GNSO
New gTLD Committee teleconference
6 August 2007 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD committee teleconference on 6 August 2007. 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/new-tlds-06aug07.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

Committee Attendees
Avri Doria - GNSO Council chair Nominating Committee appointee
Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice chair - gTLD Registries constit.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Bilal Beiram - CBUC
Tony Harris - ISPCP
Adrian Kinderis - Registrar c.
Cary Karp - - gTLD Registries constit.
Cyril Chua - IPC
Ute Decker - IPC
Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee

Observers:
Marilyn Cade - CBUC
Werner Staub - Registrar
David Maher- gTLD Registries c
Miriam Sapiro - President, Summit Strategies International

ICANN Staff
Denise Michel - Vice President Policy
Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Kurt Pritz - Senior Vice President, Services
Craig Schwartz - Chief gTLD Registry Liaison
Liz Williams - Senior Policy Counselor
Karen Lentz - gTLD Registry Liaison
Glen de Saint Gery - GNSO Secretariat

Apologies:
Kristina Rosette - IPC

Mawaki Chango - NCUC
Norbert Klein - NCUC

Coordinator: …will now be recorded.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay let's start the meeting. First thing is Glen or Chuck, can you do the roll call of people here?

Chuck Gomes: Mm-hm.

Glen De Saint Gery: Shall I do it?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Please Glen. Okay.

Glen De Saint Gery: We've got Adrian Kinderis, Registrar, myself, Chuck Gomes, Registry, Karen Lentz and staff, Kurt Pritz, staff, Cyril Chua, IPC, Craig Schwartz, staff, Avri Doria, GNSO chair, NomCom representative, Miriam Sapiro, Liz Williams, both staff, Olof Nordling, staff, (Werner Staub), observer Marilyn Cade, observer from the BC, Mike Rodenbaugh, Business constituency, David Maher, registry constituency, Denise Michel, staff and Philip Sheppard, Business Constituency.

Chuck Gomes: Looks like around maybe back in.

Glen De Saint Gery: I think he may be, yes.

Avri Doria: And Dolores what's the …

Glen De Saint Gery: It's (IPC).

Avri Doria: PC, okay. Okay, we're still missing two. We're still missing ISP and NCUC.

Glen De Saint Gery: And we have got apologies from Mawaki and apologies from Kristina Rosette.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay. So that goes two hopefully somebody else from there will join in. Otherwise but we should keep proceeding. Does anyone need to do a immediate interest in any update?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. If any one does please make sure you do it with Glen so that we could go on file with the report.

                In terms with going on the agenda I don't have many lines on the agenda. I think we should have an open discussion on the draft that was put out on 30 of July preparatory to scheduling the council for discussion and vote in the September meeting and also going out for review.

                We view the action item were just to see where we're at if everything has been covered and what hasn't been covered is been taken cared of. Chuck can see if there are any other issues. And then as a last thing, is do we consider ourselves done?

                And basically if we answer that question then this all will revert back refer back to the council if we answer that question positively. Then I'll

revert back to council if we answer that no, then we have to schedule another meeting.

So any changes or recommendation - recommended - comments, recommendations about the agenda?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria   Okay. In which case, starting the open discussion on the draft is basically being two major sets of comments. One from Chuck with major set of edits, one from Kristina with the major set of edit. I sent in a few comments in edits nothing new as substantial as they did.

I'd probably like to start with Liz responding to the edits, find out what we have in terms of open issues that we need to discuss. And then go into any other issues that people want to bring up. Does that sound like an - that seem like an okay way to proceed with it?

Liz Williams: Okay. Avri?.

Avri Doria: Yes Liz.

Liz Williams: Okay. I have been through Chuck and Kristina's notes and I've nearly completed inserting Chuck's edits but then I realized that I probably needed to wait till I finalize those until I work that whether anyone has any additional comment to make. Chuck could provided us a lot of cartographical things rather than sub-phasing. And I just wanted to make sure that nobody had any issue with me just going ahead and adopting those edits as they stood.

And then the ones - the one that I was concerned about with respect to Kristina's suggestion which just came around today was the positioning of the full text of the minority…

Woman: Americans.

Liz Williams: …statements. And so fortunate that the NCUC are not yet on the call maybe - because I think that if we are going to do as Kristina suggested to do agreed with...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...and it means that I have to shuffle around the rest of the things which is absolutely no problem to do. But I'll just prefer to hear whether anyone has any particular concerns about moving everything that looks like an additional statement into the text of part B.

