

WIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwFbfrsjWv9&m=kJbJgVy8FLcOTUG5PGRaOjgaOe8FU9gtdm76qns9oKQ&s=W9I0-FxBqdL3ft3AlJ_uft_50cM7XtUbyHwh0wAxByE&e=

George Kirikos:But, once an hour makes more sense.

George Kirikos:@Kathy: Great minds think alike!

Martin Silva:Hello all

George Kirikos:Or, was it 'fools seldom differ'? ;~)

George Kirikos>Welcome Martin.

George Kirikos:Our meeting coincides with the Apple iPhone announcement. :-)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

George Kirikos:Hi Maxim.

Steve Levy:Hi Folks

Philip Corwin:Hello all

George Kirikos:PDF is at: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/attachments/20180907/71ca1266/CLEANSUPERCONSOLIDATEDURSTOPICSTABLE31August2018-0001.pdf> for those who want to read it in their browser, etc.

Jay Chapman:congratulations, Kathy!

Julie Hedlund:All: The document is unsynced.

Michael R. Graham:Morning -- sorry I'm a bit late.

Julie Hedlund:Start on page 5 -- green draft recommendation.

David McAuley:Thank you George

George Kirikos:Bottom of page 5, into page 6.

Mitch Stoltz:Hello all, sorry to join a bit late

Martin Silva 2:Ok, but the Provider may not be receiving the "full registration data" from the Registrars and thus may not be "disclosing" the "full registration data" to the Complainant. Full WHOIS registration data includes *phone number* which is not a piece of

data needed by Providers or Complainants. This something we should address, maybe with just a little modification.

Martin Silva 2:if the process is online, why also send him the email and address as well?

David McAuley:I support getting public comment on this draft recommendation (three points) as described by Phil

Martin Silva 2:I think we should add "appropriate" registration data

Martin Silva 2:"disclosure of appropriate registration data"

Lori Schulman:I agree with Kathy.

Lori Schulman:We can have the same suggestions in both phases. Each phase addresses different mechanisms and each mechanism can have similar recommendation. Also support Kathy's argument about timeliness of issue.

George Kirikos:Same should apply to the various "loser pays" proposals, etc.

George Kirikos:There's also urgency to registrant's access to the courts.

David McAuley:good point about EPDP

Julie Hedlund:Next recommendation is on page 10.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Just going to support Martin's proposed clarification

Martin Silva 2:is a minor change, but it seems necessary

Brian Beckham - WIPO:@Martin, can you explain what you mean to clarify by that language? Thx.

Martin Silva 2:that provider might not be getting "full registration data", and it may not even be relevant that complaints get "full registration data", so making it clear is not full, but appropriate

Marie Pattullo:Agree with Lori that can have the same suggestions in both phases. Also, if we don't put such (obvious) options out to public comment, I think it's pretty sure that some of said public will comment on them, albeit questioning why the WG hasn't considered them.

Mary Wong:The Appendices in the Temp Spec pertinent to URS (and UDRP) will be on the EPDP radar/agenda, yes.

Philip Corwin:Believe it was characterized as Policy because GDPR compliance is a policy issue, as reflected by creation of EPDP

David McAuley:@Mary - old Navy saying, may EPDP have fair winds and following seas

Lori Schulman:That's why IP folks have been arguing that contact forms are not a good compromise.

George Kirikos:Right, 'if available', but the clock issue is more important.

George Kirikos:Since, the registrant would want to get it by email, FAX, and by mail, etc.

George Kirikos:Clock shouldn't start if only sent via contact form.

Lori Schulman:The contact form is an EPDP issue but we see it the effects of it as a bad option.

Brian Beckham - WIPO:@Martin, do you agree that any such limitation should map to the information required by providers (e.g., name, email, fax, post, etc.)?

Julie Hedlund:Kathy: Change "full registration data" to "appropriate registration data".

George Kirikos:What is 'appropriate', though??

John McElwaine:Agree with George K

George Kirikos:That's very ambiguous, and open to interpretation by different registrars.

