GNSO/SSAC
International Registration Data Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 22 November 2010 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO/SSAC International Registration Data Workign Group on 22 November 2010 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is   incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is   posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not   be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ird-20101122-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Present for the teleconference:
Edmon Chung –Group Leader
Jim Galvin – SSAC –Afilias
Andrei Kolesnikov -- Nominating Committee Appointee
Owen Smigelski, Sunrider International, Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group
Rafik Dammak -- GNSO Non-Commercial Users Stakeholder Group
Steven Metalitz -- GNSO Intellectual Property Interests Constituency, Commercial

ICANN Staff
Steve Sheng
David Piscitello
Gisella Gruber-White
Julie Hedlund

Absent apologies:
Avri Doria - NCSG

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to
everyone on today's IRB call on Monday, the 22nd of November.

We have Rafik Dammak, Andre Kalashnikov, Edmon Chung, Steve Metalitz,
Owen Smigelski. From staff we have Steve Shang, Julie Hedlund, Dave

Piscitello and my self Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies today from Avri Doria.

If I could please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Gisella. Thank you and welcome everyone. And I want - this is Julie Hedlund. And I want to thank all of those who provided comments on the draft Internationalized Registration Data Working Group slides for the session in Cartagena, actually for two sessions, believe the slides both the session on Saturday for the GNSO Council and also the session on Thursday for the public session.

I've sent the slides around again to everyone this morning but we also sent the revised version around on Friday. I'd like to suggest and Steve let me know - well and others and Edmon in particular, Edmon is on the call, as Chair I'd like to suggest that we go through the slides and just capture any final changes to them so that we can go ahead and make those changes and get the slides posted or send around, first send around a revised version and then if there are no further comments get the slides posted later this week.

Does that sound like an acceptable approach Edmond?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, great. Steve would you like to go ahead and take us through the slides and then, you know, and address any questions that people may want to raise?

Steve Shang: Sure. I have the slide open. I think it's a typo, draft November 19, 2010. I suggest we go over slide by slide and see if people on the call have specific added comments. And I can just edit right here and now and then we can send out revised slides.

So first of all do people have - could people have open up the slides so we can discuss.

Okay, so Slide 2, agenda. Do we have any comments?

Rafik Dammak: Just ask a question. What seems - I'm not sure what time you have for the two session in the Cartagena?

Julie Hedlund: I can answer that. And this is Julie. So there - the two sessions in Cartagena, there's one that is in the - as part of the GNSO working session and that session is scheduled - let me just pull it up here, is scheduled for Saturday.

And let me give you the time here momentarily. Sorry for the delay.

Okay it's scheduled for Saturday the - and the date is the 4th. It's in Barahona 1. I'll send information to the list (unintelligible) but I will send information to the list again with the times.

And (that's) scheduled for the afternoon starting on about 16:15 to 17:15. There's actually several updates, brief updates during that time so this will be a brief, really a brief presentation, brief for them what we will be providing in the public session.

And then the public session is scheduled for Thursday. And like I said I'll send this around to the list. And on Thursday it's scheduled to begin at 9:30 and to end at 11:00. It's also in - it's in Barahona 3 and again I'll send that around to the group.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Does that answer your question Rafik?

Great.

Rafik Dammak: It does. Though I was wondering for the second session and the GNSO Meeting I think (that) we have short time, more shorter than the update and the - for the first GNSO session so (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yea the GNSO session is quite a bit shorter. It's not really the same slides but I think we'll get through them quite quickly.

Rafik Dammak: Also I'm not sure maybe we are going to submit motion or something for Cartagena Meeting.

Julie Hedlund: There's no motion to post. And there isn't really any action that this international - that the Internationalized Data Registration Working Group is asking for from the GNSO Council at this time. This is simply an update on the interim report which I do know is also out for public comment for 60 days. And that will be extended actually as soon as the translations are ready and I have requested the translations in the six UN languages. As soon as those are ready and posted then the public comment period will be extended.

