

**Internationalized Domain Names Group - IDNG
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 09 December 2009 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the **Internationalized Domain Names Group - IDNG** meeting Wednesday 09 December 2009, at 21:00UTC 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-idng-20091209.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Edmon Chung - Registries Stakeholder Group - Group leader

Chuck Gomes - Registries Stakeholder Group

Eric Brunner-Williams - CORE

Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Liz Gasster

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Stéphane van Gelder - Registrar C.

Adrian Kinderis – Registrar C.

Steve Delbianco – CBUC

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Edmond, would you like a quick roll call on this call?

Edmond Chong: Yes, I think so.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's IDN Report on Wednesday the 9th of December. We have Edmond Chung, Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes, Eric Brunner-Williams. From staff, we have myself, Gisella Gruber-White and Julie Hedlund has just joined. And apologies, we have Steve del Bianco, Adrian Kinderis and Stéphane van Gelder. If I could

please remind you also please to state your names when speaking. This is for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Edmond.

Edmond Chung: Thank you. Okay. So I think there has been - continues to be quite some discussion on the list. This is the main discussion one past was following last week, specifically on the issue of using similar TLD string, and what the possible next step might be.

So essentially that's the main discussion, could be short if we just basically say we would approve this whole discussion for council.

So I guess the first question is on the topic itself, whether this is the group to talk about and also is there any specific - while I understand that this might be, as was mentioned last time, might not be an IDN only issue, but, you know, the questions, or should there be a different process for this. And quality considerations, does it make sense to have considerations for IDN specifically, because we are anticipating where the - I think we would be anticipating more and more of these in the future. Because today we have the existing as the details leads, but in future there will be many more as the detail leads, who would be looking into approved maybe having the same issue.

So on those few items I didn't really - I have the few items, but I didn't really have any particular order to that. I think we can just open it up for discussion so.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Before we...

Avri Doria: Am I hearing nothing or am I falling off the call?

Chuck Gomes: Oh, Avri, can you hear us?

Eric Brunner-Williams: It doesn't seem that she can, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, yeah. So it didn't sound like she heard what was being said, so let's see.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry, sorry. Avri is just disconnected. I'm sure that she'll be dialing in again. She was actually on-line.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right, thanks. Edmond, what I was going to ask, before we start the agenda that you proposed, where are we at - I mean are we at a stage where it is for us to continue to consider any sort of IDN gTLD Fast Track that was the original...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...the original reason for this group. It sounds like Avri's back. Are you back Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm back. I was there the longest time and it was silent and all of a sudden it occurred to me you guys must have started so I hung up and tried again.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah, you know, we could hear you on some things but you couldn't hear us, so I'm not sure what was going on.

Avri Doria: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Anyway. So Edmond, my question is, is if that was I think the original issue that this group was formed to discuss and possibly to create a charter for that, but it's not on our agenda today, and I'm not advocating one way or the other. If there is not reasonable feelings in this group that there is anything worthwhile pursuing some sort of a Fast Track, you know, we can come to

that conclusion. I'm just curious as to where we're at. So you may want to add that on the bottom of the agenda or wherever you like.

Edmond Chung: Sure. I guess the discussion the way that I guess I added a note in the email that was sent perhaps we can talk about that particular note to start with. I think the IDN TLD Fast Track was one of the premise of the discussion for sure, but it was more so - I guess my impression overall was that we - the basic premise of the group was to come up with the resolutions on trying to minimize the timeline between the introduction of IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD, and you know if there are situations where introduction of IDN gTLD may be, you know, impeded like this issue of producing similar strings.

You know, it may be an item of interest to further discussion, as well. IDN TLD Fast Track was definitely one of the things that was originally suggested and one of the suggestions, but that might not be the only way to at least address the issue of the timeline between introduction of IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD. That's sort of what I think, I guess.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. And I read your message and understand your point, and I understood when I read it. So one of the things you're suggesting is maybe the broader purpose for this particular group is to minimize the gap between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs, and if we accept that as a broader mission, then anything that helps to do that would fit into our objective. Am I understanding you correctly?

Edmond Chung: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: That's good.

Edmond Chung: Where my head is I...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm curious as to where others' heads are on that. I'm okay with that. I don't have any objection to that.

Edmond Chung: Anyone want to add?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well yeah. I'll wait for Avri.

Avri Doria: I was being silent.