Avri Doria: All right and then basically in that as I said I was one of the two components of those comments I basically answered that personally as long as there was at each instance a pointer to be I can probably be comfortable with it. The other possible suggestion I offered that was an intermediate to Kristina's and to where you have things.

Woman: Now...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) an end note of some sort in A so that they will still on the same document…

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: …but weren't basically - I mean I understood certainly Kristina's comment about on some of them - the footnote in the entire page.

Liz Williams: Just a point of readability I think. Avri on - some of personal reader sort of personal point of view as I said to the group earlier, "I'm not happy with the way they currently structured but I did it that way because I have sent a note to the group saying that this was my suggestion and nobody said 'Oh, that's terrible, let's do it another way.'"

                  If we do change it and I'm absolutely happy to do it whatever the group wants to do then it will just - I will just have to make sure that it only comes in the right place and nothing is forgotten. Maybe there is - two ways of doing it.

                  One is I think that the full statement should be contained in part B. And then if the group is happy so that would mean there would be an amendment to part B which is a shame because has already gone off to the HTML with the red master in preparation for the public comment period but I prefer to get it right rather than worry about that.

Avri Doria: Wait a second, point of clarification, I thought you'd already included these in part B.

Liz Williams: No. These are new ones…

Avri Doria: The only place these were included was in the footnote.

Liz Williams: In part A.

Avri Doria: In part A. I see.

Liz Williams: At the back of part A in full and then at the footnote whether as a reference in the part A of the document. So I suspect - I mean to say it is up for comment for what people think. I mean its - I'm having to do with which every way around it goes.

Avri Doria: I would suggest leaving them in A but taking them out of footnote and just putting a cross-reference to where they are in A.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Chuck Gomes::   So you're talking about appendix or an annex to part A?

Avri Doria: Yup.

Liz Williams: Yup. And there is already one there. The glossary is already there as an annex.

Avri Doria: Right.

Liz Williams: And so the glossary of terms is already there. So that's not a problem for me to do it...

Avri Doria: And then you could do what Kristina had suggested and, you know, put a big bowl of flashing sign is attached saying these are minority statements - these are minority statements so, you know, no one takes or comments as the case may be.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: So nobody takes them as in line text.

Liz Williams: Sure.

Avri Doria: And then just as every time you mentioned that NCUC had an objection, you have a cross link. And then in the HTML of course that's no problem.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Because it then becomes a proper cross reference. Anybody wanted, they just click on it.

Liz Williams: Yes, exactly.

Avri Doria: And for people reading in PDF, they just know to go the end and, you know, page 24 et cetera.

Liz Williams: Yup. In that case, I think Avri, I think that's a great suggestion because frankly that would leave alone part B which I've done a lot of work on last week and I've tried to give the web master's table as much notice as possible because part B itself is a very big, live document that needs to be posted for the public comment period so that anyone is interested and wants to go back, has the full set of its mention in front of them. I was actually anxious to mention that happen.

((Crosstalk))

Glen De Saint Gery:...would you say something.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes if I could. And apologize for this Liz because it goes against the thing you just said but at least …

Avri Doria: Oh, no, no that's all right.

Chuck Gomes::   But at least I want to raise the question especially on the case of the NCUC because we do have constituency statements in part B. Should their minority statements be included in part B along with their constituency statement? And I don't have strong feelings there I want to ask the question so we can talk about it.

Avri Doria: Okay. I came to think that more relevant to the recommendation than they are but, you know, anyone else?

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that. So…

Avri Doria: Anyone who want to speak to that issue? Does anybody not think it's acceptable to include this in A but not as footnotes? Just for cross referencing? Does anybody objected doing it that way?

                  No we haven't heard from NCUC but …

Liz Williams: Avri, could I make our suggestion then? If you like, I will try to get in touch with Robin by phone after the call today and just see if I can get her or Milton or Mawaki or one of the NCUC guys to just make sure that they're happy with it. Because after this, this document is probably not going to come back to the committee again because if everyone is happy with it then I'll make sure that it's getting prepared for the public comment period.

Avri Doria: By and large I do think that we have though sort of broad support for doing it way.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Avri Doria: So hopefully, you know …

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: They can be - I mean I think it's a good idea to talk to them. I don't say that they should be well loaded on it. But…

Liz Williams: Sure. Sure.

