

**ICANN MEETING  
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA**

**REGISTRIES STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

**19 NOVEMBER 2013**

**JOINT SESSION WITH THE REGISTRARS STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

**Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.**

Man: Not in the room. Thanks. For the purposes of the transcript this is Tuesday, November 19...

Michele Neylon: Okay so the Registries are joining us now. There's some space up at the table.

Man: ...1600 local time November 19 (unintelligible).

Man: No, I just want to record (unintelligible) the recording but not in the room.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, if you could please take your seats. Please take your seats. The Registry and Registrar meeting is about to start. And Jeff Neuman is now sporting a very disturbing looking thing.

Okay then everybody, we're starting now the Registries with Registrars. There still might be one or two spaces up at the table if you want to join. So this is

being chaired jointly by myself and Mr. Keith Drazek. So welcome, Registry people.

The first order of business I suppose we should all take a moment to salute and thank Mr. Neuman for his many years of service on the GNSO and elsewhere as I believe he has announced his resignation from the GNSO this morning.

Oh sorry as Chuck points out you're not resigning from the GNSO, just the GNSO Council. I spoke too soon. Maybe we got a little bit ahead of ourselves. Yes, wishful thinking. Thank you, Jeff, at least you have a sense of humor about these things.

So, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Michele. And thanks to all the Registrars that are here for inviting us in. Always look forward to these opportunities to engage. Apologies for being late. We had to have a conversation at the end of our meeting today that ran a little bit long anyway about how we were going to handle Jeff's replacement so that's still sort of TBD.

Anyway thank you. I think we have an agenda - a joint agenda. I need to make sure we pull it up. But before we do that I want to note that we - towards the end of our session this afternoon, which is scheduled to end at 5 o'clock, we actually have arranged for IBM and Deloitte to come in to give a brief update on trademark clearinghouse.

So that's an opportunity if we finish our joint agenda early we can get them in early. People, if you have to leave at 5:00 that's understandable but, you know, if you could stick around a little bit after than that would be great to.

Does anybody have our agenda handy? Pull it up.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Sorry. I'll pull it up if you give me a second.

Michele Neylon: I've just been asked to pull it up. Nobody bothered specifying what "it" was so this could get quite interesting.

Jennifer Standiford: That would be the agenda. Thanks, Keith, my machine is locked.

Keith Drazek: So I know one of the topics - or I believe one of the topics on the agenda was Registrar onboarding and the AROS project. I don't think we received an independent briefing on AROS. I don't know if there's anybody here that would like to give an update on any work that's been going on?

Michele Neylon: Well we did get a demo of it today. Don't know if anybody wants to speak to AROS. Okay, (Tom) or Matt or somebody, I mean, or Volker, I mean. Tom, go on, Tom.

Tom Barrett: The Registrars certainly are very enthusiastic about all of you Registries signing on board to AROS. We know it's voluntary. But, yes, we're certainly interested in - if any Registry does not plan to use AROS can you raise your hand? So everyone is planning to use it?

((Crosstalk))

Tom Barrett: Okay. So obviously it creates huge efficiencies for registrars which means it helps out you as well. So we would highly recommend that you come up to speed on it and started using it asap.

Michele Neylon: Volker and Matt?

Matt Serlin: I guess I would ask the Registry folks is there anything that the Registrar community and stakeholder group can do to encourage all registry operators to use the system?

Because I think that's one of the things that we're - at least I personally am - that has me a little hesitant about AROS is I don't want to have to manage, you know, this set of registries over here and another set over there so how can we kind of work together to encourage all registry operators to use AROS? And I don't know if you guys have had a conversation about it in your stakeholder group meeting or not. But thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay, you can reply, Jeff. I'll allow that.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. We don't even know how to use it. We've never been invited to use it. We haven't...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...it's great you're encouraging us but...

Michele Neylon: Is it - lack of communication is what you're saying basically.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay. Volker and then Matt - oh no, Matt, you've already spoke.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just as a quick intro into AROS from what we've seen today it would really greatly improve the need for paperwork, the need for updates being processed, the current process as the incumbent registries will be able to confirm is that when a registrar has to change certain data then certain documents have to be filled out, not in triplicate but certainly in a lot of - a lot of paper has to be made (black), Fed-Ex, faxed or couriered to the registries.

Each and every registry similar has to be informed of these updates be it a company name change, a company incorporation change, change of the officers of the company, anything important is currently paperwork.

The AROS systems would eliminate that need. The registries would automatically all be updated of the new data by the registrar when the registrar updates this information with ICANN. This will probably also decrease the workload of registries when a registrar wants to update his data.

Therefore we see it as a great advantage because we will not - as a registrar we will not have to fill out the same information again and again and again for hundreds of registries in the future. That's a system that's simply not manageable anymore under the new gTLD regime.

So I would strongly encourage registries to look at the system, inform themselves if they haven't been informed directly of what the advantages are to them and I believe they are substantial and implementing this as fast as possible.

Michele Neylon: I'm just going to go to James in one second. Just another point as well for the registries the demo we got this afternoon one of the things that they did point

out is that well first off the system is built on Salesforce, which some of you use, I know not all of you do but some of you do.

And they are talking about offering some form of API so that if you already have a system of some kind you can, you know, link them together. And I'll echo everything that Volker said. James.

James Bladel: Yes, just to respond to Jeff. I don't think anybody is trying to push a pig in a poke. We saw a demo. We were impressed. You should be demanding to see the demo as well. And, you know, our message to you guys, we're seeing this from our perspective and we're liking it. You guys may be something - you may have some other feedback but let's get that feedback incorporated so we can get this thing up and running as quickly as possible.

Matt Serlin: You know, I was looking for someone from ICANN staff just to make sure that, you know, you guys had access to - yes, go ahead, sorry.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks, Matt. Sorry to jump in. I mean, I believe that I remember seeing an email that came across asking if we as the Registry Stakeholder Group wanted to see a demo this week. I don't believe we took them up on it. So I think that's the - maybe the confusion. And I apologize if that wasn't made clear.

It sounds like, yes, we had a pretty busy schedule so there was lots other going on but it sounds like you've seen something that is actually meaningful and real in terms of a demo and now is the time for us to ask to see the same thing so we can make a more informed evaluation. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Keith. It's my understanding, talking to Krista, that the guy that demoed the thing for the Registrars is going to be around and there'll be a

demo opportunity perhaps tomorrow or something. Let's just ask her. But to Keith's point it was just, hey, our schedule is slammed. We weren't going to take another half hour, 45 out.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks. How long was the demo and the conversation?

