ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – GNSO: Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in gTLDs Working Group (2 of 2)
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CEST

| | |
|---|---|
| [ANDREA GLANDON:] | Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the second session of the ICANN 69 review of all rights protection mechanisms PDP working group call being held on Tuesday the 13th of October 2020. |
| | Please note all RPM group members have been promoted to panelists. Panelists can activate their mics and type in the Zoom chat pod. To do so, please remember to select panelists and attendees in the dropdown menu so that everyone can read your comments. Panelists cannot ask questions via the Q&A pod, so we ask you to kindly type them in the chat pod. |
| | We are welcoming observers on our call today. A warm welcome to all of you. Observers on this call are silent observers, meaning you cannot activate your mics. |
| | As a reminder to all, this call is being recorded. Recordings will be posted on the ICANN 69 website shortly after the call ends. All panelists must remember to state their names before speaking. All participants on the call must abide by the ICANN standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Phil Corwin. Please begin. |

**EN**

PHILIP CORWIN:   Yeah. Whatever time it is where you are, welcome to our second working group meeting of this morning, at least this morning for me—started early—and this will be the second and last meeting during ICANN 69 of the RPM working group, which is going to be delivering its final report to GNSO council no later than November 25th. So we'll have about six weeks left after a four-and-a-half-year journey.

On the last call, we had a very extended discussion of URS recommendation 9 and converted into this whole proposal, 34, and now on the agenda, there's draft discussion language on ALP. Somebody remind me what the A in ALP stands for. Approved launch procedure, I believe. It's a variation on sunrise registration. And I understand that there's new staff language contained in the document linked to on the left side, but I have to ask whether working group members were aware of that.

I don't recall seeing an e-mail alerting working group members that there was new language to be discussed on this call. If we can resolve these issues today, fine, but if no one's seen this language until now and it goes on for several paragraphs, if we're bogged down, we're going to table it and come back to it at a future meeting.

Paul Tattersfield, you were the leader on this issue. Were you aware of this new language in the document developed for this meeting? All right, Mr. Tattersfield was aware of it. So let's go through this language, staff, quickly, and see if we can get the working group to sign off on it. We did have a recommendation on this but there were some issues with that, lack of implementation guidance, lack of much

context and some other concerns, but we did promise those concerned about this issue that we would have final report language speaking to their concerns.

So, who on staff is going to take us through this?

ARIEL LIANG: Phil, I'm happy to take everyone through this language.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: So the first paragraph is basically just provided definition what the approved launch program is. Some of you may recall when the initial report was published, there is sunrise question number three that's related to ALP and definition was included in the footnote for that particular question, so we just used that exact language from that question and put it here.

The second paragraph basically talks about some of the preliminary discussions of the working group when they discussed the ALP, and the feedback is that ALP didn't integrate smoothly with sunrise implemented under the 2012 new gTLD program. So basically, this language also comes from the contextual language of sunrise question three that's talking about ALP, and then we just borrowed that language here to provide further background.

ICANN | 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

**EN**

Following that, the third paragraph talks about the public comment results, so basically, that's just reiterate that there's limited feedback received from registry operators, but they all point to the difficulty for registry operators to obtain ICANN Org's approval for ALP application in a timely manner. And also, another thing the working group found out is that there's no clear guideline for the ALP process at the start of the 2012 new gTLD program, and the relevant documentation was published during the implementation phase of that towards the end of 2013. So that's a point to the difficulties related to the ALP and specifically these two items, the lack of clear guidance at the beginning of the program and difficulty to get ICANN approval in a timely manner.

The final paragraph is basically staff's attempt to capture the small group's proposal, [inaudible] very clear language, and in the future, the IRT can review and consider. So I'll just read it quickly here because that's probably the most important content the working group want to agree on.

Based on public comments received, the working group agrees that the ALP process should be predictable, timely, and as transparent as possible while respecting the need for confidentiality and flexibility for ICANN Org and an ALP applicant to engage in a constructive discussion.