Avri Doria: It is a readability thing. It is really difficult.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: On the ones where uses up the whole page.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: (Unintelligible) through it. I have report in annex A the NCUC statement about recommendation six. In annex B is Avri's comments and in annex C is recommendations, (unintelligible) implementation, guideline, S H and P. So they are included in full already and I can make some relatively simple changes for footnoting within the body of the document.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and it's not a matter just of being one full page, it's actually more than one page.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: That they cover.

Liz Williams: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: And I don't think it's acceptable to believe that that's the way it is because it's really a readability problem not only from the - reading the footnote but even more so the continuity from where the footnote…

Liz Williams: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: ...starts to the next item.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Avri Doria: And while it maybe there's a (unintelligible) paper I only read it online. So the online even though I knew what was going on it was confusing.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: So yeah I think if no one on the call objects - I mean I think we should you know, socialize it with the NCUC as we're saying but I think consistent no other objection to doing it that way.

And as they say, as long as it's a good, you know, a good reference and in the HTML version, a proper working hyperlink - I just don't see the issue.

Liz Williams: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: In the HTML version the footnote would have been a - would have been a HTML link anyway.

Liz Williams: Yup. Okay. Avri so that - that was clear then. I will leave them as an annex and I will change the footnote so that won't fit in the - as page of text. And I'll do that later today.

Avri Doria: Right. And yeah. Okay.

Liz Williams: It's done. Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: And as I say if - when the HTML that they can be made properly.

Liz Williams: Yes they will be.

Avri Doria: Right. Proper cross reference point, yeah.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Avri Doria: Going on then, I don't know if you were done. We were on that one issue.

Liz Williams: Yes I just wanted to just double check with everybody that they had read Chuck's edit and there was not any issue with any of it. I didn't see any as I've gone through them all. And I also just wanted to ask the same question about the edits of Kristina has submitted.

So can I just…

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Liz Williams: Would you mind Avri if I just open that question to everybody on the group because if no one…

Avri Doria: Okay. I certainly don't mind your question. I'm wondering Chuck if you have (unintelligible) a couple of being one that you wanted to make sure everybody thought about, did you consider it worth just quickly walking through them at the moment and explicitly asking everybody, what did they went up, or are they fine.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Were you fine but doing a (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Let me do that. I highlighted them in the document that I attached, the ones that I thought were a little - had a little bit more substance to them. The first one was on page 10 paragraph, 13 were the second sentences "the committee has opted to enable potential applicants to self strings that are either the most appropriate for their customers who are potentially most lucrative for the string manager.

And as I recall I don't remember talking about the idea of strings being lucrative. I'm sure we all realized that - that's the case so but I didn't think it was good for us because say it that way so I suggested wording it that way, the committee has opted to enable potential applicants to self select string that are either the most appropriate for their customers or potentially most marketable.

Avri Doria: Does anyone have any issue with that one and want to discuss anything on it?

That seemed fine to everyone, anyone object? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Page 23 then, another one that I highlighted is - having a little bit more substance in terms of change, paragraph three reads "this quality development process has been designed to produce systemized and on-going mechanisms for applicants to propose new top level domain after the first round of new applications, the application system will be evaluated by ICANN PLTs process office to assess the effectiveness of the application system. Success metrics will be developed, and any necessary adjustment made to the process for subsequent round".

And then I commented that it's been a long time because - its seems to me that we have - at some point we have agreed that there was a second round and timing for a second round was supposed to be communicated when the first round has started. And I don't think that's anywhere in the document.

Now certainly consistent with principle A which is the idea of orderly, timely and predictable manner, I didn't suggest any particular additive

at this particular case. But if my memory is correct there, and the staff, if it is the staff aware that we supposed to start off the first round, announce a day - a proposed date for the second round.

Craig Schwartz: Chuck this is Craig. And I - what you're saying is consistent with what our approach is it. If this is going out in the RSP will contain information about when the subsequent round may begin? So this is (unintelligible) communicate right at the onset what the future game plan will look like.

Chuck Gomes: Then - then it sounds like that's okay. The only question is this, do we need anything in this document and again I don't feel strongly that we do. I wanted to make sure we didn't loose that - that set point.

Avri Doria: Do you need something in this document giving an exclusive date or …

Chuck Gomes: No, no, no, no. I'm just saying that - that's all I would be talking about and again I can live either way with it. But it would be a simple statement that says that the subsequent - information about timing of subsequent round will be included in the RSP, something like that is …

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not demanding that - that's in there. I just wanted to raise it. It sounds like staff on top of it. That's the most important thing. So I'm open to whatever people want to do in that regard.