Paul Diaz: I think it was - oh sorry. I think it was like 30 minutes. You know, I mean it's...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Yes, even less.

Michele Neylon: I mean, the demo functionality - I mean, they can show you just either the registrar perspective or the registry's side of it or both. And it's pretty intuitive from what we've seen. I mean, it's - I mean, as long as you can read and know how to operate a keyboard, I mean, I think you'd be fine with it really. You don't have to be technical.

Tim Cole: Michele, can I get in the queue please?

Michele Neylon: Yes, sure. Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Cole: Yes, Steve Allison did the demo here. He is also doing demos out in the lobby area. There's a schedule up there that some - part of the time it's being a demo of AROS, other parts of the time it's a demo of one of the URS. And there's a couple other things. So you might want to check that out.

And, you know, it would be - the Registries actually were the ones that initiated this whole process to develop this. So Roy Dykes has been chairing

the group. So I would hope that they would - there was communication with you guys but evidently there wasn't for - at least for this meeting so - but, yes, you know, if you don't - you're not going to have a meeting time to hear from him he at least can - you can - one on one you can see the demo upstairs.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Tim. Volker then Chuck. And, excuse me, before we go on, what was the name of the guy?

Tim Cole: Yes, Steve Allison. Also he is willing to do like a remote participation demo. So we could arrange for a call and then Adobe Connect and he can demo the whole thing that way if you'd like.

Keith Drazek: Okay great. Thanks very much. Appreciate that. Volker then Chuck.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just one more add on of information for Registries that think that they - because they need a paper document do not benefit from this system. What we learned when we had this demo given to us was that it can also only be used for contact management and when paper contracts are required they can be implemented into the system so you have the paper contract but still can make use of the contact information update features.

So every registry that uses contracts in any form and uses the registrar data can use this. And this also applies for registrars and registries that have already signed the RAAs even when you have a contract already signed you can plug that in and start managing the contacts through that system as well.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Any other comments, questions on the AROS update? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Keith. And thanks, everybody, for the information. Tim addressed the issue I was going to raise. And the people that need to see the demo for us are

not here so the fact that it can be done remotely is very helpful. Now one of those people have been involved in the group so I think it's probably all going to go pretty well. But that's great.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Chuck. Any other comments, questions on registrar onboarding?  
Tim?

Michele Neylon: We have one remote question which I did want to put in. The remote question comes from Rob Golding. And he wants to know whether registries are still going to insist on using faxes as faxes and telex machines were removed from the UK about 10 years ago.

Tim Cole: I just volunteered that Krista and I could coordinate with the registrars and the registries about one or more demos so I'll take that back as an action item.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks, Tim. And that's great especially for those who aren't here. So very good. Okay let's move on. Let me just run through the topics that I think we have on our agenda. Jennifer, I know you mentioned that PIC Specs or the PICDRP - PIC Specs probably is one - okay.

And then the other items that I had maybe we could just cross check here, discussion or update on IGO INGO PDP Working Group report and the recommendations. And that ties in directly with the pending motions before the Council. I think those are a couple of the items.

Jennifer Wolfe: So one of the items that was proposed to discuss is how do the registrars feel about the PICs that have been set forth, the proposed implementation of those. Jeff voiced our concerns to the Board earlier today. We wanted to open up that topic for discussion.

Jeff Neuman: So, yes, I don't know how many of you were - stuck around for our session with the Board but I brought it up saying that, yes, okay we have this letter from Steve to Heather, you know, saying, you know, we were like thanks, this is great, good movement forward. But what is this? Is this the first step? Is this a first step? Is this the final rules? Explained to them, you know, how much work we have and wanted to know where this fit in into the schedule.

Like is this going to be - do we - is it going to change from this format? And if it does when would we know and to give us some sort of certainty on that timeframe. I don't know if, you know, how the Registries feel, I mean, just because looking at it, it says, you know, registries will enter into a contract with registrars and registrars will do it. There's also how is it going to be enforced? I don't think that was very clear.

I think it would probably be good for this group to work together on figuring - if we want to get it done quickly to figure out a way to try and implement it. But I don't know, those are just some of the suggestions. I don't know what, you know, the Registry Stakeholder Group discussed it today but I think I'd rather this group be proactive than having it put into our lap.

Or unless the way it's written is that's, you know, the final piece and then everyone gets to figure out how to implement it on their own but I doubt that's the case.

Michele Neylon: Yes, I mean, just following on from this, I mean, one of the key things that Jeff touched on during that session and so the Board also agreed with us on is that depending on how this PIC stuff kind of gets implemented there's going to be quite a big burden on registrars in terms of implementing it since we're the ones at the end of the chain.

You know, the thing at the moment is of course a lot of us are talking to registries or prospective registries and, you know, it's like the goal posts are kind of moving. It's not simply a question of just signing on; it's like you could be signing on then turn out that things were quite different further down the road. Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: So what I was proposing is perhaps we re-engage with one another and create, you know, monthly calls or bimonthly calls to address issues such as this so we can get in front of the issue sooner rather than later.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jennifer. I think from the Registries perspective and - I'll speak for the Registries ExComm, we would certainly welcome that particularly as things start to ramp up in terms of our interaction and integration all around new gTLDs. Anybody else? Anybody else from the Registries want to sort of chime in on the PIC Specs?

Volker Greimann: Yes, it has been a bit of a concern for many registrars that in response to the requirement of PICs by ICANN to respond to government - GAC concerns with regard to some of the TLDs. Some registries have opted to offload all requirements on the registrars by including language in the PICs as registries shall require registrar to do X, Y, Zed.

That is a bit of a problem for us because, again, offloads all the implementation requirements and requirements for possibly costly implementations on us whereas the registries are kind of Scott - getting off scott free by making these requirements.

And so also opened the door for things that ICANN was not able to include in the RAA, i.e. creating new obligations for registrars that are not consensus

policy. And I just would like to see a statement to that effect how these burdens should be shared equally between registries and registrars.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Volker, I think that's - I think all those concerns are very legitimate. So I think it's something the registries should take back and think about. Obviously we can't speak for the applicants and each applicant is different.

There are certain things in those PIC Specs that were given to the registrars because they can only be done by registrars, things like entering into agreements with registrants that say, A, B, C, and D. That can only be done by registrars.

But the enforcement of some of those can be shared and that's - I don't think we can speak on behalf of every registry. I know there are registries that are not offloading all of that. So - but it's a good topic for us to discuss as registries moving forward.