Martin Silva 2:is more accurate than full :-P

Lori Schulman:I would say "data necessary to advance the complaint"

Martin Silva 2:fair enough

Lori Schulman:ord "data required to advance the complaint"

George Kirikos:+1 Kathy. But, that means there's no 'uniform' requirement.

Lori Schulman:Yes, happy to do that.

Julie Hedlund:Next recommendation is on page 19.

David McAuley:I also support getting public comment on these two recs on page 19

George Kirikos:But, same issue.

Brian Beckham - WIPO:(dialing in)

George Kirikos:The 3rd one is also a Phase 2 topic...each of these will get repeated in Phase 2 for the UDRP.

Philip Corwin:George's comments are valid points for public comment, but I don't personally believe they are a rationale for not putting this out for public comment -- noting further that whether a proposal is more properly addressed in Phase 2 can also be included in public comment

Marie Pattullo:+1 to Phil

George Kirikos:@Phil: how do you expect providers to coordinate to come up with the same guidance?

George Kirikos:That needs to come from ICANN, ultimately, to ensure uniformity.

Rebecca L Tushnet:I agree with Phil.

George Kirikos:Then, the individual proposals should also be sent out for public comment in Phase 1.

George Kirikos:(i.e. even the ones identified as Phase 2)

George Kirikos:Otherwise, the sub group recommendations that are clearly Phase 2 like this are gaining an advantage over individual proposals.

George Kirikos:Uniform guidance developed by ICANN, yes.

Mitch Stoltz:Guidance could be closely linked to the effective standards and outcomes, making them effectively a part of the policy itself. Therefore, I agree that it should be developed by ICANN.

George Kirikos:That would have overcome some of that WIPO 2.0 guidance problems re: Octogen analysis.

Julie Hedlund:Next recommendation is on page 23.

George Kirikos:(which was controversial)

David McAuley:Remedies will also come up in some of the 33 individually suggested proposals

George Kirikos:The recommendation was to not make a recommendation. :-) There are individual proposals out there.

David McAuley:proposals

David McAuley:Agree with Brian on this

George Kirikos:Next is page 26?

George Kirikos:(into page 27?)

Julie Hedlund:Page 26 is next.

George Kirikos:This seems more like an operational fix.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Can I comment on Registrars issues with renewal?

George Kirikos:+1 Maxim

George Kirikos:e.g. a US registrar might not be able to do business with TM holders in Iran, for example.

Philip Corwin:The information we are getting from Maxim is exactly the type of feedback that is needed via public comment

Michael Karanicolas:Agree @Phil

Griffin Barnett:Agree - it would be helpful to see these comments in writing

David McAuley:good points Maxim, and agree with Phil and Kathy on handling this - PC would be good

Julie Hedlund:Page 30.

Marie Pattullo:Interesting. Could the hypothetical Iranian TM owner use an agent?

George Kirikos:This is the same proposal we've seen before.

George Kirikos:(albeit, for the appeal phase of the URS)

George Kirikos:(similar to the recommendation on page 19)

Griffin Barnett:+1 Brian

David McAuley:Brian described it well - the terminology in appeals was very confusing

Griffin Barnett:Eh, I see George's point, but it might be more sensible to keep this rec in the appeals section

Griffin Barnett:Just keep the recs within their respective categories

George Kirikos:It's ultimately the same issue, though. We'll have to go through twice as much work to review the comments, then, if kept separate.

Justine Chew:Disagree with George K. And agree with Kathy's explanation. Better to be complete.

Julie Hedlund:Next recommendation is pages 30-31.

Julie Hedlund>Note that Mary Wong has her hand up.

Mary Wong:Re David's observation - the inconsistencies also seem to appear in non-Appeal determinations, hence the suggestion for a checklist from the Docs Sub TEam elsewhere.

George Kirikos:I think someone made an individual proposal on this.

Mary Wong:(based on staff review of the Claims Denied, Appeals and other determinations).

Julie Hedlund:We have hands from Mary as well as David.