Chuck Gomes: So you may wait a long time here.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay. For my money - this is Eric for the transcript - for my money the question is to find out whether or not the no-harm language still applies? That is the statements of the council that no-harm from - no disadvantage, excuse me, come about due to the difference in offerings of the IDM inventories from the cc, as well as from the g. So if you accept that that language is still operative, then as Chuck said, most anything that helps us describe and perhaps reduce the inherent delays between the two, to manage the creation of disadvantage is within the scope of this working group.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. Like I said on our last call. I don't think - I haven't seen anything in the GNSO that changed our position. The fact that the IDN ccTLDs are moving forward doesn't really, I think, change our position. So I think that's still the same. Avri, have you seen anything that changes that position?

Avri Doria: No. I mean, I think it nullifies it.

Chuck Gomes: Right, right.

Avri Doria: I think the GNSO having said, you know, as close as possible and if not as close as possible with discussion and agreement between us - I paraphrased

badly, I'm sure - is obviously not the operational condition we're in. You know, they're going full steam ahead and the gTLDs are still in a halted state, I mean or perhaps not completely halted but moving along slowly.

I think in terms of this group, you know, I still don't know for example personally or NCSG-wise whether, you know, I think we think that a Fast Track should happen and whether the threat, the risk of it slowing down other things is sufficiently substantial to stop it.

Obviously, like in everything, there is a risk, but it may be low probability and low danger, in which case it's not a risk worth worrying about. So I think that is a council question. When you get right down to it, this group, and it's not even a working group yet, as far as I know, it's a drafting team for a charter, is for people who want to propose a charter that sort of says what you were saying, how do we reduce the gap?

Now when it gets to the council, the council gets to say, nope, doing anything for one hurts, you know, hurts the rest of us, and enough of us think so that we do not charter the group. Or there's enough people that say the risk is sufficiently low, but yes we charter the group and this is good work you proposed to do. So, I think it's quite reasonable for this group. We've talked through a lot of issues. None of them have been really resolved. And those are all good fodder for proposing a working group.

I dare say I don't know personally where I stand in favor of such a charter when it's written nor where the NTSG stands on that. But it certainly seems worth it for those who think that something should really be done to propose what it is they think should really be done and get it on the table and let people talk about something concrete.

Edmond Chung: Thanks. This is Edmond. And I guess today, speaking about, you know, where we've been, I think the joint details built in from the group, so that was

sort of what I from that, you know, because these things are dated and now assessed it. And I guess one of the things that seems to be coming up.

And this goes back to the premise that I think is analogous to if we identify it might impede introduction of IDN gTLDs, then we could purpose things to do to clear it away for its introduction. And one of the things that seems to have been identified again, you know, if you see anything similar details in the application. Although it might not be IDN only, then I mean the possible next step would be as suggested is to suggest that the council to either create a group to address that issue, or, you know, just really send it back to Fast saying this is (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So maybe one of the - this is Chuck again, maybe one of the fundamental questions we need to try and reach consensus on is should we develop a charter then, a proposed charter or working group that would attempt to come up with ways in which we can minimize the cap between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs.

Is that where we should be headed? Is that where we want to head? I guess is whether it should or want or I don't know that that matters. If there's a group that wants to work on that, I think that's okay. And ultimately the council will decide based on the input from the various stakeholder groups and other groups whether to go that route.

Edmond Chung: Sure. This is Edmond again. I guess my question is a little bit disparate - well then going through broad, perhaps to consider whether a working group could be formed to specifically look at the history of the similar TLD (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Just focusing on that one issue is what you're saying. Is that right?

Edmond Chung: Right. That seems to be a more fruitful, that seems to be might be a more fruitful discussion to be considered at this point. Yes. I think we considered

different ways to minimize the time lag as an overall, you know, a larger goal, but I don't think we have reached the point where we could make a charter draft and actually do that. But it seems to me that we have enough stuff to consider creating a charter for addressing the issue of the reasoning for details.

Chuck Gomes: Well I'll be curious, this is Chuck again, I'll be curious to hear what Eric and Avri think, but I'm not sure, as important as I think that one issue is, I'm not sure it justifies a working group just to deal with that issue.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I go - this is Eric.

Chuck Gomes: What did you say Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I said I'll go first this time. The confusingly similar or the intentional, as I understand it, we've been discussing the problem as the example, the hypothetical of a single applicant bringing two or more applications, which form a string contention set, as defined by the ICANN evaluation process. That is if we use this sort algorithm for two or more strings by a single applicant, we find that they form a contention set.