But there is no motion because there is no action requested from the Council from this group, unless I'm mistaken.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Julie. I'm sorry, go ahead please.

Julie Hedlund: No problem. Glad to help with your questions Rafik.

Steve.

Steve Shang: Okay, sure. Slide 2, no problem, okay.

Then moving onto Slide 3, we added a terminology slide just to properly scope and be more precise in our discussion and the use of words.

Do we have any comments on that - on this? Yes, no?

Okay, moving onto Slide 4, again we changed the - since we have the terminology to describe the Who Is as directory service, so in Slide 4 we change it to the directory service on the seventh sentence.

Comments, no?

Moving onto Slide 5, the two objectives are how to internationalize the main registration data; and second, how to specify how to internationalize the Who Is protocol.

Jim are you on the line?

Jim Galvin: Yes, I am.

Steve Shang: Jim I - you mentioned earlier that, you know, the two objectives, one is how to internationalize the domain registration data and the second in your email you said how to replace the Who Is protocol.

I think the reason I do not incorporate your second change is because replacing the protocol had not been discussed very much in the working group. So I did not take that change. Rather I put it more general how to specify how to internationalize the Who Is protocol.

And this is essentially at a higher level what kind of service requirement we should set for the Who Is protocol. So that's how I put (it here).

Jim Galvin: I understand.

Steve Shang: Okay, so are you okay with it?

Jim Galvin: Yeah. No, I'm fine with it. Yeah, absolutely I'm fine with that. That's great, thanks.

Steve Shang: Okay, thanks, any other comments on Slide 5?

Slide 6, so the change in red, now the reason I changed is I said that the deficiencies of the Who Is protocol, the change is - changed it to a question to be more neutral. Is the Who Is protocol able to support IRB?

Questions on that?

Slide Number 7, again just changing the title; nothing else changes.

Oh yeah, we added a bullet point and the second one is (IC 3912) is silent. It's (not encoding) other than requiring (ASCI) character returns. Maybe we should expand on that. Yeah.

Man: Steve?

Steve Shang: Go ahead.

Man: I think - (unintelligible) maybe just a little bit clarification because given that (unintelligible) it's more jargon for the GNSO.

Steve Shang: Yes (it is).

Man: I think too much jargon for GNSO Council, maybe just...

Steve Shang: Yes. Any suggestions on how do we make this language more understandable to people outside of technical community?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I would spell out what does CRLF mean?

Steve Shang: Okay. The CRLF is a - it's (ASCI) what this - the two codes for - the two (ASCI) codes for character return for back slash R and back slash N. Sorry I find this difficult.

Steve Metalitz: You could just say, you know, other than requiring a specific end of line marker and not really...

Steve Shang: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...say what it is.

Steve Shang: Okay. So (IC 3912) is (unintelligible) encoding rather than require end of line marker.

Steve Metalitz: Well I would - yeah, I would say specific end of line marker just...

Steve Shang: (Yeah).

Steve Metalitz: ...to be clear that there's - you know it's well defined.

Steve Shang: Okay. So (IC3912) is (silent about encoding) other than requiring any specific end of line marker, right?

Steve Metalitz: Works for me.

Jim Galvin: Okay, sounds good. This is Jim.

Steve Shang: Okay, we will change it to that. Moving onto Slide 8 nothing changes from the previous. Any comments? No.

Go ahead Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Hi. Just sorry, I actually don't have the deck of slides in front of me right now so...

Steve Shang: Oh, you don't have the slides?

Edmon Chung: ...if you can (actually) you know, very, very summarized each slide as we go through this, that'll be very useful.

Steve Shang: Okay. I think Julie just sent the slides but sure I will.

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible).

Steve Shang: Yeah. So the title is query and display of variance in internationalized registration data. The first bullet point is it is outside the scope of IRB that we (perceive) to (define) variance.