Avri Doria: So what - I'm sorry I miss it some - Craig what are you suggesting we do there?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if Craig suggested we do anything there - except he is telling us that staff plans in the RSP to include information about subsequent round.

Avri Doria: So does it make sense to save that in our document?

(Warner):   This is (Warner). Can I speak to the subject?

Avri Doria: Please.

(Warner):   Yes. And the reason why repeat I repeatedly comment (unintelligible) to Mike in numerous times in the - previous forums since 2002. On this very subject that Chuck has raised is the fact that if he gave the impression that there is not much focus on the follow-on rounds and the kind of they'll going to come sometime, you know, who knows and they're going to develop metrics and that kind of thing.

                (Unintelligible) take this as an indication that nothing is less certain that even a second round in due time will exist. And they will rush on the only available round with - you know, on prepared application because they have no other choice. They can not even afford to think that, you know, let's maybe, you know, wait for another rounds.

                So I do think that this indication in this recommendation document should be about the fact that, you know, the process is designed to - from the beginning…

Avri Doria: Somebody should be on mute. Go on (Warner).

(Warner):   Okay, that we shouldn't give the indication, new indication of the
                   process that there's always more than one round going to be, you
                   know, timed.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Warner):   And let people know where they act. They're not going to have to be
                   worried about and round being pushed off at (unintelligible) so to
                   speak.

Chuck Gomes: Why don't we that a sentence to this third paragraph that says
                   something like the RSP for the first round will include information about
                   scheduling of subsequent round.

Avri Doria: Sounds good to me, does anyone object to doing that? Liz, do you
                   think you're comfortable with adding that sentence?

Liz Williams: Yes. Chuck I was just making an amendment somewhere else. Just
                   say it again please so I can write it down.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. In - the RSPs for the first round will include scheduling
                   information for subsequent rounds.

Liz Williams: Yup. Thanks.

Adrian Kinderis: This is Adrian. Can I speak to that?

Avri Doria: Yes, please

Adrian Kinderis: Chuck I - certainly support that terminology. I just wonder whether it's a little bit of a nothing statement in the way that it's currently worded. Because without really saying anything, information about scheduling could be for example, there will be - I can commit to subsequent rounds of TLD full stuff. And that - that is addressing scheduling.

Whereas something specific as far as timing, I don't know how can get around that but it just seems to me in its current form to be little wishy-washy. And I don't know whether it serves the purpose one way or the other.

Chuck Gomes: Yup, okay. Yeah, I'm open to suggestion for piecing it up a little a bit because we really did agree that, you know, a second round would be targeted for specific time frame at the start of the first round and it's a deal. Primarily, there at least one of the key issues was the one that (Warner) raised that we want - that we want to deal with. So…

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah, is there a way to maybe say, no crisis there or no longer then a certain period of time. So I can address…

Avri Doria: We could (unintelligible) within a year

Adrian Kinderis: …with subsequent round within a certain time frame. Is that - yeah I would be so involved?

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn. Can I ask a question about this particular point?

Avri Doria: Please?

Marilyn Cade: What I remember Adrian is, in the discussion about the - to these two concerns, first of all, will there be predictability and is there assurance to the community that there will be subsequent round.

Secondly, I wonder and maybe we could ask the operational staff hereon to comment on this. Let's just say that they got 50 applications in the first round and they could literally be concerned for a year working on those before being able to announce the second round. I don't know if the Board would be able to guarantee a date certain.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: As far as I'd like to…

Adrian Kinderis: But to this point you're trying to have addressed that. You're trying to have to put the pressure on their on respect upon the Board to deal with these things that probably for (unintelligible). We can certainly ask the pre application (unintelligible). You don't have to resolve the previous one.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

(Warner):   Yes, can I speak to that also and - this is (Warner)?

Avri Doria: Yeah. Well, anyone else want to be on the queue on this one? Anyone from your staff who wants to make a comment on this while we're talking about it.

Okay. (Warner), go ahead.

(Warner):   Okay. The first reason is that in the absence of the announced previous - the announced follow on rounds, they're almost certain us we're ending over the so (unintelligible) for the prophecy of having lots of issues to deal with. If there is follow on rounds, many people will be happy to push their applications off to the following rounds just for the wrong timing reasons.

The second reason is that, as you know, we already know from the previous experience and maybe dealing with the applications may take a little time for one and much time for another. And we don't have -we are able to work in parallel specifically as things have piled up. We may have certain backlog of something. When that time and this was asked can be with expert whatever they can be hired dealing with that stuff while on a date certain the next round goes ahead.

