Reserved Names Working Group

Teleconference 11 APRIL 2007 at 17:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN Working Group teleconference on 11 April 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made by the Chair, in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/RN-wg-20070411.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Neal Blair - CBUC

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh – CBUC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Edmon Chung - Registries c.

Michael Palage - Registries c.

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Absent - aplogies

Jon Nevett - Registrar c.

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Counsellor

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Liz Williams: …and get (Bob times) organized And luckily it's not (school week) where homework needs to be done. So if it moves a couple of hours later, that's great for me. But that depends on everybody else.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, well let's see what (Bob)…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …early in the agenda.

Woman: What we come up with. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And I was willing to do it 5 o'clock in the morning in my time, but there are others - there's quite a few in the Pacific Time Zone that are actively involved and there was some that couldn't do it then.

                  And then so, anyway, and that would have made earlier in the day for those of you in Europe, and so I apologize that - messing up the evenings for those of you in Europe. And there are several on that category too.

                  All right, getting over here to my agenda, and I assume that the recording is on.

Coordinator: Yes, sir it is ready.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you very much.

Okay so, as usual, the meeting is being recorded and transcribed. Remember to identify yourself when you speak so the transcribers know who to attribute comments to. And if you're using a speakerphone when you speak, please use the handset.

Any other than the comment that the agenda is very long, are there any other suggestions on the agenda?

Okay, then let's go ahead and proceed. And if we think of other things as we go, that doesn't mean we can't add them.

If anybody does have any updates to your intrastatements regarding this working group, please send them to the list. And that's kind of a standing procedure.

This - now let's talk about the meeting dates and times. Now unfortunately we have a minority that was on this call, and the fact that others haven't joined maybe indication of a problem. But how do these dates and times work?

Now, Victoria has already indicated that later - a little later would be preferable. I can do - we probably can't move more than an hour later, but…

Liz Williams: No, no, no. That was me.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, wasn't - who was that?

Liz Williams: It was Liz.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, Liz. I'm sorry

Liz Williams: Sorry, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Liz.

Liz Williams: And I'm the least of your consideration, so it depends on what else, the other group, because I can make it up as we need.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well, Alistair obviously would like it an hour later. And I'm not opposed to that. Is that bad for anybody on this call if we move it an hour later? Is this time a better time or an hour later?

Victoria McEvedy: And this is certainly a better time for me. This is Victoria. Just because we end up late into the evening if we're taking two hours out.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Liz Williams: It's 6 o'clock now.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. It's fine by me.

Chuck Gomes: Either way?

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I actually - it's Marilyn. I prefer it later including when I am in Europe which is the next two weeks just because it doesn't interfere with work days. But I will do my best to be flexible, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Woman: Yeah. I'm in the same position as Marilyn on that one.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Woman: Fine now, but later is fine too even when I'm in Europe in a couple of weeks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well maybe what we ought to do is survey the group that's not on the call and see if there's strong leaning one way or the other, one hour later or the time that we have right now. Again, I can do either one. And let's get a broader response. Hopefully people will respond and we can (tell). And Alistair already has committed that he would prefer the hour later.

                 So, Victoria, I think you're the one who said that we - that an hour later really isn't desirable on your part, so make sure you communicate that when we send a message out the list.

                 Liz, could you while we're on the call because it's hard for me to lead and send emails, but could you send an email out to the list asking that question?

Liz Williams: Yup. (Done now).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, I appreciate it.

                 And while I'm talking about that, it was decided in Lisbon in talking with Denise Michel and with Liz and others that Liz would be able to

support this working group and during our 30-day extension. So we won't be using Tim Denton services.

One of the things that we'll do that will facilitate integrating the reserved name working group things, so into the new gTLD process which will come to an end very shortly after our 30-day ends.

I do want to update everybody that the council has not yet approved our working group extension. I want to be right up front about that. I had hoped that maybe it could be done via email. Frankly in Lisbon we just - the council just ran out of time. We had the Whois discussion not only took up most of the regularly scheduled meeting time in Lisbon but ran over to other time slots as well.

And then on Thursday afternoon when we reconvened on new TLDs and so forth, again, we ran out of time. So, no action was taken regarding the extension of this working group. I sent to the council list end of last week a revised statement of work that you essentially have in front of you. It's probably one modification suggested by a council member.

And the - I'm hoping that maybe we'd get enough responses on the list to seek a council approval. But that didn't happen, so it'll be on the agenda tomorrow for the council to decide.

So, whatever we do today is contingent upon that if we - if they don't extend this, we're all - we all pick up a couple of hours plus a lot other hours, I guess a week. I expect though that it will be extended.

Now, next item and this is a very important one. I'd like to go over the draft statement of work. And hopefully you have it there so you can see it as well. And I'll try and clarify some things.

Liz and other who were in many of the meetings we had regarding new TLDs and reserved names and so forth, and Lisbon, feel free to add comments as we go through this and everyone should feel free to ask questions.

The statement of work doesn't need - we don't need to view it as overly restrictive in terms of just because it includes something here doesn't mean we can't do at the same time. We're going to have to manage our time very carefully to be able to get done in 30 days.

You can see that I listed under General Tasks some things that came out of the meetings in Lisbon redefining reserved names, reorganizing the reports so that the rough recommendations are grouped, first of all, reserved name recommendation is ready for input into the new gTLD report, recommendations for possible use in the new gTLD evaluation process. There's at least two - there's two categories that really (set) that. That's the geographic and a controversial.

It was decided in Lisbon that there won't be reserved names for those categories. But the work we have done and are going to do in this 30-segment could be very useful in the challenge processes that are being built in to the new gTLD selection process.

And then the third category would be categories of names deemed to be out of scope for the reserved name working group. And those would be the three character names at the third level.

Gregory Shatan: Now, Chuck, this is Greg Shatan.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Gregory Shatan: Somehow that got perverted. It was never three-character names at the third level as the subject matter unless we're kind of parsing out three-character names from all other names at the third level.

Chuck Gomes: With regard to .name and .pro, there were some third character, three-character names that were reserved at the third level.

Gregory Shatan: Right. But they're also those with other numbers of characters.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Gregory Shatan: And then in the final report that went to Lisbon, for some reason that got headed three-character names at the third level even though it was about…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay, well that was a mistake then. Regardless, it's in the same category of out of scope for the reserved name working group based in the direction we received in Lisbon.

Gregory Shatan: Then are other names - reserved names at the third level in scope or out of scope?

Chuck Gomes: It depends which ones we're talking about. Some of those were ICANN and IANA names.

Gregory Shatan: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Those aren't out of scope. Okay.

Gregory Shatan: And there were some that were specifically…

Chuck Gomes: But the ones - basically the principle, Greg, as I understood it, and others can correct me if I communicate this incorrectly, is this that any reserved names that were unique to particular registry models were not in the reserved names category.

Gregory Shatan: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: What the council and then the new TLD committee was really looking for is reserved names that would pretty much apply across the board for the new TLD process and then as applicable in the contractual conditions that would applied to all TLDs, not particular categories that may be proposed by a specific registry.

And so that principle would apply to each one of these registry specific names at the second level, you know, the long list of names for Afilias for .info and so forth, and then other names - other reserved names at the second level.

So it's not - we do need to include the work that was done in our report, but the work will be included in such a way that it doesn't feed into the new TLD report. And any subsequent work that would ever be done on that would be done by a different group than this group.

Does that make sense?

Gregory Shatan: I think so. What was the thinking behind eliminating certain (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Well, first, I already gave you part of that thinking. And that was that the reserved names are being thought of as reserved names that are reserved for essentially all TLDs, not one or two, not specific to any particular thing.

Another reason that was brought up by more than one person was that these categories tend to be business-model specific in some cases, and so that didn't seem to be a policy issue so much as a business model issue.

Gregory Shatan: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody want to add other reasons that you heard there?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, its Marilyn. Maybe I could just - I kind of took out of the discussion that we were trying to make sure that reserved names is a category of - that has a (prohibition), meaning, do not allocate while business models, et cetera, had assumption of they will be allocated but at a time and space to be developed and by the registry. Right?

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me. I had - I turned the phone on mute for a second while the other line was ringing.

The - yes, I think that's accurate.

Marilyn Cade: So maybe, Greg, maybe that addresses a little bit of the clarification?

Gregory Shatan: I think so.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Does anybody else want to add something that you recall from Lisbon?

Did we capture that accurately, Liz, and in your recollection? Did we lose Liz?

Liz Williams: Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we did. Okay, thanks.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Williams: I'm sorry. I just need to be on mute while I'm doing - sending this, all the message to my computer…

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Okay. Sorry about that.

Liz Williams: …keyboard…

Chuck Gomes: Sorry.

Liz Williams: No, no, it's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay now, and so the report after the Thursday period would group the categories in those three categories that you see there. And the - one of the general tasks that all of us will have, and you'll see this is an action item if you haven't already done it at the end of this call today is to review the GAC principles for new TLDs, new gTLDs, and then review the IDN working group report if you haven't already done that. And I distributed those to the list, so hopefully everybody has that.

We need to add the GAC principles for new TLDs to the - to our report and reference them where applicable, which probably be more than one place. I'm sure it will be more than one place.

We need to request that the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, identify any possible security or stability issues with regard to any of our recommendations as well as suggestions at how any such issues might be mitigated. And I think - and then Number 7, create an annex as feasible. This is a suggestion that Phillip Sheppard on the council that would just simply list all of the reserved names in alphabetical order for easy reference.

Now that works for some categories; it doesn't work so well like for example for tag names. But it's probably a helpful suggestion to have an annex that just kind of somebody could just look up in alphabetical order really quickly. Now again, it doesn't work very well for IDNs. So, but I think there is some value in having a list like that. That's kind of a logistical matter that can be fairly easily handled on the ASCII side anyway.