To this end, as implementation guidance to the IRT, the working group suggests that the IRT review the published process documentation

and review guidelines with a view towards providing future ALP applicants with clear guidance as to expected timelines for decisions.

In addition, the working group suggests that the IRT consider whether, in order to fulfill the objectives of transparency and predictability, all applications received and their results will be published appropriately redacted so as not to display personal data or business confidential information at the request of the applicant.

The working group hopes that these suggestions will help enable the ALP to become an effective solution for geo TLDs for the protection of interests of public authorities and local entities.

And I note that Maxim has provided a comment in that paragraph. He suggests to delete that the IRT consider whether—that's the highlighted phrase here in the paragraph, delete that, and then there's some minor edits from Paul Tattersfield in the text, but there doesn't seem to be anything substantial. So that's all for the overview of this section.

PHILIP CORWIN:          Thank you, Ariel, for taking us through that. So basically, we have four paragraphs proposed for the final report. The first three are background on the issue and our findings from public comments, and the final paragraph is the operative one giving some direction to the IRT about the need to provide second round applicants, future applicants who want to use the approved launch program, with some greater certainty on technical issues and particularly on timelines for

ICANN response that worked for them where they can get things in order before launch.

I'll open it to discussion. I invite both Paul Tattersfield and Maxim to explain their proposed edits, and then open it up to other comments, but I think we can probably put this one to bed very quickly.

Maxim Alzoba. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about the lower part about IRT to consider whether ... I was under impression that this bit says that IRT may consider or not, and it's up to them. So if I'm mistaken, then my comment that it needs to be removed is not important. But if I'm right, then this bit says that IRT may consider or may not. Then we might need to remove this bit. Thanks.

PHILIP CORWIN: Maxim, with your proposed removal of that language, the sentence beginning "In addition" would say that we suggest that all applications received, and the result of them will be published with appropriate redaction at the request of the applicant for what they want redacted. So it would say we want this done rather than telling the IRT to consider whether this should be done. Is that correct?

| | |
|---|---|
| MAXIM ALZOBA: | Or we just remove word "whether," effectively saying that it's up to them. I might be mistaken, because I'm not a native speaker. So my intention was to say that we recommend this, but without options like if they want or not. Thanks. |
| PHILIP CORWIN: | Okay. My only concern—being a native English speaker, and I speak no Russian so you're way ahead of me—is that if we take that out, the word "suggest" is kind of weak. If your intent is to strengthen this sentence, we might want a different word than "suggest." We could say "expects" or something along those lines to make clear that we want this to be carried out. But I'll stop talking and leave it to others. Paul Tattersfield, go ahead, please. |
| PAUL TATTERSFIELD: | Thank you. Thanks to Ariel for a very rapid turnaround on this at the 11th hour, especially while preparing for an ICANN meeting. I'd just like to say I agree with Maxim. The language is very weak and I think we need something stronger. And I think we had something stronger in the last meeting. I think we need to say "expects." I prefer "expects," really. Thank you. |
| PHILIP CORWIN: | Okay. So the working group expects that in order to fulfill the objectives, etc., all applications received, and the results will be published. I saw that Michael Graham suggested in the chat that "will" |

be changed to "should." I think the result is pretty much the same. But I think that change is fine if we want to go ahead with it. "Should be published." Okay. And is it clear that changing at the request to requested by, is it clear that that is still—the applicant is giving some direction as to what they want protected by redaction? I'll leave that to the working group.

PAUL TATTERSFIELD:     That was a staff edit, but I don't have a problem with it.

PHILIP CORWIN:     Okay. Yeah, at the request of the applicant, or requested by. I think it's fine either way. Let's scroll back up to the other green language in the opening paragraphs for subsequent registration prior to sunrise. That seems just fine. All right, so let me put the question to the group. We reviewed the staff drafted language, and we appreciate their work on this. We've reviewed the language, particularly the operative final paragraph which gives direction to the IRT. Is there anyone concerned by this language as it now stands, or can we approve it and move on to the next item?