So I would actually (unintelligible), you know, firm dates that the application for the RSP going code the firm date for at least one follow-on round. It should be a firm date.

Avri Doria: I - I'm not sure about the firm. By firm date, you mean September 7 or I mean, you know, could it be a specific number. Because it seems to me that theoretically, my gut feelings has within six months would be good. So I'm wondering whether we can say within a year and have that be enough. Or that (unintelligible).

(Warner):   Avri, that's not exactly - I would say that's not exactly what I was thinking.

Avri Doria: You know.

(Warner): Is that correct that a one year will be the maximum and six months will be done as a hope?

Avri Doria: Right. Within one year. Right, as the new one will happen within one year.

(Warner): Mm-hm. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay with that from an end of implementation point of view?

Man: I think we should ask - I think we need to talk about that before we commit.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well, that could certainly be something that, you know, we put in a policy that we think it should be within one. And then the staff can come back and say yes it is going to be not.

Man: I agree that (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. So, are we agreed from the policy point of view we want to say within one year? Does there anybody object to saying with one year from a policy perspective?

Kurt Pritz: Sorry, This is Kurt. I'm sorry Avri, I dropped off for a couple of seconds. So one year from when?

Avri Doria: One year from when we're putting the RSP for the first one.

Chuck Gomes: And actually let me throw this out as a compromise. I think in what you're getting out there. First, I don't think it would be bad as would

year from the start of the application process whether than one year from the start of the four month period.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Avri, it's Marilyn. I think the guidance we're trying to give also needs to be achieved because we're trying to achieve predictability.

Avri Doria: What is the next RSP also have a four months announcement?

Kurt Pritz: Oh yeah. I think so. My concern is most to the (unintelligible) is going to come from dispute resolution process which will occur, you know, as they if the whole process takes a year, you know, to get through dispute resolution part, you know, process then. There are sometime for making adjustment in the process after that.

So, you know, obviously I'll touch with one that is to concern with it being too sharp but, you know, a year from the date of initial RSP, you've got - you've got a couple of months there for responses and then a couple of months there for without two to three months for going through the initial evaluation process.

And then if you're, you know, seven months for all of dispute resolutions, there's not time left for considering the results of that process and then feeding it back after potential change in the policy either in the policy or in the implementation of the policy.

(Warner):   Can I speak to that? This is (Warner).

Avri Doria: Yeah, (Warner).

(Warner):   I think the danger doing here, is you're trying to make everything so predictable that nothing will be. If you want to feedback just for the resolutions processing into the next round would to be something, so that there's more damage than whatever feedback is going to help.

If you know that the thing has been held up with dispute resolution that you really seem to know. And be may have more thing that we're going to help up the (unintelligible) resolution. Whatever we add to the process, we'll probably know the (unintelligible) resolution. Maybe it make sense, a little bit clear, who knows.

But those who are applied and all watching on what stable price, I don't think that's going to be a huge change. Their biggest damage is not to be able to apply. And then the basic have no other choice to going the bad way with a badly prepared thing the first time so basically we end up with self and how difficult things will be. And they did not have to do would like to that. Stage file processes they would be easiest.

Avri Doria: Anyone else who has comment?

Denise Michel: Yeah, this is Denise. I think they gave us compromise here that will and need the objective set than articulated. Liz has doing also been very clear that after the first round of application, we went to assess how the process has been carried out and make any necessary changes. So I think we can make it very clear that at that on the first RSP is issued that we can make it very clear that the second round will be coming as well.

And I think it's incumbent on staff to come back to that committee as counsel and lay out the process and timeline in more detail and give

you a sense at how does the whole first application process would work including an assessment period and how that would be carried and how that would then been feedback into proposed changes to the application process and launch the second round.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, if I - Avri, can I add something here?

Avri Doria: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: I think one of the important things is that we don't see the evaluation process as needing to be generally scheduled. In other words, we don't have to wait till everything or even most things, most applications completed the start the evaluation process, much of that there is no reason why much of that can not occur while the process is on-going.

And if we approach it way, I think we'll avoid excessive delays for subsequent round and still get a lot of good improvements for then.

Avri Doria: I can't do agree with, you know, I tend to look at it like Gant Chart where some things are begin and some things overlap, some things are end. And that in this case, yes we do an evaluation of the application process after applications have ended. And we do evaluation of house from the more difficult dispute processes go. And some of dispute processes may not be over in a year. And that, okay, those won't have been evaluated by the time we start a new one. But I have a feeling that dispute process evaluation will be on-going.