The second bullet point, the IRB (unintelligible) will use the categories as they are generally defined that's activated versus reserved and then sub-bullet activated means variance that are in the DNS; reserved means for given domain (these variance) that are not in the DNS but are reserved.

The bullet point is query of activated variance should (deter) all information of the domain. And second query of reserved variance is a matter of local policy.

Any comments on that? No, okay.

Hearing no comments, moving onto Slide 9, Slide 9 we see label. There are two things. One thing is we add - in the Who Is clients, Jim suggested we should say Who Is protocol clients. Is that right Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes, that's correct.

Steve Shang: Who Is protocol clients. No, Who Is service clients. The reason we choose the Who Is service clients because the registrars also have obligation to provide web Who Is. So the Who Is - so it's not just a portfolio free only. It's also a - you know for the web Who Is as well.

                  Actually maybe we should just simply want to say this directory service clients so that people are clear that this refers to the Who Is service.

Jim Galvin: Well I guess the question in my mind is which are you referring to, the clients on the presentations?

Steve Shang: Sorry, what?

                  Jim?

                  Jim?

                  I think we have - is Jim?

Julie Hedlund: He's still showing as being online.

Steve Shang: Oh okay. Jim I couldn't hear you. Maybe you're on mute.

                  Okay, we'll get - we'll come back to Jim when he's back.

                  What do others think on this Slide 9?

                  And specifically, you know, either retain the Who Is service clients or change it to director service clients.

What do people think about changing it to directory service clients because we are talking both the portfolio suite and the web Who Is, right?

Edmon Chung: I think keeping it, you know, keeping Who Is in there is better. Because I think generally the community would feel more (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Shang: (Unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: ...they understand it a bit better than if you use the very generic description.

Steve Shang: Okay. All right, so we'll keep the Who Is service clients.

Edmon Chung: And I'd like to hear what Jim says, you know, if he maybe comes back online.

Steve Shang: Sure. Jim are you back?

Yes, no, no, couldn't hear you.

Gisella Gruber-White: He's dialed back in.

Jim Galvin: Hi, this is Jim again. I apologize. I dropped off there. Did you hear anything that I said before?

Steve Shang: No.

Jim Galvin: Are you still on Slide 9 or did you move past me?

Steve Shang: Yeah, we're still on Slide 9.

Jim Galvin: Okay, the reason why I said Who Is protocol as opposed to service is because it's a question of layering. I - you made the reference to the web clients but that would be a presentation issue.

And my point here is that we really are talking about the service on the back end and what it has to provide because strictly speaking a web client doesn't have to take either a U or an A label. It could take whatever it wants to take as long as it maps into one of these two things before it asks the server.

So you really want the client of the protocol. The client side of the protocol needs to deal with - needs to convert to the U and A label before it talks to the server.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Jim Galvin: I mean that's where I was (unintelligible). Now unless I have the point of reference here wrong, so I'm happy to listen to other people say that I've got the wrong, you know, (full reference) here.

But that's where I was (coming from) (unintelligible) service.

Steve Shang: Jim my understanding is so you're saying that for the web clients, they can (access) any encoding, (like) anything. But they have to convert to like a U label or A label.

Yeah, I'm trying to think. How would you propose this pertains to, (this pertains) to Who Is protocol clients?

Jim Galvin: Yeah, I mean that was just the suggestion. Just essentially change service to be protocol. I mean there are other ways one could switch this around but that seems to be (unintelligible) (change with) terminology that we've already defined.

Steve Shang: With protocol. Let me think.

Jim Galvin: You (had) suggested directory service. I mean I'm comfortable with that too if that's - if people have a preference for that.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Jim Galvin: I mean if we can - I mean that's fine too. Although I do - I mean maybe this is just a comment to Edmon to keep in mind. I mean it is important to separate the actual client side from the server side and just keep that in mind. I mean if that question comes up in discussion about this, this particular recommendation here really does apply to the server side not really to the client.

The client just has to present it in that way to the server but it can present it anyway it wants to a user.