So basically, if you have concerns or objections—my co-chair, Brian Beckham. Go ahead, Brian.

BRIAN BECKHAM:     Thanks, Phil. I just want to make sure that I'm answering your question in terms of agreement and moving forward. There were some

discussions with the small group regarding basically what this adds to the existing process. And I don't want to hold up progress, I know we want to move on during this call, but in other words, I personally wouldn't say that I agree with this recommendation because I don't feel that the small group actually answered the questions that were put to it and I don't feel that we're actually moving the ball forward and doing what we want to do here, but I appreciate that might be a statement that's more rightly reserved for consensus call purposes or something like that. So, sorry, I don't want to belabor or confuse things, but when we talk about agreeing, maybe it's agreeing to move on versus agreeing with the text on screen.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yeah, we're agreeing to the text on the screen. This is not the consensus call. And I do want to note that this is no longer a formal recommendation of the working group, it is narrative language in the final report basically setting forth that in that review of the public comments, we found that some applicants who had wanted to use the approved launch program had difficulty doing so in terms of some technical issues as well as timely response from ICANN and that we wanted to bring that to the attention of the IRT and suggest that the use of this approved launch program for subsequent rounds should be made more responsive to the needs of applicants so that those who want to use it can practically use it.

So I think it's less than a recommendation but it's quite a bit more than not saying anything about the subject. But again, we're just

calling for working group approval of this narrative language in the final report at this point in time. So Brian, I see with that you have no objection. If people have concerns about this—I'm not sure if we get to this stuff on the consensus call, but again, it's not a formal recommendation.

So, anyone want to speak further to this item, or can we accept the language as it is? I see no hands up and I hear no voices, so we're going to accept this language for the final report and we thank staff for their work on this, we thank the members of the small team for bringing this issue to our attention and for their diligent work on it.

So let us move on now to the next item.

ARIEL LIANG:               Phil, if I may, perhaps I can just let folks know what we're reviewing. As you can see on the screen, this is already approved recommendation related to geographical indicators, so nothing to review of the recommendation itself. The only thing that's new is really to the contextual language, because when that recommendation language was circulated, it doesn't contain context or the paragraph of public comment reviews, so to be consistent with the format of the other recommendations in the final report, staff put together this contextual language and also a short paragraph about public comment review just for the working group to confirm whether you're okay with this text.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. So to repeat, the recommendation is locked down, the new language is the context language, and the language on review of public comments. Do you want to take us through it quickly, Ariel, and then we can see if anyone has concerns?

ARIEL LIANG: Sure. For the context, first paragraph just talks about where this recommendation originated from. That's originated from the TMCH individual proposal four and five, so these two proposals were consolidated and became this recommendation.

Second paragraph talks about the working group's deliberation of public comments received on these two individual proposals, and there were three ideas the working group has coalesced about. The first is mandatory RPMs should only be for trademarks, not other types of non-trademark marks, including geographical indicators.

Second idea is while other types of non-trademark marks can be entered into the TMCH, they're not eligible for sunrise and claims. And third point is the ability for the TMCH provider and registry operators to offer additional voluntary ancillary services to other types of non-trademark marks should be preserved via ancillary database.

So these are the three ideas the working group has coalesced around after deliberating on the public comments. And then following that is basically just to kind of recap, the working group has agreed on the policy principles reflecting those ideas. Those policy principles were in the recommendation itself, and following that, there are some

suggested amendments to the applicant guidebook text in the implementation guidance. But also note that this suggested amendment to the AGB should serve as a starting point and IRT should have the flexibility or latitude to develop the final language of the AGB.

The working group also recognizes that there would be community consultation related to the future implementation and the actual language of the final policy will be posted for public comment. So that's pretty much it of the context.

