

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group
Friday 13 February 2015
Part 4**

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.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

Chris Robinson: Right, so we said we'd come back in and see if anybody had any further thoughts during a 10-minute head-clearing session. And then I think what we probably need to do is summarize in broad terms the - what seemed to me to sort of be three possibly four areas for follow up. And then do you need to get a bit more specific around the questions, Mary and Petter, or do you just need broad - just confirmation of the broad areas for follow up? Confirmation of the broad areas it seems to me. Great.

So Petter or...

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. Just try to start to make a summary of what we have discussed and conclude today. It seems that the first basic thing to do is to reach out and get an initial response to the jurisdictional issue. And beside of that we can of course also - based on what we sent out previously and what we have discussed further today make the basic suggested clarification to the UDRP, if we need to make any specific amendments to that.

And then of course also to send out a questionnaire on the identification of IGOs. And from that I think we can make a first initial summary of what we have come out of this some conclusions. And at the same time we do that or

the next step to also look at the URS to see what kind of clarification we need to add to that.

And then it seems, when we have done that, we have the basic information to actually come out with our first official report.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, I'd agree. I think we made good progress today on the standing issue, we have identified the remaining kind of secondary issues within that that we need to look at, the subtle differences between the scope of the UDRP and the protections of Paris Convention. We'll look at the significant difference between UDRP and URS - all that.

I think we're - we've reached some good general preliminary conclusion that the standing we're seeing being sufficient under the Paris Convention is not there for the other IGOs just based on (dotIntelligibility) and things like that. We've got to circle back to all these things and make sure we're right but we've done - and on sovereign immunity I think we've gone as far as we can go without the additional information we need but we've done a real good job of identifying that information.

Now talking with staff we're proposing to the group that our next meeting be on Wednesday, March 4, next week being too soon after this meeting. And the week after maybe not that soon but Wednesday the 25th is going to be the day that the Senate Commerce Committee is going to hold their oversight hearing on the IANA transition and folks like me are not going to be available on the call that day so Wednesday wouldn't work.

And also staff feels that they're going to need that period of time to do the outreach and some of the research on some of the issues that were identified today particularly on sovereign immunity that will allow us to get going on a good discussion in early March. So anybody have any thoughts or comments on going until March 4 or does that seem like a good idea to everyone? We're

seeing nods of happy smiles and nods around the table. So I don't have anything - I think this was a very good session.

I think we made - let's see, it's 3:00 pm. We started at 9:00 so that's six hours and with breaks we worked five hours - I think we made a lot more progress with the assistance of the facilitator in five hours today then we would have made in five separate one-hour phone calls.

So I think this was a very worthwhile device to kind of - particularly when you're at the right point in a working group's progress it makes sense to have this kind of facilitated extended meeting because it's great by being able to continue discussions and not have to arbitrarily end after one hour you're really able to wrap things up and move forward in a much better way. Of course we can't do that every week on the phone; we're all too busy with other stuff.

But I'm just rambling on. I have nothing else to say. I think it's been great. I don't know if other folks have anything they want to say before we wrap the meeting? I see Kathy raising her hand.

Kathy Kleinman: First, thanks to the chairs and for the organization and the preparation leading this meeting to the facilitator and staff, thank you all very much. And to the people who participated remotely, a really, really cool thing.

One of the things I really liked and I just wanted to highlight it is the idea that we will go to some neutral people for both law review articles as well as just expertise that there are probably some people out there who have some shortcuts to - short of all of us becoming experts in this area who may have some shortcuts to the specific types of questions we're asking for and I love the idea, let's bring them in and ask them.

Chris Robinson: Any other takers? Anybody on the south side? No? Great well thank you to all you guys. It feels to me like you made a lot of progress although it didn't

possibly get to answers, I think you've identified some helpful questions and some helpful issues for requiring clarity.

So thank you and thank you for letting me in and good luck.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Robinson: Yes, I'm being reminded and I have it on my desk. Mary has asked - and apparently this was done at a previous meeting in San Francisco was it?

Kathy Kleinman: Los Angeles.

Chris Robinson: Los Angeles, okay. Previously so would everybody please just take three or four minutes to fill in a quick survey on the format of this meeting which is a pilot. And for those of you who are still awake and online and the survey will be sent to you via email by Mary. So thank you very much indeed and good luck.

Petter Rindforth: Thank you all for today.

END