1:17:44 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: And the UDRP review was delayed in the past, too.

May 2, 2018 1:17:57 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: \*6 ?

May 2, 2018 1:18:28 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: I've been clicking the mute and unmute icon. perhaps I'm centrally muted?

May 2, 2018 1:18:49 PM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: Michael your mic is open, but if you're having audio issues, you may call into the audio bridge or request a dialout. Possibly try dropping your webex audio and reconnecting.

May 2, 2018 1:19:20 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: 1-866-692-5726, code = RPM Member

May 2, 2018 1:19:23 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: URS is going smoothly so far

May 2, 2018 1:19:31 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: all this is worth to think

May 2, 2018 1:19:38 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: but we shouldn't get over distracted

May 2, 2018 1:19:51 PM from Martin Silva to all participants: timeline and concentration wise

May 2, 2018 1:20:15 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: And it we can just do 2 Initial Reports

May 2, 2018 1:20:29 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: And 1 or 2 Final reports

May 2, 2018 1:20:34 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: like we are doing in SubPro

May 2, 2018 1:20:44 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: Where we did not have to get a charter change

May 2, 2018 1:21:19 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Phil - sorry - just when I figured out Adobe's Hand's Up, we change...

May 2, 2018 1:22:17 PM from Nathalie Peregrine to all participants: @Michael: would you like the operator to call you?

May 2, 2018 1:24:14 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: I've called in now - will give in one more try

May 2, 2018 1:24:17 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: I wonder if people would argue that the PDP improvement discussion was only about future PDPs if they supported the proposal? It seems quite sad to think we were only talking about the future and not about the PDPs that the Council is actually managing.

May 2, 2018 1:24:31 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: Could staff post the current RPM Phase One Review Timeline?

May 2, 2018 1:24:44 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: It might be helpful.

May 2, 2018 1:24:53 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: In any event, it's irrelevant to whether it's a good proposal or not.

May 2, 2018 1:25:50 PM from collin kurre to all participants: I don't think people should be deterred from trying to improve PDPs. Changing the rules or game plan halfway through could undermine or even invalidate past work, which is sad when volunteer time is such a scarce resource

May 2, 2018 1:25:52 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: We are likely to delay the Sunrise and Claims if we keep URS in Phase 1.

May 2, 2018 1:26:07 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: Tx you!

May 2, 2018 1:26:10 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Moving the URS wouldn't make sense, given that chart/timeline.

May 2, 2018 1:26:20 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: Quick

May 2, 2018 1:26:36 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: i.e. we'd be finished the URS review while awaiting the TMCH data.

May 2, 2018 1:26:52 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: This slide was prepared before ICANN62; based on ongoing discussions with the co-chairs (as Phil has just noted) it may need to be updated slightly.

May 2, 2018 1:26:57 PM from Kathy Kleiman to all participants: Quick note that URS review is due to wrap up with preliminary recommendations in July/August.

May 2, 2018 1:27:13 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: It's now May, so that's coming up fast.

May 2, 2018 1:27:15 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: \*ICANN61 (sorry)

May 2, 2018 1:28:08 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: In would be interesting to view the original RPM Phase One time line

May 2, 2018 1:28:14 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: I'm different...I enjoy your company, week after week after week. ;-)

May 2, 2018 1:28:57 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: Exactly, Kathy - the URS review is pretty close to the finish line

May 2, 2018 1:30:23 PM from Farzaneh Badii to all participants: it doesnt mean consensus is banned or not recommended Mary

May 2, 2018 1:30:34 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: If we wasted a week debating process, that moves the timeline back by a week.

May 2, 2018 1:30:43 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Let's just get on with the work.

May 2, 2018 1:31:02 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Everytime I ask for the top 500 TMCH terms, it's never delivered, for example.

May 2, 2018 1:31:08 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: It seems absurd to me to suggest that we require less consensus for changing the charter than for a policy recommendation. If that were the case a bare majority could just restructure the charter to push towards policy positions they favour.

May 2, 2018 1:31:54 PM from Farzaneh Badii to all participants: totally Michael. charter change actually has consequences on policy and substantive matters...

May 2, 2018 1:32:43 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Mary - but facts on the ground change, e.g. GDPR

May 2, 2018 1:32:54 PM from Cyntia King to all participants: @Mary - Would aboslutely ike to hear the background info.

May 2, 2018 1:32:58 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: GDPR was known 2 years ago.

May 2, 2018 1:33:08 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: So it's not a "new fact".

May 2, 2018 1:33:20 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @Paul, - yes, staff is not supporting/espousing a view one way or the other, just providing the background information

May 2, 2018 1:33:45 PM from Cyntia King to all participants: @George - the scope of changes necessitated by GDRP was not - and still is not - known.

May 2, 2018 1:33:58 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @Farzaneh - we're just providing the rules (or lack of them); as noted, it's up to the WG/chairs to decide how to make that decision.

May 2, 2018 1:34:09 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: @Cyntia: that's because people's heads were in the sand; a problem of ICANN's own creation.

May 2, 2018 1:34:24 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: @ George - the new fact is the tardiness with which GDRP has been dealt

May 2, 2018 1:34:32 PM from Mary Wong to all participants: @Cyntia, we can follow up with an email to the list with the background.

May 2, 2018 1:34:48 PM from Cyntia King to all participants: @Mary - I'd appreciate that.

May 2, 2018 1:36:04 PM from Cyntia King to all participants: @George - regardless of whether ICANN should've/could've done it differently, we are where we are now. For better/worse.

May 2, 2018 1:36:38 PM from George Kirikos to all participants: Bye folks.

May 2, 2018 1:36:41 PM from Greg Shatan to all participants: The discussion about GDPR was all focused on the effect on Whois, and it was only very recently that the "knock-on" effect on URS and UDRP was acknowledged.

May 2, 2018 1:37:49 PM from Paul McGrady to all participants: Thank you all for a great, productive call. Looking forward to our next call.

May 2, 2018 1:38:15 PM from Salvador Camacho to all participants: thanks to all

May 2, 2018 1:38:33 PM from Cyntia King to all participants: Thanks to @Phil for his leadership on the @Providers group. Kept us on-time. Like nailing Jello to a tree.

May 2, 2018 1:38:38 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: Also RightsCon for the noncommercial folks

May 2, 2018 1:38:43 PM from Michael Karanicolas to all participants: May 16