We need to create - then we need to use format specification that Liz will provide. So in the sub-groups that we form on this group, Liz is

going to give us some format specifications and it will be essential that every group follow those and individuals follow those.

One of the problems that Tim and I ran into trying to pull everything together in the final report is this that there are lot of different formats and styles and everything else used and it made it quite difficult and time consuming at the end to pull our report together. So this is just a logistical matter that will be very helpful.

Any questions…

Liz Williams: Chuck, would you mind if I…

Chuck Gomes: …on the general tasks? Yes?

Liz Williams: Chuck, would you mind if - I'm sorry, I just interrupted you then.

Just so that everybody knows, in case you don't have the GAC TLD principles (to) hand, I've just sent them to the list again in case they're not easily gettable. And you need to refer to Annex B. So if we're going to discuss that later in the meeting, then that's where it is in the paper copy of the GAC principles.

Also, for the document templates, I just want to reiterate what Chuck said about the time it took to put the reserved names working group report into a format that enabled me to search information and enabled it to be published easily. I will be sending to the group after that I send it to Chuck later on tomorrow morning a system of templates for any of the smaller working groups that come together to enable me to easily integrate the materials that we get in a consistent form. And so there'll

be - and I'll send those around to the group, and I'm more than happy to help whoever is in the smaller working groups to actually put that information together in a consistent way.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Liz.

Any other comments or questions on general tasks?

Okay.

Edmon Chung: Chuck…

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Edmon Chung: …this is Edmon. I just joined the call.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Edmon, I appreciate you letting us know.

And the - then we go to tasks regarding recommendations. And these are organized in pretty much the same order that they were in the - in our work previously.

First of all, ICANN/IANA reserve names, the - one of the general directions we got from Bruce and the council work and committee work in Lisbon was that we really need to take an approach where the recommendations are ready to go into the new TLD report. And so, the - this would apply to everything we do. To the extent that there's going to be some reserved names requirements, then and they need to be stated in such a way that they are ready to go. Because, Liz is just going to have a few after we're done to incorporate the work from our

group into the new TLD report because in early June, we need to be ready to get a board report from the council. So the council has to approve it and then - and send it on to the board before the Puerto Rico meeting and with - hopefully with some lead time there.

So, in the case…

Liz Williams: Can I just add one further wrinkle to that? I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Liz Williams: …to do that.

The other further wrinkle of course is that many of the things with respect to reserved names fall into the basket of contractual conditions. And the contractual conditions need to be reflected in the base contract.

So, if we're drafting a base contract, which we are indeed previously working on, then anything that this group comes up with respect to continuing reserved names that are part of a baseline contract for new registry operators will need to be included in that base contract. So it's really critical that we get the timing right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, thanks. And that's good point. Our recommendations really cover two kind of broad areas. One of them is obviously what names would be reserved and not be usable by people applying for new TLDs.

The second thing is what reserved names requirements would be included in new registry contract.

And so, both categories are very important and both have to be done for the report that needs to be done by the end of May on the new TLDs. Obviously, our reports need to be done sooner than that.

The - so ICANN and IANA reserved names, it's not an area where we reached consensus. We agreed that there needed to be more work. It was - it's my personal opinion that I don't think we can get that, the additional work done in the 30-day period especially considering all the other work that we have. And the suggestion that was really given in Lisbon was that we maintain the status quo for now regarding ASCII names and we confirm that the names are reserved at the third level for Name and Pro, that we reword the recommendation for example at all levels for ASCII and IDN names, including providing examples, we incorporate any relevant comments from the IDN working group report, and then we provide a brief rationale in support of the recommendations referring to the role of the categories (applicable).

Now - and then secondly, we need to finalize some guidelines for what that additional work needs, you know, should be. So to the extent that we can provide some information that the council can then use to form a little group or something to work - do further work on this, we should also provide that.

Any questions on that particular category?

Michael Palage: Is that at the top level or the second level, Chuck, or both? I just joined a couple of minutes ago, so I apologize.

Chuck Gomes: I'm assuming that it's both, (Mike). Thanks for letting us know you joined.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. And maybe we can just get an update to see because I think there maybe a few other people who joined as well.

Chuck Gomes: I'll look at my list while you're talking, Marilyn, so.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Michael Palage: You have to hit the "Refresh" button.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, that's right. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …Edmon and Michael Palage that have joined. Edmon Chung and Michael Palage.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I saw that without hitting "Refresh," they were on there. So, I was okay at that time.

                          Okay. All right, Marilyn, is that all you wanted or did you have something else?

Marilyn Cade: No, I just had a question in terms of the guidelines for additional work. But why don't I hold my question because I think that's the recommendation in a couple of places.

Chuck Gomes: It is.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. And maybe we can come back to…

Chuck Gomes: Well it's okay to give it now because then we'll have to eventually cover it anyway.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. Well it seems to me that guidelines for additional work might include such things as on a periodic basis reassess whether change is needed. But I'm assuming the guidelines for additional work will in fact vary by category. So, additional work for Item 1, ICANN/IANA names may be very different from 3, for instance.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right. No, and I think that's good and what we should do. So again, when we're talking about guidelines, I think it's fairly flexible as to what we can recommend. Obviously, the more helpful we can be, it'll make it easier to eventually form a statement of work and so forth for that work to get accomplished.

Marilyn Cade: So my other comments which is more for Liz and you to just take note of, and that is - and I'm sure that will happen will Liz sends us the format, but our format for instance in 1 is not similar to the format in 3. And if we were writing under those headings, we would have different numbering.

So I'm just pointing that out as a - be as guidelines for additional work. And we have different categories. We put a lot of work as a sub-item under A here in ICANN/IANA work.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: So I just point that out for Liz…

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Marilyn Cade: …to come back to when she addresses the format, so we're also getting the - you know, if we're for instance going to try to align work on finalized guidelines for additional work across the three or four groups that have such a recommendation...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think that the format guidelines have to be flexible enough to accommodate the variations in the different categories. And I'm sure that that's what Liz is intending. But very good point.

Liz Williams: Thanks, Marilyn. Yup, no problem.

Chuck Gomes: Then going on to use of symbols and reserve names, it seemed like that one - that recommendation was pretty well established, there was consensus in the group on it and so forth. It's just a matter of restating it. And as you'll see when we look at our proposed work schedule, this one could be taking care of including providing a rationale in support of the recommendations by Liz and I in terms of this. And of course, anytime that we're doing that, we'll - the whole group will get a chance to look at it. But we don't need to form a working group for this.

Back - well, I won't jump ahead to the work schedule yet. I'll come back to that. But - and Number 3, then single and two-character reserved names, again, we'll obviously (brook) that down into several categories. And by the way, Marilyn shared this with me before the meeting.

Symbols and reserve names was obviously part of the single and two-character reserved names category. I pulled that out mainly because it's kind of a separate one that we can handle separately. But it certainly appropriate to make note in our report that that was a part of this - of the single and

two-character reserved names category.

The - one of few things that need to happen…

Marilyn Cade: And so, these are letters and numbers only?

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Marilyn Cade: This is letters and numbers only.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, this is letters and numbers only -- single and two-character and - so we need to be clear about that. And that's the thing that we need to make clear in our report.

There's quite a lot of work that needs to be done in this area. In some cases, there's at least one case where a fairly firm recommendation was made and really didn't change the status quo much either, if any.

But the things that need to be done, we need to consult further with IDN experts regarding single and two-character IDN names, including the definition of the term "character" as it relates to non-Roman scripts.

This particular area is one that's going to be fairly complicated mainly because it may not be the same. It may be script-dependent. There are

some scripts that -- and Edmon can talk more to this -- where if you reserve single and two-character IDN names, you're eliminating huge numbers of words and names and so forth. So it really wouldn't work.

There are other scripts where maybe it still makes sense to do those. I don't know what the answer is, but we obviously need some more expertise in this regard. And this came up in a joint meeting between the GAC and the GNSO, and the ccNSO in Lisbon. And I even got to Mike and welcomed input from experts that were on the panel there in that regard. And so, that's definitely an area we need some - a lot of expert help on.

((Crosstalk))

Second - go ahead.

Liz Williams: Chuck, it's Liz here. May I ask a question, please?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Liz Williams: This is a general and a specific question. In quite a few of the spots, it says "consult further with (unintelligible)…"

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: …da-da-da. One of the things that Bruce and I have learned is the value of explicit and formal correspondents rather than just the email to say, hey guys, what about such and such?

Is it the intention of the group to, for example under 3A and 3B to derive quite not formal meaning, you know, treaty base but formal correspondents between the you as the chair and for example, the SSAC or the IDN group or the President's Committee on IDN to seek this kind of input within a certain timeframe in a formalized way?

Chuck Gomes: I think that would be very wise to do.

Liz Williams: Okay. So, then it seems to me that that's an action item for me to take to draft that and give it back to you to send it or are you happy to draft that yourself?

Chuck Gomes: That would be great if you can do that.

Patrick Jones: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: It would really help me.

Yes?

Patrick Jones: On the first one, I guess 3A, and (you know this), I've already reached out to a linguistic expert on helping with the definition of a character that we can then provide to the GAC and the ccNSO and see if they have any comments or problems with that proposed definition.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Patrick Jones: So, you know, I'm waiting on some feedback. The Easter Holiday has sort of delayed getting a response. But I expect we have something pretty…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Now, Patrick, it seems to me that it still wouldn't hurt to do a formal…

Patrick Jones: No, not at all.

Chuck Gomes: …(task) to that person as well. So would you provide that contact to Liz if you haven't already?

