ICANN
Transcription
IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group
Wednesday 28 August 2013 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Teleconference on Wednesday 28 August 2013 at 16:00 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-20130828-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

Attendees:
Griffin Barnett – IPC/ IOC
Jim Bikoff – IPC/IOC
Avri Doria - NCSG
Elizabeth Finberg - RySG
Susan Fridy - OECD
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Robin Gross - NCSG
David Heasley – IPC/IOC
Judd Lauter – IOC/IOC
Sam Paltridge – OECD
Christopher Rassi - Red Cross Red Crescent
Thomas Rickert – NCA –Working group chair
Megan Rogers - OECD
Greg Shatan – IPC
Claudia MacMaster Tamarit - ISO
Joanne Teng – WIPO
Ingrid Arana
Jean Abbout
Andra Nicoara

Apologies:
David Maher – RySG
Osvaldo Novoa - ISPCP

ICANN Staff:
Berry Cobb
Brian Peck
Glen De Saint Gery
Mary Wong
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone and welcome to the IGO/INGO Working Group call on Wednesday, 28 of August, 2013.

On the call today we have Jim Bikoff, Elizabeth Finberg, Alan Greenberg, David Heasley, Judd Lauter, Sam Partridge, Christopher Rassi, Thomas Rickert, Greg Shatan, Claudia MacMaster-Tamarit, Jo Teng, Susan Freeley which I have not - I don't have your affiliation, Susan. Can you hear me? Maybe Susan is not online. No, she isn't. I will see that later. Sorry about that.

Griffin Barnett, Megan Rogers. We have apologies from David Maher and Osvaldo Novoa. And from staff we have Berry Cobb, Brian Peck, Mary Wong and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcript purposes? Thank you very much and over to you, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you so much, Julia. Hello. My name is Thomas Rickert and I'm chairing this working group. I would like to welcome everybody to this call. And without further ado we can start with our agenda. And the first item on the agenda, as usual, is whether you have questions with respect to the agenda and also whether there are any updates to statements of interest.

Hearing and reading none in the Chat we can move to the second agenda item which is the consensus call discussion. Now this might surprise you a little bit because we have started the consensus call already. However, we wanted to give the working group or working group members the opportunity to ask clarifying questions with respect to how to deal with the consensus call

or whether you have further need for discussion with respect to the recommendations as such.

As you will have seen on the list I have sent some clarifying notes to the mailing list. And maybe we use that to kick off the discussion. And please feel free to indicate if you want to say something in the Adobe. And I will give you the floor then.

One of the questions that were asked were whether all participants of this working group can individually respond to the consensus call or whether this right is reserved to the SOs and ACs and, you know, other groups in the GNSO community. And this is certainly not the case.

So we are the ones that have come up with these recommendations. And the consensus call is to find out the level of consensus within the working group. So you are all invited and encouraged to respond to the consensus call.

The second item that has been asked is whether, you know, organizations representatives that are participating in the work of this working group are limited to answering the consensus call with respect to the organizations they represent. And the answer is no.

You are all invited to respond to the consensus call for all recommendations that you find in the document so you're not restricted or limited in any way to a subset of these recommendations.

And the third question that was asked is whether the response - because we didn't indicate what the response to the various recommendations should look like - whether the response should have a certain format. And we would like to encourage you to say whether you support or do not support the various recommendations.

You are certainly free to give additional explanations to each of these if you wish so. You can file a minority position that will be published in the final report. But you don't have to do so. So it is completely sufficient to say you support or you do not support certain recommendations.

And with this I'd like to open the floor and give you the opportunity to ask questions or make comments, maybe correct what I've been saying or add to that.

I guess that's, you know, it's very important that now that we've been working on this for so many months and now that you have given so much of your time to contribute to what we now have on the table I want to make sure that all of you actually do have - do take the opportunity and make themselves heard in the consensus call.

Okay now I don't see any indication of people that are willing to speak so let me turn to ICANN staff and ask them whether they have something to add to my introductory remarks?