Jordyn Buchanan: I guess we don't have roaming mics so I'll roam to one. Jordyn Buchanan with Charleston Road Registry, also known as Google or a subsidiary of Google. Volker, I want to understand a little bit better sort of the range of options that - I mean, maybe this is the implementation discussion that we need to have.

But certainly I know in conversations we've had with many registrars when we start to do things that involve the registry interacting directly with the registrant you guys start to get a little nervous about that. So I think a lot of registries are probably passing the requirements down to the registrars because you guys often tell us don't talk to our customer.

So we need to figure out how to get that balance right and I think that's probably part of an extended implementation discussion. I do think different

registries are going to choose to do a lot of things different ways. There's registries, I'm sure, who are not on the GAC advice list that are going to do all sorts of annoying GAC-like things, right? And we'll have to figure out how to work through those - those as well.

And I don't say annoying just you guys, right, they're annoying to implement for the registry as well but it may fit a business model that's, you know, intended to provide a credentialed space or to you, you know, give some certainty about who registrants enter in some particular space. We're going to be trying out a lot of new business models. And I think it'd be good to have ongoing dialogue on a lot of these implementation issues.

But it's hard to imagine we're going to end up at a one-size-fits-all implementation scheme where every time there's some requirement on the registrants it's always going to be implemented by one party or the other.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. Thanks, Jeff. Any other comments, thoughts, feedback?

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay so we'll follow through on this and try to coordinate another conversation around sort of implementation a little bit more detail. We've got some more time. Jennifer, any next items on the agenda or should we revert to my list?

Jennifer Standiford: Let's go with your list next since I was up last it's your turn.

Keith Drazek: All right. We'll alternate. Very good. I think it's important, before we run out of time to discuss motions before the Council tomorrow. I know IGO INGO is

of particular interest. So why don't I just tee that up for Jonathan and our councilors and Chuck on IGO INGO. And I think what we want to do is to give you at least an update on our conversations today and our thinking going into tomorrow; probably have a dialogue about that.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll try and be as brief as I can. This is a complicated issue based on a complicated piece of work. But I think we've - there's been a revision to the motion. I hope you guys have seen the revision to the motion.

Essentially it breaks the motion down into three component parts. One is a recommendation to deal - which is, in a sense, nothing to do with the core work of the working group, but deals with the consensus levels in the working group.

But one of the issues that the working group found is that - what it chose to do was take the recommendations the working group makes can be based on various levels of consensus or varying levels of consensus can be established in a working group.

This working group chose to make recommendations to the Council based on two different levels of consensus. The Registries have elected - or we believe that the right way to deal with this I think is to - and I hope I'm reflecting this accurately - is to separate out the vote according to the two different levels of consensus reached by the working group.

I'm over-simplifying it because there's lots of background in here as to why those different consensus levels were reached, who participated in the working group and so on. But the net effect of all of that is there is a set of recommendations made by the working group to the Council and with a

relatively complicated discussion we've ended up at a position where we propose to vote on those in two different batches, if you like.

The majority of those that received consensus support in the working group, that wasn't full consensus, but they received consensus support. And then there is one result - one recommendation of the working group, which in fact breaks down into three sub recommendations which received strong support but significant opposition status from the working group and we propose to vote on that separately. I don't know if anyone else would like to add anything to that.

Where we're at is we intend to vote in the affirmative for those that received the consensus level support and there's some subtleties in the breakdown of the three sub levels if - we currently - if they stand altogether as one group we would vote against them. But it's important to recognize that a couple of those recommendations - a couple of the sub recommendations did receive registry support in the working group.

So that makes it a little awkward for us to be voting against them. And if those - if another group were to see those as worth separating out we might change our position. But currently we're not asking to, ourselves, to separate out those sub recommendations.

So it's complicated. We've all talked about it a lot. I hope I've represented that accurately here. I'm not sure how much you guys have talked about it or where you're at on your intentions to vote.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jonathan. So I think just to put a point on it, if the last three recommendations are not split then we would vote no on all three because they would be together.

Jonathan Robinson: And in current formatting for absolute clarity to that 7a, b, c. So 7a, b, c all received strong support but significant opposition and as Keith said we intend to vote against those if they are clustered.

If for some reason they become - there is a proposal from - I guess another group to break up that clustering and vote for them separately we may break up our vote. We would likely break up our vote and support - have support for one or more of those but not all of them.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. I think we've been discussing this a little bit in our own group. I mean, maybe a couple of the registrars have some opinions. I see Yoav waving his hands.

Yoav Keren: Yes, just a clarifying question. So which one would you not support or which ones you will support out of the three parts?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, someone might need to help me here. So we will vote in the affirmative for Recommendations 1-6 which received the consensus support. On 7, should it remain bundled we will vote against it. Should it remain separated, which is your question, which is the one we will vote for and which is the ones we will vote against maybe someone can help me. Jeff or Chuck?

Jeff Neuman: Chuck can clarify but I believe what we were in favor of - or okay with, I should say, is having the acronyms of the IGOs in the trademark clearinghouse. And we were okay with them being used for claims. We were not okay with them being used for sunrise.

So the first - so that's the three parts. One is do we favor it in the clearinghouse? We'd be okay with that. Do we favor it for claims? Yes. Do we favor it for sunrise? No.

Michele Neylon: You have something to add, Mason? Then Chuck.

Mason Cole: I just wanted to explain a little bit to the registrars about why this is important. This started with the Red Cross and the International Olympic Committee looking for a way to protect their names at both the top and second level so nobody would preemptively get those for delegation.

And the GNSO undertook a PDP to get that done as a - sort of a gesture of goodwill to these international organizations. It grew into something much bigger than that through a lot of procedural - an issue that we don't really need to discuss.

What the working group arrived at was consensus on protecting full names at the second level of certain organizations like the Red Cross and the IOC. What there's no consensus on is protecting acronyms that were submitted to the working group by the GAC. And it was a very extensive list.

And some of those names are usable by a wide variety of registrar customers. So for example, ISA, that stands for the International Seabed Authority. The GAC wanted that to be protected. Well, okay, you can understand their position but ISA, whatever could be a very valuable name for registrar customers. So that's the reasoning behind where we are on that level of consensus.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and then just to add to that so if you break down 7a, b and c, you could take ISA - let's work with that example - so ISA could be added to the

clearinghouse, have a claims notice against it but not be eligible for sunrise.  
And that's where we're at. Not - that's where we believe we could at least live  
with so pulling out the sunrise.

