Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference

18 April   2007

18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 18 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-20070418.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Bilal Beiram - CBUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Jon Nevett - Registrars

Greg Shatan - IPC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Jon Nevett - Registrars constituency

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Ray Fassett - Registries constituency

Caroline Greer - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Absent apologies:

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council IDN

wg Liaison

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Caroline.

Caroline Greer: Thank you, Chuck. Hello everyone.

Woman: Hi, Caroline.

Man: Hello everybody.

Coordinator: Excuse me. Michael Rodenbaugh have joined.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Mike.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Hey, Chuck. Hello everyone.

Chuck Gomes: We're just waiting for - people are joining quite regularly right at the
               moment so I won't name everybody that's on because that - I would -
               that's repeating myself anytime. But we're doing pretty well so far.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Great.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck, these documents - I need your agenda, the revised terms and reference. Do I need to report?

Chuck Gomes: For what, Marilyn? What are we - what are you talking about right now?

Marilyn Cade: Just this…

Coordinator: Excuse me…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Just this working document to support our call.

Chuck Gomes: Right now - the agenda was sent out yesterday.

Marilyn Cade: I've got that. I just wanted to find if I needed the actual report that we submitted or if we're going to report it that much.

It's - never mind. I found this, so.

Coordinator: (Ruth Williams).

Chuck Gomes: (Ruth)? And welcome (John).

Coordinator: Sorry. It must be Liz.

Chuck Gomes: It must be Liz. Okay.

Coordinator: Excuse me. Alistair Dixon joined.

Chuck Gomes: Is that correct, Liz. (Ruth Williams) means Liz Williams?

Woman: (Ruthie).

Glen Desaintgery: I was…

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: …to start off the call.

Liz Williams: Yes, Chuck, It's me. But if you call me (Ruth), you'll get my mother, not me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, they've sent update on the (unintelligible) so.

Liz Williams: Good.

Glen Desaintgery: I told them to take you off the call, Liz - (Ruth).

Liz Williams: Well, you know, I am, Glen, in the guise of my mother.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alistair, welcome.

Alistair Dixon: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Well, hopefully a little better time for you?

Alistair Dixon: Pretty good. (You know), the same.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Good. Okay.

Well, we're - we've got a pretty good group crew here and we're five minutes past the starting time. So, I'm sure some others will join but I'm going to go ahead and get started so that we don't waste other people's time on this.

I'm going to hit star-0 right now to start (recording).

Coordinator: Thank you all for standing by.

At this time, I would like to inform you that this call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect…

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim joined.

Coordinator: Thank you. You may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Tim.

And the meeting as you just heard is being recorded. And it is also being transcribed. Remember to identify yourself when you speak.

And again, if you're using a speakerphone, when you're speaking, it usually helps to use the handset.

And I don't think he's done yet but I do want to welcome Ray Fassett to the working group. Hopefully, all of you saw my email there yesterday in that regard.

And I actually - because Ray had expressed interest earlier and I didn't have a chair for the gTLD name at the second level, I actually asked Ray if he'd be willing lead that and - so that we'd have a chair for every group. And he agreed.

So, I'm sure he'll be joining us shortly. He said he would, so.

Marilyn Cade: So, Chuck, it's Marilyn, I have a question.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: If we have someone else who would like to just join the group but doesn't want to be a chair, can we still get them in? It's a joke.

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know the statement of work, Marilyn. You helped me draft it.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So - yeah. And it is open but we're obviously at the stage where…

Marilyn Cade: Right, moving.

Chuck Gomes: …it's (probably harder).

Now, in Ray's case I happen to know personally that he had been tracking work of the group and listening to the MP3 recordings and so forth so it made a lot of sense in that way too and because that particular subgroup really related to registries a lot.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And we've got the connection there. It made a lot of sense from my point of view, but.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

All right. The next item is to just - discuss the agenda. Are there any suggested changes to the agenda?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, before we do that though, although people check in, can we just do - can you have Glen confirm of all called so we all…

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Glen, would you like to do that?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly, Chuck.

On the call, we have yourself, Avri Doria, Marilyn Cade, Neal Blair, Greg Shatan, Mike Palage, Bilal Beiram, Caroline Greer, Mike Rodenbaugh, Jon Nevett, Alistair Dixon, Tim Ruiz, Tamara Reznik. And for staff, we have Patrick Jones, and Liz Williams.

Chuck Gomes: And did we miss anybody? Then, that's all I'm showing on my view so, that's good.

Thank you very much, Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: A pleasure.

Chuck Gomes: And now that we've done that, any suggested changes or questions about the agenda?

Okay. I would like to encourage people to make sure that you update your intrastatements to the list and then, they will be included in all of the intrastatements that are posted.

Keep in mind that especially those of you…

Woman: Hi (Chuck).

Chuck Gomes: …who are chairing groups, if you have, you know, particular interest in a particular group you are chairing that maybe you didn't think about this closing in the - in your original statement. A simple little update would be a good idea.

Welcome, Tamara.

Tamara Reznik: Thank you. Hello.

Chuck Gomes: And so, going on then. Our meeting schedule dates right now are Wednesdays in April and Thursdays in May. So, we've got the 11, 18, and 25 with the time being the one that we're using today rather than the hour - earlier time that we used last week.

And then in - on Thursdays in May, it's the 3rd and the 10th, but I want to alert you that I thought maybe I was going to be able to avoid it, but I haven't been able to - I have an unavoidable conflict on the 3rd of May. So either we need to reschedule that or find an alternate chair for that day.

And I apologize for doing that but it's a two-a-year meeting that I have to be in and so it's not one that - is - one I can work around.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. Although, I would be happy to chair in your place, I actually think given the accelerated schedule we're under, we're better off with you in the chair continuously. Do you have an alternate date to propose?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I put on here - I looked at the GNSO calendar - and Glen, would you do me a favor and - I just saw a message from Ray Fassett. He currently doesn't know the call in number. So, if you could email Ray real quick…

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly.

Chuck Gomes: …the number that would be appreciated.

The only day I could find on GNSO calendar is Tuesday, the 1st of May. Because, what happens is the PRO Working Group is switching from Tuesdays to Wednesdays in May.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: And so their meeting on Wednesday. We know Friday is not good.

And…

Marilyn Cade: Do…

Chuck Gomes: …on that Monday, I'm traveling, so.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Do we have - we - (hey), Greg?

Greg Shatan: I'm here.

Marilyn Cade: Your group is meeting on Tuesdays. Is it possible to work around - because that would give your group four hours of call potentially. Is it possible - do we have a lot of overlap on the PRO group? Glen would know this.

Glen Desaintgery: Just quite a bit. But the 1st of May is a holiday in the whole of Europe.

Man: Yeah, Labor Day.

Marilyn Cade: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: It's not a holiday for me Chuck. So, if you want to go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marilyn. It's not for me either so, the - well, you know, so that's the only alternative I came up with that week.

And on Wednesday, of course, there was a PRO Working group going. It makes it - our times would also have - would be very difficult for some people if we try to - not only have two back-to-back meetings, but for some of our members, the times would then have to be…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: …very uncomfortable.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, I'm happy to step in as chair. Are we going to be primarily reviewing reports from the subgroups at that point?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think we will or at least as they are at that stage. That's our next to last scheduled meeting.