Berry Cobb: Hi, Thomas. This is Berry. Nothing specifically. I think more or less your answers kind of covered the perspective we need. I'd only add that for those groups that do wish to draft a minority position, you know, essentially the context of that position would be that a certain organization should receive more protections than what a particular recommendation is offering and something along those lines, you know, whether it be an objection to a certain type of protection, protections against a certain organization or even as the package altogether turns that the overall recommendation.

And as Thomas noted, within the final report we'll be creating a section just after the proposed recommendations where the minority position statements will be loaded. And that's really all I have to add.

Thomas Rickert: And that was very useful. Thank you for that, Berry. Anybody else? Okay and that allows us to move to the next agenda item which is the third agenda item and that is...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Yes?

Berry Cobb: Sorry, the TBD for the language?

Thomas Rickert: Oh thanks for reminding me. As you can see in the Adobe the gray cell at the very top of the - of this table still has the question of languages to be discussed. The - I want to ask the question to the group whether we do want to try, you know, formulate a position on that or recommend languages.

I mean, certainly synchronizing the languages with the languages for IGOs would, at least in our view, make sense. You will remember that the protections that have been proposed for INGOs or the change of the attitude of some parts of the working group came about when the draft recommendations in favor of the IGOs were formulated.

So some of you said that if the IGOs can benefit from certain proposed protections that the INGOs should also enjoy a comparable level of protection. So - and that - in the light of that it makes sense to synchronize the languages for the two categories of organizations. But that's certainly something that can be discussed.

Since we haven't dived into this - the specific item for INGOs I wanted to give the opportunity to the working group to express their views on that. But that certainly shall not be mistaken as, you know, answering the question of

whether or not protections for INGOs will be granted or not. That is certainly reserved to the outcome of the consensus call.

Do we have any suggestions as to what we might discuss whether it should be the six UN languages or more or less than that?

Berry Cobb: Thomas, this is Berry. I think just to add to that it's not - I'm not sure it necessarily needs to be answered now since we've already sent out the formal - or the recommendations for the consensus call. But if members of the working group have any ideas about what the scope of languages should be if protections were granted for the INGOs that can be included in the response back to the working group.

I think in general the - for lack of a better word kind of the default is the UN six. Certainly that has been applied for use with the temporary protections that were granted for the IOC and the RCRC. There's a slight modification with the IGOs although that, from an implementation standpoint if protections are granted what's listed there now could be a little bit more complicated to manage.

And then, again, as I mentioned, the UN six is kind of the facto default. But we definitely welcome comments from the working group members as to what that scope of languages should be if protections were granted for the INGOs.

And so - and then lastly the reason why it is TBD we never really, as a working group we can nail down what that scope would be and it wasn't in our position to just try to apply what that language protection should be hence why you see the TBD. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Berry. That's certainly very helpful. Okay I've seen some activity in the Chat which is well noted. But okay Robin just said that she's not supporting creating any special privileges for any of these special interests.

I'm sure that she will make these indications in the response to the consensus call.

Robin, if you could indicate if you want your statement in the Chat to be perceived as the response to the consensus call please let me know.

Otherwise do we have any more feedback with respect to the languages question? And it is my impression that we don't have more wishes from working group members to contribute to that.

Which is why we can now move to the third agenda item which is the discussion of one question that we've been chartered with that we have touched briefly - I see Alan's hand up. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, that was in request to your question of is there anything more to say about languages. Basically I'm not not talking about languages, I'm supporting what Berry said that you've sent out the consensus call with languages unspecified and that's the way it needs to remain. We can't refine it at this point with some people answering one question and some another.

So, yes, we're going to have to address that but it cannot be until after the consensus call in my mind at this point.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Alan. Which is, you know, more reason to the move to the third agenda item which is the impact of proposed recommendations on existing TLDs. We've started briefly to discuss this question during one or two calls. It was - the argument was made that it is hard to make determinations on that without knowing what exactly the recommendations would look like.

Others said that we don't need to worry about that at all because once recommendations become a consensus policy they would become binding for all contracted parties anyway.