And so the question is where do you stand? And if you know at this point.

Mason Cole: Yes, we're with - we're in lockstep with Registries on the voting. I think  
Volker wants to speak there.

Volker Greimann: Yes. I mean, the entire topic has a bit of a longer history in the Registrars  
Constituency. We've been discussing this one since when the first proposals  
came out with the special protections for the IOC and the Red Cross. And we  
were very resistant and hesitant to grant any exemptions and only after we  
were promised by the GAC in certain language that this would be the end of it  
that we agreed to granting certain exemptions.

This was a very contentious topic at the time and I'm not aware that the  
general feeling of the Registrars Constituency has changed so granting claims  
notices for abbreviations is still a very, very contentious topic. And we have  
not, to my knowledge, made any decision of how to vote on that.

Michele Neylon: I've got one query from Luc on the remote participation. And the question is,  
"Is it even possible to have a trademark clearinghouse label that can only be  
used for claims and not registrations during sunrise?"

Jonathan Robinson: The answer is yes. I mean, the trademark clearinghouse is specifically set  
up to deal with those two categories of application. I mean, it may require  
some form of modification. But the fundamentals of this clearinghouse are set  
up in that way.

I should say that there's one other point I should make. We went through quite a lot of discussion and I don't want to reopen that discussion. But there was a principle point here as well is should a recommendation from the working group be voted against by the Council or not. And we talked about that quite a lot. Or should it simply be referred back to the working group if it wasn't satisfactory?

There are some nuances in this case. And we've spent quite a lot of time discussing it. I don't think we need to go into that now but it's worth reflecting that that was part of our discussion. Nevertheless the position remains we propose to vote yes for 1-6, no for 7 if it remains bundled and potentially if it becomes unbundled, by whatever means, to split out our position on that to vote yes for inclusion in the clearinghouse, yes for claims but no for sunrise.

So we're absolutely with you on no for sunrise no matter what. The only question is whether we accept acronyms going into the clearinghouse and acronyms, therefore, getting claims notices associated with them.

Mason Cole: Just one thing I wanted to clear up and I guess it's to Luc's question online about (unintelligible) in the clearinghouse only subject to claims. And if you look at the TM plus 50 the plus 50 is not available for sunrise and for registrations, just for claims so that mechanism is already built in and is available so.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. I mean, Yoav, did you? No, okay. The impression I get from the registrars is that most of us don't seem to be happy with this acronym thing, or maybe I'm misinterpreting it. But I think that's the general kind of feeling. Yoav, did you want to add something?

Yoav Keren: Yes, just a suggestion. Maybe we can hear from people here what do they think from the registrars kind of because we had some discussion on the ExComm but, you know, hear some others...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay. What was the other item on the agenda?

Keith Drazek: Are there any other motions that need to be discussed?

Chuck Gomes: There's one other.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Ching Chiao: Yes, I guess the other one is the translation and transliteration of the contact information. I think, Yoav, this is actually your motion, right? You would like to, right.

Yoav Keren: Yes, so this came to the Council two meetings ago, no, two - two meetings ago and to call for action, to be precise. We asked for a deferral because there were some problems as we saw in the charter. We then, in the next Council meeting, there was a coordination between us and Jonathan who made it first, withdrew it. We had a quick discussion on different points that I raised and also Volker raised and Ching also supported some of them.

Just to clarify, the translation and transliteration of the Whois data can be a huge problem if we don't do it right and, I mean, both for registrars and both for registries. I think it's more much than anything we've seen like in the IDNs or something like that; this is much more complicated.

And so what we were asking is to add more text to the charter that - well, actually, make sure that the PDPs covering different aspects of that issue and we'll bring concrete answers or recommendations actually to the Council.

It was added in our call of the working group. And looks like we are all, in the Registrar ExComm, we took - we are in consensus about it. Registries as well so it should go through.

Michele Neylon: So this is just to vote on the actual charter? I mean, the PDP itself is going to go ahead anyway? Right?

Yoav Keren: We're voting for it; now it's amended finally and it will be with the right things inside because before that it was lacking of a lot of points that it should cover to make sure that - and I forget, like what would be the cost for implementing that and who should pay that would be a registrar paying for translation and transliteration...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No, okay, I mean, obviously the horse has already bolted on this one anyway. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just to clarify by pushing this back to the working group and having a very quick turnaround and discussion in the working group that caused the motion to be resubmitted to the Council within less than a week, I believe. We were able to insert some language also that required or recommended to the working group to also engage in a weighing of the benefits versus the potential costs as in a nice to have, nice to have benefit versus a significant cost for multiple operators might not be worthwhile pursuing.

That had been missing before. And I think this evaluation makes the motion that much stronger and beneficial to our interests and also better policy - the result will be better policy I think.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Volker. Just going back to the AROS discussion we were having earlier, Tim Cole sent on some information about the demos. They are scheduled at the top of the escalator across from the ICANN newcomers lounge from 3:30 to 5:00 pm today and tomorrow and from 11:00 until 12:30 on Thursday. So both registries and registrars are encouraged to go along and have a look at this wonderful tool that will make our lives significantly easier and save registrars from developing writer's cramp.

Tim Cole: And, Michele, it's just based on if you show up and want to see it. There's not a - he's not going to be standing there doing demos over and over unless people come up and want to see it so it's really going to be hands on demo.

Keith Drazek: Okay so, Michele, if you send that to me I'll forward it to the Registries list and the applicant list. So, did we finish on the motion you guys were just discussing? Okay then I think we need to just circle back briefly. Jeff asked the question about IGO INGOs, what do the registrars plan to do in terms of voting on this motion? If you know at this point.

Yoav Keren: Maybe we need a little more discussion? Yes. We didn't hear anyone else so.

Michele Neylon: Well, I mean, I think I already gave my opinion on this I think.

Yoav Keren: I think the same but...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Well, I mean, I think I said that I was opposed to adding anything for the acronyms either into the trademark clearinghouse or anywhere.

Jeff Neuman: So there's like 20-something recommendations in the entire motion. Are...

Michele Neylon: We're talking about if - if the motion is split so that the bit about the acronyms can be voted on separately because that's the part of the motion that had, was it strong support but not consensus or - was it...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Let me help you, Michele, if I may? So as far as I'm aware - and what I think I've heard here is you are with us on Items 1-6 of the motion. We're all okay on that. We will vote together and in the affirmative...