Marilyn, I certainly would be available that week even though I'm going to be traveling to assist however I could in preparation for that. So, if you're willing to do that, why don't we work towards that alternative and we'll just plan accordingly.

And…

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: …I'll be able to come up to speak quickly after the meeting. I just - I'm tied up from 1 pm Eastern until 8 that night in a long meeting, so.

Marilyn Cade: So, we would keep the 5…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: …,3.

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Marilyn Cade: And we can work ahead of time with the subchair group and try to make this primarily reporting out and getting feedback.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay?

Chuck Gomes: And I'll - any feedback that I'm not able to get to the chairs directly, I can communicate with you…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: …at that meeting and so forth - before the meeting and so forth because I will be able to, up until 1 o'clock Eastern that day, do some things, so.

All right. Good. That resolves that.

Now, the next thing I wanted to do was just give an update on the subgroups that we have going. I think we have everything still there.

I don't see Ray on yet. So, bear with me a second and I don't know if he didn't get it or what, but I will send another email real quickly to him because I'm - I haven't seen him join yet.

Okay. That's done. All right.

Now, back to the agenda.

So, here's the status of the subgroup membership and the chairs that I have right now. And please add any corrections if you're aware of any.

The ICANN/IANA reserved names working group is going to be chaired by Mike Rodenbaugh with Edmon Chung supporting him.

The single and two-character reserved names group is being chaired by Greg Shatan with nine other people joining in that one -- Patrick Jones, Neal Blair, Marilyn Cade, Mike Rodenbaugh, Victoria McEvedy, Avri Doria, Jon Nevett, and Alistair Dixon.

Geographical and Geopolitical Names, Mike Palage is chairing that. Caroline Greer, Tim Ruiz, and Alistair Dixon are all members of that group.

gTLD Names at the Second Level, third if applicable, is Ray Fassett that. Edmon Chung, and Patrick Jones supporting there.

Controversial Names, Avri is chairing, Marilyn, Victoria, Tamara and Mike Palage are all on that group.

Did I make any mistakes in subgroup membership?

And my understanding is that the controversial names group has an email list that's been set up for them. And that the single and two-character group has also requested one of those. And Glen is aware of that.

Neal, if there are no questions or comments on that, let's go to - the action items for Liz and I. And there are quite a few of those.

Liz and I talked briefly this morning and have exchanged some emails. And I won't spent a lot of time on this one because she and I are - have a call scheduled for Friday morning…

Ray Fassett: (And I didn't have it now).

Chuck Gomes: …in that regard.

Is that Ray?

Ray Fassett: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Ray.

Ray Fassett: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And we're on Agenda Item 7.

Ray Fassett: Right.

Liz Williams: Chuck, yes. I'm sorry. I've been on mute. And yes, that is correct. I have that in my diary.

Chuck Gomes: Good, good.

And the - and so we're going to - we've both done quite a bit of work on our action items. In fact, our goal is to - before the next meeting have - made very good progress and have completed some of those

action items especially those that the rest of you are dependent upon in the work that you're doing. So, we will do that.

Just - with regard to a few specific ones defining reserved names that was something that was requested in our meetings in Lisbon and I sent a draft of that. That's a little bit more than just a definition or the approach that the working group is taking, the focus the working group is taking.

And I sent that to Liz yesterday. And we'll be talking about that on the call on Friday morning as well.

Liz Williams: Chuck, just so that - just before you go on to the next a bit. The stuff that I sent you today in terms of the templates for the working group to start using, I'm happy that there's table enough that you want to.

If you want me to, I can now identify the chairs of those groups and send the chairs those templates now that I've got the list. And I'm happy to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Let's hold off until after our meeting on Friday morning.

Liz Williams: Sure. No problem. It's up to you.

Chuck Gomes: I have a few questions that I wanted to ask…

Liz Williams: No problem. Fine.

Chuck Gomes: …and a few things. And so, I think it all probably be more effective if we wait until after the call on Friday morning.

Liz Williams: Yup. No problem. It's done.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: And - she's - Liz is all ready just to let you know - and Liz, feel free to jump in if you want to. But Liz has already done some reorganization of the report along the lines that you see in the agenda there and the basic format for that is up.

She is also - and what she was just referring to prepared a document template that each of the working subgroups will use for your individual subgroup

Chuck Gomes: So - and we'll get that out hopefully Friday, if not by early next week.

The - and I think that's it. Unless anybody has any question about the work that Liz and I are working on, we'll move to the status updates from the subgroups.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I just have one question. It's just to verify.

I really appreciate how much work the two of you are volunteering to take on. I just want to - just verify, so, once you do your work and it comes back to the full reserved name working group for edits and addition and comments. And so we're going to have to do that very quickly. Is that right?

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's what our goal really if we can achieve it. And as you can see, there are quite a few things on there. But if we can achieve it, our goal would be to have that out before the meeting next week.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: That doesn't mean that comments would have to come back by our meeting next week. It kind of depends on when we get it out. But yes, that is correct like I said last week.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anything else on the work that Liz and I are doing?

Okay. Now a - let's start with the subgroups and have the chairs give a little update. And what I'm going to do along with your update is go back to the statement of work and just discuss a few things in case there are any questions or comments about some of the actions in the statement of work.

So, let's start off with the ICANN/IANA Reserved Name. And Mike Rodenbaugh, I know that you just jumped into that so, I won't be shocked if you haven't got a lot done, but you can at least tell us where you're at.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure.

Well, I need to talk with Edmon specifically but I had sent draft question to you and to Liz, I think last week, as to what I proposed to send out. I'll send those to Edmon once I can find them. And bottom line, we're just thinking to send them out to the various organizations asking them, you know, to what purpose they put these domains essentially if any and whether they think the reservations would be continued in all gTLDs reach (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Now, Liz, I'm going to involve you in this. We talked last week about the importance of kind of having - making sure we essentially coordinate some of these things going out the people. Is it best that those go out from you, Liz, or is it okay that those goes straight from the chair of the subgroup?

Liz Williams: Chuck, I think that not that Mike won't have any trouble getting responses from people, but I think there's a couple of things we should remember. Is that perhaps coming from me, people will respond more quickly, maybe.

But also if they respond to me, then we'll have a repository of all the responses. And I have a couple of things happened to me on the last week or so that people have thought they responded to me or to you, and they haven't.

So, I'm happy to do whatever the group wishes. But I suspect that once Mike (is ready), if he gives me his table and his questions, I can make sure that they are distributed through all the likely suspects that might be interested in it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Williams: That's an easy email thing to do but perhaps Mike doesn't have access to those list. So, I'm happy to do that for him.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mike, if you will resend those then include Liz on the distribution - and just one thing, we're going to have to get those out this week because we know that people take time to respond and really to get those sent not later than this week to the various parties that they're going to.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. I have a question for Mike.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: It would be helpful I think for the full group to have a better understanding. I understand that the council did make modification to the view that the full reserved name working group had. Can Mike - can you just share with us or Liz who are we going to? Are we going to, for instance the Tier 1's who may be affected by changes like this? Are we going to the country code managers? Are we going to - just generally, who are the folks we are going to to ask this question?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think we should go to plenty of people, Marilyn, you know, try to get a broad - try to get anybody who might be affected to at least consider the questions.