Nonetheless since we've been chartered with this topic I guess we should at least exchange some thoughts on this because in my view one could help establishing some guidance for the implementation of these recommendations should they ever be adopted by the Board for existing TLDs.

You know, there are questions such as how do you deal with existing registrations? Would existing registrations be good enough for grandfathering of certain domain names or certain strings for other TLDs? What about renewals of these names?

And I'm not saying what the answer should be but there are some questions where I think this group can contribute and help answering. So I would very much like to invite the working group to express their views on this. This is not part of the consensus call certainly but nonetheless we wanted to have this discussion in the course of our work.

Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Having no specific interest in any side of this I'll make a proposal that all of our rules apply to the existing gTLDs to the extent that they are relevant, number one. So anything related to start up sunrise 90-day periods clearly is not.

Anything that relates to ongoing operations is and that any existing TLDs that might violate blocking rules are grandfathered and they are allowed to be - they are handled as if - as any existing domain name registration is, that is they can be renewed, they can be transferred to other people, they can be transferred to other registrars and such. Period.

Thomas Rickert: That was...

Alan Greenberg: I think that covered all of them when I said period. I may have forgotten some subtlety but I believe - I think I've covered all of the important issues. I specifically did not address that if you have X, X, X, - sorry bad expression - if you have ABC in dotCom that means you can keep ABC even if ABC is forbidden. It does not necessarily allow you to register it in DotNet or Dot NewTLD if it doesn't exist already.

Thomas Rickert: Well you got applause for your statement, I mean, silent applause but it is indicated in the Chat.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think what I've said is different from anything we've talked about but I'm putting a formal thing on the table and maybe we can get - if people agree maybe we can get closure on this quickly and not dwell on it forever.

Thomas Rickert: Sure. I mean, if everybody agrees - and I see Greg has also indicated support - then we might be able to end this call early. Elizabeth, please.

Elizabeth Finberg: Hi, for the record Liz Finberg, PIR. Just point of clarification, are we addressing a scenario in which ABC.org is registered to someone other than the IGO? And imposing upon the registries or asking the registries to somehow cancel or transfer the registration?

Alan Greenberg: I can answer what I said, Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Please do so.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: What I said is if ABC, which happens to be the name of an IGO, is owned by John Smith Esquire, John Smith Esquire keeps DotABC if John Smith Esquire may want to sell it to the - to the IGO and make an embarrassingly large profit on it that's a private transaction between the two.

But John Smith Esquire can treat that domain as any other validly registered domain even though we have now added a new rule that it could not be registered as a new domain.

It's essentially the exact same rules as we - as applied to, for instance, IANA.org. IANA is on the do not register list. But it was registered prior to it going on that list and IANA keeps that registration. There's literally many, many other domains that are on the do not register list, cannot be registered as a second level domain but exists. ICANN is an example.

And there's nothing that has changed there. We're just saying that we're now going to apply these rules just as we do for IANA and it can be kept, it could be transferred according to the normal rules. It cannot be registered anew.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Alan. Elizabeth, you still have your hand up; do you wish to add to your question?

Elizabeth Finberg: No. Thank you for the clarification, that was very helpful.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Liz. Next is Avri, please.

Alan Greenberg: We have a bad echo from someone.

Thomas Rickert: Yeah, can you please put your - mute your microphone if you're not speaking.

Avri Doria: I think you got the echo because I turned my microphone on and I'll mute it as soon as I'm done. I tend to disagree with this point of view. I certainly think that ABC should be able to keep the name through to the next registration but I believe that if names are put in a blocked list for new gTLDs then there must be an effort to get those names off the Internet and the Web in terms of some methodology, some trades, some whatever.

Certainly there should be a gap of time to do it in but if we're going to impose all of these restrictions on the new gTLDs and say oh but the past is the past. No, there are renewals. These are leases. These are situations that change when consensus policies are made.

And if we are going to block names, and I'm not in favor of blocking any names, but if we're going to block names we need to treat everyone equally both incumbents and new gTLDs. That's certainly my view. I haven't cleared it yet with the NCSG. But that would be my view at this point. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Avri, I have a follow up question for you before I move to Chuck and then to Alan. Are you saying that neither trades nor transfers should be allowed? Or would you even as go as far as not renewing existing registration contracts?