Michele Neylon: Yes, if...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...it's all about Item 7 which is A, B and C on acronyms. We currently will vote no if the motion - if that Item 7 remains bundled. And I'm - I mean, you guys, I expect, will vote no as well if it's bundled. The question is if it gets broken up for whatever reason we - our intention is then to vote yes on two of those and acronyms could well end up in the clearinghouse and we might end up voting differently with you.

So the question is - I guess what we wouldn't mind is how strongly you would feel about us diverging at that point. Because, you know, we obviously work with you; we don't always - we aren't always in absolute lockstep with you. But at the same time we're sensitive to our relationships with you and we don't

want to blow it unnecessarily by going against something you feel very, very strongly about.

Michele Neylon: So diplomatically you're asking are we going to stab you later? I mean, look, I don't know. (Tom), go ahead.

Tom Barrett: Yes, I mean, I guess the - I would certainly be opposed to even allowing the IGOs to have protection of claims. It just seems like a...

Michele Neylon: You mean acronyms?

Tom Barrett: Yes, the acronyms, they're not trademarks. You know, so unless they are trademarks they're eligible for the clearinghouse anyway. But now you're having the folks in front of the clearinghouse having to make judgments beyond trademark rights and that's not what it was designed for.

Michele Neylon: James, Yoav, (Ben), Jeff, Mr. Berryhill.

James Bladel: I was actually going to defer to - was it Jeff that was next? Whoever is next in the queue.

Michele Neylon: Just one of you to go first, please. Thanks.

John Berryhill: Yes, I just kind of want to pick up where Tom was. The claims notice has a prescribed form and format. It says, you know, there is a - intellectual property claim.

I don't even understand if you're going to say well we're going to have a claims notice that, you know, there's some IGO that really likes this acronym. And the only way to do that in a standard format is to say, you know, it's

either a trademark claim or it's some piece of fluff that you don't know about.  
I mean, it puts me on - as a registrant it puts me on notice of what? There's...

((Crosstalk))

John Berryhill: ...the point. Just let me finish. The point with the claims notice is that there are dispute policies that follow on, all right? And what we didn't want to have was a situation where under UDRP or a URS somebody would have a trademark registered and would be able to come in because those require active malfeasance, would be able to come in and say oh I had no notice of this, all right?

But here you're providing - that's the point. That's the point of providing the claims notice is to eliminate a defense in a dispute policy that applies to the registration. Now what is the point of the notice here? What does it do for anyone? Or are we then going to have some follow on thing to some dispute policy?

It is a pointless thing to do and it dilutes the value of the express notice of potential trademark violations that we wanted to include in the first place. I don't understand the point other than giving the trademark clearinghouse something else to charge people for.

Jonathan Robinson: Can I just check one other point in fact. What does the - does anyone know what the trademark claims notice looks like for a abused label?

Michele Neylon: Well, look, there's actually people from the trademark clearinghouse sitting in the back of the room staring at us so maybe they can answer that. (Vicky), I'm looking at you. I think she's either ignoring us or looking for that. Okay, I'll let them scurry around the back and see if they can find us one.

(Ben).

(Ben): Go on, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: So we're in a little bit of a dilemma here because the working group is now at the final report; they've delivered their final report. And a lot of these points are very valid. I don't disagree with any of them. The problem we have here is that those points weren't expressed by the registrars in the working group.

In fact, the registrars, I mean, they were - before the initial report but the registrars and, again, I don't mean this to sound blaming, but there was no one there from the registrars to actually change the position of the working group. There was no one there to make the argument that John has made very well.

And so now we're in a position basically of it gets to the Council level after it's all done and we're in a position of basically shooting down a lot of the report. So I agree with you on the notion of - with the acronyms, with the IGOs because that's an area we separated out and we can vote that down. But there's other areas of the report that talk about trademark claims for different things that I would agree with you, John, it's the same logic would apply.

But so that's kind of a little dilemma here, right? Because we want to preserve the policy development process and we don't want to second guess what the working group did. We can, however, vote down the one area where we have objected to and that's what we're recommending. And where the recommendation wasn't a consensus but a - as Keith pointed out it was strong support but significant opposition.

Keith Drazek: So, yes, James, go ahead.

James Bladel: But wasn't here another option where we would - where the Council would defer on some of those and send it back to the working group for...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, there was an option but we discussed in the Registry Stakeholder Group and we're not going to defer just to vote it down later...

James Bladel: No, no, no not defer. I'm sorry, not defer but essentially say we're accepting these recommendations; these recommendations have prompted additional questions that were not addressed in the working group and we'd like some refinement.

Jeff Neuman: So we - that's an option. But when we discussed it within the Registries we didn't see a point of sending it - there's no questions, we don't agree with it. So it's not like the working group is going to work that out.

James Bladel: Then you've got to vote no. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: On that part.

James Bladel: It feels like a GAC thing to do but...

Jeff Neuman: Right, so we're going to vote on that one part but the points raised by Tom and John are actually broader and are included in other recommendations which we're saying to vote yes to.

Man: I'm with John on this one. I mean, inclusion into the clearinghouse should be on the basis that those terms meet the requirements for inclusion in the clearinghouse anyway. You can't create a special subset in this instance.

Jeff Neuman: For the acronyms?

Man: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So just so you know the ones that we're saying yes to - and you guys said you would vote along with us - we are creating that class for the IOC, the Red Cross, full names of the IGOs, right, not the acronyms. So we're doing that.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: I saw a hand from Yoav and then Berry Cobb wanted to jump in from staff and then (Tom). Yoav, go ahead, Berry, then (Tom).

Yoav Keren: Jeff, I think you're hearing here from the registrars that I think the problem that we have is that we are opening a door. And we've already talked about this and long ago when this whole process started that we're opening a door for something that we were promised that will end at some point and it doesn't seem that it's ending. And this is clearly an issue for many of the registrars.

The fact that we didn't have anyone participating is not a good functioning of our stakeholder group but that doesn't mean that we should go now and vote for it when we're against it. And us as councilors of - that represent this working group, sorry, the stakeholder group, if the stakeholder group is against it how can we go and vote in favor?

So, you know, I think it would be great if this - if this was split to - we can actually don't vote down everything and only the acronym part. But I think this is what we're hearing here.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Yoav. I saw Jonathan wanted to respond to something you said and then we'll go to Berry and Tom.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I'm not 100% sure where we are because at the moment we've split it up into this 1-6 and 7. I think if we were to go back now and essentially - well I mean, I think we've got to be very careful about the integrity of the process. And, I mean, we've got a higher level of sensitivity here of having had some work of a working group in one of the most highly visible and sensitive areas, much as all of us may not like, the genesis, the progress.