And also it would be a good indicator to people that "Gee, really don't want to be controversial about your applications because it gets stuck". So I guess I'm personally in favor of putting all recommendations at a

year for the next recommendation. And seeing what the staff, you know, can recommend in terms of the schedule that fits in within that policy recommendation.

Adrian Kinderis: Avri, it's Adrian. If I can add some supplementary information to that?

Avri Doria: Sure.

Adrian Kinderis: I think that we've seen especially in the public forum a lot of the new TLD potential applicants that have clean-cut applications that they consider as an advanced sort of (unintelligible) ICANNs to, you know, that hurry up and do the process for the ones that are going to be clearly going through.

I think you don't want to be retiring them or future versions of them. So it's a sort of support why you just said then I think that we have to assume it's going to be some on-going dispute processes but the same time we should - make sure that we have strict structure around to handle those applications that are going to go straight through that are controversial and that will - I guess streamline on the process.

Tony Harris: Can I speak? This is Tony Harris.

Avri Doria: Sure. Hi Tony.

Tony Harris: I just wanted to support with what has been said, I think that's the way to go.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you I'm glad you're here.

Okay, so does everyone want to say anything further on basically the sentence that Chuck recommended that the RSP on the first round will include scheduled - I guess you gave a specific lines to Liz. And Liz did you capture that line?

Liz Williams: Yup I did. And I'll just read it back to Chuck to make sure he is happy with it. The RSP of the system will include scheduling information subsequent round within the year.

Avri Doria: To occur within the year?

Liz Williams: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. And still free to - work method so that it means that's fine and that's the intent there.

Avri Doria: Yup. Proper and that's the good thing.

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks Chuck. We're still on your issues.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. Let me - I was going over of the meeting request form. Here we go, okay.

                Page 46, RN working group recommendation 12 tag names at the top level. Now we kind of covered this for a recommendation 13 and 14 which are for the second and third level but we didn't do it for the top level. And I think that it would be useful to do it there. And basically

what we have is there - were reserving all tag names. That's the top level.

But there is actually an exception to that that we don't comment on and that is obviously for a new IDN TLD to be introduced, we're going to have to allow a tag name in the DNS. Okay?

Obviously it will test on through the process so I just suggested adding a parenthetical that says "Note in the cases where an IDN TLD is approved, the corresponding ASCII string that starts with the currently accepted IDN prefix and then parens XM dash dash as of August 2007 will be allowed."

Just to clear, I think all of us understand that. Obviously we understand it or we won't be moving forward with this because that would eliminate the possibility of IDN TLD. But, people that aren't - don't understand IDN as well as otherwise wouldn't and this is just for clarification that to be put in there.

Liz Williams: Chuck this is Liz could I just ask a clarifying question please?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Liz Williams: Chuck, I was just going to insert that in the table. Like I did because now (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's fine.

Liz Williams: It's all captured in the table, is that okay with you that's what I was going to do.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think that's a good place for it, Liz.

Liz Williams: Okay. And (unintelligible) in a footnote?

Chuck Gomes: I heard, yeah. And in fact I would be probably be comfortable either way but I think of the table is fine.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I heard that from Patrick, he thought and Patrick of course is - most of you know work very hard with us on the reserve name working group. And he thought that it was fine to change. I never did hear back from Cary. I don't know if you did Liz.

Liz Williams: Yes, I do thank you. I have.

Cary Karp: Can you hear me? This is Cary.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, hi Cary.

Liz Williams: Oh, hi Cary.

Cary Karp: Can I comment on what Chuck has said and I have some of this new label, A label terminology that we'd liked to recommend anyone to vote with, can we use that here as well? And do you think the reference is to extend - tag labels active compatible encoding just the kind of stuff that we'd like us to move away from.

Liz Williams: Yeah as long as they're in the glossary.

Cary Karp: Well again - I mean if we agree that the A label, new label dichotomy is an appropriate way to describe this, I think we should apply it consistently wherever we declare the definition.

Chuck Gomes: Well but those terms Cary don't talk specifically about the tag. And that's what we're talking about here. Reserving any tag names…

Cary Karp: It's pathological. An A label is a sequence that starts with XM dash, dash.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with using that language. I actually think that the way that it's worded is probably the average person is going to be able to figure it out more readily than the other. But I have no objection that modifying the language that way.