Edmon Chung: Jim this is Edmon. Actually I did comment earlier when you were off that I'd like to keep Who Is as (unintelligible) marker for this because I think most people understand. Well I should say at least most people get a sense of what it is than if we just call it a directory service.

Jim Galvin: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: But I'm okay with Who Is protocol slide. Steve, do you have any...?

Steve Shang: Okay.

Edmon Chung: ...protocol clients or I understand your point about, you know, including both the web and a or whatever (text-based) client.

Steve Shang: Yes. Yeah, I'm (trying to) think on this slide. Who is protocol clients, mostly (unintelligible), we can...

Jim Galvin: Let me suggest - let me, you know, yield my comment and suggest we go with directory service as you had first proposed Steve. I think that's probably a better change for right now in these slides.

Steve Shang: But Edmon preferred the - use Who Is.

Jim Galvin: Oh I'm sorry. Then I misunderstood Edmon. Well fine, let's go with what Edmon wanted to do.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, that's sort of what I said. Yeah, because if you just say directory service I think, you know, people in the audience just looking at it might not be sure whether you're talking about Who Is or some other directory service.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Jim Galvin: Right.

Steve Shang: Who Is client.

Edmon Chung: Maybe we can just say Who Is directory service then, you know, that's...

Steve Shang: Okay. I'll do that. Who Is directory service.

Jim Galvin: Well...

Steve Shang: Who Is directory kind of...

Jim Galvin: Yeah. You know one of my preferences in this work is that we try to, you know, establish and use terminology in a (unintelligible) way. I mean obviously, you know, trying to suggest that we do our part to change the dialogue, you know what I mean, because I think it's important going forward.

And I'm not comfortable with Who Is directory service because I feel like that just starts to confuse the issue again.

Steve Shang: Right.

Edmon Chung: I do, Jim actually. I think Who Is protocol probably just fine. I - Steve maybe you can, you know...

Steve Shang: Okay, we change it to protocol clients.

Edmon Chung: ...that is if you have any, you know, real big objections about it, let's go with Who Is protocol clients.

Steve Shang: Okay. We'll do that for now. I've made a change on this slide.

Okay so let's move onto Slide 10. Mapping changes this slide. Actually this slide was taken from Brussels but nothing changes.

Slide 11, any comments? Again there's nothing changing in this slide on a previous version.

Okay, hearing no comments, Slide 12.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I have one comment.

Steve Shang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: On Slide 12.

Steve Shang: Go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: On model 2 I would suggest that we put at the end of that bullet for
                     transliteration/translation. Because point of contact is not very - I mean it
                     could mean a lot of different things.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: So...

Steve Shang: So you want to specifically limit the scope point of content.

Steve Metalitz: Right, yeah, because that's what we're talking about here.

Steve Shang: Right.

Steve Metalitz: And so I think it would be helpful to clarify that.

Steve Shang: What do others think? So that means adding (modify) in model 2 at the end of
                     the sentence at point of contact for transliteration or translation.

Owen Smigelski: Hi. This is Owen. I agree with Steve Shang, and that reflects what we've
                     been discussing on the group

Steve Shang: Okay, anyone else? Yes.

Jim Galvin: This is Jim. I...

Steve Shang: I'm sorry Jim. We lost you again.

Jim Galvin: No, no. You switched to saying anyone object and so I went quiet.

Steve Shang: Oh okay.

Jim Galvin: I was just going to toss out I agree.

Steve Shang: Okay. All right I will add point of content for transliteration or translation.

                  Okay any other comments on Slide 12?

Jim Galvin: There was just my comments from email about...

Steve Shang: Oh okay, sorry.

Jim Galvin: ...you know not saying - well I guess model when you say directory service data so we should say domain registration data.

Steve Shang: Okay, yeah.

Jim Galvin: I mean let's see. It's probably okay to just say data in model 2 and 3. I mean and in 4 in fact...

Steve Shang: Four.