Chuck Gomes: But Mike, aren't you specifically talking about the IETF, the (IFC).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, exactly. Exactly. And we're not going to ask all - everybody about all the names, right? We're only going to ask the IETF about IETF or…

Marilyn Cade: I know - Chuck, I don't really support that. The - I think we've going to be careful here.

We actually affect more than the IETF and more than IANA when we talk about the reservation of this name, of their name.

Chuck Gomes: Well okay, Marilyn, I understand your point.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And we're going to have - we'll have a broad statement at the beginning.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: This is where we're at with this issue. Listing all the names that are on reserved and obviously people will have a chance to comment.

At the same time, Marilyn, it seems to me that if in fact the IETF has concerns about the reserved name IETF that it would be good to hear from them.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly. I was thinking it was necessary but not sufficient.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. No. No. I think we're all in agreement there. That's a very good point.

Michael Palage: Can I get in the queue, Chuck. This is Mike.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. Can I get in too.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Mike, and then Patrick. Anybody else?

Michael Palage: Patrick should go first to (unintelligible) staff.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: No, Mike.

   All right. Well, I guess I'm concern that these questions are going to go out to organization. Is there also questions going to IANA or ICANN staff because I think from staff perspective, we already commented on this…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: …during the first stage of the working group and you're not going to get much more information than you - we already received.

Chuck Gomes: So, Patrick, I think - are you referring to the email that said we will look into any basis for that?

Patrick Jones: I could be.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But I…

Man: That's where I understand this was last….

Marilyn Cade: Could you…

Man: … in the last group.

Marilyn Cade: Could you put me on the queue as well on this, please Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: It's just a comment on that regard, Mike is just that, I think you - and
                  perfectly reasonably, you assumed that that was going to - that any
                  further looking into this was going to happen fairly quickly. I didn't read
                  it at the same way. Now, I don't think they were specific. So, who
                  knows which one of us is right.

                  But I think Patrick is trying to tell us right now that he doesn't think
                  they're going to have time to look into that very quickly.

                  Is that right, Patrick? I'm not trying to speak for you.

Patrick Jones: I would say so. And…

Man: And that very well will be the case for ICANN staff and for other
                  organizations. So, you know, I think we all realized that a lot these
                  issues aren't going to be resolved in our 30-day period. But to the
                  extent, we can continue to dialogue and push things forward. Then, I
                  think the decision was made to do that.

Chuck Gomes: And in fairness to Mike, he has knowledge very clearly that he realizes we may still not get all the work done that needs to be done in the 30 days. But what the council approved was to make an effort at it. And if we succeed, good. If we don't, we have a backup plan.

Marilyn Cade: And Chuck, I have a question or clarification about what the council approved. Can you just make sure I'm in the queue please.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Mike Palage.

Michael Palage: Thank you, Chuck.

I guess when we contact these people, some of the issues that I raised previously on this topic is I would like to document whether in fact there are any instances of confusion because many of those names that appear on the current reserve group...

Woman: Hi…

((Crosstalk))

Michael Palage: …are in fact a current - some of the competing legacy TLDs.

So one of the reasons I think, you know, Mike's approach of contacting these organization is we need to go to see whether there's actual harm. As I have articulated on this point from the very beginning, unless there's a harm I do not understand the justification for why we continue to reserve these names many of them which, you know, again, just the DNSO which is no longer even in use. So, you know…

Chuck Gomes: That one is kind of a (moot) point though, Mike. And so, just because…

Michael Palage: But well, but as I said, there was also some of the - as I said, in one…

Chuck Gomes: No. I respect your point. I'm just saying - is, the DNSO is one that's being changed as agreements are revised so I don't think we need to spend any time on that one either.

Michael Palage: Well, I just used that as an example to the - just the arbitrary nature of the list.

I mean, it was put out there. Oh, well now we're taking it off. Well, why do some of the other ones still exist?

And again, if we are talking about, you know, I think is - the reason I think Mike's approach of contacting the organizations first is I believe that's where our first point of information gathering needs to be. And unfortunately, the response from ICANN as to "Oh, we'll get around to it, I'm sorry." You know, not, you know, not, you know, it's just Patrick didn't provide that, it was actually dumb. But I think the response was rather lacking.

You know, how hard it is to find the basis, you know. Staff has (unintelligible) budget of 40 million and they can't figure out how they came out with this list.

I'm sorry. I find it unacceptable, so.

Chuck Gomes: Well, and also it may not just be the basis of the - they may not just be need the basis of why it was done in the first place. In fact that maybe

less than important then if there are real reasons why maybe they should be reserved going forward.

And I'm not trying to advocate one way or the other. It's just - so there are other things I think besides just the basis for why it was done in the first place.

You and I, Mike, for example -- Mike Palage -- pretty much know how it was done.

Michael Palage: Yeah, I understand.

Chuck Gomes: Now, there are many…

Michael Palage: And wouldn't it be nice if somebody would admit that on the record. But of course, they won't because that may prejudice…

Chuck Gomes: I think I just admitted.

Michael Palage: …or continue on an ongoing basis.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. All right.

Michael Palage: So, let's just - let's move on.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. Good, good.

Now, Mike Michael Rodenbaugh, with regard to the - I don't think you need to go through Liz on the issue with regard to Dot Name and Dot PRO.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And that would be a good task for Edmon to do some seize in on the
                registry list just to contact the two contact (reach) of those or just to
                check the document, actually, can we just check with their agreements.

                So, with that one you don't need to go through Liz on - to confirm that.

                The - now, what about the rewarding of the recommendations for
                example.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah?

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry I was in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I understand Marilyn I haven't forgotten you.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But go ahead, I was…

Marilyn Cade: I was kind of…

Chuck Gomes: …following up on something that was specifically said there.

Marilyn Cade: I know, but it kind of sounds like you were coming to a conclusion that
                I'm not in agreement with and I want to be on the record.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, get on the record.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

I know that some people have a passion and concern about these various issues. I myself have those same passionate views.

But I must say that I'd like just to be dispassionate about assessing the - this topic and just ask factually and neutrally, what is the basis and advantage of keeping these names on reserved.

And not go back - and Mike, I'm specifically, probably commenting about your view of people on the other record of justifying, I think that's a waste of our time and a waste of the ICANNs (best) time. Let's just do what's the basis for continuing this going forward.

I think in the grand scheme of things of all that reserved name issues we have to deal with, this is not impairing innovation. And I would put this myself, personally when I think about business users, I put this topic as a really low priority for business users that we would go pool business users around the world. I don't they care, I think they would care more about what's the rationale for just keeping that in place and lets just ask that question.

Man: Chuck, if I could respond to Marilyn?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Man: Marilyn, as you articulate - as you noted in the past you're not a
                trademark attorney or an attorney in general. The fact is there are
                certain chances that I can't accept. I just thought I'd put that on the
                record.

Marilyn Cade: That's the (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: This is Greg, is that a good thing or a bad thing?

Marilyn Cade: I know, I'm struck by that.

Man: It depends on who you're talking to.

((Crosstalk))

Man: As I've tried to articulate there are certain strings on that reserved list
                that are nationally registered trademark on behalf of businesses.

                Now, maybe all businesses may not care about their names but certain
                businesses that may have their strings excluded from registration by
                an ICANN Policy potentially impacts them. And since ICANN gets this
                authority and enforces these authorities through contracts, its
                important to understand the nature of where those contract right exist
                to preclude someone from using the domain name.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I want to make a dispassionate statement here, okay?