But we are where we are. There are a set of recommendations from the working group. So from my point of view, you know, thinking from a GNSO Council, GNSO policy development point of view, I would, you know, personally I'd happy accept some compromises around Number 7 for the sake of the perceived integrity of the overall process. So if you guys felt you could live with voting in the affirmative for 1-6, I mean, my sense is let's keep 7 bundled and let's, you know, vote it down.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Jonathan. So, Berry then (Tom) then Jordyn and then John.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Keith. This is Berry Cobb. I'm not sure if this'll help the deliberations or not but in terms of the implementation for this going forward and the use of the trademark clearinghouse there was feedback from the community that the claims notice itself, you're right, is very trademark-intensive or, you know, tailored towards that.

That likely in terms of implementation that it would be tailored more for language of protecting of IGO identifier so it would be two different notices. And I'm sure that opens up some other doors.

But ultimately it's something that would be looked at in the implementation component and I think there's one clause or one of the last clauses in the Resolve statement that there would be an implementation review team formed and that we'd go from there. So I don't know if that helps or not.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much, Berry. Okay, Tom.

Tom Barrett: Yes, I mean, we're - it is a policy versus implementation issue. And I think - correct me if I'm wrong - when the 50 plus variants were added to the clearinghouse there's a lot of community feedback saying that that language should be changed to reflect these are no longer exact trademarks.

I'm not sure that actually was implemented. And so, you know, to promise another variant claims notice, again if it wasn't implemented last time, you know, the confidence this low it would be implemented this time.

So I don't, you know, I don't think we can keep saying yes, keep saying yes and find out oh, you know, sensitivity is a bigger issue than all of us, let's just keep saying yes and hope, you know, maybe this time we can trust them. It's just - history tells us we're going to get burned, right.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Tom. Let's - so I had Jordyn and then John in the queue and then Jonathan. Okay that's fine. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Tom, look, I mean, personally I have a lot of sympathy with where you're coming from. I get it, completely. But the challenge that I think we face

is for all of us collectively is the perceived integrity of the policy development process which is something we've worked really hard to persuade the broader ICANN community and others that it works and does the right thing and does the right job.

Now the challenge for me is if we, at this stage, at the Council-level, not at the working group-level, make these points, the basis on which we vote these recommendations down, it's ugly; it doesn't look good at all.

So our opportunity to make the modifications you suggest and propose, which I have personally great sympathy with, we should have done and should always do at the working group level. So that's the dilemma. I've got a lot of sympathy with you but I've got a job as GNSO Council Chair to manage the integrity of the policy development process.

And all of us have been extremely focused on new gTLDs, this is an extremely time-consuming issue that in many ways is a sideshow for most of us in our businesses, yes. So it's a real challenge.

And that's why I think the hat I'm wearing is much more defending the integrity and perceived integrity of the policy development process and the optics of this issue more generally in the community so it's on that basis that I'm arguing rather than any lack of knowledge or sympathy or understanding for the points that you and John Berryhill and others are making.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jonathan. So Jordyn, John, Volker.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, and I mostly wanted to echo what Jonathan is saying. I, you know, over the last year or so we've seen sort of incredibly important threats to the functioning of the bottom-up process, right? Like we see staff going off and

just sort of deciding that they can't wait for the community to decide things so they're just going to do it themselves.

And in the end of the day, given all the pressure that we put on them to get things done as well, there's no other reasonable thing for them to do if we don't have a functioning bottom-up policy development process. We have to show that the policy development process works.

And just today in our meeting with the Board we said, "Hey, Board, look, the PDP works. We have this IGO INGO thing." This is what we're using to advertise the fact that we can get stuff done ourselves rather than having the staff just go off and decide whatever they're going to do and having bodies set up strategy panels that are going to, you know, reshape ICANN.

So if you care about the integrity - if you - the question is, is getting this exactly right on this particular policy question on the merits more important than having a win in terms of being able to show that the PDP works?

And I think, for me, it's obvious to me that having something that we can use an exemplar for the fact that we can get our act together as a community is way important - way more important than whether we can trust, you know, whether the exact implementation details are going to get right and which exact strings are going to get in here.

Because at the end of the day we're going to look back and say the IGO INGO thing was not a big deal for our businesses but whether ICANN works or not is incredibly fundamentally important for all of us.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. So I've got John, Volker, Jeff and Yoav.

John Berryhill: I'm just at a loss to understand than - having a GNSO Council vote is not part of the process is the way I understand it. I mean, I don't understand if the process terminates in a GNSO Council vote, and that's part of the process, I don't understand why there is this, you know, this compelling need for the GNSO just to rubberstamp things because I would assume that in the overall design of the process that is a safety valve for, as Jeff said, a working group that didn't have proper input, ran off the rails, whatever.

I mean, you admit that, you know, the working group did not function correctly. And having a - well having a Council vote, I mean, we either have a vote or we don't have a vote. If we don't have a vote then let's take that out of the process.

Jeff Neuman: I think the working group worked amazing. The amount of participants in that group there were like 40-something participants. They met once a week every week for the past year. They've had 38 calls since the last ICANN meeting in Durban. I mean, just incredible amounts of work.

The only part that didn't work - and I'm sorry to be a little blunt here - is that we didn't have representatives from the registrars. That's the - that's it. Right? I think the process worked extremely well. I wasn't on the working group, right? But from what I observed as the Council liaison to the group it worked really, really, really well.

And this is - other than the registrars not being there, which is not something the working group could have controlled, everything was done right. The Council really is not a legislative body. It shouldn't be a legislative body. It shouldn't substitute its view for the view of the working group.

We all agreed upon that when we set up this model. We've argued that before in other motions in previous years from the Non Contracted Parties and this has been consistent. For us to now just say no because we don't like it and there were no problems in the working group, I just think, as Jordyn said, that's part of the fundamental ICANN model.

And, I mean, the registries are going to vote yes so the registrars can do what they want. I mean, we're not going to tell you what to do.

John Berryhill: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: But our point is that probably think a little bit more about the ICANN model.

Keith Drazek: So thanks, Jeff. So - and, you know, obviously this is something we wanted to talk to you all about as the Contracted Party House, right? I mean, at least to kick this around. So I've got Volker and then Jeff and then Yoav if it got that order...