If that was the correct statement of the problem, Edmond, fell free to tell me if it's not?

((Crosstalk))

Edmond Chung: ...also existing.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Well the existing string of course is already present in the root. Well as I was trying to describe in last week's call and an email on the subject, the issue of a single applicant signaling to the evaluation process that it is bringing multiple applications for strings which form a contention set, and which the applicant desires not be treated as one of the set, barring all

others of the set from being considered and perhaps delegated to the root, to make everything else work.

That's a problem that is not inherent to IDMs, it's rather a specific instance of trying to signal between the outlook and the evaluators that there is some information that presently is not captured by the evaluation process. So that it seems to me, even though it arises from or it arose from this discussion about IDMs is actually a general problem of evaluating independently with no dependent knowledge, no communications between applications as they're evaluated, a more general problem in the evaluation process. So it arises from IDMs but it's really (unintelligible) to the evaluation process.

So that's my take on the similar strings problem, which is probably incorrect.

Edmond Chung: I don't think anybody disagrees with that observation, I think we stated that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: All right, so let me answer the question asked, which was do I think this particular team or group this call this email list should write a charter around a specific purpose such as the similar strings. And my answer to that is I think that abandons the assumption that there should be no harm produced by the lack of simultaneous or near-simultaneous introduction of IDM between the CC regime and the G regime.

So if we are attempting to manage the harm created, the disadvantage created, I'm sorry, if we're trying to manage the disadvantage that is being created continuously as the Gs and the CCs different times for the introduction of IDM inventories, that is a much larger problem, that string similarity within any two G applications or an IDM or a non-IDM. So I'd like to see, my person view is the charter should attempt the larger problem, which is to manage the creation of disadvantage.

Edmond Chung: I think we can attempt a charter like that and I think that's the same point that Chuck made.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, yes it is.

Edmond Chung: Right. And I guess my question is, what about the issue, do we now, do we even take it back to the council or not or is that a completely independent discussion from the - we've identified this set, do we do more on it?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I think if I may Edmond, we've identified another instance of this kind of issue that is two applications from a single applicant sharing a property that is the applicants, which is not captured by the evaluation process, and that is the technical provider information. We have applications being considered independently with the same technical provider and it's wasteful, or it has cost, and it - so just because we think about one problem doesn't mean that that is the only instance of the kind of problem that we can find and cause. We can ask the council, are they interested in communicating to staff that (DAG) B4 should be modified from (DAG) B3 on this specific or this specific issue in order to address the deficiencies that we've identified in the evaluation process.

Edmond Chung: Okay, but the difference here is there is a pretty strong statement in the recommendation and we probably need an interpretation of that if we want to go down this road. We want pre-clarification of that for the issue of technical provider that there isn't any particular recommendation that might have difficulty operating on.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well actually staff had a proposal out, one in early 2008 and then in the middle of 2008, staff announced that ICANN made a business decision to drop pursuing the qualified technical backend, registry backend provider proposal.

And as we look at the possibility that the technical provider portion of an application may be, oh I don't know, a third of the total cost of evaluating an application. I'm just guessing, because (Burke) hasn't replied to my request

for his guesses - if there are 100 applications or several hundred applications, it's a third of the time that is spent on them is wasted, thus a significant waste, a significant non-necessary cost.

Chuck Gomes: This is a Chuck again. I think we have to be careful about mixing two related but different issues. One of them is the efficiency of the evaluation process, which I think you're talking about right now, Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes I am, Chuck, and I appreciate that we can accept the inefficiency.

Chuck Gomes: Well no, and I'm not advocating - I'm on the same page as you in terms of efficiency, I think. But I think that's a very different issue than the fact that the evaluation process may, at least it's been described so far, failed to recognize situations, regardless of the efficiency issue that may or may not be intended by the recommendation from the GNSO, depending on which one of us evaluates it.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, this is true.

Chuck Gomes: And so I think because they are very different, even though related, that it's better that we keep those separate. Now there is nothing to prevent this group from going back, if the group wants to, and identifying the two issues, but I would do that as separate issues not as one issue.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri, can I interject some stuff.

Chuck Gomes: I was hoping you would.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Likewise.