The council did make a decision that we would continue to pursue this particular one further than within the original 30 day statement of work and we are doing that and we will try to do our best. I know the committee will try to do - the sub committee will do their best to get what they can done in the 30 days.

And at this stage of the game, I don't think its really good use of our time to debate the pros and cons whether this is a high priority or not because, I think all of you know my view and it doesn't matter what my view is.

Let's see what we can get done and then we will all be able to comment on the decisions that come out of the subgroup.

Okay, anybody else want to jump in on this one?

Okay, and of course with regard to the work example, you need to involve - make sure you incorporate any comments from the IDN working group. You're not obligated to necessarily abide (by those) but you certainly should address those as a subgroup so that the full working group then can put that into consideration.

And then remember that one of your task is to provide a brief rationale in support of whatever recommendation end up being made by the subgroup and then could be - would be considered by the full working group.

Any questions on that?

Marilyn Cade: Would you just state that last thing again Chuck, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: And this true with every kind…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …of working group…

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right.

Chuck Gomes: …just to provide a brief rationale and support of the recommendations.

Now, in essence, Marilyn, in most cases, that's going to go back to the - remember we defined the role…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …of the category?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: That's probably very closely related to that. But one of the suggestions made in Lisbon…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …was that we provide a clear rationale for the recommendations that we're making.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: That's all it is.

So, it's certainly that what we did for role will help there. I suspect that may go a little bit further than that.

Marilyn Cade: Right, I just want to be sure because I understood that this is - what (unintelligible) for all of them.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct. In fact, and I won't - I'll refer to that again, but I won't resay as much as I did this time when I'm looking at the - this is the requirement for each subgroup, okay?

All right, going then to single and two character reserve names, Greg you're on.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Chuck.

We had a - our first telephone meeting of the subcommittee yesterday and I think we accomplished quite a bit. We are in the process of putting together a call with at least one technical expert, Steve Bellovin, for Monday to discuss the issues in single and two character names primarily at the top level but broadly speaking, what the issues are from a technical standpoint. And we are looking to engage in discussions or email - exchange us with other technical experts as well on that point.

Neal Blair is coordinating that call.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, I want to ask a point of clarification.

Greg Shatan: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: I assumed, you're talking about single character ASCII…

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …in the technical call, is that correct?

Greg Shatan: That is correct.

Chuck Gomes: That's - okay.

Greg Shatan: Separately, we are also looking to put together calls with technical experts in the IDN area as well as a Point A of our working group.

Points puts in - to consult further with IDN experts to (write) single and two character IDN names.

And basically, a definition of character, Patrick Jones is going to be circulating shortly a definition of character for us to use or for use to consider in this as well.

Our next working group call is scheduled for Tuesday - coming up.

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me a second, somebody is - got some music coming through on the recording here. So, if you could mute.

Jon Nevett: This is John, I'm from New York but I'm not guilty of this.

Marilyn Cade: And Chuck, you know, I would - (unintelligible) comment but I'm dancing around my hotel room.

Man: I always work with background music in my time in New York as well.

Marilyn Cade: Let me just - I think Greg, we, briefly talk about this that the call should be open to any members of the broader working group on Monday right?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And were going to transcribe it.

Greg Shatan: Yes. We will transcribe and post it and all those good things.

                  The call is schedule for 4:30 Eastern. I won't attempt to do all of the conversions. I know that's not great for some people but it's when the expert was available, so on this case so we have to bow to his schedule.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: We also have - working on the questions for the GAC with regard to IDN as well and Patrick has volunteered to help coordinate that as well.

Chuck Gomes: Now, let me make some suggestions there and it's - none of these are probably new to some of you anyway.

Asking questions of the GAC -- and this is not at all meant of the criticisms of the GAC, its just reflecting on reality of the GAC -- when you ask questions of the GAC, the only way that GAC can respond is that if they reach a consensus, and were not going to get a consensus from the GAC in three months let alone 30 days.

So, my recommendation is, is to try - if you're going to ask questions and want some responses in 30 days, rather than addressing them to the GAC, its okay to mention that you want GAC input but you probably ought to address them at some experts in the GAC or the GAC working group for gTLDs and let them know that, some responses from individuals would be appreciated because the GAC is going to - you're not going to get a response from the GAC officially.

Okay, did that makes sense Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes it does.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and so I'm just trying to make sure that you maximize your efficiency.

In the joint session in Lisbon with the GAC and the ccNSO and the GNSO on IDNs, you know, I even got up to the mic and said, hey, you know, if some of you as experts in this area could help us -- for example on, single character two characters and so, forth and Patrick is fully aware of those so, I'm really glad that you - he's providing some support there.

Addressing into some of those individual and doing that I think you have a chance of getting something back in s 30-day period.

Patrick Jones: Chuck this is Patrick.

That's exactly what we're planning to do and I'm going to be working with - Donna Austin is the new GAC Liaison here a ICANN and she'll help make that go to the proper people and (unintelligible) to the GAC as a whole.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Patrick.

Man: I guess approaching the GAC is somewhat like approaching the great and powerful or…

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know, we're learning though there. And again, I - that's not at all particular of the GAC but we need to fully understand how they operate and if we do, we'll be much more effective and interacting back and forth.

Man: And understanding how you feel with the plenary body they have to speak officially and speaking officially require a lot of mechanical effort.

Chuck Gomes: And a lot of time.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I'm - I think and we'll leave it to Donna to work that as the new liaison, but the good news is, of course, there are - is a subgroup that built the - act as repertoire to - but the chair needs to be communicated to that as well.

But I think, this is a larger issue I think, in terms of how we send the questions forward and that is, what can they send out to GAC numbers who might be available to participate in a dialog and what do they feel they need to speak as a consensus on. Because, what we thought in our recent consultations there are - there is a growing willingness to have a conversation but not to speak on behalf of the GAC.

And I think, you know, this is just something for us to come back to at the end of our work and say, "Has the outreach to GAC members been sufficient or do we see - and it's the guidance from the chair of the GAC and subgroup chairs that there needs to be a more detailed GAC consultations."

Chuck Gomes: And that may very well be able to happen in (unintelligible) but that will of course be well passed on to our working group.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And Marilyn, you're reinforcing some other things I was saying.

And - I know that Patrick is fully aware of this because he and I have exchanged emails and so forth on this topic, but keep in mind that the GAC principles for new TLDs only apply to ASCII.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: They admit at the very end of their document that, you know, they're probably not going to be done with the IDN…

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …TLD issue until - at the soonest the annual meeting of ICANN which is being schedule to be at the end of October, early November so…

Marilyn Cade: But, they would welcome questions.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: It would - yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

And then I would - I heard you use the word consensus. I just want to caution…

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …, with the GAC, you're not going to get any consensus until they approve the statement at - as soon as probably in the annual meeting.

Patrick Jones: But Chuck, again, this is Patrick. This - the type of questions and the information that we send to them might actually be really helpful to them or as - to educate them as they're developing their IDN (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely Patrick and I know you listen to the MP3 I think of the call with the GAC on Monday morning and as I was saying they reinforced that. Some of the things we were asking, they recognized as helpful as they look at the IDNTLD issue.

Go ahead, Greg, sorry to jump in so much, but you guys have a huge task here…

Greg Shatan: We do.

Chuck Gomes: …and I'm really impressed with how you're - you started it.