Patrick Jones: I can do that. I've already reached out to him formally, so (unintelligible)…

Chuck Gomes: Well, we'll have formal. So you don't think it's necessary then for something to come from me in that regard?

Patrick Jones: No, I don't think so, no. I think he was out on vacation with…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: …the Eastern Holiday and I'm waiting on him to come by.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's fine.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: (I'm happy)…

Liz Williams: Chuck - sorry, Marilyn. Go ahead, I'll go when you finished.

Marilyn Cade: I - we had this concept in study group that the ITU that actually works very, very well. And that is a liaison statement with a specific request. So it has a background paragraph, the request and a timeframe and both the chair and the counselor to - for purposes of ongoing communication.

It seems to me that's a larger issue that council may take up of, you know, what do they think their formal communications are. But for purposes of this, I think what we're looking for is just enough information, write a description of the request, provision of any background materials, and then whether it's a written consultation or a phone consultation that's being (sought). Is that right?

Chuck Gomes: Or both - or either or both, right?

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Because I will just note that on both B and C not to leap ahead, but on both B and C, I think we're probably going to need to do both -- written and - be open to both written and conference calls.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Agreed.

Liz?

Liz Williams: Sorry, Marilyn, for jumping across you then. Just to manage everyone's expectations, we had in internal call today with Donna Austin and (Bob Nickle) and (Bob) is taking over the ccNSO support from Donna as she moves to the GAC liaison. So it's a quite a nice little triangle.

The ccNSO and the GAC are far behind us in terms of formal consideration of these kinds of things. So, I really like Marilyn's suggestion about just enough information with the background paragraph request and the timeline that says - that indicates what we're actually trying to do.

One of the things that I'm anxious that what we don't do is bind ourselves to the timeline of, for example, the GAC deciding on what kind of letters or numbers or whatever it likes for its IDN representation of its GAC member or indeed for the ccNSO to decide what kind of reserve names it wants for representing existing ccNSO - ccTLDs.

So, just to a note of caution there that I think that the formal correspondent is really necessary to telegraph the urgency that this process puts on other supporting organization within the ICANN environment. And I think if we can be relatively formal, that's great. But also I think we need to be realistic about the timeframes in which we can expect a proper response.

Chuck Gomes: Well, and I think in that regard, Liz, what we need to do is make it clear that we're not asking for a consensus statement.

Liz Williams: Exactly, exactly.

Chuck Gomes: We need to say, you know, if they have some committees, for example, if ccNSO had an IDN working group, it could be some feedback from them, it could be some experts in their community that can provide some guidance to us and help us in this area. I think we need to be very clear about that.

Liz Williams: (Yes).

Chuck Gomes: Because if we're waiting for consensus positions, we will not get them. I mean it's a fact. We don't even need to guess about that. Okay?

Marilyn Cade: But, Chuck, to that point, when we, for instance, have a category as we do in B or in 1B or in 3F or in 6I - no, sorry. Let me just stick with those two. The further work or the guidelines for additional work may specifically include more elaborated consultation.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Absolutely.

Marilyn Cade: And a goal for when they would be able to get a consensus.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well I don't know if we can give them goals, but that would be nice.

Avri Doria: Chuck, can I add two things in here?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: One is I think it's important when we do communicate with them formally - that we put in our date that we tell them, you know, what kind of schedules we're on.

Two, I think we need to be really careful about saying that we don't need consensus statements when we've tried before to do something that came out of the GAC that wasn't in consensus statement. We basically got (unintelligible) and were told that we couldn't use it.

So, I'd be very careful on saying, you know, we're looking for other stuff too. Yeah, we're looking for it but it doesn't.

And I guess the third thing is purely administrative tracking thing, is that we do this reach-out and we've done to one or another. We should really keep these thing tracked with (dates), you know, what's gone out, when it's gone out because it's kind of like doing a very complicated liaison matrix, and it's really easy to lose track of who talked to who, when and who's on point, so that you don't, you know, cross signals…

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: …and you don't, whatever, so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Yeah, very good points, Avri. Although I think if we don't make it clear that we're not looking for a GAC or ccNSO consensus statement, then the chances of us getting nothing are 100%. And so we can be tactful about that, but we're looking for some expertise from their communities rather than supporting organization or advisory group consensus statements. If we don't say that, we're going to get nothing because…

Avri Doria: Right. And I think in many cases, we're starting to see a new model in the GAC where some of them can participate. We had it in…

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: …you know, some of them can participate on their own, not as representing. And that is something that does seem to be effective because you've gotten a buy-in of at least…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: …someone that understands. So, working with them, making sure that they've got people participating as themselves despite that fact that they are in GAC, maybe a stronger way to get their involvement.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Good. Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I just raise a general question?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: I'm just wondering if you can enlighten me. I'm sorry, I may not follow very well, but what is the (status) - I mean this task list because I'm just wondering where does this task list come from?

Chuck Gomes: The task list, the one that we're…

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: The task regarding recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: …right now?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, that we're going through now. I mean…

Chuck Gomes: I created it based on feedback from - that we received in Lisbon.

Victoria McEvedy: Feedback from?

Chuck Gomes: From the GNSO Council, and in particular the counselor chair. We have a lot of meeting.

Victoria McEvedy: Do we have access to that feedback?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. The council meetings were recorded, and I assume transcribed. Is that correct, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: All of the meetings, they're being transcribed and they're on the GNSO Calendar page.

Marilyn Cade: And that includes our weekend discussion, right, chair?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. My concern is that, I mean, you know, I'd like to be quite precise about that because if we - are we just - I mean are we being bound? I mean are we formally bound, limited by this list in some way? Is this list up for negotiation?

Chuck Gomes: Well, first of all, we're not going to have too much any time for negotiation, okay, just from a purely practical point of view. And to negotiate, we'd have to go back and get revised direction from the council. Again, that would put us past the point where we would…

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I'm sorry. I'm obviously just don't really understanding - I mean, (has there been) - I mean are the documents that you can - I mean, you know, I just want to know what the basis and the premises that we'll, you know, that what we're really working from here. So…

Chuck Gomes: Do you have specific questions that you can ask?

Victoria McEvedy: Like what - no, it's more in the things that what if someone else, you know - I mean, obviously you've compiled this from that feedback but, you know, the working groups may themselves want to have some input into the scope of the tasks or the approach to the tasks…

Chuck Gomes: Well, in fact…

Victoria McEvedy: …in which point…

Chuck Gomes: …that's why we're discussing it right now. So if you have specific things (to suggest)…

Victoria McEvedy: No, no, but what I'm saying is that it would be - you know, to do that effectively, you know, one would need to see the - would need to review the feedback.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. Chuck, can I get in the queue to speak on that? It's Marilyn.

Chuck Gomes: Are you finished, Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I want to be helpful to what Victoria is asking. But I must say that having - I was only there on Saturday and Sunday and I reviewed the transcript and, you know, was heavily involved of course in drafting of our reports and editing our report.

This seems to me to be a very consistent with what we put into this and the discussion that took place on the weekend. So, I'm more interested in understanding what specific is that you're concerned about, Victoria…

Victoria McEvedy: No, no, it's the process that - it's more the process I think because I mean first of all, we don't have a mandate necessarily. We don't - (you don't) have a mandate to continue this group, so we can't - you know, obviously, you know, working from that beginning, the nature of our work cannot have been (seasoned stone). And I just think it's important to maintain flexibility, you know. I mean, I know that, Chuck, you've spent enough time and then produced this great result. But I mean I think it's important that we have the chance to input in a meaningful way into the work that the subgroups are going to be doing and into the work of the working group from going forward.

Chuck Gomes: And the best I ca say is that now is your time to do that.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I can't do that without reviewing the (base) materials.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: I can't have meaningful input.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

By the way, I want to welcome Tamara to the call.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Can I just ask a follow-up question…

Tamara Reznik: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: …though? You - if you look at the transcript…

Woman: Which transcript? Sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: If you look at the transcripts, and I don't know, were you in the public meeting?

Chuck Gomes: No, she was not.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. But I mean, okay, in itself, you know, what anyone takes out of an exchange of discussions is not necessarily what someone else would take out of it. So, I just - I want to understand the process because if we are being limited to those lists, then I think it's important that we have the ability to, you know, decide whether or not we're all happy to be limited to this list based on the same material that we're working from. Just as a, you know, procedural (meta)…

Chuck Gomes: Let me talk about procedure and process, okay.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, before you do that…

Chuck Gomes: We - just a minute, Marilyn. We were tasked with providing a report under the original statement of work and presenting that to the council. And the council is - has the option of assigning the workgroup another 30 days to continue some work.

What I - they saw the report. We discussed the recommendations in quite a lot of detail in Lisbon with the council and also observers in the new TLD committee as well as the council, and received feedback there. And from that, I developed the statement of work. That statement of work was sent to the council late last week. Actually earlier, versions of it were sent earlier, but in its current form was sent late last week. And that - and so it's up to the counsel to decide whether we capture their - the things that were said. And like I said, one person has already commented from the council that there was one thing that he thought we missed, and that was added in some sense.

So…

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Well, I don't think that's satisfactory quite frankly. I mean if the council hasn't come back and we haven't been tasked going forward and, you know, one person's anecdotal comments are not sufficient. And, you know, I think what you might have taken on the feedback is not necessarily what anyone else will.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we'll find out tomorrow whether it's satisfactory.

Victoria McEvedy: I guess all I'm saying is, you know, I think it's appropriate that we have an - before we bind ourselves to this, you know, to the task and don't have anything flexibility going forward, I'm just putting a marker down that I think I certainly would like to have an opportunity to have a meaningful input into the task list if we're going to be married to it going forward. I think it's important.