Avri Doria: I decided to limp through for a while instead of exercise my too much talking attribute. I think, perhaps I'm getting confused. I think I'm hearing a whole

bunch of different stuff. First of all, there is the whole IDNG Fast Track, which is kind of what this group was supposed to think about a charter of, and that's something that might have a policy implication.

I think in terms of coming up with any charters for working groups, one needs to be coming up with a charter for a working group that has a policy implication.

I don't think that the efficiency of implementation is necessarily one. I don't think that the issue of there is no space to indicate on the form that, you know, several different applications should be seen as part of a set.

I think those are interesting points that should be pointed out to the (DAG) writers, and you know and they should certainly know about them. I don't really know that there's anything for, you know, the GNSO to do about them unless you think the GNSO in a working group should come up with an implementation guideline for these things. And I just don't see that is, obviously I don't know, would be high on the priority.

Now on one of the things when you were talking about the issue of the contention set plus the contention with existing, which isn't properly a contention set, but is something similar to a contention set issue, there are perhaps policy considerations, not in the fact of flagging it, but in how you deal with that.

You know, the things I started thinking about is assuming that similarity is good in a contention set that is controlled by one applicant. Well how do you indicate that it's actually similar enough. Or and perhaps that is a bogus notion, I really don't know, I just started thinking about it today. But basically once you get into those, if you've got a contention set of five and there is an external person that has another member of that contention set, well what does that mean and how is that decided, how is that looked at.

Those questions seem to start bumping up into some possible policy issues. They're still not specifically IDN Fast Track issues, so I think you'd have to go to the council and say, hey, you know, while talking about IDN Fast Track, we also saw these other problems that we'd kind of like to, you know, work on some more, but we figured we ought to tell you about.

And in terms of this particular group, I think Edmond is right. The group has already had, a drafting team has already had one success, which was drafting the JIG charter. Does this group see an opportunity to draft another charter, which is some form of IDN Fast Track.

I think if it can't, then either it does do that or it doesn't, but then this drafting team is sort of done, and perhaps getting blessing for this drafting change and continue working on the other problem, which is a very interesting problem is a reasonable thing. I guess that's my reason.

Eric Brunner-Williams: One question, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Eric Brunner-Williams: And also Chuck and Edmond, whatever became of the JIG. It's just starting as far as I can tell. It was waiting for the (unintelligible) to finish.

Edmond Chung: Right. And it was waiting for the staff report on those two issues. And I haven't brought up that, so I think the group is looking at the report right now, came up from staff to see what are the other things that we need to do about that report, and also there were a couple of other items that were identified as prominent from there.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. And it's a staff report actually, spent a lot of time on two of the issues that the JIG is considering, and so you probably haven't had a chance to see it yet, but I have sent you a message and I'm just getting your opinion in before the council meeting, because this will probably be talked

about. As to how the JIG may consider the staff report and the suggestions that they make in that report on variance and on single and two character names.

Edmond Chung: I did get your email, I haven't a chance to...

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. So and my understanding, in case those on this call aren't aware of it is, and a status report from (Olga) is in the CCNSO about to select a co-Chair for the JIG.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Chuck, who's the co-Chair for the JIG from the GNSO.

Chuck Gomes: I think it's Edmond, is it not, Edmond?

Edmond Chung: That's what I think - I think that's so. So back to this particular question. So I guess it seems like what I'm hearing is that we should at the next council meeting bring out the issue of using the set of strings and ask the council what the next steps are. It seems like we don't really want to discuss what the next steps are, but ask the council what the next steps are. And one of the possibilities might be to ask if this is an issue. The other might be to say, you know, we form a new group to look into this, and if we do look into forming a new group, whether this is to help some of the disorder. Does that summarize?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, let me jump in from my council role from that perspective. And first of all I think asking the council to make a decision, you've got to give them enough of something that they can make a rational decision on. So I think it would be incumbent upon this group to work together to develop a concise statement of the problem we've identified. Maybe even containing various ways of looking at the problem. But one that we're all comfortable with that we give to the council, otherwise it's going to be very hard for the council I think to make a decision. Because they're not going to be tuned into the problem like we are.

And by the way Avri, I thought what you shared really hit the nail on the head pretty well. So if there is a possibility whether it be this working group or some other one that the council decides to further examine this issue, but we need to clearly articulate what the issue is, what the problems are that we've identified, so that the council can hopefully make a rational decision on that.