Greg Shatan: Well, we have a huge task and a large active group and it's been - first call is a pleasure.

As well, we are - as I said, we are working in draft questions for the experts. These have been, you know, circulated initially by Marilyn - by some of the technical expert with regard to ASCII side of things. Patrick is taking the lead on the IDN issues.

Oh, were back to the music again.

We will be - obviously, taking, you know, we're mindful of the short amount of time and the large amount of work. We're trying to identify the low hanging fruit that we can bring to a conclusion during our, you know, stub period here and try to identify maybe some more meaningful things that need further work for those places where the needs further work was not (in itself) some sort of conclusion. And was really, you know, more of a placeholder.

I think it will be our next -- as I said our next call is scheduled for next Tuesday and I think we'll be working on those items as well as, you know, perhaps, further, you know, discussion follow out from our experts call on Monday.

Chuck Gomes: And just one more bit of guidance, and I suspect that you're way ahead of me on this but I think it's better to leave things and not to leave things unsaid. To the extent that you can, make sure that you prioritize items that you're quite confident that you can have a complete recommendation at the end of our 30-day period.

And in contrast - and I'm not saying don't work on the ones where more work is going to be needed because we need to do that too. But any of them that we can finalize, lets make sure we get those not forget those and all of the other hard work that were doing because - that those will flow right into the new TLD process.

Greg Shatan: Chuck thanks for that, that's really where we're going on the low hanging fruit.

Hopefully, we will, you know, be able to devote, you know, some good time to the higher fruit and at least bring it lower, just not pick it entirely.

Chuck Gomes: And as you're going, and this for all the working group, I mentioned it real briefly in the first one - on ICANN/IANA names, but, in any cases where we can provide examples that was another request in the Lisbon that was suggested by Bruce and others that anywhere we can provide examples to illustrate what were talking about, we'll help the (lay) people and this particularly true with IDNs but it can - it applies to ASCII as well.

Anything else Greg?

Greg Shatan: That's all. If any members of the subgroup would like to chime in on the things that I left out. I'm still getting used to this chairing thing Chuck. You make it look easy but it's not.

Chuck Gomes: It takes a lot of time.

Anybody from the subgroup first of all, would like to comment?

Okay? Anybody from the full working group?

Ray Fassett: Hey, Chuck this is Ray.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Ray.

Ray Fassett: I have a request, if we could swap C and D only because I've had a commitment come up here at 3 o'clock. So, if Mike Palage is okay with that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, another (unintelligible) goes. Okay, that would be fine.

So, we'll go the gTLD names.

And before we go there, did anybody want to comment on the single and two character? Any other comments?

Okay. Ray, I think that's okay. I'm not even going to ask Mike if he's okay with that. We'll just kind of jump - I'm sorry Mike.

Michael Palage: That's okay. I wouldn't have objected anyway.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't think you would, I probably would have said that.

But - okay gTLD names at the second level. Go ahead, Ray, I know that you just accepted this role yesterday but (unintelligible).

Ray Fassett: Well my - first thing I did is (unintelligible) understanding of why the initial recommendation was for more work and I see that, you know, the subgroup has Edmon and Patrick so, we - that covers my deficiencies.

And what I've learned is that the - there was varying opinions on this one brought forth during the initial work and that was - what led to the conclusion for additional work and basically, those opinions came from the affected parties being the registry operators.

Now, not all of them even provider and opinion which also, I think weakened the output of the original work. So, the strategy here is to double pack and make sure we get as much in place as we can from the effective parties being the registry operators on this particular issue. And then, you know, we'll be discussing that with Edmon and Patrick on this.

That's pretty much the update.

Chuck Gomes: And on this particular one Ray, I don't know if - you know, I don't recall the results right at the top on my head on the registries that did respond to the subgroup that worked on this before. But, I'm curious as

to whether there was a difference between responses from sponsored gTLDs versus unsponsored.

Ray Fassett: Yes, there was.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ray Fassett: There was.

And I think part of what we will be looking at is that, you know, obviously, it was an original reason why there was this reservation, okay?

And, you know, it does have original reason if it's still valid. But, also, you know, things do change and there might be very valid reasons to continue the reservation that may not be the original reason.

So, those are things we need to look at.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, can I get in the queue please?

Chuck Gomes: Please, Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I just want to offer a suggestion Ray, and it isn't that I have more time to participate in other group, but I think we need to be careful at ICANN overall when we use the term affected party. Registrants believe that they're affected parties just as do the registrars in the registries?

Ray Fassett: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So, in addition to outreach to the registries which I think is important I think we - it would be good to try to figure out how to hear from the groups of - that can try at least to represent the user community…

Ray Fassett: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: …that being the three commercial user constituencies, the NCUC and the At Large. And obviously, you know, give them all timelines to try to get back to you.

                 But, I think we'll run the risk here if we think at ICANN that the only affected party is the registries who are actually missing both registrars and the rest of the user population.

                 So, maybe, if - when you design your outreach you could, you know, go back as well to the At Large and to the various constituencies and give them a timeframe to get back to you that might be helpful.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, Marilyn, you know, actually I use those particular words just for that purpose. Was to, you know, bring out, you know, the thoughts on that. But I'm glad that, you know, I'm glad that you mentioned that.

                 I think the primary affected parties here are the gTLD operators. Now, there could be indirect or secondary implications to registrants. But right now in - unless -- correct me -- or others, they're not affected now because they're simply reserved now, okay, and have been reserved.

So, if there is a change in the reserved name policy, then the primary affected parties are going to be the gTLD operators.

Is that reasonable?

Marilyn Cade: I don't think so because if I have a bank of 300 reserved names or a bank of 5000, or a bank of 15,000, registrants are affected as well as registries and registrars.

Chuck Gomes: There's the issue of confusion which is - was one of the reasons why they reserved in it in the first place…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …, and so, it does seem like a reasonable approach to get some feedback from the various constituencies with regard the - in how they view it. And Liz can help in that regard so that we have this - following the same principle as - that we can have a centralized coordination of this communications going out.

Marilyn Cade: And I do think - just to follow on, I think it's reasonable really to say, you know, we've a short timeframe. Please respond within X number of days on, you know, whether you think that your - the community that you're trying to represent has significant questions or concerns.

Ray Fassett: I think that's an excellent suggestion, really, Marilyn. That's exactly why I used those words. And I appreciate you…

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Ray Fassett: …pointing that out.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

                And, again, not only to go out quickly so that we can give them a
                reasonable time.

                Now, Ray, I didn't mean to imply that you need to go through Liz to
                communicate with the registries because you can do that readily
                because you're part of that constituency.

Ray Fassett: Right.

Chuck Gomes: But, in other cases, I think it does - it is helpful to central (unintelligible).

Ray Fassett: Very good. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else, (Ray)?

Ray Fassett: No. That's it.

Chuck Gomes: Any other comments or questions on the gTLD names at the second
                level?

                Okay. Good. Thanks a lot Ray and thanks for jumping in here and
                helping us out. We really appreciate it.

Ray Fassett: Sure, I might be able to join the call again in a little while. But…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ray Fassett: …I'll be jumping off right now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good.

Ray Fassett: Thanks everybody.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

                Mike Palage, I think you're up with geographical and geopolitical names.

Michael Palage: All right. Thanks Chuck.