Avri Doria: I guess you're right, I would say trades and transfers. Now there's the issue of transfers to the blocked name. The other thing that I've already made my view known on is that I don't believe that we should create a second kind of reserve list that allows for exceptions.

So I wouldn't see a transfer of the name to one of the institutions as valid either. If the names are blocked the names are blocked. As I say, I don't agree with blocking names but if they're blocked they're blocked.

And if there's only one kind of reserve list that the whole notion that we're creating a second kind of reserve list that allows exceptions is very problematic to me and something that we haven't explored nearly deeply enough to be able to say it's a recommendation. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks. Just for your information I was using the term trade and transfer to make the distinction between an owner change and the mere change of registrant; whether you would see any differences with this. But let me move to Chuck first.

Avri Doria: I don't care about registrar.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas. This is Chuck. First of all anything that is required of existing registrations I think then there needs to be some indemnification of the registry operators and registrars so that they don't get used for an existing registration.

Now - and I think Avri dealt with that in terms of if they still have the registration that's fine. So that may not come into play. But if we do put some new restrictions on that registrations not allowing the registrant to do certain things like transfer or anything else, then there needs to be some sort of protection of the registries and registrars so that they're not liable for something that was changed midstream.

Now that being said, I guess I, at least partially agree with Avri that if a name is deleted - if one of those names that is a legacy registration that is now not allowed and it's deleted then it may be appropriate then to not allow it to be registered again.

That would be an operational issue that would have some impact but it may be manageable, I don't know for sure, without a lot of cost to do that. But if we go that route then some work does need to be done because there are impacts from several different angles that need to be dealt with and processes that would need to be established to make those things happen.

And it's not without impact on those that have the existing registrations whether they are registries or registrars and of course the registrant too. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Chuck. Sorry, I was on mute. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. First of all for clarity I think I certainly meant - and I thought I explicitly said - that if the registration ends, if it is deleted, that it could not be reallocated, it could not be reregistered by the same person or by someone else.

So - and I believe that, you know, Avri said she doesn't believe in the concept of exceptions but there are exceptions today that is anything that was registered before the rules were put in place, and IANA.org, ICANN.org are examples, they stay. No one has deregistered them because they're on the list of names not to be registered.

All we're talking about is essentially the status quo and we're saying apply similar rules to any new blockings, which regardless of the mechanism by which we're blocking, that we're talking here.

I realize I did omit one thing from the set of caveats. I specifically said that a registrant - obviously they can change registrars, registrars go out of business and whatever, that has to be allowed. And I believe a registrar - registrant must be able to transfer the name to another registrant. People's, you know, if nothing else people's businesses their names change, people die, whatever.

So I think we want to continue that. What I believe we must explicitly forbid, however, is the - and I don't have the wording that we would use to do this at the tip of my tongue - is there are provisions in virtually every registration agreement from every registrar that says if the name is not renewed the registrar can then sell or auction off the name. And I believe that must not be allowed.

So the registrant has the right to do that, but not the registrar, taking on responsibilities of the registrant after renewal should not be allowed because that's akin to the name being dropped by the original registrar - registrant but

still being in play. And that, I believe, we must explicitly forbid. And, you know, it may take some - some careful wording to make sure that happens.

That's a provision for those who aren't familiar with it that many - most registrars have that essentially allow names to stay in play without actually begin dropped even though the registrant who had it is no longer interested in the name and has not personally sold it either. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Alan. I guess that's helpful. Nonetheless I guess the question remains whether trades of these names should be allowed or whether, you know, those domain names are just taken out of the loop, if you wish, once the - once they're formally closed with the registry. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas. I'd like to point out that I think that what we're talking about is an implementation issue. Now I don't say that that means we shouldn't be discussing it because it's perfectly appropriate for us to consider implementation and to make some recommendations in that regard. In fact, that helps later, I think, in the implementation process. But what we're really talking about is how it will be implemented with regard to existing TLDs.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, and I was expecting you to make a statement on that because you said something along these lines in an earlier call. Nonetheless I guess there is a policy side to it because if you can't just implement the recommendation should they ever be adopted as you would a new transfer process which then would become a de facto industry standard.