So I guess what I'm saying is what would be good for us in that regard in the next few days or weeks or whatever it takes us, to try and come up with a draft statement that we would all be comfortable with submitting to the council. And I think we're past the time where we can get that done before the 17 December council meeting, but there is a council meeting on 7 January that we could shoot for.

Edmond Chung: Okay. I guess I wanted to echo Chuck's comment. I totally agree with your analysis early on. But on this, specifically, my question is even whether people want to think about drafting a statement. Because we've spent the last 40 minutes on the topic and it seems like we keep getting distracted. That might be because our main thought is on IDN details.

So back to the question, do we even - I don't know whether right now to pass it back to the council to clear away. And I guess my next point is that, you know, if we did pass it back to council then I seem to hear it loud and clear is that we would draft another version of the sort of IDN detailed Fast Track and talk about it, if we can't come to any conclusion then we should wrap it up.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri. I pretty much agree. I think that this other issue that we've gotten totally distracted by is really an important one for the council to have seen, heard about and think about. What happens next is another thing. But there is obviously an issue here. There is obviously application intent. There is obviously, you know, a hole in the process that all of us don't think has been thought about enough and we all think about differently. So I think it should be dropped on the floor.

I really do think what Chuck said, whether it's for just sort of a statement of. We went down this dark alley and these are the things we saw in that alley. And, you know, at some point you guys may want to send some people to investigate. And do that so it's not lost. Then yes, you're right, come up with, you know, come up with a charter. The people that wanted to do IDN gTLD Fast Track, you know, put it on the line, say, yep we want to do it, these are the issues, you know, this is what we want the charter to say. Bless it or, you know, don't, but put us out of our misery.

Chuck Gomes: It's Chuck again. If our paper, and I'm thinking of a short paper, but a paper to council identifies the problem well enough, that's the basis for the tasks that any possible working group would form.

Edmond Chung: This is all the confusing similar that you were talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. Because I think Avri is right. This is an issue that has possible policy implications, and so it does fit, if we're right on that, then it does fit the category of the need for a working group. But, again for the council to be able to make some sort of decision on this, they need to understand the problem, so I think it would be good use of our time on our list in the next few days, maybe just start off brainstorming.

Okay, what are the elements of the problem. I've heard some good articulation of that on this call. Eric, you made a statement that I thought there are situations, that the sort of guide book doesn't really address. What are the questions that need to be answered, and probably all of us contribute to those just in an email brainstorming session, and then it will be a matter of, you know, one or two of us, you know, pulling that together into a draft and then getting some concurrence from the rest of the team members.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri. Can I offer sort of a counter suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Avri Doria: I think we've already had the brainstorming. I think we've been brainstorming about this, and I think that's one of the things that Edmond said, it's been distracting us for the last week or so. I think if one of us were to take a first crack at actually writing it down and then we basically do the text edit, you know, someone were, and I'm not volunteering, someone were to take a crack at basically explaining this issue in simple language, you know, and getting it down there, then we could go from that.

And we could sort of stop discussing it until we have seen how well it could be captured. The only reason I say I'm not volunteering is because I've got three writing things that people are already yelling at me to finish, so. But because if we continue talking about it now, I think we've pretty much talked it through, other than, you know, we've gotten totally lost in this alley. We know what's in there, and, you know, it's a long discussion to take it further. So my suggestion would be if one of us is willing to take a crack at writing it up and then we can just do edit passes on it with the full group to get it to where it's a coherent statement.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, Avri, this is Chuck again, I support that totally if we can find somebody to do it. I have to be careful about volunteering too, because of my workload. But I wasn't suggesting that we start discussing it when I said brainstorming, I was talking about, okay, what are the ideas that we probably already mentioned? Let's pull them together. And if one person can do that, and then the rest of us can chime into that. That's a great approach in my opinion.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Chuck, this is Eric. I thought you meant me, but then when you said simple, then I knew you were speaking about someone else.

Chuck Gomes: Eric, if you make it more complicated, we can simplify it. So if you are volunteering?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure.

Avri Doria: Eric, you do your best to be simple and then we'll make it simpler.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Avri Doria: Because we are simple.

Chuck Gomes: That's a good approach.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Actually we're not, but there are others who are.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and we need to keep it - we can work that part out. That's just a matter of cleaning it up. If you're willing to draft the main points, the main questions that have been raised in our discussion, I think we can clean up the document to satisfy the needs of the council.