Kurt Pritz: Well, this is Kurt maybe. This is Kurt, I think if you go with Cary's idea, you should use both. So that the document explains - it's okay for the document to explain the terminology as it uses it, I think.

Avri Doria: Yeah I think that's fine to take A label that is.

Kurt Pritz: (No).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah i.e. Yeah good. That's fine.

Avri Doria: That works for you Cary.

Cary Karp: Yeah. He is in line that I mean also a lot of getting idea to work is going to be pedagogical. That's some - people has to become comfortable

with the notion that an IDN is two labels, immutably linked to each other by some algorithmic process that they don't need to understand...

Avri Doria: Mm-hm.

Cary Karp: And I'm getting everybody accommodated to the notion of seeing the most A label U label pair is going to - ultimately going to make that easier.

Avri Doria: Yeah and I think you're right. So I think following the suggestion that we use the terminology that is correct but until such time as each word come trippingly off of everybody's tongue we ought to explain them when we use them. And also make sure they're in the glossary.

Liz Williams: Avri, its Liz here. Did you name the glossary of terms in the back of part A?

Avri Doria: Yup.

Liz Williams: Or did you mean the IDN in glossary because there are two things there?

Avri Doria: I think I would have to be in the glossary at the back of A.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Avri Doria: If we use the term in A.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: Then we need to explain it in A.

Liz Williams: Yup. Terrific and just a second I'm just taking notes while Cary and talk and speaking, Cary just a quick reference to you. The pattern parenthetical of - well perhaps Cary I could speak to you later because I just want to make sure that I've got the language exactly correct to capture what you've said. I have received your notes and I just wondered if I can do that offline.

Avri if you don't mind I can just save (the great time) by doing that.

Avri Doria: Sure thing. Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Let me ask you a quick question there Liz. It seems to me that you replaced ASCII string with A label right?

Liz Williams: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Is that all that's involved?

Liz Williams: Yes Chuck it is. In this instance, but there were several things that Cary had sent to me separately about the IDN questions in the reports. So it's (a bulk lot) which we'll carry later.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. That's fine. Thanks.

Liz Williams: Is that all right with you.

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Liz Williams: No problem.

Avri Doria: Okay Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Page 47, the same category tag names except that the second and
                  third level are in working group recommendations 14 and 15, I could
                  suggest at adding a parenthetical term so that it's more generic
                  because and we should follow (Carey's) suggestion and this is well - I
                  said note that name starting with X and dash, dash may only be used if
                  the current IDN (unintelligible) by the registry and what - all I was trying
                  to do there is change at to say the currently accepted IDN tag now.

                  Some IDN experts don't think that tag is likely to change but if it did we
                  want our language to be properly worded so that whatever the
                  currently accepted IDN tag is pre text for the A label would be the ones
                  that we're talking about.

Cary Karp: A brief observation on that, if I may, changing the tag will have such
                  significant effect straight up and down the line but the document as
                  we're currently adjusting it probably would be (unintelligible)
                  replacement in any case.

Avri Doria: I'm not so sure as long as we keep pointing to the IDN guidelines. And
                  don't try to be explicit about what they are and whether the tag
                  changes or not is really an IDTF level issue or not an ICANN level
                  issue.

Cary Karp: But it sure going to have resounding complications and implications if it
                  ever happens.

Avri Doria: Yeah and the result of those in the ITF thinks if does not happen we're going to have a resounding confusion. So we might full of stay out of it in strong call.

You know, because it is not really relevant as long as we say in this document that the policy document that we have to follow the idea and guidelines, then they can change. But the policy remains consistent. You know, and we'd live out any of those that for technical discussion instead may or may not happen in the IDTF, you know, out of consideration.

Chuck Gomes: All I was trying to do on this one. I just want to make sure that if on the remote chance or not remote chance whoever opinions you want that it ever thus change there are language just that properly word as our fellows trying do.

Avri Doria: Mm-hm.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think that we need to spend a lot of time on that.

Cary Karp: Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: Page 62 paragraph 7I, reads "This recommendation supported by the majority, GNSO constituencies and for other recommendation", the wordings slightly different. Let me just talk about this one of (unintelligible) instead of reading what I've submitted.

For consistency through out the document I think it's important how we describe the level of support. And different words are used in different places without definition.

The one I referred to here says there majority support. Other places have says there's broad support. And other says supported by all GNSO constituencies except, I don't necessarily favor one over the other. I just think we should be consistent and make sure that there's a definition for what we're saying if it is needed. Now but obviously but says support all GNSO constituencies consistency except, that's pretty clear.