So whether grandfathering is allowed or not is something that is not an implementation detail, at least that would be my personal view on that. But nonetheless I'm not sure whether it's for us to decide on which side of the line it is whether it's still possible or whether it's already implementation.

What's important to me, as chair, is that we work through the questions that we've been chartered with and for me but that's also certainly something that

we can discuss. The full life cycle of the PDP includes some sort of implementation oversight anyway.

So I guess we should very well be aware of what the impact during the implementation phase might be like and how we can assist with that to avoid friction at a later stage by including our views on that in our recommendations.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas. I agree with you. And I would simply say it doesn't matter which side of the line it falls on, implementation or policy, it is appropriate for us to deal with it.

Thomas Rickert: I subscribe to that. Thanks. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I was going to say something very similar. And - but I would add one point. It's been made clear that one of the problems that some of our policies have had in the past is that they were too ambiguous and that we didn't give specific guidance for implementation.

So some of these things like are transfers allowed? Are renewals allowed? Are certainly things that need policy statements. And as it gets, you know, further down into well what part of transfers aren't allowed? Well under what circumstances, etcetera. Those things are policies that affect the implementation.

But, again, accepting what Chuck said that just because it's implementation doesn't meant we're not involved. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Avri. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: And I'll say the same thing in yet another way. Some PDPs have chosen, consciously or not, to stop the policy such that the implementation has to make a lot of decisions.

In this particular case if we believe we want a very specific outcome it is our obligation, I believe, to go as far down as necessary so that there will not be any misunderstandings and surprise outcomes because someone interpreted our words differently than we meant them or realized there was a loophole in our words and took advantage of it.

So I think we can go as far as we want to down that path and as far as we believe we need to.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Alan. Any further thoughts? Well then I'm - I'm not sure whether we have too much diverging views in the group on this. I guess there is - there is some level of common views, certainly not in all areas, but the question is whether we as a group do think we're now sort of on the fly in a position to jot down the ideas or whether you would like us to go through the transcript and put that together in a document for you to review?

Alan Greenberg: Berry looks like he's volunteering.

Thomas Rickert: To tell you a secret I have sent Berry a note in our - in a private chat whether we can do that on the fly but I don't want to put him on the spot certainly.

Berry Cobb: Hi, Thomas. This is Berry. Yes, Alan, I am volunteering. So I basically took some rough notes and I'll for sure go through the transcript to make sure I accurately capture anything.

But I'll put together a compilation of the principles if not necessarily policy ideas that were discussed here and send that out to the list this afternoon so that we can get some feedback because most definitely this will be a

subsection in the recommendations part of the final report that we'll want to put in there.

And I'll just remind the working group that if, you know, it seems pretty clear that most of this is indeed more implementation and certainly, as Alan pointed out, there have been past PDPs that didn't discuss enough of the implementation components.

If need be that we wrap up this PDP and there still are some vague areas with respect to implementation will most certainly help establish some sort of implementation review team or keep the connectivity of the existing working group as the Council and the Board process anything that comes out of the working group.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Berry. Avri, you have both typed in the Chat as well as indicated disagreement in the Adobe. It was my understanding that with the clarifications that have been offered by Alan for existing registrations that we're not too far apart. So could I ask you to clarify which point you specifically are in disagreement with?

Avri Doria: Yeah, right. Okay, yeah, and as I say I may be in a minority of one role and that's, you know, a minority statement; I'll accept that. I don't believe that the position that I'm holding is that they should neither be transferred to another party nor should they be renewed. And that we have to find a way to work beyond that.

I did not gather that that was the understanding. The understanding I had was that, you know, ICANN.org has been able to keep it, has been able to renew it and theoretically could even transfer it to somebody else.

So I have a feeling that I'm in a diverging position and that's what I was indicating that. And it may be one and if it is I accept that and I'll, you know, minority view how I believe that the incumbents really do have to, you know,

and so maybe renewal is problematic and because of the ICANN example. But do we really want to allow ICANN to transfer to whomever they please?