Volker Greimann: Yes, Volker Greimann speaking. I just wanted to support Jonathan and Jordyn that politics of this are important. As registrars we have, in a way, failed this working group by not participating in it actively. That is something that we have to live with.

We have the option to look at the results of the working group and as the working group was not able to come to consensus on something - on some parts of the issues that are dear at heart for many registrars to evaluate - to evaluate these situations but we should not block the motion in its entirety or something where we would have had the input to block it earlier on the Council level.

We need to participate more in working groups, that's maybe some - the content of what I'm trying to say - if we want to have a voice within ICANN. We should not use a vote in the Council to block something that does not - that we do not like, that we could have prevented in the working group. That's the wrong level. As the Council we need to show that we are efficient working with ICANN upholding the process. That's our job.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Volker. So Jeff then Yoav.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. And actually Volker stole some of my thunder. I completely agree with him. The registrars did not participate and, you know, shame on us for not going through. But I agree, I think that there are certain things to take stance on and that might be, you know, that are crucially important. I think if everyone just takes a step back and look is this more critical than the GNSO process and that people have faith in it?

I would rather go, you know, say, listen, it might not be perfect, it's okay. I personally think in the grand scheme of things - I think Jordyn said it - we'll look back in a certain amount of time and be like, holy crap, we wasted all this time and effort on this issue and it wasn't - just my personal opinion.

But that being said I think that the process in general and having faith in the PDP and in the process is more important than I think the issues are at hand. And I think as far as taking stands, this is not one worth taking a stand over forward. And I think it just sort, you know, just lick our wounds for not helping out and just move on to the next one.

Keith Drazek: Okay. I've got - sorry, Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: I think issues are worth taking a stand for but in the right place in the working group. If we want to take a stand on certain issues then we need to participate in the working groups better and more and take a stand there. Taking the stand on the Council level for an issue where we could have taken a stand at an earlier place, but didn't, that's torpedoing the work of a working group and that's not what the Council should do.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Volker. Yoav, you're good?

Yoav Keren: Just wanted to say that it looks to me that even if we had someone in the working group we would still be in a minority and that would still be the position. So it doesn't look like - because - it looks like it wouldn't change the result and would probably get to the same point and we'd need to decide whether we would (unintelligible) or not but just my own opinion.

Volker Greimann: The main points that we're arguing about are the points that in the working group did not achieve consensus but did achieve strong support with significant opposition if I remember correctly. So had registrars voted in the negative in the working group then it would have been even less support and more opposition therefore maybe the recommendations wouldn't even have turned out this way.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Okay, thanks Volker. Thanks, Yoav. Matt, go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Yes, thanks Keith. Just real quick I just want to agree with Jeff and Volker. And, you know, I just think it sends the wrong message for us to, you know, not participate in the process and then at the end of the day vote it down so I'd encourage us to stick with the plan that the Registries have in place and support you guys on that. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, Tom, go ahead and then we probably need to wrap this up.

Tom Barrett: Yes, we recently updated our bylaws in the Registrar Stakeholder Group so even if there were full involvement in this working group the stakeholder group are entitled to instruct their councilors on how to vote regardless of their input into the stakeholder group. So they basically have to come back to the group and ask us how we want to vote on these motions.

Keith Drazek: Yes, okay thanks, Tom. Any last thoughts on this before we move on? And we're already over time. Matt, did you have anything else to add?

Matt Serlin: Well I was just - just to be clear I don't believe those bylaws that we passed in our stakeholder group are actually effective right now; I think there's still a question about the next steps and how we go about getting those approved - so finalized and in place.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Volker.

Volker Greimann: While that is true as councilor I would feel honor-bound that the policies that we have voted on should be followed even if they're not quite implemented yet. However, as a councilor cognizant of the duty of the Council and our duty to the community I would urge the constituency not to give us a vote that would substantially have the impact of damaging the ICANN process in the public view.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, everybody. We are already 20 minute past the scheduled end of the Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting. But we also have our colleagues from IBM and Deloitte, I think on the trademark clearinghouse here. So I would like to - for those that can stick around for another 10, 15, 20 minutes, take this opportunity to thank them for joining us and to engage in some

dialogue. Questions, any updates, anything like that. So if you all would like to come up, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: All right, why don't we go ahead and get started before we lose anymore folks out of the room. So I guess what I would offer is the floor to you all to give any sort of brief update or remarks or anything that you think is relevant or meaningful in terms of new information and then we can open it up for a dialogue.

(Jan): We will do that. Sorry. First of all thank you very much for inviting us here. We have a couple of representatives from Deloitte, myself, (unintelligible) (Vicky Follens) from Deloitte and then we have (Francis) (unintelligible) and (Lynn) from IBM.

I'd like to, you know, mainly have this - more of an open session with questions if you have them. I can spend couple minutes in sharing some information. There is, I think, not that much new information and we obviously will have a session tomorrow where we can share more statistics and we will actually do that.

So thanks for inviting us anyhow. It's been a great journey, up until now, a long journey with a lot of changes, the plus 50 and all of the implementation that we had to do around that.

But I think we're definitely at the situation right now where everything that was required has been implemented which is slightly different story than the last time when we presented in your session.

We have about - around 17,000 trademarks in the database right now. Those 17,000 represent just around 30,000 labels. As you know there are certain trademarks with special characters that could result in multiple labels. And there are quite a number of trademarks that have spaces in them and that's why those create quite some labels.

On the IBM side we still see a slow uptake but we're definitely been working hard on the last two months to also come out in those regions especially in China we're now having a couple agents that are very active and that are wanting to promote. We're having a first event in Japan. Next week we will be in Japan. And we're finally starting to get some traction in the Middle East.

We will be at (NTAC) in Dubai in December. But we're still struggling finding local agents that are willing to represent the clearinghouse. But based on my information some of the registries are also having difficulties finding local registrars. So it's - yes, I think it's more of a regional problem than only our problem.

For some reason - and we'll try to explain it in more detail tomorrow - there still seems to be some confusion on the pricing. Obviously there is a pricing on our side, on the Deloitte side, and there is a pricing on the IBM side. The \$150 US or below is on the Deloitte side, is on the front end of the trademark clearinghouse which is for the trademark agents and holders. The \$5000 US is the registry fee which is on the trademark database side which is owned by ICANN and operates by IBM.

We will definitely go in a little more detail about - IBM will go in a little more detail on the pricing model tomorrow. But if there are any questions I'm sure that they can also answer them now.