Chuck Gomes: Just so you understand the timing, the council will be making a decision on it tomorrow.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

But maybe it's helpful just for everyone to have a reminder. And I only say this because I (unintelligible) on the task at the time and I volunteered to do the original statement of work and used jointly in drafting and, you know, it seems like a long time ago, no, but it's not.

The working group, the way working groups work is they have to have a statement of work that is approved by the council. And just to - you know, that's the nature of the creation of a working group.

Victoria McEvedy: I understand it, but we don't have one that's been approved by the council in terms of the work going forward until tomorrow, is that right?

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, so…

Chuck Gomes: And as I've stated at the beginning.

Victoria McEvedy: So, although we had an originally improved statement of work, that's no longer dealt with in terms of the report that got through today, right?

Marilyn Cade: Actually, Victoria, the business statement report did include the option of the council extending the working group and specific to the tasks that were - the general tasks that were identified in the original state of work, not to change it but to just extend it and in a refined way based on the input we put into our final report.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Look, all I'm saying is I think it's important that everybody in the working group has the ability to do meaningful input into this task list if we're going to be then restricted by it going forward.

Marilyn Cade: I thought, Chuck, you sent the draft to the working group as well as to the council.

Chuck Gomes: It was sent to the working group, yes.

Marilyn Cade: So…

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I got it yesterday. But I'm just saying I'd like to look, you know, it's important to see, you know, where, I mean where it's come from and whether or not perhaps there are, you know, other people and they have other thoughts. And the whole group should have the ability to have input into this should we choose to.

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. Can I get in the queue?

Michael Palage: Can I get in the queue after Patrick?

Chuck Gomes: After Patrick, did somebody else want in the queue?

Michael Palage: Palage.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Mike. Let's go with Patrick and then Mike.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

I think that the statement of work, the additional I guess work plan that Chuck's put together reflects what either didn't get done or needs to be finished based on the report that we sent to the council and the feedback from Lisbon.

So I guess, Victoria, I just start there and, you know, but that's about I'll have to add.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Mike?

Michael Palage: Yeah. Victoria, I think what Chuck is trying to do is juggle things in a prudent fashion given the rather tight timeframes that we're on. That being said, I do believe the comments that you're talking about are important, not within the context of this working group but moreover in connection with new people coming into the ICANN process.

You know, Chuck, me, you and Marilyn have the benefit of working together now for eight years under the ICANN structure. And I think

what really - what the council and future working groups need to take account of is new people that come in to the process. They need to be able to (understood) when they need to review stuff, when they need to take action. And I think those are I think the high level points that Victoria are raising, which I do think do - there are some value to that.

That being the case as I said at the beginning, I do think, Chuck, as chair, you've tried to - I think you've done an excellent job in chairing this and I think things are on target. But again just for future sessions, I do think that the points Victoria raised are important, particularly for new ICANN participants because if they come in and feel that they've not been heard or that they haven't made a valuable input, they are most likely going to walk away and that's not what we need. We need more people coming in to this process, which is one of the reasons we've tried to go with this working group structure.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mike. And I'm not questioning the value of your concerns, Victoria. The - and certainly hope that you can look at the transcripts and provide some input there. If we spend very much time talking about process at this stage of our work, then we won't be able to accomplish the objectives, whatever the council approves there.

Victoria McEvedy: Sure. I'm the first to admit that I'm new to the process. But what I'm finding in a number of context and which is why I raised this is that, you know, it can become very difficult down the track, you know. There should be some flexibility retained I think, you know, in terms of, you know, being bound to things and what have you. And this one has spent that time because, you know, otherwise one can find it one is restricted further down the tracks. So I was just putting a marker down, you know….

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: …hoping for some flexibility, you know, should it turn out that we want to look at - perhaps the subgroup wants to look at something wider.

And I think sometimes those markers are important because before you know it, you know, one ends up restricted with, you know, and it could be important.

Chuck Gomes: So one of comments I tried to make at the beginning was that we don't need to look at this as overly restrictive. Now we obviously, like we did in our first round, we need to be pragmatic, balanced pragmatism with idealism, okay. But don't look at it as overly restrictive. At the same time, if we take on more than we can chew, we're not going to finish. So, we just need to balance that.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, but let me - I think we need to try to resolve this issue of subgroups not creating works with themselves. They may identify work that they wish they could do or think needs to be done in order to fully address the topic. But I, you know, I'm a big believer in flexibility and I think we all learn things as we progress, but I - one of the things we learned a long time ago is that neither a task force - task force (and then) working groups are not even of the stature of a task force.

Task forces have to work within their terms of reference. They can give other information back to the council to say, look, you know, our terms of reference are broad enough or we disagreed for these reasons, we now have become the experts, we learned all these things.

Maybe there is a way to just have that parking lot for subgroups because we're not going to finish our work in 30 days. And, you know, Victoria, I'm not exactly sure if I'm capturing one of your concerns, but it's feasible that things will come up that just can't be addressed in a subgroup but your subgroup thinks needs to be taken up at a later time.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Now a lot that can be - can happen through the constituency structure. I think Mike's comments are good and that obviously the council and GNSO as a whole can do a better job of communicating process especially for those that are new. At the same time, there's a responsibility I believe that falls on to the constituencies to make sure that they help their own representatives come up to speed on these things as well. So it's a two-fold responsibility.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. That's actually concerned me, you know, sort of takes me right back to where I was. But here we go.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Going - continuing on Item 3 then, B was to consult further with experts in the (technical committee) regarding single letter ASCII names, single number ASCII names and two-character ASCII names involving at least one number. Those were the things we didn't find finalize recommendations on.

C was to consult with the GAC as possible regarding single and two-character IDN names. We've already talked about that.

D was restate recommendations and working group report, so that they can be readily transferred, that similar.

And you notice in a lot of these it says provide examples. One of the things that Bruce suggested and others concurred with in Lisbon was to the extent that we can provide real examples even with IDNs, it will be very helpful for people. So we want to do that and then of course incorporating comments again from the IDN working group report.

And again, this is a comment that you'll see at - in several categories. We need to provide - do a better job of providing rationale in support of the recommendations. Now we kind of did that to an extent and defined role. But it can probably be done more clearly.

And then F was finalize guidelines for additional work for ASCII single character names at all levels. And as necessary, finalize guidelines for additional work for IDN single and two-character names at all levels.

Any more comments or questions on single and two-character reserved names? It's a huge category and a big task.

Tag name is one - I won't spend very much time on that unless people want me to. That's one that I don't think we need to form another subgroup on; we just need to refine the recommendations, provide some examples and so forth. Several specific suggestions were made, and I just incorporated those right into the task here for that one.

Nic/whois/dubdubdub, pretty much the same issue, not quite as many suggestions for things that need to be done there. Again, we're not going to need a special group on that one.

Geographical and geopolitical is a totally different category. As I stated earlier, we're not anticipating the - that there will be a geographical and geopolitical reserved names category.

But the issue of geographical and geopolitical names will need to be handled in the new TLD process. And so the work that's been done and the work that we're going to do in the next 30 days if the council extends our work will need to be - can be very useful in that new TLD process and the challenge processes.

Quite a lot of suggestions were made from different sources, from GAC representatives, from people in the council, from a lot places on this category. And so I personally believe that the work that was done already by the subgroup and our committee as a whole, as well as the work that we're going to do in the next 30 days can be very helpful in that new TLD process, even though it's not going to end up in a reserved name category.

So, I'm not going to go through the items there, but if somebody wants to comment or ask a question on any of them, please do so right now.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I have a question.

Avri Doria: …Chuck, but I'll go at the end of the list. It's Liz.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Avri, and anybody besides Liz?

Marilyn Cade: And it's Marilyn. I had a question.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let's go - you want to ask the question before Avri?

Marilyn Cade: I do.

Avri Doria: I just - I didn't put myself in the queue yet. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: You did not?

Avri Doria: Nope.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I misunderstood.

Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: D, references to the word "treaty." And since I seem to spend a lot of my time dealing with international treaties, I didn't understand what we were referencing.

Chuck Gomes: Well, maybe there's not a treaty to reference.

Marilyn Cade: Not that I'm aware of.

Chuck Gomes: The point was that we've got to be pretty specific in terms of what we're referring to, if it's just guidelines, if it's law, if it's local law.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. We can't - we shouldn't just ask you, all of us to be insensitive not to use the term "treaty." Treaties are internationally negotiated instruments and tend to make a number of people move into a hyperthyroid condition when they consider the development of treaties.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay. And that's good. The intent here was not to certainly go against that. But we need to be specific if we're going to - if our recommendations are going to rely on something…

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right, right, right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And so there I assume we might be thinking about conversations that have taken place at WIPO, which is a treaty-making body…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right.

Marilyn Cade: …but they're actually is not a treaty.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And we need to be very clear in the end and make sure that there's no implication that we think that there's a treaty.

Marilyn Cade: Right, right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: (Or that we want one).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Good point.

Anything - anybody else want to comment on geographical and geopolitical?

Liz Williams: Yes, please. Me, Chuck, if you don't mind, it's Liz.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Liz.

Liz Williams: Chuck, I think I might have misheard you when you said that you didn't want a particular category for geographical and geopolitical names in the report. Is that…

Chuck Gomes: No, no, no. Not in the report. As a reserved names category.

Liz Williams: How do we treat then - and I'm referring now particularly to Ross Rader's discussions about if the status quo is not justified to be changed, then what do we do? Because for example in most of the existing registry contracts we have a reserve named category that refers to that.

Chuck Gomes: No, that's not true.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (In some), right?

Chuck Gomes: It's in six.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: That's all.

Liz Williams: Okay. So then in terms of reporting, it's really important for me to get the six that are - that have a restriction on geopolitical and geographical names and then separate out the others….