Eric Brunner-Williams: On a confusing similar question.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Avri Doria: I think I would recommend you also is you would want to use proper terminology, like contingent set and stuff like that, so as much as possible where you can use the common terminology with the diags that makes it understandable. I think that's useful.

Chuck Gomes: That's excellent. And that's one of the things that caught my attention, Eric, when you said the whole idea of the contingent set, this resonated with me, and I think it will with the broader community as we move this forward.

Eric Brunner-Williams: And there's also the policy issue of whether or not there is a single winner in a contingent set, regardless of the mechanism used to allocate, you know, to decide who the winner is. Right now it's a contingency that has only one survivor, and we're making it plain that there should at least be two, possibly more.

Chuck Gomes: Edmond, you've been quiet while we've all been talking. Where are you at on all this?

Edmond Chung: It's great that Eric is taking an interest. I guess there's two things I want to say. One is that as we go down this path, the four of us here talking, as Eric will be working it, I want to make sure that - I'm guessing that people would again be a bit confused is this the IDN TLD Fast Track issue that we're talking about. And the thing about that, just clarifying to people that this is a slightly separate grid. And then I guess my job is in the next couple of days to try come up with actual statements where IDN details detracts, whether it's Fast or not, and we'll get on that then.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. And I thought Avri said it pretty well, that this is - the way you said it I liked Avri, in that you said that in our work and looking at a Fast Track or however we want to word it, you know, we came across this issue that we want to bring to the council of the intention that's a separate issue.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Edmond Chung: Okay, so I guess that's really it.

Avri Doria: We decided. We actually decided.

Edmond Chung: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: Now Chuck again. And it seems to me that assuming we're able to make some progress in the next seven days, it probably would be helpful to have a call again next week. But it would sure be good if we could get a couple of people that haven't been able to participate on this, that in some cases have had differing use, so that we get that perspective, as well. And so they hopefully will understand what we're doing.

Avri Doria: It would probably also be good, with so few of us on this call, for somebody like our Chair to sort of write up what we've decided as the two actions coming out of this, so, you know, they know.

Edmond Chung: Yeah, I'll summarize. It should be pretty simple that we're doing this two things, and Eric has volunteered for the intention set discussion. And I get on with the part that we're supposed to be working on.

Avri Doria: And then if there is contention on the list about well why are we doing this two things, I think those, the rest of us that participated in getting here can chime in and say the same things we said here.

Chuck Gomes: Agreed.

Edmond Chung: So that sort of brings us to wrap for today.

Chuck Gomes: And so is there going to be a doodle for next week. Maybe we start off with the same sign and see if like Stéphane and Adrian might be available next week. If not, my suggestion would be we try and find some other times to try and see if we can fit them in. If we can't, we can't.

Avri Doria: Is this a regular registrar thing they've got?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Are we running up against the regular registrar meeting.

Edmond Chung: It's definitely not weekly, just regular or something, but I guess this time was chosen by a previous doodle, and I doodled to suggest the same time of the week, but it just fine it coincided with a...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well let's first find out if that's available for them next week.

Edmond Chung: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And then we'll go from there.

Edmond Chung: All right. I'll ask Glenn to go forward with a doodle and figure out the time.

Chuck Gomes: Gisella, are you still on?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. All right. We've provisionally got the time penciled in for next week, just because I need to just make sure that you have a slot with the number of doodles and calls we've got at the moment.

So I've provisionally got this time in, but I'm very happy to send out the doodle. Would you like next Wednesday, and see what available slots we've got.

Chuck Gomes: Well, left first of all, I think it's best for us first of all to find out will this slot work. You know, it looks to me for next week. I already kind of penciled it in for me, I don't know what others have done. But we really need to find out whether it works for those that haven't been able to make any of our calls. So why don't we - do people agree with that? Let's check to see if they're available next week at this time.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: And if they're not, then let's do a broader doodle.

Edmond Chung: Okay. So doodle will bring it out.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm happy just to send the email now for the doodle that I'll be (unintelligible), to see if this time next week. I'm just putting in the email that if people aren't able to make it, you know, then let's do it, and (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: That works.

Edmond Chung: That works.

Avri Doria: Okay then.

Edmond Chung: All right, so I'll go back to sleep a little more.

Avri Doria: Take another nap. Good night.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay. Thanks Edmond.

Avri Doria: Talk to all, bye-bye.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Good night.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thanks. Bye-bye. Thank you, (Jackie). You can now stop the recording
thank you.

END