Jim Galvin: ...once you (unintelligible) what kind of data you're...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible). Sorry, that's just Andre (unintelligible) put us on hold.

Steve Shang: Oh okay, hi (Andre). Okay, sure.

                  So instead of directory service data we change it to domain registration data. I think this is consistent...

Jim Galvin: Right.

Steve Shang: ...with our terminology at the beginning too.

Jim Galvin: Right. It does - and then I do want to ask a question then...

Steve Shang: Go ahead.

Jim Galvin: ...about the title of the slide. Do we still want to say contact in the title? I mean we are the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group so I'm okay with internationalized registration data. But do we have to call out contact at the top there?

Steve Shang: I wrote that title. The reason for contact data is this set of slides, the four models only pertains to the contact data. There are other registration data. For example the registrar, the registrar's domain server, the telephone fax, email, you know, registration status. Those are also part of the domain registration data but...

Jim Galvin: Okay (I mean)...

Steve Shang: ...we (maybe) discussed before that, you know, they can separate - they can be internationalized as we discussed before.

                   And that does not pertain to the four models. So regardless which model we choose the internationalized (new channel) those fields will not change.

                   So actually model 1 to be more precise would be registrant provides domain contact data, right, instead of being very general.

                   Any other comments on Slide 12? Okay.

                   Slide 13, one of the things we tried to address on Steve Metalitz's comment is and it's not clear from these models like who's responsibility is it. But this is, you know, our attempt to try to highlight so like in model 1 we'll highlight

registrant provides and their registrars provide in model 2. It's not very eloquent. I welcome, you know, good ideas on how to highlight those.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve Metalitz. I think in terms of highlighting it you could just capitalize it or bold it or something so that it's clear who's supposed to do what.

But I had a different question about model 1.

Steve Shang: Go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Again I had raised this by email. In model 1 seems to presume that the registrant would provide this in the English language. And I don't think that's what we talked about. It could be enough for the registrant to provide this in (ASCI) scripts.

So and as I said I don't know whether that means we have a model 1(a) or model and model 1(b), one with translation and one with transliteration. But I just think there's need to be some way to indicate that in this - this example shows translation but it could also...

Steve Shang: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...simply be transliteration.

Steve Shang: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: And maybe just a parenthesis at the bottom of the Russian example and the Chinese example would suffice.

Steve Shang: Okay, what do others think? This is an excellent point.

So this tool reiterates what Steve mentioned. You know model 1 we specify the data must, you know, must be present in the script but we did not say, you know, whether it's the translated or transliterated in that script.

So we are a little bit imprecise there and so we want to see what the working group think, any thoughts?

So as I discussed on the email we can think of a 2 by 2 table that capture almost all of these models. So the horizontal axis would be transliterated versus translated, right, and the vertical would be, you know, registrant provide versus registrar provide.

So then, you know, we have four combinations that roughly captures model 1, 3 and 4, right. So 3 and 4 captures the registrar, you know, registrar provide translation versus registrar provide transliteration.

But we have not discussed greater details, you know, whether registrant to provide just the transliterated version of the contact name or the translated version.

So I think this is an excellent point to raise of substance, so to hear your thoughts.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve Metalitz again. I think just in terms of presentation we could either use the parenthesis as I said at the bottom of the model 1 examples or else it would require - you'd have to add one more slide. But you could basically add model 1. The Russian example would be as it is there and then you could just say or and you could cut and paste in what you have in model 3 because that's the transliteration, right, so.

Steve Shang: Right.

Steve Metalitz: So whatever you think is clear. I mean and that might be clear as just to say Russian example, you know, the translated one or the transliterated one. You (can) probably add an extra page to the slides because then model 2 wouldn't fit on this page.

Steve Shang: Right.

Steve Metalitz: But I think that'll probably be the easiest way to do it.