So - and they are the institution so there's, you know, there's the parallels don't really hold on ISOC or ICANN because the institution got it. That pertains more to the do we allow exceptions to reserve list issues than it applies to do we let ABC who has absolutely nothing to do with the organization to renew the name or transfer it to some other person who has absolutely nothing to do with the name? Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Avri. That's certainly very helpful. And I guess that the - that we need to discuss a little bit further the question of renewals and transfers and maybe also in the light of who currently owns these names.

Certainly bearing in mind Chuck's view, which was supported in the Chat by at least Elizabeth, that the registries, if they sort of jeopardize the asset of a registrant by limiting the chances for the registrant to renew or transfer the name as they could any other domain that there might be liability issues with respect to that.

Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, two issues. First of all I'm not sure there are liabilities in the case you described; there may be other cases since registration contracts with registrants all contain the clause that registries and registrars must obey consensus policies.

So it's not a unilateral action of the registry to disenfranchise the registrant if indeed the name had to be given up or couldn't be renewed or whatever it is. There may, in fact, however, be some cases where there is a liability and that needs to be looked at of course.

But, you know, in - there's a very subtle distinction or perhaps not subtle in some cases, of transferring a name to a related party or transferring the name on an open market.

And certainly ICANN could transfer DotOrg if ICANN was newly reconstituted as an international body not registered in California anymore and meeting the expectations of a lot of people around the world you know, but the new organization was still called ICANN I would expect that new name would be transferred to this new entity.

So I think we've got to be a little bit careful and not try to craft brand new rules for this the kind of exchange that don't already apply because then we start getting into the issues that Chuck mentioned of how do we recognize one from the other and do we have to build a whole new infrastructure to be able to catch these kinds of things? And I think we need to be very careful of that. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Alan. And before we hear Claudia let me briefly comment on one statement that you made with respect to liability issues in the light of registrars being obliged to follow consensus policies.

This certainly true although at least in the jurisdiction that I'm living in you would have huge difficulties in making consensus policies that are not existent in the moment when the contract is entered into binding for registrants which may be consumers where it's very hard to make these terms and conditions and they would legally be terms and conditions binding.

But either way even the defense against unjustified claims might be an issue for registries. So I think that's an issue that needs to be taken into the equation anyway. And I think it's a valid concern.

Alan Greenberg: Yes...

Thomas Rickert: Claudia...

Alan Greenberg: ...just for the record, Thomas, though, that is in your registration agreements already that the registrar must obey consensus policy and must take action - appropriate action. So I don't know if anyone has ever tested it in the German court but it's already - it's there so.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, it's there but the consensus policy that the registrar needs to adhere to might not be in existence at the point in time when the contract is entered into. But I guess that's a separate discussion...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: …which is the whole definition of consensus policy.

Thomas Rickert: But the - if you can validly agree upon those with consumers that's yet another question. But I think we reserve that for a private chat in Buenos Aires, right? Thanks so much, Alan. Let's move to Claudia then.

Claudia MacMaster Tamarit: Hi, Thomas. Claudia here. I'd just like to say from our perspective I think, you know, this discussion would be very different if, for example, a block of acronyms had gotten more traction.

Since it seems that there's much more traction for a block of - or reservation of full names, you know, the scenarios we're talking about are far less in terms of number certainly in terms of, you know, registration of international organization for standardization dot whatever.

And I think that in terms of that, you know, we really can - we can really stand behind what Alan and the few others have been saying in terms of any kind of - these kind of reservations should not have retroactive effect.

And whether we say okay, you know, transfer yes but not renewal or whatever I think that these distinctions we should go the simplest way possible to create the lowest kind of burden, I think, to achieve the greatest effect.

There will be very few cases, I suspect, where there is the full name registered of an international organization registered by an entity that's not the international organization or an entity that doesn't have an interest in that name somehow whether it be to criticize them or as an affiliate or whatever.