Brian Beckham - WIPO:right @Mary, a checklist for first level determinations, and then more about terminology for appeals

Griffin Barnett:@George, yes there is an individual proposal on this topic

George Kirikos:Can we take a 5 minute break at the top of the hour, to stretch, check email, etc? Otherwise, 2 hours sitting down is a long time.

Griffin Barnett:I think this serves as a fine umbrella, as Kathy suggested

Justine Chew:Even necessary, in fact.

Julie Hedlund:Next recommendation is page 31 (bottom).

Rebecca L Tushnet:Procedural (maybe) question: will we have an "umbrella" label that is separate from more concrete proposals?

Jay Chapman:valid point, Rebecca.

Brian Beckham - WIPO:@Rebecca, the umbrella is simply a convenient term for today - we will get to the details in the individual proposals

Justine Chew:Would the individual proposals (if they are agreed to) not act as bullet points or fillers for the umbrellas?

Mary Wong:@Rebecca, if it helps, implementation will be the responsibility of the Implementaiton Review Team that's formed only after the Board approves any PDP recs. But to the general point - the WG can categorize/label its proposals as it wishes for the Initial Report.

Mary Wong:The idea is to flag key issues and make the contents clearer to facilitate useful community feedback.

David McAuley:I think the rec on bottom of page 31 to top of 32 falls into same discussion as on this one

Jay Chapman:So effectively, by calling something an umbrella point for disucssion, we're simply punting those points & discussions to the individual proposals?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Note: I have not suggested to oblige registrars to accept payments in any currency or to conclude contracts with parties they do not like, just to find an option for a new registrar to accept it

George Kirikos:@Jay: I hope not....i.e. we should actually discuss it as a group, where new proposals might emerge, rather than limit only to the individual proposals.

Julie Hedlund:Yes, 31-32

George Kirikos:Bottom of page 31, top of 32?

Griffin Barnett:This is essentially the same topic as the prior rec

George Kirikos:+1 Griffin

Rebecca L Tushnet:@Mary, I'm not sure it really does help because "implement this specific fix" is different from "Implement a different treatment of defaults"--but I just want to make sure the question is identified for the public comment/cdiscussion period

David McAuley:+1 @ Griffin

Martin Silva 2:I gotta agree with Rebecca

Philip Corwin:Noting that we have 18 minutes left and only 3 policy proposals left, so we should complete all sub-team review on this call -- thanks to all!

Julie Hedlund:page 34

George Kirikos:@Phil: this is 2 hours.

George Kirikos:So, we have 47 minutes left.

George Kirikos:Would be nice to take a 5 minute break, though.

Griffin Barnett:Would be better to finish early without needing to go 2 hours ;)

George Kirikos:There are at least 2 individual proposals on language.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):what page is it in the document

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):?

George Kirikos:Page 34.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I can comment

Mary Wong:@Renee, yes - this bullet point was based on Maxim's earlier feedback.

Brian Beckham - WIPO:thanks @Renee

Philip Corwin:Thx for reminder of 120 minute duration -- so we will definitely wrap up all sub-team recommendations today

Martin Silva 2:+1000

Martin Silva 2:we have to try to give a fair chance to a global community

Martin Silva 2:language is not a vane issue

George Kirikos:We have 39 minutes left, not 9.

George Kirikos:This was a 2 hour call.

Julie Hedlund:All: This call goes to 1900 UTC -- 120 minutes.

Renee Fossen (Forum):The registrar does receive translated documents. The registry does not.

Philip Corwin:It's simply a fact that English is the primary language for global business in the 21st century -- but ICANN does provide translations into all the UN languages -- personal view

Julie Hedlund:Next is page 38.

Julie Hedlund:Actually 38-39 -- Providers and Documents ST recommendations

Lori Schulman:Agree with Phil The only exception I might make is for the Chinese provider to provide Chinese notices to Chinese speakers as a practical matter and given the size of the Chinese market. Translating everything into UN languages at the provider level is certainly not feasible.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):English was not an issue , difference between messages was, but it is a minor one

Griffin Barnett:Is there a reason ADNDRC is called out specifically here re developing references? Is it because of their location in Asia and potential services involving Chinese speakers (or other non-Latin character Asian languages)?