Steve Shang: Right. That's - yeah, that's fine. We can do that.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Steve Shang: But I want to be clear that, you know, because I think substantively we leave model 1 a little bit - there's still a little bit of room to define. It's a little bit imprecise whether we just say that it's in a must be present script. You know whether it's translated or transliterated maybe that's a local - a matter of local policy for (registrars).

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, it's true. We haven't - this is Steve again. It's true we haven't resolved that. I'm not sure we can resolve that right now as we're just preparing these...

Steve Shang: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...slides. It's something to flag for our future discussion.

But just in terms of presenting it, could be either way.

Steve Shang: Okay, all right. All right, we'll make that change.

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim. I apologize. I'm just having connectivity problems. Did you move up to Slide 13 or are you still on Slide 12?

Steve Shang: I'm on Slide 13, yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay. Then let me just say thank you for your explanation of contact on Slide 12. And I appreciate the clarification.

Steve Shang: Okay.

Jim Galvin: And then on Slide 13 I assume you'll change directory service data in model 1 to match what's on Slide 12.

Steve Shang: Yes.

Jim Galvin: Okay.

Steve Shang: Okay, so I'll make those changes.

                 Slide 14 and 15 are the continued explanations of models; any comments on those? Okay, no.

                 Moving onto Slide 16, preliminary recommendations for community discussion, nothing has changed here.

Jim Galvin: I had suggested Who Is protocol clients for Who Is client.

Steve Shang: Who Is protocol.

Jim Galvin: And Who Is responses should say domain registration data.

Steve Shang: I'm sorry. What, the Who Is response should be?

Jim Galvin: Who Is responses should say domain registration data or responses. I mean the Who Is needs to be replaced by domain registration data I think.

Steve Shang: Okay. Slide 17 and Slide 18, the question for community consideration.

Jim Galvin: Just a minor editorial. The first question in question 2 needs a question mark.

Steve Shang: Oh okay. We said that preliminary recommendations if any are feasible, right?

Jim Galvin: Correct.

Steve Shang: Okay, any other comments?

Woman: ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

Steve Shang: I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Andre, I think we're picking up some of your...

Andre Kalashnikov: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm just getting calls and...

Julie Hedlund: No.

Andre Kalashnikov: ...switching it, coming back to you, okay.

Julie Hedlund: (Perfect).

Steve Shang: Okay any other overall comments? I think we're done. Slide 19 is the last slide; any other comments on the slide that we have not addressed?

Jim Galvin: No, I just want to say that these are great Steve. And to thank you for your great work in putting these together.

Steve Shang: Thanks Jim. It's a team effort. (Dave) and Julie have done all the work as well and as far as all the people on the committee, not all but several, yeah.

Any other changes; if not, I'll hand over to Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Steve. And this is Julie. Thanks everyone. Are there any other items we want to discuss today? I think as I recall from previous discussions and I think Jim in particular had noted that we might want to develop a comment to provide in the public comment form on the latest version of the (DAG) relating to the unsuitability of the Who Is protocol. Is that something we want to consider today, discussing today I should say?

I'm not hearing a resounding support there for that. What I suggest is that we go ahead and Steve has captured these changes. We'll get them out to you right away. I'd like to suggest that we ask for a quick response. We've got a holiday later in the week for those in the U.S. Perhaps if we could ask for responses by Wednesday, then we could have a chance to get these posted in advance of the Cartagena Meeting and that will be important too for getting people to the meeting and encouraging people to come.

So are there any objections to that or do you people need more time?

Steve Metalitz: That sounds fine. This is Steve Metalitz, sounds fine to me.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. I think we have - you know, I think we've, you know, we've been over these a couple of times so since Steve has been capturing changes we should be able to get them out to you pretty quickly so of course if people need more time we can extend it.

But the sooner we get them posted the sooner we can encourage people to come to the public session in particular although of course the, well the GNSO Working Sessions are not general. It think they're generally closed.

But the public session is the most important one to make sure people have a chance to see the slides.