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: …that don't have that in the report.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we identified those in our…

Liz Williams: Yup, yup, got that. And because this is a reporting mechanism that, for example I'm thinking about how we would do this in terms of the new TLDs report. There is going to be a section on reserved names. There is going to be a section on the concerns about geographical and geopolitical identifiers.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: Particularly as they relate to the GAC principles. And I think it would be practical to recognize that there are some concerns about that. And

there's that also come up in the protecting the rights of others' group about NGOs and IGOs and how they might wish to protect their names.

The other question that I had was if we imagine that we had a recommendation that said status quo stays the same for the six or for the new or for whatever, it's not just about what we might do for the recommendation. That recommendation is going to flow through to three different things.

One is to the recommendation itself in terms of the treatment of those particular names.

The second part of it is at - to the contractual conditions for the base contract.

And the third part of it is instructions to applicants in the process for the new TLDs about the reserved names that it might be wise not to apply for.

So, even though it might only apply - those restrictions might only apply to an existing set of six registries, we need to think more broadly about the impact of this recommendation in terms of what it would look like for the process. And what we know is the discussion that's going on within both the GAC and their principles and the ccNSO with respect to more broadly to IDN versions of geopolitical terms and geographical names.

Chuck Gomes: Yes on all of the above. I mean…

Liz Williams: (Damn), I was hoping you'd say, "Oh, no, you're really dumb. You're not going to do it that way."

Chuck Gomes: No, no, no. That's all in sync with what - and again keep in mind that (we're as would) not expect, you know, at least so far the recommendation with regard to this category has not been that the requirement that's in the six agreements be applied to new TLDs.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: But we are assuming that the recommendations that come out of this area will help - be useful in the process of selecting new TLDs, including being a signal to applicants in terms of some problem area.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Liz Williams: Yup, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome. Now thanks for the input.

All right. Third-level name, the - that's just some editing work that primarily needs to be done.

gTLD names at the second or third level, that's one that needs some additional work. We probably don't need a lot of people working on that. But it'd be nice if can firm that up a little bit. (I have to put a) plug in for getting some feedback in our gTLD registry call earlier today, so

that more gTLD registries will respond to the questions that the subgroups sent on that and that Caroline was asking them to do.

But that one is going to need some work. You can see it there. Does anybody has any - anybody have any questions or comments on that?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

My only comment is that can we write this gTLD names, probably it has meaning to most of us. I think what we mean there are the strings that are allocated to the gTLD registries to manage. Is that right?

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Marilyn Cade: I have to tell you as a layman, had I not been on this group, I wouldn't have recognized gTLD names as the same thing that I just said.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: So…

Chuck Gomes: So we'll have to make sure that we're - we speak in better layman terms in our reports.

Marilyn Cade: It's just a, you know, it's something maybe for the group when they work on it to just include a clear statement of what it is they're referencing.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tamara Reznik: Yeah. And this is Tamara. Since I joined late and I'm sorry, I've was - I've been out for a week, I might have, you know, not gone through all the emails fully.

Can you briefly summarize what happened with the other names at the second level because when I saw gTLD names at this second or third level, I thought that that perhaps that was the same thing, that we were going to further discuss.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Before I do, Tamara, any other questions or comments on gTLD names at the second level?

Okay, then going to Number 9 then, other names at the second level. The direction we received from the council in the meeting in - meetings in Lisbon, -- not just one meeting but meetings -- was just that that is really not - that that's essentially out of scope for the reserved names working group that that particular issue in any categories -- and I said this earlier in the call before you're able to join -- that the - any category that's unique to a particular registry or something is not really what the council was looking at us to deal with on this. That doesn't mean it can't be dealt with through the GNSO and other forums, but they are not looking for us to do more work on that category.

Tamara Reznik: Okay. So you basically brought forth their recommendation that it should be further discussed then they went against you and said, "No, it shouldn't."

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's basically it because we gave them the full report. I went through the full report. And in fact, we spent quite a lot of time in meetings. They're going through the full report that we had approved as a working group. And this category as well as a couple of others, they felt were categories that were - they really weren't looking for this group to work because of their uniqueness.

Marilyn Cade: Hey, Chuck, I think to be responsive to Tamara's questions, and this may actually be responsive to Victoria's as well, that doesn't mean - you know, and I may have said this before you got on the phone, Tamara. It's Marilyn.

Tamara Reznik: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: That, you know, there may be areas where a constituency or you as a subgroup member think that more work is needed. The question - you may not be able - we can't necessarily expand the scope of work of this working group. But, Chuck, weren't you suggesting that that is something that needs to be brought back in through the constituency representation on the council?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah. And, Tamara, in fact - it's Mike Rodenbaugh. I have - I'm trying to get some language in this topic basically discussed in the context of the new TLD task force.

Tamara Reznik: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: If it's decided it's out of scope of this working group, fine.

Tamara Reznik: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: But certainly broader issues are not out of the scope (of the task force).

Tamara Reznik: Right, right. No, not that I assumed. I just was kind of - I just had - you know, I just I apologized because I was out and I'm catching up. (Unintelligible) materials trying to get caught up.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, no problem. It's a good question.

Gregory Shatan: Now this is Greg Shatan. Mike, I'm glad to hear that because my concern was that this would, you know, could fall between the cracks if it's out of our scope but not made part of another group scope.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I certainly intend to not allow that to happen. I've already asked Liz specifically to put some language in there. I think it should be not objectionable that we should at least consider issues. You know, certainly new TLD registry operators need to know the rules I think.

Tamara Reznik: Yeah.

Okay. (unintelligible)We'll all look back with you on that.

Gregory Shatan: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Tamara Reznik: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: The last (cater) is controversial names. And again, we received clear
                 direction that we're not going to have a controversial reserved names
                 category. At the same time, the work that was done is - has the
                 potential of being extremely useful in the new TLD selection process
                 with regard to controversial names. And of course controversial names
                 like geographical were key elements of the GAC principles that we
                 received in Lisbon.

                 So, we are going to need a group here to refine that, to contribute to
                 the new gTLD process. And so you can see as the list underneath
                 there, A through G. Are there any questions or comments on that?

Marilyn Cade: I - it's Marilyn. I have a question. So what I'm envisioning is a narrative
                 discussion without a specific recommendation - set of
                 recommendations that are narrative discussion that goes into more
                 detail. Are we - and, Chuck, I didn't grasp this completely. Are the - is
                 the process since we're talking about the challenge process, are we
                 not?

Chuck Gomes: We are.

Marilyn Cade: Are these not then two kinds of challenges that could be brought as
                 opposed to two separate work initiatives?

Chuck Gomes: Could very well be, Marilyn. Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So when we come back to recruiting new people for geopolitical
                 and geographic and controversial names, maybe we ought to ask
                 ourselves that question given lack of resources and to avoid overlap if

this is part of a challenge process. And they're just subcategories of challenges.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: Does it make sense? And I don't know if it does or not. I haven't - I know a fair amount about both of these issues and was on the controversial names subgroup. But it's just occurring to me if they're part of the challenge process, I'm going to wonder if they belong in the same - if they either belong in the same subgroup or very close working relationship between…

Chuck Gomes: Let me make sure I'm clear on what you're suggesting.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Are you suggesting that maybe one group work on both?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Marilyn Cade: I raised that question. I'm not making the recommendation. I'm just raising the question about the similarity.

Chuck Gomes: Oh yeah. There is in that regard. And so you were thinking of that as a possibility.

Marilyn Cade: I certainly was, but I...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's good. I just wanted to make sure I was hearing (for that). I don't think that's a necessarily a bad idea. We can talk about that.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I'd actually like to say that I think it's a good idea.

Marilyn Cade: (Oh).

Avri Doria: Because - and I think we were driving in that direction that we were - and there was a lot of the same people on the same group…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: …on the two groups.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: But we were sort of driving in the direction of there being such a process of us recommending such a process.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: And we did find in both groups that we were tending to place this in that process…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: …without necessarily having (unintelligible) the notion that the process would be a common one and the process itself is going to be a fairly controversial entity that we've got to get right and we don't want to have more than one of.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: So I would definitely, you know, agree that these two should perhaps to be looked at in common.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I would agree with that too.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And thanks, Victoria. And we're going to actually - that kind of leads right into the next topic on our agenda in terms of our work plan.

                Before I go there though, as you can see in the statement of work at the very end there, the schedule restart date being today contingent upon council action tomorrow and completion date Monday, the 10th of May. So the - that's our short timeframe. And…

Marilyn Cade: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: … -yes, There was - another comment?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. That's 30 calendar days, not 30 working days.

Chuck Gomes: I never heard the term working days used. If we do 30 working days, Marilyn, we will miss the deadline for the new TLD.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I just thought I'd try to buy more time.

Chuck Gomes: Good try. I mean, it would be nice if we could, but that would put is into June and…

Marilyn Cade: Doesn't work. You're right.

Chuck Gomes: …on both, yeah. It just doesn't work. I'm sorry about that but that's the reality here.

Keep in mind that one of the board members in the meetings in ICANN pointed out in some session, I forget which one, that I think it was a little bit erroneous but that there was a promise for a new TLD process by January 2007. I don't think there was a promise. I think that's what the board asked for. But we're considerably behind that request already in the new TLD process, so there is considerable pressure to keep things moving in a prompt manner. And of course, ICANN is constantly being criticized by how long they take. So and ICANN is us.

All right, moving over to the proposed division of work for the 30-day extension. What I did is I took that statement of work and suggested what you see in that document. You see that it includes a lot of the information that we just went over, so we don't need to go over much of that in detail.