George Kirikos:+Griffin: seems to be based on the bullet point at the top of column 2 on page 39.

George Kirikos:@Griffin, rather

Griffin Barnett:Right...in any case, this one seems non-controversial to me

George Kirikos:"ADNDRC seems to only provide simple forms"

Mary Wong:@Griffin - it may be that the assumption was that because they are based in Asia that they service mostly Chinese and other registrants whose primary language is not English; although ADNDRC (as noted) communicates only in English.

Griffin Barnett:Right, thanks Mary

Mary Wong:Note that staff reviewed all the cases that were tagged as possibly having language concerns.

George Kirikos:That was the last "green" point, I think?

Julie Hedlund:@George Kirikos: Yes, that was the last draft recommendation highlighted in green.

Mary Wong:On whether there is a real need for translation, it may be helpful to refer to the preliminary findings in column 2 about those cases.

Justine Chew:Put it to public comment

George Kirikos:This too would apply to the UDRP, though, so might best be suited to Phase 2.

Julie Hedlund:That was the last of the draft recommendations.

Julie Hedlund:Yes, the individual proposals are next.

George Kirikos:Last week we sent various topics back to the sub teams --- did we hear back from them?

Ariel Liang:Individual URS Proposals can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/display/RARPMRIAGPWG/URS+Proposals>

Lori Schulman:Agree with Kathy but we should ask. If someone is ready then it would be a good use of time.

Lori Schulman:but I would not put anyone on the spot.

David McAuley:is it possible to map out dates and times of calls in Sept - early Oct?

David McAuley:i know next call is Monday

Julie Hedlund:wiki at: <https://community.icann.org/x/aACNBQ>

Ariel Liang:@David - the dates for the next few calls where the individual URS proposals will be discussed are noted on the wiki

Philip Corwin:Question for staff -- as we have set time limits for presentation and comments, will we have online capability to keep and display that timing?

Mary Wong:@Phil, we are looking into it.

David McAuley:Thanks Ariel, I should have known that

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I am fine with 17th sep (3 minutes would be enough for my item + 2 min for questions?)

Philip Corwin:Thx, Mary

Ariel Liang:No worries David

David McAuley:good point about being 'on deck' and ready to present

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I am ready if allowed to present

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):ok

George Kirikos:I'm ready too. Very simple fix.

Griffin Barnett:I'm fine either way - either proceed with the two presentations from George and Maxim now, or defer them

Marie Pattullo:Concern that someone may want to comment who isn't here.

Martin Silva 2:we have 20 mins only

Griffin Barnett:Fair point Marie

Brian Beckham - WIPO:(fine with either)

George Kirikos:@Marie: they can always participate via the mailing list, though.

David McAuley:compromise - do one

Griffin Barnett:We should stick to the schedule that we published, as folks may have missed this call knowing they could be on next week for the presentations

George Kirikos:Just like others who can't make the meetings.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):that is it , looking at amount of x

George Kirikos:Looks like the "no" side wins.

Griffin Barnett:But still, pretty much ambivalent

David McAuley:good point Griffin

Marie Pattullo:That's my thinking, Griffin

Philip Corwin:To clarify, I am fine with addressing the two operational fixes if there is not substantial opposition -- but there is

Griffin Barnett:Appreciate that George and Maxim were ready to go though

George Kirikos:All 4 operational fixes seem non-controversial.

Justine Chew:Thanks, and good night!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):let's ensure all members have their ideas expressed

David McAuley:thanks Kathy, good meeting, and thanks staff and co-chairs

George Kirikos:Bye folks.

Griffin Barnett:Many thanks all, see you Monday

John McElwaine:Thanks

Jay Chapman:thanks, all

Mitch Stoltz:thanks Kathy and everyone

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Marie Pattullo:Thanks all

Philip Corwin:Get to high ground!

Lori Schulman:ciao