We have around 165 clearinghouse agents so there are still agents extra. It was a little bit slow a couple weeks ago but in the last two, three weeks we've had around, I think, 10, 15 agents extra. So, yes, definitely I think also there are quite a number of agents that are willing to invest in getting some things up and running.

We're starting to work a lot with those agents to promote the trademark clearinghouse to help them promote the trademark clearinghouse but we're also starting to work a lot with the registries and we're also have been having a lot of discussions this week in some launch programs that we'd like to assist in.

((Crosstalk))

(Jan): So perhaps there are a couple of registry's activities that we have started off this week that we discussed with them. Yes.

Woman: Yes, so the idea is that we - first of all in the beginning when we started the early bird sunrise before any sunrise was happening and we had open registration we said that it could take up to 20 days to register - or to verify a trademark record and another 5 days - or 14 days for proof of use.

Please note that we've already changed that to a turnaround about seven days now. And we are looking into the fact definitely for some registries it's interesting to have them, I mean, after sunrise with them being that they would be kind of have a fast track process so when trademark holders would want to at least register with trademark clearinghouse for that benefit of that registry or TLD that they would be processed more quickly than the other ones.

But we are already currently are changing turning around on seven days and we're ramping up as well as - the number is going up as well from our side.

(Jan): So we're definitely interested in understanding from the registries how they will shape their sunrise so that we can see how we need to organize ourselves to react swiftly to their demands and make sure that we can also help you have a good sunrise.

We have a central page currently on the clearinghouse which - where you can actually, if you provide us the information, you can upload all the information regarding your TLD but obviously especially around your sunrise and having the URL here, [sunrise.clearinghouse.org](http://sunrise.clearinghouse.org) and then it jumps to the page on the Website.

We also have been approached by a number of TLDs, especially gTLDs, which presented their launch program and seems that they're thinking of having quite a number of different periods in there. Yes, we're trying to grasp also what's coming out a way there.

On the other hand there are also registrars that came to us and that - yes, that we're looking for information around that because, yes, they also need to change their systems to be able to adapt that. Some of them were complaining about that but anyhow I think that we can definitely, in their story, also be a (catalysator) of bringing info streams together so that both parties know what is coming their way.

I had one more point I think. Yes.

Woman: So as (Jan) explained, we have adjusted our Website to have the information on the launches of the sunrise. We also will have a page where the registries can put their information on there if you want, yes.

Secondly, for those of you that are interested we do want to invite you to participate in our webinars too, our trademark holders and agents so that you can also market your TLD before the actual launch of any sunrise. But at least there's awareness being created that people know what's going on so we do invite the registries for that.

(Jan): Bottom line I think we're here to help you, to work with you. A lot of you have come to our booth, asked for a meeting and we've had a lot of productive discussions already this week. For the ones who haven't feel free to contact us and see how we can help you with promotion - with organizing sunrises to the extent that it's possible. That's a little bit the message that we have.

Man: (Unintelligible) remark from IBM. so we will be also be interested to receive some feedback if currently the information provided on how to get connected how you can set it up, what kind of testing you have to do, how the testing certificates has to be obtained.

On one hand we see still quite a lot of questions especially this week. We received quite a few questions on this. On the other hand we have seen at the participation in the Webinar which we have been organizing is really slowing down. So any feedback that you want to provide on how you would prefer to receive information or how we should make it available would also be very useful for us so we can make sure that everyone is knowledgeable about the difference process.

Obviously we will also come back to some extent on that during the presentation tomorrow afternoon. Thank you.

(Jan): Are there still any questions?

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you all very much. Appreciate the update. Any questions? Comments? Inquiries for trademark clearinghouse colleagues? No one?

Michele Neylon: Okay then I think our slightly extended - oh, no, Volker wants to say something.

Volker Greimann: Switching my hat from a registrar to a trademark agent at the moment we found that the current practice of only allowing one update to any database entry to be very disadvantageous for us as agents. And we would like to encourage trademark clearinghouse to allow at least one further update to take into account spelling errors, mistakes by customers. Even if such updates would be paid for this would be preferential to having to enter an entire new entry request.

(Jan): Yes, point taken. I think we're still trying to work as much as we can on helping you get correct records in. Yes, but I think in some instances we've just seen that some people or some parties have really difficulties getting in correct things. And I'm not talking about one or two times but five, six reiterations on the same record. And I think that's why we gave the message like we're only going to do it once.

If there's really an issue on a record or something I think that if it's on an exceptional basis we will do our best to help you. But we also - I can tell you of the 165 - I mean, on the agent's side it's still quite okay. On the holder's side it is sometimes really dramatic. It is - the errors and the delayed - the type of

errors are so basic that you sometimes wonder whether they even read what they put in there so.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just one further addition. One case - I'm not quite certain of the details but just to illustrate my point that has been described to me by our processors was that the customer had - when copying the data into the necessary fields that then caused the upload to the trademark clearinghouse ignored page break and therefore the goods and services categories were not quite exactly as the goods and service categories in the register therefore it was denied. We had to enter that again.

And then later the customer came with a certification of use that he needs for a trademark sunrise registration and that was not possible anymore because the one update attempt had already been used for the update of the error. That clearly is a - a very problematic position and for the trademark holder because now he holds an entry that he cannot use for sunrise process.

Therefore I would like to see a modification to the rules that further updates are possible even though that may cost additional fees.

Woman: Yes, we'll definitely take a look at that. But have you - did you file a request at the customer support for those specific cases? Because normally, I mean, our customer support they really try to help out as much as can.

And we definitely - we pulled the trademark record and approve of use also separate so even if your trademark record is verified you can still add proof of use at a later time. And also we've done a lot of modifications the last couple of - two months to really focus on making the process even more smooth.

Volker Greimann: The process - the case that I was talking about it happened last week. And the only response we got for a request for further upload of the case of use information was to file a dispute.

Woman: We'll look into it.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. Any last questions then? I guess we can wrap it up. And thank you all very much for participating and for your patients in waiting for us to get started so thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Bye-bye. Next Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting will be held in Singapore where we'll all probably be sweating like pigs. See you all then.

Volker Greimann: Haven't we been there before? Will that not be kind of déjà vu?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yes, as long as the air conditioning works it won't be too bad but those of us who smoke the going outside for a cigarette is painful.

(Tim): And ICANN didn't have an office there last time.

Michele Neylon: So are you offering tours of your offices, (Tim)?

(Tim): I'd have to see them first. But sure.

END