And I will send around as I mentioned before the schedule for the meetings so you all have it. We have not scheduled a meeting of this group in Cartagena. And what we'll do is ask our - the Cartagena session, we'll get back onto a scheduled call. As you all know we'll be bumping up against the Christmas holiday season. So we may only be able to fit in one call.

If that is the case I guess I would ask and looking ahead to those of you here, you know, we could conceivably schedule a call for the 20th of December. I'm suggesting perhaps not holding a call on the 13th of December just because that's immediately following the Cartagena Meeting and people are traveling and trying to catch up with work.

What do you think? Do we want to schedule kind of a follow-up call on the 20th just to talk about the comments and the discussion that we may have heard in Cartagena and maybe (unintelligible)...?

((Crosstalk))

Jim Galvin: And this is Jim. I have another question too.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, sure.

Jim Galvin: I waited a little too long to jump in when you asked the question about whether we wanted to talk about this today and (unintelligible) public comments to the (DAG). I mean if not today which is fine, what was the (course) of your question? Was it about whether or not the group should do this or whether or not we should do it today?

And I'm hopeful that we do want to do it. And then I was going to ask well if not today when?

Julie Hedlund: Right (I'm not)...

Jim Galvin: And would that December 20th you're proposing be the day.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, the (course) of my question was whether or not we wanted to take the time today to discuss if the group wants to do a comment.

                   And we don't necessarily have to get into what we want that comment to be but we certainly could. We talked about it a little bit before.

                   So yes, Jim my question was do we want to discuss this a little bit today. We have about 15 minutes remaining on this call.

                   And then perhaps we could tee up a subsequent discussion on the 20th. I should check and see when comments are due however because that will be an important point. Let me just do that now while the rest of you are giving me your comments.

                   What do you think? Should we talk about this today?

                   Jim what do you think?

Edmon Chung: Is this going to be...?

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Is this going to be a long comment or short comment?

Julie Hedlund: I think we talked about it being a short comment, really quite brief. But we haven't really talked that much about the substance of it.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. My thinking is that it's not really in the charter of this working group to comment on the applicant guidebook. All of us are very busy preparing our own comments or those of our constituencies or other groups. And I don't think we should devote the time to doing this. The deadline is practically speaking about a week away. And I just don't think it's feasible.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, other thoughts?

                    Jim?

Jim Galvin: Well then I yield to Steve's comments.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, anybody else have a comment on this? And I think you're right. I mean it is a pretty short. I don't see the deadline right now but I...

Steve Metalitz: I think (to say the) deadline is December 10th which is a less than 30 day comment period.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, it was (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: So I just...

Julie Hedlund: Well sometimes they do a 21 day comment period. But oh I see, yeah. Oh because they are - because of the fact that I think they want to have it - have the comments in time for Cartagena. That's probably it. So you're right.

                    Okay, then we will - does the group agree that we will not try to do that as suggested? And I think Jim has concurred.

                    And I'll take that as a yes.

So then my next question is do we want to have a call on the 20th of December prior to the start of the holiday just to maybe do a wrap-up of comments that we may have heard or received at the public session or from the GNSO Council in Cartagena?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. That would be fine with me.

Julie Hedlund: Others?

Jim Galvin: So this is Jim Galvin. I think it would be helpful to have a meeting. I mean we certainly could either use the opportunity to move forward or at the very least some discussion of what happened in Cartagena and how that affects us moving forward would be good.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Okay, well we'll go ahead and schedule a meeting for the 20th at the same time. And then we will - the next meeting after that will be in the New Year I suspect so is there anything else anyone wants to bring up today?

And I want to thank all of you very much for all of your support and helpful comments. And we'll get the revised slides out there and I'll send out the meeting information. And look forward to any final comments from you.

And very much look forward to seeing those of you who will be in Cartagena.

Jim Galvin: Okay, thank you Julie and Steve and everyone.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, thanks to all the staff.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks everyone.

Man: Bye.

Jim Galvin: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

                        END