For the public comment review recap, it just talks about both the individual proposals four and five received similar level of support, but then the stakeholders, sometimes they indicate their preference for either/or of these two proposals. But due to their similarity, the working group has agreed to put forward a recommendation that consolidates them based on the agreed policy principles that receive cross-community support.

The final paragraph just talks about that Deloitte did comment that they never deviate or overstep the TMCH guidelines. But the working group believed that this working group is necessary in clarifying the requirements and rules in AGB and that Deloitte must follow. So that's pretty much it for the contextual language of this recommendation.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. Thank you, Ariel. Let me first note that there are some suggestions for some minor wordsmithing in the chat. Susan Anthony says that the term should be geographical indications, not indicators.

And then Professor Tushnet, rather than the phrase entered in the TMCH, she suggested entered into a database maintained by the TMCH operator, and Greg Shatan suggested, going further, and said additional database or ancillary database, and Professor Tushnet agreed with that further clarification.

Paul McGrady, there's a link to the document in the same place on the ICANN schedule, but Julie Hedlund just gave you the link. So let me stop there and open it up for additional comment and see if we can approve this contextual language regarding the context and the review of public comments. Thank you, Ariel, for making those technical and typographical changes. Professor Tushnet.

REBECCA TUSHNET:     Super quick, I think it would actually have to be "an additional or ancillary database," just for greater clarity. Other than that, I feel like if Greg and I can agree on something, there's almost a presumption that there must be agreement elsewhere. Thank you.

PHILIP CORWIN:     Yes. And any day that you and Greg are in agreement is a good day for the planet. We like that. So, I don't see any other hands up. Does that mean that with the modest changes we've just agreed to, that we can sign off on this language?

If anyone has an objection to this language as edited, please speak up, and if not, we're going to approve it. It could be operator or provider.

I'm not sure. I think everyone is going to know who that is regardless of which word you use. And staff will check that. Greg, I see your comment in chat. I think we can all agree that it's Tuesday. That's something we can all agree on.

I'm going to close this item out unless I see somebody who wants to speak to it further right now. Going, gone. It's approved as modified on this call with staff to, I think we agreed on operator, so we're done with that and we can move on to the next item for review.

So Ariel, I'm presuming that the language we're going to review now is just what's highlighted. Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. That's correct. And I just want to note that this section is charter questions annex in the final report. There's one particular section, it's the overarching charter questions, so it goes basically across several pages and that's the working group's conclusion of these overarching charter questions based on public comment input.

So this is additional content compared to the charter question annex in the initial report, but I want to clarify that this is not the first time the working group has seen this text. So if you recall during the public comment review phase, staff has been keeping up with the working group's deliberation and updated this public comment analysis document so when the working group was working on these overarching charter question public comments, we have already captured the conclusion of the working group's discussion of these

public comments. So these are not new and have been circulated in the working group before, but we want to flag it here, is these are inserted in this annex because we believe this is the right place to reflect the working group's discussion of the charter questions here. So just want to clarify that.

PHILIP CORWIN:    All right. Thank you for that clarification. I don't think there's any need to go over things we've already seen and approved. Saying that, if someone has any concern about any of the language you've already seen while we're going through this section, now would be the time to raise those concerns.

I'll get to you in a moment, Kathy, I see your hand is up. But mostly, we're going to just focus on the highlighted language, which is language we haven't seen before. Correct?

ARIEL LIANG:    Yes, that's correct.

PHILIP CORWIN:    Okay. Kathy, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN:    I'm not sure we've seen a lot of this language before, particularly some of it involving overarching charter question number two. It may have been something referenced, but I'm not sure it's come before us in the

working group. Maybe Ariel can tell us what date, or maybe I missed the meeting. But I think some of this looks, at least to me, like fairly new summary material. Important, but a lot of it doesn't seem familiar to me. Thanks.

PHILIP CORWIN:          Ariel has put in chat that all this language was circulated to working group members on August 26th.