But if you look at the subgroup's task in the table at the very beginning of that document, what I envisioned - and this is for us to decide and some good suggestions were just made in two of these groups right now in the previous 5 minutes. But that we need a small subgroup for the ICANN/IANA reserved names. In reality, Tim did that one pretty much by himself with input from the rest of us.

We're going to need a small subgroup to work on that one. We're going to need expanded subgroup or maybe even subgroups, depending on how we want to organize it, for single and two-character reserved names, geographical and geopolitical expanded group, gTLD names at the second or third level. I think that can be a small group. I don't think we need a lot of people on that but we - there are some work that needs to be done there. And then we have controversial names where we need an expanded group as well.

So that would be five groups the way I laid it out here. We do not have to do it the way I laid it out here. And some people have already made some good suggestions in that regard. That's what our task is on this agenda item.

Now, with regard to five of the categories, my suggestion is that myself and Liz, and if she wants to involve other policy staff, she can do so but basically work on the editing of the five categories you see there -- symbols, tag names, nic/whois/dubdubdub, third level names, other names at the second level. And then what we do will be put back for the whole group to review and comment on them so forth to provide feedback into what we do for finalization there.

And then general task that Liz and I would assume, and Liz has informed me that she's got quite a bit of hers already done. I wish I could say the same but I can't. Basically defining what we're meaning by reserved names. For example, things that came out in the sessions in Lisbon. There are names that are pretty much reserved across the board for new TLDs and then in contractual conditions for new TLDs.

We need to do the reorganization. And that's something that probably Liz mostly will do in that. I'll (serve the quarter) as I can. Add the GAC principles with references, and then some of you need to do that in your individual subgroup reports depending on how we organize ourselves.

Liz is going to deal with the SSAC contact and get some things there, some feedback there. Again, the formal request idea I think is very helpful there with timeframes, et cetera.

The annex is something that can be done by us -- by Liz and I and any other help she can get on that -- and then the format specifications.

Now, the general task for all of us, it's very important that everyone reviewed the GAC principles and the IDN working group report, okay. That does not mean that we - keep in mind the GAC is an advisory body, okay, at the same time, they're an important advisory body. So I'm saying a couple of different things there. We need to take their advisory - their advice seriously. At the same time, it may not be possible to accommodate everything - or may be even wise to accommodate every little detail.

Actually, their principles for the most part are probably consistent with - and in fact they are consistent with a lot that has happened in the new TLD process. But there's a couple areas that are much more controversial, and so those will be tougher to deal with. But all of us should be very familiar with those principles. And then they should be discussed within the - whatever subgroups we break into for this exercise.

And then of course the IDN working group report. And I won't take the time here. There are some areas in the IDN working group recommendations that there certainly wasn't agreement on in the council and reviewing that on some of them. But a lot of them are very useful and helpful there. But we should certainly incorporate that work into this iteration of our work.

Now going on, then the task regarding recommendations, you know, there's the - I don't think that we need to go through all of that in anymore detail. So let's just go over back to my agenda and get to the very important part of our work plan in it.

So I'm on Agenda Item 8, okay -- Finalized Work Plan A. And I would like to put forward at least two guidelines which regard to how we divide up our work and ultimately then come up with our final report.

First of all, I believe that it's very important that we have brought a representation in subgroups with possible exception of ICANN/IANA reserve names and gTLD names. And I'm not trying to minimize those. But I think it's less of a risk there. I'm perfectly supportive of broad representation in those if we have enough people. But it may be a little less critical in those areas than it is in controversial geographical and single and two-character letter number names.

Sec - and by the way in that regard, and as I think all of you know, I was very comfortable with the fact that people who volunteered for certain categories had particular self-interest which regard to that. I didn't really have any problem with because they're motivated to get things started and to do some work.

But if some of you monitored some other list and so forth in the ICANN community, you probably saw that there was some criticism of one of the groups in particular because they perceived it to be just some self-interested parties that are trying to get their thing. That didn't bother me then.

But we're now at a point where it's important that we broaden our own involvement in those groups, so that we make sure we get diverse viewpoints, and therefore it will be more acceptable to the whole community and chances of moving forward are greater.

And I think that applies as well -- this particular principle -- to the leaders of particular groups. I don't think and I'm open to discussion on this, but I don't think that it's wise for us to have leaders in these groups that have particular self-interest just for - if for no other reason for perception, okay. So we can talk about that more if you want.

The second prince - guideline for me is that I think it's preferable if no one - if we can swing this -- and I'm not sure we can. But it would be desirable I think if no one is on more than one group, so that people are not
over-extended -- we have got a short window. And so that scheduling of subgroup meetings is not overly complicated.

Now, let me pause and allow some discussion on those guidelines which I admitted are from me.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn, and I would like to speak on both of them.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me just go ahead and take a queue here.

So, I've got Marilyn.

Liz Williams: Me too, please, Chuck. It's Liz.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Liz.

Anyone else?

Mike Palage: Palage.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

All right. Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'll take them in reverse order.

On the issue of people not being on more than one subgroup, I'm going to propose that you modify that and make that not more than two subgroups. Particularly because given the need for resources, quick turnaround and timeframes, I think two is probably more realistic. But on the first point, on the first point…

Chuck Gomes: Hold up. Let me stop you. Because I'd like to deal with your suggestion right there right now if that's okay.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: If the group agrees with that, I'm perfectly willing to support that. I would encourage people to try to avoid that unless you've got plenty of

time on your schedule and are willing to be as flexible as possible, otherwise, it makes it very hard for the subgroups to get their work done.

Keep in mind, we had a couple of groups last time that were really late in getting their things and then that really complicated things at the end. So we want to be - make sure that we can succeed in a very timely manner. But if the people on this call think that that's a good way to go, I will support that.

Man: I guess, Chuck, I mean I sort of support your…

Woman: Sorry about that.

Man: I guess, Chuck, I sort of supported your one task force because again I think we're eliminating some stuff and I just look - I was only on really one the last time and that occupied a big chunk of my time. So…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: …you know, I thought the one with the 30 days would probably be more efficient. So, I, you know, I…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We don't have to be totally rigid on this. If there are few people that think they can pull it off and are committed to doing what's necessary, again I'm no opposed to that, I would discourage people from getting on more than one unless they're really sure that they can deliver.

Woman: Chuck, can you put me in the queue?

((Crosstalk))

Tamara Reznik: Yeah, and this is Tamara. If I could just quickly comment. I don't - I certainly don't have time to be on more than one. But I would appreciate it if everybody who is on the other reserve names group last time, you know, if we could at least be looped in for the changes being made to that one. I see it's just checklist and (Olof) listed there?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm not sure. We're not doing any - I don't have any problem. So what you're suggesting, Tamara, is that…

Tamara Reznik: Chuck, could we just be involved in seeing sort of the - (unintelligible) recommendation, just that we see kind of the final version?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Everybody in the working group will.

Tamara Reznik: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. No, no that - remember I stated that the point is…

Tamara Reznik: So I may have missed that part.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Liz and I will - Liz and I and the work we do, it will all be presented to the full working group.

Tamara Reznik: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. I'm going to put myself back in queue and explain why I think it probably needs to be two.

Woman: Can I be in the queue…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: The topics related to geographical and political names and controversial names are really - we're doing work that if we had a different vehicle we would be doing through new gTLD working group of which I continue to be an observer. And people who on this group that our councilors are on that group and trying to help complete its work.

I would just declare that I have an interest in being on the single and two-character reserve names, but because of my previous involvement as a councilor and still as an observer from the BC would want to continue to be feed in to that work because it is about the broader launch of new gTLD.

So it creates a limitation that I think both myself and possibly those who are on the council itself might say if they were restricted to only one.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Anybody else wants to comment on this particular principle - guideline?

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri…

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: I actually think that you need to allow more than one especially if you're going to maintain the notion of who ends up chairing a group, not be someone who is passionate about it.

So that you're going to have people on the group perhaps that you might convince to take a chairing spot on one thing because it's not the one that they're passionate about, but there is something else they are passionate about.

So…

Chuck Gomes: Good, good, Avri. That's well taken.

Anybody else wants to comment and on this issue?

Then let me see if I can make a command decision that - and see if anybody objects to it, that we won't be rigid about this. But just make sure if you're on more than one group that you're willing to make the commitment necessary and be as flexible as possible so that it's not impossible to get the work done on that. That would be my guideline in that regard.

Is that an okay approach on this one?

No - anybody objection - object to that approach?

And those of you that can't, you know, I know you can't commit to that, you don't have to. Those that think they can and that will be okay. And I think the one part of this principle that I would want to maintain is we certainly wouldn't want to have two people leading two different groups. I mean (unintelligible) the same person leading two separate groups. So we want different leaderships.

So okay, so if that's okay, then, Marilyn, let's come to you. And you wanted to comment on the first guideline…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: …regard to broader representation.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. And I should disclose that I am probably one of the - A, I'll disclose that I'm a party who has an interest in the allocation of single letters that the second level because I'd (unintelligible).

I should disclose also that I've actually been in correspondence and communication with some of the parties who wanted - who were concerned about the composition of the previous groups. My suggestion to several of them was please do come and get involved - that was sort of an accident of (faith).

I support the idea that those of us who do have an interest - and there are several of us who were on that group should not chair. So I think that is a good rule for everyone of the groups, particularly because

we've got I think the need to be very, very credible with the ICANN community.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Thank you, Marilyn.

Liz, you wanted to comment.

Liz Williams: Yes, Chuck. I did, if you don't mind.

With respect to controversial names, and it's not a comment actually about the composition of groups, it's actually about the purpose of the groups. Would you mind if I did that now or would you prefer I wait until you...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Liz Williams: The issue about controversial names I think was written large for us when we're all at the Lisbon meeting. And I urge you all to read the GAC principles.

