**NOTES FROM RPM REVIEW WORKING GROUP CALL OF 5 APRIL 2017**

**Updates to SOI:**

* Maxim Alzoba now a member of the GNSO Standing Selection Committee

**Discussion on Sub Team Mandates and Scope/Tasks:**

* Proposed scope of work for 2 Sub Teams circulated (scope of Private Protections Sub Team still under discussion by the WG co-chairs)
* WG co-chairs will be ex-officio members of all three Sub Teams and will monitor progress and work
* Regarding Sub Team work flow, for those Charter questions that need data, co-chairs suggest those be placed toward the end of the workflow to allow for the data gathering to take place
* Substantial discussion took place over exact role of the Sub Teams – should they identify/refine/propose questions only or also begin to develop initial answers/analysis for consideration by the full WG?
* If Sub Teams continue to work beyond question scoping to do deeper analysis, this could help with completing our work on time (similar to what is being done in the SubPro PDP)
* Suggestion:
* Use the first two Sub Team Meetings for questions refinement and then hold further meetings aimed at crafting/recommending initial answers to these questions for the full WG to discuss
* Full WG to meet every alternate week, with the Sub Teams meeting during the week that the full WG will not be meeting (staff to review Work Plan for feasibility and updating)
* Important to note that:

(1) Sub Teams all need to report back to the full Working Group regularly on any preliminary findings/recommendations);

(2) Policy decisions are taken at WG (not Sub Team) level; and

(3) All Sub Team calls are recorded and transcribed, and all draft documents published

* Sub Teams can also do the initial data gathering that is identified as being needed, and identify as well as perform preliminary analysis of documents and other relevant resources identified
* SUGGESTION & AGREEMENT: Postpone this decision. Allow Sub Teams to do their first 2 planning calls and report back. WG will then make the decision on how best to proceed

Note: RPM co-chairs are having meeting with SubPro co-chairs tomorrow (Thursday 6 April) and can find out more details about how SubPro manages its various work tracks and reporting)

**Discussion with Analysis Group:**

* Goal of report was not to provide recommendations, but rather to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the workings of the TMCH
* Additional revisions to initial report did not result in significant changes to the initial findings
* Report includes findings on sunrise period, trademark claims and matching criteria

**Points highlighted in discussion:**

On "high" abandonment rate

* Not clear that every ping to the TMDB is an attempted registration - some registrars are pinging the TMDB for other reasons as well so there is a caveat to the high abandonment rate figure (94%).
* Cannot tell if the abandonment rate was due to registrants deciding not to register because they received a Claims Notice and were deterred, or for other reasons.
* There is no data as to what the abandoned domains were.

On Exact Match registrations

* There are fewer Exact Match registration attempts made by non- TM holders after the Claims Period (over a month to month basis), but in aggregate, is that still true on an overall basis?
* Question (also asked during GAC session in HYD) whether findings clearly allow for normative conclusion of little additional benefit to extending Claims period.
* There are registrars that didn't sell gTLD registrations until after the Claims period was over.
* Question raised about cost/benefit analysis of maintaining a Claims period - however, not clear how these would be measured in any case; did not include consideration of cost of UDRP filings to determine full costs to TM owners.
* Findings show non-exact matches as a relatively small number of registrations.

On additional data

* Analysis Group has data they can share on number of TM submissions in "buckets", i.e. numerical brackets (per George Kirikos' question re Page 7 of the report)
* They may also have data on top 500 popular strings (question about Page 9 - AG to check with ICANN staff about releasing this data).
* AG may be able to do an audit (if needed) of the costs of TMCH service and $5000 per registrar (i.e. Deloitte and IBM).