KATHY KLEIMAN:          Circulated but not discussed per se. Okay.

PHILIP CORWIN:          Why don't we do this? For the sake of this open session where we have many non-working group members, I'd like to focus on the highlighted brand-new language that was not previously circulated. Having said that, there is a lot here, so I think if working group members, upon second review of this, have any concerns about any provisions of this, we can leave the report not locked down and give them time to bring it back up at our next regular session.

But [inaudible] bring it up first on the e-mail list where they've identified a concern about particular language. I think for the sake of the 27 minutes we have left today, that's probably the best approach.

So, the highlighted language here says that we believe that we've taken into account the public comments in response to the

overarching charter questions when finalizing our phase one final recommendations and that we haven't conducted any formal consensus call on responses to and conclusions for the charter questions.

Yeah, and when we do a consensus call, it's going to be on the recommendations. So that highlighted language seems fine to me, but if anyone has concerns, now is the time to voice them. All right, I don't see any hands up, so let's move on. And the next highlighted language says that we noted the difference between the general overarching charter questions and the additional overarching charter questions. The general ones were questions that were reviewed and drafted by the GNSO council specifically for the working group's consideration. The additional questions are the few community questions obtained from prior work on the RPMs which the GNSO council included unchanged in the PDP charter for the working group to refine. And I'll interject, we spent a great deal of time refining them, and that's one reason it's taken so long to get to this point.

After the text, the working group considered these additional overarching charter questions but did not further refine or modify them. We took the public comments received into account when finalizing our phase one final recommendations as well as documented its conclusions in addressing these overarching charter questions.

That language seems pretty clear. Anyone with concerns about anything there? I see David McAuley lost audio. He says in chat,

"Anyone else having audio problems?" Okay. All right. I'm not seeing any hands up, so I think we can accept this language and move on.

ARIEL LIANG:     Sorry for interjecting, Phil, I just want to note that basically, because staff already circulated this working group conclusion under each of the overarching charter questions in the public comment analysis document in August, we didn't highlight these as new language, but of course, this is not something in the initial report. So if the working group decides not to review it in this call today, that's fine, but I just want to note that for the remainder of this document, there's not much new highlighted language except for the very end that's additional marketplace RPM, the final paragraph that's the new highlighted text.

PHILIP CORWIN:     All right. Ariel, scrolling back up, you were saying that the language and the gray boxes—this language was not in the initial report, this language is drawn directly from the working group charter. Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG:     In the initial report, the working group didn't deliberate on the overarching charter questions. The working group posted these for public comments and then after the public comment deliberation, the working group has reached conclusions of these overarching charter

questions. So the gray box is just the overarching charter question itself, and then underneath, that's the conclusion for each of the question.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. And this conclusion language is the language that was circulated to everyone in Late August?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that's correct.

PHILIP CORWIN: All right, then let's move down to the highlighted language on private RPMs. And while Ariel's doing that, I'll note that working group members, if they wish to, are encouraged to review those conclusions on the overarching questions, and if they have any concerns about the final language, post them on the e-mail list and we'll address those concerns at our next group meeting.

All right, so this is about the private RPMs which, for the reminder of everyone and for our non-member participants, observers today, the private RPMs are things that were not mandated by the community and ICANN for the new TLD program for the first round but were adopted by individual registry operators through generally, I believe, registry agreements that were subject to public comment, things like protected marks lists.

And the highlighted language says that in reviewing the public comment, the working group noted that several commenters expressed the desire for the GPML as an additional measure. I presume that means as an ICANN-mandated measure. The working group agreed [it's not collected] sufficient data to develop a meaningful answer to that question and agreed not to develop any recommendation with regards to additional mandatory RPMs equivalent to GPML.

My recollection is that that is an accurate reflection of our discussion on that point, which leaves the situation that individual registry operators can seek to establish their own additional RPMs beyond those required by ICANN, but we did not decide to require any new RPMs beyond those created for the first round. So that is now open for discussion.