I think that one of the things that has come out for me that this group needs to consider is the nature of objection. What do we do when anyone objects to what maybe sort of a controversial name? And it could well be things like an entirely generic term that someone disagrees with.

One of the things that we haven't done successfully to date is to - in the evaluation process determine this situation where we could deal with objection. Now anyone who's got experience in dealing with objections and dealing with resolving disputes about controversial

names, and controversy could be about anything, not just about all those things that my mother (unintelligible) we don't speak at dinner.

But it's really important that we look at that issue seriously because what will be the output over these two things. One is the instructions to applicants about likely controversy, and the other is a disputed names list by default which won't be a reserve name if in the way in which we speak about it now, but it will be something we'll have to deal with in future rounds. So it's not just this round, but we have to - going to have to deal with it.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Liz, let me stop you because I want you to add something there.

Liz Williams: Oh, (damn).

Chuck Gomes: I didn't mention this but…

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …this is actually an idea that came up in the discussions in Lisbon that - in the new TLD process, that as names are challenged successfully throughout the new TLD process that it would probably be a good idea to create and make publicly available, this disputed names list. It's not a reserve names list, but at least for new applicants then to see, "Hey, this name was tried, it was disputed successfully and didn't happen."

So (again), if you want to comment more on that Liz, but I'm glad you brought that up.

Liz Williams: It's just something that with that group particularly, given the workgroup we did on the dispute resolution processes and given the work that we've done in evaluation process, the breakout of the importance of dealing with controversial names, and I always deal with them with a small C, not a big C because controversy could be about anything depending on what the week it is and whether the sky is blue today.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: Because it seems to me that in this community we don't seem to all agree on anything, let alone the color of the sky.

So, I really urge with whoever deals with that particular body of work, and that's a very large body of work if you look at the one to eight or nine elements that need to be handled there.

The most particularly important element is this - the process flow of dealing with objection and providing examples of controversy. And whether we use the GAC principles for the control of controversy that one could think about, or whether we just think more generally, that's actually quite an important piece of work to do.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Michael Palage, you wanted to comment.

Michael Palage: I'm fine, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: You're okay. You've got yours in earlier maybe on that one issue, so…

Michael Palage: Yes. And…

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else want to comment on the guidelines?

Okay. Now, here - and before we go to Agenda Item 8B, we - I think we need to go back to the suggestions with regard to combining the geographical and geopolitical names with the controversial names.

So let's have a little bit of discussion on that and see if we can come to a rough consensus at least in terms of whether that's a good thing to do or not.

Is there anybody - let me ask - let me start off by being fairly blunt and asking is there are anybody that thinks that's a bad idea?

(Mike): This is (Mike). I think it's a horrible idea.

Chuck Gomes: And explain why, (Mike).

(Mike): The geographical names is something where there's a clear body of documentation, analysis of law, underlying issues, there has been recommendations that have been agreed to at the WIPO general assembly by 181 member states. That to me is a very clear body of issues that can be dealt with in a nice compartmentalized manner.

Throwing that in with the ambiguous (more conscious) to these controversial names to me is just doesn't do - would not be productive towards reaching conclusion or a meaningful output on either of the two topics.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Can I go in the queue, please? This is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, jump in.

Avri Doria: Okay. Actually, I tend to disagree with that to put it directly and pretty much for the same reasons that you gave. I think that if you'll approach the two of them as the conflict process issue and that the two of them represent two classes of names that will come through, and what you're trying design is not a definitive list, it's not a definitive - this is how we will handle this one, this is how we handle that one, but more a process that can adapt, that can grow, they can basically deal with all of these types of conflicts even ones we're not imagining at the moment, which one of the things we always have to keep our eyes open for.

So, yes and it's good that in this case you can show that indicates a geographical name. You can point to this in this and certainly use that as a driving example.

And then I think it actually helps in terms of dealing with the other forms of conflicts because it's sort of saying in this one we've got a firm basis for making a decision. What is the firm basis in this other? And so, you basically define how a process would handle it as opposed to each and every specific category how it will be handled.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. Can I get in the queue on this?

Chuck Gomes: You're in, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: (Okay). I'm just - I want to support the overview that you just gave, Avri, because I'm thinking here, you know, in this case we're talking about deciding that we're going to point to a general assembly decision. I'm very familiar with WIPO's the general assembly and while WIPO has a number of member states that doesn't mean that every general assembly is attended by every member state.

But let's say, we decide we're going to point to what is in essence an administrative decision by a body of government sitting in an expert body such as WIPO. That's a legitimate reference point, but it doesn't actually make it law, it makes it the point of reference we're going to use when we address the controversy.

So, I still think it fits into geographic and geopolitical, (belong) in a, what I call the challenge process. It might be called something else. But in that case, you would decide what body of law, what body - what set of rules, what set of procedures you would turn to determine whether something that our challenge stands or doesn't stand.

Woman: Could we add to that?

Chuck Gomes: Please do.

Liz Williams: Me too, please, Chuck. It's Liz.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I got most of it. Victoria, I think, was that you first?

Victoria: Yeah. I think - yes. I think I would actually agree with (Mar). I think that there are particularly quite specific issues arising with controversial that (unintelligible) geographic -- obviously some of the freedom of expression issues. So my own view is that they shouldn't be dealt with together.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz?

Liz Williams: Chuck, I just wanted to offer a solution to rather than arguing about what should be in our out. Could I suggest that the groups remain separate until the groups complete their analysis? And then if…

Victoria McEvedy: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: …on the basis of the analysis that's done, we can combine the treatment of geopolitical and geographical and controversial names into one bucket, then that's assistance that we can give to the implementation plan is to actually deal with this through the application process.

But my sense is that it's a rather premature thing to do to lump them together until the further work is completed. But it may well be the result that they are lumped together at the end of the process.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Anybody else want to comment on this?

Mike Palage: That's - this is Mike. I think what Liz offers is a sort of nice compromise and in light to the fact that we're not limited to if you will one committee. Perhaps I could just serve sort of as a participant in the controversial names to sort of (sync) up as I've previously chaired the geographical and geopolitical ones.

So perhaps, the fact that we are now allowed to participate into, I can understand what's going in the controversial names. And as Liz says, perhaps, maybe find a way to find common points of commonality and link them up, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Any other comments?

Does anybody oppose to Liz's compromised approach? I was kind of - one thought that I was having while you're thinking there is that there are quite a few tasks in each one and you lump that. And some of them may overlap a little bit but not too much. And so it's a long list of task for one group to do if they're not duplicative.

So, you know…

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, its Marilyn.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I (sort of) object to Liz's solution. But I am going to note that where there's commonality of the task, maybe the group could try to (sync) up a little bit earlier because…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Good suggestion.

Marilyn Cade: …it's going to be very difficult if not highly problematic if people piecemeal the GAC with the request.

Chuck Gomes: And this actually as Mike kind of (entered at) kind of goes back to your concern with regards to the number of groups you're involved. And two, I mean and the principle that I have suggested that it might be helpful if there are people on both groups so that there is some liaison in that way. But in addition to that, the two groups (syncing) up sooner would be a very good idea I think.

Victoria McEvedy: Marilyn, do you mind if I just catch one idea that you just had? You said something about lots of request from the GAC. I think that - and I don't think I heard you correctly because I think you might have walked away from the phone a bit. But the GAC correspondence I think ought to be done as one group of questions.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Victoria McEvedy: And I'm happy to take…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: … each of those questions out. I drafted the correspondence to Bruce with respect to the conference call that's going to happen next week.

Now, I suggest that the group waits until after that call takes place which is on the 16th of April at 2:00 Brussels' time. And I can't (recite) the time at the top of my head for everybody else.

Chuck Gomes: It's when? Is this coming Monday?

Victoria McEvedy: Monday, the 16th.

Now what I suggest we do is of course many of - I mean everyone is welcome to join that call. It's not a close call. But I suggest that what we do is formally write to the GAC after that call with our list of questions from one - form Chuck. I mean I'm happy to drop the correspondence to Chuck. And then spread the answers over that group. Or the other alternative of this to send some correspondence to GAC chair prior to that call to say these are the questions that have come up and would they please consider them at that meeting.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to respond with two ideas for the group to think about. If there's an agenda for that -- I know there's an agenda for that group -- maybe you could share that agenda with this group.

I think, Chuck, my experience would lead me to believe, and I do work with this people in a lot of different settings, not just at ICANN. I think we ought to get the questions on the table early, but realize it's probably - you probably - you can't necessarily get all the questions up on the table by next Monday. But given our turnaround request, we ought to at least them a heads up that we're going to come back with a longer set of questions.

Chuck Gomes: Good idea.

And a logistical issue, Liz, we've already agreed that it'd be good to kind of standardize our communications external and make them formal and so forth and very clear and precise and so forth. The working groups are going to come up with things that need further exploration. And my thinking is, then I want to get your concurrence on this is that we should continue that approach via the working groups with your involvement and mine, so that we're consistent and we're not stepping on each other's toes throughout this process. Is that accurate?

Liz Williams: Yeah, cool. And also - and no problem, Chuck. And also what I had done while you were speaking then was I had pulled up the correspondence that I have drafted for Bruce and he (unintelligible) but has triggered the meeting for the 16th of April.

If we wish, and I agree with Marilyn completely, if we could put together some correspondence by close of business on Friday or early Monday and send it to the chair, he can send it around to his group. Even if I don't deal with that at that time, it can at least be on the table.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm not sure we can pull it off by…

Liz Williams: No, I don't think so, (unintelligible) but I'm just saying I'm happy to do it if you'd like it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Liz Williams: But the other is actually pretty responsive. And I think - and I'll send this to the group in a moment. There's not a formal agenda yet, but it's

going to be dealing with issues around the guideline about 2.2 which is ICANN should avoid country territory or place names in country territory or regional language or people descriptions which is the geographical and place-name stuff that we looked at in our statement of work.