                Basically, the group just got it started, right, so within the last 24 to 48 hours. But, what we've - we've come up with a few or some preliminary if you will direction on where we intend to go.

                With regard to the work that the group had done previously, we had drafted a list of questions to be submitted to the GAC and to WIPO, and some other interested parties.

                What I am doing now is I'm reviewing the transcript from the GAC GNSO call from earlier in the week and I've just gotten to actually Page 13 where they start talking about geographic names.

                So, hopefully, I will be able to see whether some of those questions have been answered in that dialogue or if those questions are still unanswered.

Based upon the group's reviewing of the transcripts and the questions previously drafted by the group, we would then be able to hopefully have them available for folding by the end of the week.

So, that is our first particular action items that we're working on.

Chuck Gomes: And Mike, if I can interrupt you right there so that I don't lose this thought. But, in the endyear report, your subgroup report, I think it will be very helpful to make reference not only to any consultation information you get and the transcript of the call that took place this past Monday, but also the GAC principles. Because I think it is very helpful for the GAC to know that we consider their input. We may not always do exactly what they're wanting, but the - it it's important to them that they know we took their input into consideration.

Michael Palage: And that will be the case because with regard to geographical identifiers, there - there's not - there really was not a lot of change on their particular recommendations in that area.

So, again, we will make sure in referencing our questions at the questions from the (said) group that were prepared previous to Lisbon to make sure that they are in synch with what was actually adapted by the GAC in Lisbon.

And also we'll, you know, if you will move in to that equation the input provided through Mondays call with the GAC.

So, again, as far as a timing if you will for deliverables, our objective is to have that list of questions available for consideration, hopefully, by the end of this week. Well, definitely by the end of this week.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Yeah, that's important because, again, we have such short turnaround time and we know that it's difficult for many people and especially the organizations that we're talking about here to responds quickly.

So, that will be very helpful.

Michael Palage: The other, if you will, second point if you will that we discussed is with regard to potential recommendation.

If in fact we go forward and so allow the allocation of names, we'll allow the names to be allocated.

The current thinking in the group which I believe is shared by all members currently participating is that we're going to try to stick to high-level principles and not get into the - if you will the granular details of allocation mechanisms right processes and stuff like that.

So that - those are I think the two points that we have discussed and sort of where we're at right now so.

Chuck Gomes: That sounds very good.

Do people in the - either in the subgroup or the working group as a whole have any questions or comments?

Mike…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …Mike covered it pretty well for us.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (unintelligible).

And Mike Palage, you're coordinating with Avri regarding the controversial names as well and you're part of that group so the linkage that we talk about last week in our meeting should happen readily. Is that correct?

Michael Palage: I am on Avri's mailing list so yes. Any if you will (cross-fertilization) that is necessary I will facilitate that communication between the groups.

Chuck Gomes: And this category like the controversial is really going to be helpful for the new gTLD process and won't be included specifically as reserved names categories and I think everybody is aware of that from our call last week.

I won't repeat the other things that you have in your statement of work as most of them apply to all the groups and I think you've covered it well.

This is a tough area and this is an area - hopefully everybody has reviewed the GAC principles. They're asking for a lot in this particular area and it's going to be tough to -- I think -- to give them what they want because even members of the GAC don't all agree on - even though they supported the language and the principles, they don't all agree in terms of how geographic names should be protected.

So - and I think the transcript will help somewhat from Mondays call.

I was generally pleased with that regard. I think it was helpful. I don't think there are any big surprises. The GAC mainly wants to be heard and know that were heard and to the extent that we can address some of their concerns that's helpful.

In some cases like this one, that may be very difficult to do with some countries want because they have very specific demands that would be difficult to implement.

Anything else on this category?

Chuck Gomes: The only thing that I would add Chuck is, that is consistent with the original work the original group had done and that was one of the reasons why in our recommendation, both Avri, John, and myself…

Marilyn Cade: Chuck it's (unintelligible), can I get in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Man: …go ahead, Mike.

Michael Palage: Okay.

One of the things that we tried to do is to recognize if you will the diverse views held by some governments on this topic and try to tie that in fact to places where the registry was incorporated and was potentially subject to those laws.

So, again, we've not if you will an exact or a perfect proposal but we were just trying to look for some potential solution to sort of navigate that particular minefield where there is a lack of international law on this topic.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I just want to note that, you know, this is something that I know and perhaps some others know who are close to the issue, there are countries who do have national law on these issues. Many of the countries don't but they have national norms.

And I think that's one of the reasons it's difficult in the GAC to come up with a single recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Correct, yeah. And, you know, what I heard the GAC saying in the call on Monday morning was - is that - again, they want to be heard.

Countries that do have laws or do have guidelines in this area, they want to make sure they have opportunity to put those forward and they want ICANN - for ICANNs commitment to consider those concerns even if it's not a GAC consensus position. And, that doesn't mean and this was recognized by GAC personnel on the call on Monday, they realized that ICANN is not - ICANN, the board, is not always going to react the way each individual country wants them to but they definitely want to be heard and they have the issues to be raised so that they can be taken into consideration.

And I think that's what your group is doing Mike and I think your original approach on this was good. It needs to be firmed up in some ways so that we make sure that there's no implication if there's loss, where there aren't loss, and so forth. But, I think you're on the right track.

Michael Palage: All right.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Okay. If there are no other comments on that let's go to controversial names.

Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Hi.

We have not met yet. We've got a meeting scheduled for tomorrow. Glen was kind enough to create a list.

So, basically at tomorrows meeting what I'm planning to have or go through first - review the statement of - review the relevant part of the (R) - the previous (RN) report, identify the relevant parts of the GAC and the IDN report, and then basically go through all work methods and plans.

Now, I'm hoping that we can actually do this with a minimal number of phone calls since the phone call schedule is getting outrageously crowded.

And so work with maybe a phone call at the - just one at the beginning and one towards the end and work with online, collaborative, passing documents back and forth, email and the list and such.

That's just me speaking at the moment. I don't know how the rest of the group will react and et cetera.

So, I will say - so that's my hope. We'll see what comes out of it tomorrow.

Chuck Gomes: I think you're - you may have a chance of doing that in my own perception because I felt that the work first time around on this area was very good and on a sound track and you're going to be able to build on that so it may actually be possible to do that and I wish you good luck in that regard.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: You know, I mean, I don't, you know, I don't have much more to add at the moment. Not having had a meeting I don't know if people want to, you know, if you wanted through any issues that exist in (unintelligible) according to the, you know, rest of the group here.

I did send a notification of both the list and the phone time and - well…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now, I think that's good. And I've been tracking as you know the…

Avri Doria: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: … - all of the exchanges in going on and finding a meeting time, so I knew you guys were working hard to get together and so forth so.

Avri Doria: And it's about to get worse because there's another working group…

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Avri Doria: …that's going ton: a picture of the schedule so.

Chuck Gomes: Yup. That is correct.

Avri Doria: There was really only one or two open spot who could get global. It's just a mess.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right.

                   Thank you very much Avri.

                   Any questions or comments on controversial names?

                   Okay. Then, just a final comment to all the subgroups and I know everybody knows this but we're going to have to keep it in front of us.

                   Very short timeframe. Our completion date is Monday, May 10.

And so, we've got a lot to do to get what we have to do done and so I certainly appreciate all of the time that everybody is putting in and your efforts.