Kathy, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN:    Thanks, Phil. A question about this. Could Ariel go up to the section heading for this section? So, GPML as you noted is not an additional marketplace RPM. It was recommended as a mandatory RPM by some. It was not accepted by the rest of the community. So I'm not quite sure what it's doing here. Just seems like an odd place to put this discussion. Not a hill I'm going to die on.

PHILIP CORWIN:     So Kathy, your concern is not about the accuracy of the highlighted language but whether this is the proper place for it to be in the final report. Is that a correct conclusion on my part?

KATHY KLEIMAN:     Yeah. Also kind of wondering why it's here. A few commenters on something, wondering—there's lots of things from a group of a few commenters that we haven't embedded in our final report. So not sure why we made the call that we had to embed this one.

So the text is accurate as far as it goes, but kind of trying to figure out why it's here and why it's in the report at all. But I don't want to delay this too much, just raising both flags. Thanks.

PHILIP CORWIN:     Yeah, I'm just guessing, I don't want to speak for staff. I think it's probably here because this is a discussion of the private marketplace GPMLs which is similar in concept to the GPML concept. So it may be as logical a place as any to note that the working group considered suggestions that we mandate such an additional RPM for all registries in the subsequent round and we declined to do so.

Does anyone else have any concerns about this language or where it's been placed in the final report?

ARIEL LIANG: Phil, just to clarify, regarding Kathy's question why this paragraph is here, it's because the working group was asked to consider another question related to the protected marks list and that's the bolded language in the paragraph here, and that's currently highlighted on the screen. So basically, the working group is asked to consider the following question related to additional marketplace RPMs following its analysis of public comment received on its initial report: how and to what extent does use of protected marks list, e.g. blocking services affect the utilization of other RPMs, especially sunrise registrations?

So this question is asking the working group to consider after the initial report, and the working group did consider this question and discussed it as in light of the public comments related to the GPML, so that's why we included the highlighted paragraph right after this particular question just to draw a close of that particular question. And we hope this is the right placement of it.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. So the subject of the GPML was raised during the working group's discussion of the impact of the private RPM known as DPML might have on sunrise. And that's why staff placed it there. I think the two sentences that are highlighted are a correct decision of what happened. I'm not sure it's that important where it appears in the report. With that explanation, Kathy, are you satisfied that it is as good a place as any for this to appear on the report?

KATHY KLEIMAN: I guess so, but it doesn't seem to answer the question, how and to what extent the use of protected mark lists—and here, you're right, I think we're talking about the private ones, affect the utilization in other RPM, especially sunrise registrations. And I thought the answer we got was no. Shouldn't we say that, that we have not collected enough data? But that answer is responsive to the question which is not a question about the GPML, it's a question about private protected marks.

So I think we need to rework this. I don't think we have to do it here. But I don't think the fully highlighted paragraph is responsive to the question. Thanks.

PHILIP CORWIN: all right, so you'd like to see an additional sentence after the word above that explains that we didn't have enough data. And Ariel has proposed some language in the chat.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Right. Perfect. Thank you. But it's not good enough for it to be in the highlighted paragraph because it's referring to something else. So it needs to be responsive to the question. I'm happy to work with Ariel offline on this.

PHILIP CORWIN: All right. I think subject to you working with Ariel and just getting that grammatically correct and in the right place here, I think we can close

out this discussion of our consideration of private RPMs. And Julie is saying the language is already there. Let's have Kathy and staff work this out offline. There are no controversial concepts here.

The language on the screen now, why are we looking at it?