And so I would assume that it would probably be better to go the route that Alan suggested which is to say, you know, allow for transfer or allow for renewal, don't allow for the registrar to pick up the domain name and certainly, you know, reserve it for any new registrations. But anything barring a new registration, you know, should be let status quo so as to create the least amount of burden.

And then, you know, we can still recognize that there may be - may be, possibly, some cases out there where an international organization would have to find another route of dealing with an abuse of their full name by an entity that is using it in an abusive way.

But I think that that case will be far, far more rare. And perhaps it's better to take this approach as a balanced way of looking at both of those interests. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Claudia. Any more comments? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just in relation to that last one, if you go back to the study that I started and then Berry expanded on of uses of existing names - of some of the potential names that we're looking at in the existing domains, there are cases where people are using them for completely different purposes or for purposes of criticism or for purposes that we're not quite sure what they're

doing. But, you know, sometime they're just taking this private name and reflecting it to the original domain.

So, you know, there are a whole bunch of cases. Presumably if they are really abusive then the IGO or whoever already, you know, would have taken some action against them using whatever mechanisms are allowed.

And we're talking, as part of the consensus call, about whether we should open up any of these mechanisms that are not already open to allow them to be used as such. And I think that will - that should be able to cover all of the existing cases.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Alan. All of those - all of you who want to provide their views on this topic please do speak up or you will certainly have the opportunity to add your thoughts to the mailing list later on.

So if there are no further comments from your side now I guess we can move to the next agenda item. But we - before we do so let me announce to you that we're going to take what's been discussed today and we're going to put together a short memo with the recommendations or with the thoughts on how we deal with existing name spaces for your review.

And as you know this is not part of the consensus call but we should document these thoughts, document the common ground and also document the various views where there are - where there's actually divergence or where there are diverging views in this group.

Okay now we've reviewed the work plan and updated it. And I'm using the word "we" although all the credit should go to Berry who's actually done the groundwork on that and updated the document for our benefit. So, Berry, if you could show us through the changes that you made.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. This is Berry. So there really hasn't been a whole lot of changes since we reviewed this last week. Hopefully we're still on track. As a reminder, the consensus call response and any minority position statement that a representative group may have those are due at 2359 UTC on the 3rd of September or essentially the day after Labor Day here in the US anyway.

I hope to be able to compile all of the responses into a draft final report. I'm still working on updating the final report in terms of converting it from the initial to the final and there's a lot of miscellaneous updates in terms of language and flow, in terms of nomenclature for it being a final report.

If I don't have that completed by the meeting at the very least I will have a compilation of those consensus call responses for us to review next week. And of course that will be uploaded into the final report. And we're hopeful that we can get feedback on the draft final report so that we can try to initiate the public comment forum late next week or earlier before that.

We do have a couple of days slack in terms of trying to meet the 21-October for the motions and documents due so that the Council can review this on the 31st of October.

And I think the other thing to take note is if we can make the public comment period open time it will close by the end of September and certainly we'll - hopefully this time around get more responses outside of the working group about the proposed recommendations.

But anyway we're slotted for the 10-October Council meeting to try to just brief the Council on the proposed recommendations as we conclude through the reply period. Not that any of those would be set in stone recommendations, of course. After the comment period closes the working group will reconvene to review through those comments and make any updates to the final report as necessary and agreed upon.

And then of course that takes us into the end of October where we're trying to target the actual Council meeting to have the Council consider any recommendations from this working group.

And if we miss any of this timeline, hopefully not, but if we do then of course this will spill over into the GNSO Council session in Buenos Aires.

Thomas Rickert: Great. Thanks, Berry. Do you have any questions with respect to the timeline? Hearing and seeing none - Chuck is typing so there might be a comment on that. Oh he thanks us anticipating that the call will be over shortly. And, Chuck, you are right with this assumption.

So we can actually end this call very early. I guess it was quite informative particularly with respect to the last open question of how we deal with existing name spaces and the implementation of potential recommendations for those.

So we will then talk again next week. And with this I'd like to thank everybody and wish you a great day. Bye-bye.

Jim Bikoff: Thank you.

END