And then the Section 2.4 on confusion with country-code, top-level domains, and that's - those are the two that are particularly relevant.

So I think we could add some supplementary questions for the meeting on Monday. And I'm going to send everyone the details of that now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And if you have suggestions, send it - you know, respond on the list so that we can see and maybe we can add them in that way. It's going to be difficult for us to formally come up with a working group approved list of questions, but it might not hurt if there are some in sync with what we believe our statement of work will be to squeeze some into that session if possible.

What I'd like to do now, I'm going to - what I'm going to do is go ahead and assume that controversial names and geographical are going to be two separate groups. But what I'm going to ask is that the chairs of those two groups do as much coordination as possible and (sync) up, you know, before - well before the end of our 30 days so that the commonalities can be dealt with together.

So what I'd like to do right now is to get some volunteers for chairs of this group. And I won't do them in any particular order. So if anybody wants to volunteer. The only thing I would ask is if you have a very

specific interest in a particular category, it's probably - I would prefer you don't chair the group.

It doesn't mean you can't be part of the group and be very active in the group, but that would be the only qualification that I would ask. And of course, you have to be willing to commit the time because we have a short window. These groups are actually going to have to get some things done between now and our next meeting. So make sure you can do that.

Anybody want to step up to the plate?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, you're actually doing this backward and forth. Do you want to go with membership for the groups and then go into the chair?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we can do that. I don't have any problem with doing that, Marilyn. The problem is we have so many people not on the call. It's going to be very limited...

Marilyn Cade: (Fine).

Chuck Gomes: But if you'd like to go that route, I don't have any problem in doing that.

So why don't we just go through. And, Glen, it's hard for me to take some notes here and keep track as I go, so why don't you go through the people that are on the call starting with Patrick and see where they would like to volunteer, and I will make note of it here on my agenda.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, pleasure.

We start with - starting with Patrick you say?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, please.

Glen Desaintgery: Patrick Jones:

Patrick Jones: Okay. I think I'd like to make myself available as a resource to any of the subgroups. But I'll stick most of my time again with the single and two-character name subgroup.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Patrick.

And so - and keep in mind - by the way, I very much appreciate Patrick's doing this to support any of the groups. And I don't think I have to tell the people in this call how much help he was in our first round. So thank you very much, Patrick.

Okay, who's next?

Glen Desaintgery: Then (unintelligible) Neil Blare.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Neil.

Neil Blare: Yes. I'd like to continue to work with the single and two-character reserved group.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. All right.

Glen Desaintgery: Marilyn Cade?

Marilyn Cade: I'd like to work on the single and two-character and on the controversial.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Hello. I'd like to continue on the single and two-character as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Mike. Thanks.

Glen Desaintgery: (Mike).

Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Hi. I'd like to be on the controversial again. And I'm reluctant. I think there may be issues in relation to the single and two-character group as well.

Chuck Gomes: So you would like to be on that one as well?

Victoria McEvedy: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: The two groups. Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Tamara Reznik?

Tamara Reznik: Hi. I'd like to be on the controversial name.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Tamara.

Glen Desaintgery: Greg Shatan?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I'm - I would like to be on the one and two-character and I'm willing to chair.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Edmon Chung?

Chuck Gomes: Edmon, are you still with us in the middle of the night?

Edmon Chung: I am.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: I (actually don't have my preference). Is there any…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well we haven't got anybody in geographical yet. We haven't got anybody in gTLD names or ICANN and IANA reserved names.

Edmon Chung: Well I guess I'm happy to help at where there needs to be helped. So at the end, you know, just…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so we'll come back to you.

Who's next?

Glen Desaintgery: Mike Palage?

Mike Palage: I guess - as I stated previously, I guess I could continue to chair the geographical and geopolitical group and will contribute in the controversial group as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so I'll add you on that one. Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: And then we've got Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah. I'd like to stay with the controversial and also with the one and two-character.

Chuck Gomes: And the one and two-character. Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: And Tim Ruiz has sent his apologies, he can't be on the call. But he says he will be willing to do a - partake in the work group.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. But he didn't mention which one?

Glen Desaintgery: I'm willing to join in and assist any of the work groups, but would not be able to be chair.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so he can't chair anymore. I was hoping maybe he continue to chair the controversial like that stuff (unintelligible).

So, okay, all right. The - now does that cover everybody on the call? Looks like it...

Glen Desaintgery: That covers everybody on the call, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Glen Desaintgery: Have I (list) anyone off?

Chuck Gomes: All right. That's helpful. Thank you very much for that, Glen.

What - and what I will do of course is to send out a note as to the list and asking people to join one of these groups.

And now we have two volunteers for chairs -- Mike Palage on the geographical and Greg Shatan on the single ad two-character reserved names.

The - now, we don't have any volunteers for two of the groups so we'll put those aside for the moment. But controversial is that we've got four people there -- Marilyn, Victoria, Tamara, Mike Palage and Avri. Mike wouldn't be able to chair that one because he's chairing the geographical.

Any of the other four of you that would be willing to chair the controversial names group?

Marilyn Cade: How about if I nominate Avri?

Chuck Gomes: Now would you be willing to do that, Avri?

Avri Doria: If people are willing to accept me doing it, sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any objections to that?

You've got it, Avri. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Lucky me.

Chuck Gomes: And Avri and Mike…

Avri Doria: (It sucks being) Avri. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. Thank you for that.

So we have chairs in for three of the groups. We don't even have any members on the others. But I'll send out a message in that regard.

Again, two of those - in fact the two that we don't have members I think are much smaller efforts, but we do need two or three people working on those. So I'll try and enlist some other people to jump in on that.

Let's see. Okay. Now, our next - our action items for the next meeting which will be scheduled right now for the next Wednesday, the 18th,

and I will - I have an action item to - and I better write it down to ask about time for the meeting, maybe moving it in an hour later.

Marilyn Cade: But that note is gone, Chuck, (for everyone).

Chuck Gomes: Oh, it's gone. Never mind.

Okay, so that's already happened.

Marilyn Cade: yes.

Chuck Gomes: So hopefully we'll hear back and then we'll let everybody know on that. But it will be on the 18th.

And I didn't comment on this and I'll be very brief on this, but we actually look very closely at the days. Fridays of course don't work because of time zone issues and weekend for some people in that case. Thursdays, there are some council meetings and new TLD meetings that interfere certainly in the month of April. And the - Whois working group is going to have some conflicts and the Pro working group meets on Tuesdays in April I think on Wednesdays in May.

So we were juggling all of those as well as time zone in coming up with that thing.

Now, remember everybody needs to review the GAC principles for new TLDs and the IDN working group report. If you've already done that, you may want to take another look at that.

Subgroups, we have three chairs on the call right now. You need them to get your group together however you want to do that between now and then.

And in terms of logistics for a teleconference call, should they coordinate with you, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly please.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And make sure that everyone in your group, including those that weren't on the call today that may be added understands the tasks. And by next Wednesday's meeting, make sure that you're organized. And if you can get started on something especially in terms of consult - any additional questions that need to be asked of our experts and so forth that that get moving because our 30 days is going to be gone before we know it.

So then next week we'll have, you know, brief report from each of the chairs in terms of the progress made in the first week of our four weeks plus of work.

Marilyn Cade: And, Chuck, its Marilyn. Can I ask you whenever you - whenever Glen or Liz sends the minutes out, it's sounding to me like the groups that have five members are going to need to have a meeting even though they may not have heard back from other parties.

Chuck Gomes: Right. I'm sure that's correct. Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So the notice that goes out from whoever does the minutes is going to encourage people to sign up. How do they sign up? Do they let Glen know so that she can get them added to…

Chuck Gomes: I'm going to ask that it'd be done on the list. In that way…

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: …all of us can see it. The chairs can see it, I can see it , Liz can see it, Glen can see it.

Glen Desaintgery: And then I'll (code) and add that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So I was just wondering how that way we can move ahead with the idea that people call join in (unintelligible) so to speak.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And I will - as soon as we're done here, my plan is to get a message out to the group - high-priority message that asking people to volunteer for groups and looking for two chairs as well.

Greg Shatan: And you, Chuck, you'll send around who's on which committee?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I will. Good suggestion, Greg.

Edmon, do you have a preference now that you see what everybody else has chosen? ICANN/IANA reserved names…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …single and two-character geographical and geopolitical, gTLD names at the second level or controversial names?

Edmon Chung: Right. I guess you mentioned that there were two that, you know, we - that hasn't been anybody yet. So I'm guessing there would be more, but I'm happy to be on those.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So let me put Edmon…

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: …to chair.

Chuck Gomes: …on both of those. Do you want to chair either of those? I think you have the - at this time?

Edmon Chung: I worry, my time be…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let's just put you on there for right now and we'll see how that goes in.

Edmon Chung: Cool.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Very good. Thank you of that.

Now, very quickly and I know we're out of time, Chuck and Liz have some tasks, so we'll work on the time for the meeting, general task from the statement of work we'll be working on. Liz has a lot of those done already. I have some that I need to do. And we also have some tasks regarding the categories of symbols, tag names,

nic/whois/dubdubdub, third-level names and other names at the second level that hopefully we'll have done by our next meeting for review by the full group. Not that we have to finalize it in our next meeting, but at least have those on the table so that we'll have a little bit of time to review those (unintelligible) entire group.

Anything else on today's call?

All right, thanks everybody.

Woman: Thanks. See you. Bye.

               See you. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Bye.

Man: Bye.

                        END