And Chairs, I ask you to keep that target in front of people and do the best you can. I know you can only drive so - as hard as people will respond. But, a short timeframe, focus on things that we can get done and certainly focus on others as well so make sure we get the low hanging fruit done and then - at a bare minimum try - provide some good guidelines in cases where other work may be needed.

In the case of most controversial and geographic names, I believe that the new TLD committee is going to have to do a little more work in terms of their…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …process based on what's (unintelligible) into that.

Man: Chuck, as far as the new TLD committee, is that something - would we be able to migrate over and continue our contributions into that? Myself, I've attended a lot of the new TLD committees that - the sessions that have been happening.

Chuck Gomes: That's right. I personally think that would be very helpful. And in fact, the way the new gTLD that's been operated by Bruce all along is that observers have been welcome and not only welcome to observe but have actively participated throughout.

So, I see no problem there at all from the way it happened in the past and I don't see that changing.

If anybody wants to comment differently there's several people that have been on that throughout. Please feel free to jump in.

Again, we have to realize that that group also has a very short deadline because they're looking at the first of June for completing - having the work completed although there are a couple of areas where it may be a little bit difficult. But Liz, do you want to comment a little bit on that?

A timeframe for the new TLD committee?

She is probably on mute.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. I think Liz had to - at least leave it on mute for the second hour. She might not be able to jump on.

Chuck Gomes: Oh. Thanks Patrick.

Okay. But anyway, she has…

Liz Williams: No, Chuck, I am here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Do you want to comment briefly for the benefit of the group - especially controversial names and geographic names where their recommendations likely will fit in to the new TLD process itself rather than as reserved names?

I thought it might be helpful if you commented on the timing of what you expect with regard to the - a new TLD process.

Liz Williams: Top line is, as quickly as possible to get the work finished would be tremendous. Bottom line is, at some point we might need to adjust the timeframe.

Probably the adjustment of the timeframe depends on the availability of internal resources to do the posting of the document and it's actually a very detailed process. And that is invisible stuff that generally the committee can't see that must take place.

There's also another element which needs - because we're going to be posting a final report we need to go through the General Councils Office to make sure that that's approved.

So, I would hope very much that we stick to the timeframes that we've set, but I just want people to realize that there maybe some (unintelligible) and depending on resources internally.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

All right. Slipping back over to the agenda now.

I - do any of the subgroups need any - have any special needs of support that staff possibly could provide? Other than the outreach to experts with Liz - we're coordinating through Liz in most cases.

Okay?

Then, let's go on to the update on the GNSO call that occurred with the GAC on the 16th.

Now, let me qualify what I attached to the agenda. That was just my notes on the questions that I asked. I did not try to take notes on other questions that were asked so I would welcome others providing feedback on that. I just happen to have that readily available and did not have time to go through the transcript or the MP3 and capture everything that was said on the - other questions that were asked there.

So, if you - and I guess, if you have the agenda in front of you, if you'll just go down to the document that I attached to the agenda after the - end of the agenda there.

The - I incorporated the principles to make it easier to follow what was said and what I'll do is just quickly - I'll let you read the principles yourself, but I'll just focus on the questions and the responses we received from the GAC.

On Principle 2.1 the - I asked what criteria could be used, you know, determine whether a proposed gTLD string violates this principle of the universal declaration of human rights and also ask if it's possible to develop objective measurable criteria. Again, focusing on the fact that the new TLD committee has really tried to make sure that whatever we so is measurable, is objective and really minimizes subjectivity.

Basically, the responses that we got back on those questions was you know, what the GAC is looking for as the ICANN board to ultimately

make any judgments that would be required even if they're subjected. I know the ICANN board loves that.

The GAC in general, didn't see this particular area coming up frequently whether they're right or not on this it remains to be seen. I think because of the way the new gTLD process is going to be set out that probably it wouldn't be very wise for people with investing a lot of money in the application process and other areas to submit names that are going to be a problem here because I think it will be pretty clear upfront that there's going to be the possibility of challenge and increased cost and so forth.

So, maybe the GAC will be right in that regard that these kinds of occasions will be infrequent. They also said that they thought that the - these kinds of things would be handled on a case-by-case basis.

They - (BLD) specifically and – again, he can only speak for (BLD) but he is a spokesman they've used often. And they didn't expect a particular procedure in the selection process which regard to this. But one, it's some sort of a means by which these kind of issues would be dealt with if they do occur.

They did not have any examples, for example with ccTLD, where criteria of this particular declaration of human rights have been applied and that's pretty covers the feedback that I took notes on from that.

Now, to anybody who was on that call or maybe read the transcript or listened to the MP3 have anything to add which regard to this particular principle. But obviously it's the one related to controversial names, okay?

Okay. Good enough.

On 2.6, principle 2.6 - or let me stop. I think there were some other principles that there were questions asked about between 2.1 and 2.6. Patrick, I think you're aware of one. Could you provide some feedback on that?

Patrick Jones: Hey, can you repeat the question again? I was on mute.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think it was principle 2.4 that you had a – that a question was asked by (Philip Shephard) regarding what they meant by single character. And did you want to provide some feedback on that? I can do it if you want me to.

Patrick Jones: Well, I don't have it in front of me right now. So, maybe if you have it, you can go…

Chuck Gomes: I don't have it right it front of me but I think I remember it pretty well.

First of all again, let me go back to my comment that the GAC was clearly not in their principles that they provided an official statement from the GAC on in Lisbon for new TLDs did not include IDN.

So, they clearly were not talking about IDN characters when they said single characters.

So, from that, you know, it became very clear in the discussion that they were really talking about single letters and they're dealing in the ASCII realm not the IDN realm.

Do you want to add anything to that, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: That's what I heard them say, and I don't really have anything actually to ask that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And of course, that's what the single character and two character name working group is going to be pursuing further.

And the discussion also that occurred in the joint session with the GAC, and ccNSO and the GNSO on IDN and TLD in Lisbon, you know, that topic was talked about there as well. So, that's another place that you can look at the transcript and a few things came out there and see questions that were asked.

Patrick Jones: I have the question now in front of me and it was about 2.4. The way that section read is that it's not clear whether the GAC is referring to ASCII letters or characters. But then in the end, it says that the whole document is only on ASCII characters and they're ASCII letters and not IDN.

But when they were discussing this, they said that the question about character versus letter is very interesting and something they should consider, and they'll be thinking about that as they talk about IDN.

Chuck Gomes: And some of them obviously have even before Lisbon because that issue was discussed briefly there in the joint session.

Patrick Jones: Yeah. And this is where coming up with the definition of character is going to help them and be useful for going forward with the new gTLD process.

Chuck Gomes: I absolutely agree.

Okay. Unless somebody has another principle they want to talk about before 2.6. The next one I'll ask a question on was principle 2.6.

And if you look at the notes, you'll notice that I highlighted in yellow the words ensures and promotes. And those were - (Bill Gram) from Canada made the statement that ensures is intentionally a stronger word than promote.

And I think that's enlightening in terms of this particular GAC principle. So - and you can read the question I asked specifically and of course, they received those in writing before the call.

But they definitely think that security and stability is a priority and that's perfectly consistent with the new TLD report on – that has been posted for quite a while and the GNSOs position in general.

They made the point though that they believe that diversity supports security and stability which is a true concept.