ARIEL LIANG: If I may, Phil, so the highlighted paragraph is basically the same as the one you saw in the end of the annex that talk about additional marketplace RPMs. So we're just putting both places because in the final report, there is a section about additional marketplace RPMs, and we just repeated the same update in the section. So we don't think the working group needs to closely review this language, because based on Kathy's input, we need to reorder some of the sentences. But essentially, it's the same update.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. So we need to have both those sections on the same subject pretty much reading the same, and staff will take care of that. All right, so we're moving on to the next item for review. This appears to be updated language on what we've been doing since April. Do you want to take us through it, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Thanks, Phil. I think that may be easier and we can just quickly give you an overview what update has been done. So the highlighted points that you see here are the update related to the procedure

that's, as Phil said, what the working group has done after the initial report has been published for public comment. So some of the milestone dates—and I won't go through the detail, but basically talk about when the working group has extended the public comment when it's finished, when it finished reviewing some of the recommendations. Some of the dates are still put as XX because we haven't to that milestone yet. Once those milestones have been accomplished, we will fill in those dates.

And then following that—

PHILIP CORWIN: Can we go back up there a second? Yeah, so scroll back down to where it starts with the double Xes. I just want to highlight this for our members and observers today. This is what we have left to do between now and November 25th, review of the final report. We've started that today. Complete that review, conduct a consensus call on our final recommendations, all of which have already received [rough] support and minimal opposition, so most of them should have a very good chance of reaching consensus.

Then the co-chairs are going to get together and agree on their consensus designations for all the final recommendations and publish that to the working group. And then we're going to receive minority statements from any working group members who were aggrieved by one or more of the recommendations.

And then by November 25th, we're going to submit that final report to the council. So there's a lot left to do in the next six weeks, but there's no reason to think we can't complete it. Thank you for stopping there. Let's move on.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Phil. Next update is related to the TM PDDRP review process. We just added a final bullet here saying that the working group has agreed to publish one recommendation. That was actually the preliminary recommendation on TM PDDRP and didn't go through any changes after the public comment. So just confirming we have [inaudible] recommendation for that particular RPM.

Following that is the TMCH review process. Similarly, we added a final bullet talking about 6th of October. That's when the working group has reviewed and confirmed all of the final recommendations related to the TMCH. That's a total number of four recommendations. Three of them were originated from the individual proposals as part of its initial report. So [inaudible] just clarify that there were a total of four and three come from individual proposal converted recommendations.

Following that section is sunrise and trademark claims services review process. Similarly, final bullet is talking about the total number of recommendations pertaining to sunrise. There are eight, and then there are six recommendations pertaining to trademark claims. And we just need to add the date here to just confirm when exactly the

working group has confirmed all of these recommendations. And we'll check back the history and make sure the date is filled out correctly.

And then for additional marketplace RPMs review process, again, that's a final bullet point with reference to the GPML discussion and we will make consistent update based on what Kathy has provided input on and just clarified that the working group didn't find enough data to answer that particular question.

PHILIP CORWIN: Okay. Continue. Ariel, are you speaking? I've lost audio. And I see others have lost Ariel's audio. Ariel, we've lost you. We can see you but we can't hear you. No, Maxim, her image has frozen. Something's gone wrong there. We've lost her screen now too. Which is unfortunate, now all our participants and observers have to stare at me and Maxim, and no text.

All right. Julie, are you able to take over or do we have to wait for Ariel to come back on?

JULIE HEDLUND: I can try to take over. I'm trying to get the document to get to the point where she was and then bring it up.

PHILIP CORWIN: I have to comment, Greg Shatan, your background screen is psychedelic. I can think of no other word for it.

JULIE HEDLUND:     So Phil, I think that she was on the sunrise … New text that [inaudible].

PHILIP CORWIN:     Yeah, that was the last one.

JULIE HEDLUND:     That was the last one? Okay.

PHILIP CORWIN:     Yeah, and so far these have been just very factual and noncontroversial to me. We're just going through the new parts, but I didn't see anything that … You can never tell what'll be controversial, but I didn't see anything that was likely to be controversial or subject to comment so far.

[inaudible] That's where she had stopped once she froze and disappeared.

JULIE HEDLUND:     Thank you, Phil.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**