And - but again, I think the main thing to point out here is that they expect the process to ensure security reliability, global interoperability and stability of the (DNS) and promotes competition, consumer choice, geographical and service provider diversity.

I did question them in terms of what they were really looking at for service provider diversity. They didn't get too much back on that but obviously they're looking for hopefully other new players in the registry services field including in from other regions of the world and so forth.

Any questions or comments on that?

Okay.

2.7 was the next one I asked. And again, I highlighted it in yellow. Notice that they say applicant registries for new…

Caroline Greer: Chuck…

Chuck Gomes: …gTLDs should…

Caroline Greer: …, Chuck…

Chuck Gomes: …should (unintelligible) to. Yes, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, sorry. I wasn't able to get off and I'm going to comment on the previous issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I was slow getting off mute.

I do want to comment on that. As former council of the (BC) I was actually involved in helping to draft the (BC) position. And I thought that the way that the GAC responded is actually very helpful and that is that

security and stability as you said is a primary imperative, but in addition, the GAC is expecting the introduction of diversity in infrastructure and service providers and particular all things being equal seeing a geographic distribution providers.

So, you know, just - it's worth noting that there are some constituencies who have also indicated support for that position keeping in mind, the imperative of security and stability.

And I thought the GAC was actually coming out pretty close to where many of the constituencies have.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think that's correct, Marilyn.

And again, this is an area where I thought the way they responded was quite helpful.

Caroline Greer: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: I think -- this is Avri -- that they went one step further. I mean, they basically went to partly (unintelligible). But I think I hear that there is stability and security without diversity.

Marilyn Cade: You know, Avri, you're right. The bill I think they'll be - in particular talked about how. And I think we've seen that in the IST world and in the IT networking world that diversity brings its own form of reliability and redundancy and choice. And I think that was a point that bill was making as well.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay. Anything else, Marilyn, on that?

Marilyn Cade: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So, going back then to 2.7, this one here actually used the world blocking of names and the feedback we got on that they were really not talking about new TLD in this regard. And they're not necessarily talking about and they're not talking about a reserve name list. They're talking about second level names and really looking – expecting that either to a sunrise parade or something that names that – and applicant for a new TLD would pledge to provide some coverage with regard – or some blocking of government names.

Now, in that regard – and this is just me speaking, okay, I'm not representing anybody in this but I think I kind of relate it to the Dot Asia bid for a new TLD. They certainly put in a process in their application in what they're - as they introduced their – the Dot Asia TLD where government in their region do have an opportunity either block or register or whatever procedure they're using there.

And the impression I got from the meeting on Monday was that that's kind of what they're looking for applicants to do to pledge to do those sort of things and it may makes sense to do that. If a registry is coming from a particular jurisdiction where there are laws in that regard or strong guidelines or whatever.

So if somebody else wants to jump in on that in terms of that. Now, this one obviously involves more than just geographic name. They've got IGOs which - that's another issue I'll come back to in a minute.

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, it's Alistair. Can I ask you a question?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Alistair Dixon: So, you see - sorry, I haven't gotten the (unintelligible). You say blocking of government names, did you mean country names or did you mean government organization names?

Chuck Gomes: Well, Alistair, if you look at their principle and I'm sure you have, they actually talk about government, public authorities, IGOs and wants them to be able to challenge abusing of names and what they clarified was really at the second level, not the top level. I think there's going to be a process at the top level and a new TLD procedure for that to happen.

But there isn't one at the – for a second level except in – I think it's five agreements where there's some geographical limitations and so forth.

But they say – so they use several terms. I don't think it's just government names and we're going to come to another principle in a little bit that goes even further.

Alistair Dixon: Okay. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Now, with regard to IGOs the intellectual property constituency as most of you are probably aware has submitted a recommendation to the GNSO council for an issues report regarding IGOs that - and investing the possibility of whether a dispute procedure should be put into place

for a fairly restricted definition of IGO to be able to challenge uses of their names.

I don't – it's not we don't need to go into that on this call, but I just want people to be aware of that.

The council possibility will act on that in their May meeting whether or not to establish an issues report. And for those that are new to the process, an issues report could then lead into policy development process if the council decides to do that.

Anything else on that one?

On 2.8, applicants should publicly document any support they claim to enjoy from specific community.

This one is really well covered already in the new TLD process. It's been designed on this. So I think this is one that - where the GAC principles and the GNSO are already pretty much in sync.

On 2.12, this one was interesting because - and I will refer to the wording on this. It says, ICANN should continue to ensure that registrants and registrars, a new TLD have access to an independent appeals process in relation to registry decisions, related to pricing changes, et cetera.

We point out to the GAC that we're not aware of any such procedure. So we were questioning the use of the word continue there. And so, I think they understood the point…

Yes, Avri. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think one thing that did come up and hadn't occurred to me or I think any of us is that they were considering (process) with the ombudsman and making appeal to that was indeed part of such a process.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Yeah.

As most of us know, the ombudsman's role might be able to be used in the respect but it is fairly restricted in terms of actions by the board and staff, but yeah.

So, anyway, I don't know that we…

Avri Doria: Yeah. I wasn't saying that was adequate. I was just saying that…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No, no, good. I'm glad you shared that.

And - so anyway, we made the point they're aware of that and I don't think that there was anything much substantial beyond that.

And then going to the very - towards the very end of their document, 3.3, this was a tonedown version of what they had in the draft GAC principles that were circulated. And this is the one – if individual GAC members or other government express formal concerns about any issues related to a new gTLD, the ICANN board should fully consider those concerns and clearly explain how it will address them.

Well, their comments on this was really – they really intended this, at least in what they said, the representative said on the call in Monday to be pretty much a restatement of what the ICANN board has already committed to with the GAC. And that was the main thing I heard from them in response to this.

And if that's true then that is already in place. The ICANN board does do that.

Any questions or comments on that?

Again, a general comment about the GAC principles, again, several of you especially controversial names and geographic names category, you know, it's going to be very helpful in your report that you refer to the GAC principle. I think that's very important that the GAC can readily see documented that we have considered their principles and that will be very helpful.

Any other things to talk about with regard to the call with the GAC on Monday?

Okay. Well then, I think we've done really well today. We actually may have a call that gets done early unless somebody wants to complain.

So, the next thing on the agenda then is – and by the way, as I think all of you know, the – I gave the URL where the transcript can be found and MP of that GAC meeting in the agenda.

Action items for meeting, again, it will be next Wednesday, the 25th of April, same time of today and the subgroups know.

You know, we'll just going to continue your work and again, we'll have a brief report from each group. And if you have issues that you would like some feedback earlier on from the full working group, please be prepared to identify those. If you need some support in some way, please be ready to do that as well.

Progress is going to be increasingly important in each meeting that we have. And next week will be our third meeting out of five, regularly schedules meeting anyway. And I think it maybe hard to squeeze it in the other meetings with everything else is going on.

So you might want to be a little more detailed in terms of your progress next week so that we know how you're doing and how we can help.

Liz and I as we already said are going to continue on the task that we have from the statement of work as well as the wording on some of categories that just need some word (sniffing) and so forth from the feedback in Lisbon.

And that brings us to the end of our agenda. Is there anything else that anybody wants to bring up?

Okay. Thank you very much for all the hard work by everyone and we'll meet again same time same station next week.

Goodbye.

Man: Thank you, Chuck.

Woman: Okay. Goodbye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye.

                        END