So my suggestion here was is that throughout that we - our consistence I need break one of the recommendations as well as the implementation guidelines and principles in terms of the language we used to describe the level of support to make it clear.

Avri Doria: I would recommend that we use- they were all - I think by all have broad support. I don't think there's any reason that every using majoring support which how we believe is a lesser criteria. But I believe that if we can strange ourselves broad support, anonymous and all but, I think we've got the cover I don't if you do.

Chuck Gomes: That -that may be fine what are the thing?

Liz Williams: Avri, this is Liz can I talk to (Greg Christian). Chuck, thank you very much speaking that up because we've running to some definition problem. Because when Avri and I were doing PDD form for the contract condition we used different terminology.

I know may use different terminology again for example and the protective (unintelligible) with another working group and others, another chairman has determine and define things differently. So if I - whatever you come up with, I think given that the only things that did not have unanimous support or recommendation seeks recommendation 20, isn't it clear to say the recommendation was supported by our GNSO constituencies?

Avri Doria: Except and all but.

Liz Williams: Yes, an old but, because then we don't have even used the adjective broad or unanimous.

Chuck Gomes: I think that clear, works for me.

Liz Williams: Is that a right (Edwards)?

(Edwards):   Yeah, works for me too.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Man: Sounds good.

Liz Williams: Okay in that case we'll go to in all those pick that up. And it this will might look as adjective taking out.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, I think this will be very helpful for the Board because some of conversation with individual board members on the new TLD in (unintelligible) recommendation then one, you know. I few of them will kind of support. I guess please to hear but surprised but that

there's very strong support in a GNSO for this recommendation. And so the clear we can be on that is think -that there can help a little bit.

Liz Williams: Then just for clarity then Avri I'll describe with all but in everything except recommendation 6 and recommendation 20 and net calls out to the minority statement.

There's only one tricky part here Avri which is how I referred to you in your personal comment. Because if you grade report that says something along the lines that this recommendation were supported by GNSO constituencies and Ms. Doria in her personal comment or use the Board with concern or you accepted it with concern. Now you provided that the solution of your personal comments.

Avri Doria: And that's in my personal statement there.

Liz Williams: Yeah, exactly. Yeah exactly. Are you happy with what you read to further stand that...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes. I was happy with the way you designated my stuff.

Liz Williams: Okay. Thanks. That's clear.

Chuck Gomes: Actually the all but language works even on 6 and 20 except we have a but there.

Liz Williams: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Liz Williams: Exactly.

Marilyn Cade: Liz, it's Marilyn. Can I present the question to you and Avri and others? Is it individual comments or personal comments?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Because you know…

Avri Doria: It's from constituencies except from me and could have been from (Jon Bing) who as NomCom appointees…

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: …only have personal comments. I mean, were individual or personal the same? But...

Liz Williams: Marilyn, were you asking a different question about whether (unintelligible) to you?

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no. I was asking that question because we are publishing something in an international forum and I guess my point was, you know, sometimes people think that personal comment would be Marilyn Cade speaking in her personal capacity as opposed in her role that was end. This is, you know, I think you're speaking, Avri, if I'm not mistaken, in the role of Nominating Committee Appointee.

Avri Doria: Right. But, you know…

Marilyn Cade: I hear you. I just - it can be misunderstood in international settings I just wanted to raise it as a currently…

Avri Doria: So you're saying it should be an individual comment as opposed to a personal comment?

Marilyn Cade: I think so because personal means it is not in your official role.

Avri Doria: Okay, I understand what you're saying. Liz whatever word worth using you think works best.

Liz Williams: Yup, I'll do that. I understand what you're getting at Marilyn. Thanks it's helpful clarification.

Philip Sheppard: So the pages from the same point. I mean it does (unintelligible). I did not work done in the past if we've captured by personal name. And supposing you've got all three nominating committee where percentage making a particular comment is our normal style to indeed capture those by name or I am referring by institutions to the constituency or we captured them by who they are by being nominating committee appointees.

                  It may be clear if you do that if it's in the representative capacity. I only use name where it's in the personal capacity. Whatever we do, we just need to be consistent with the way that we capture this comment in this report and others.

Liz Williams: Just a quick follow-up there on that one Philip. It's been quite a tricky divining exercise on this one. And in some of the footnotes I did refer

explicitly to the transition between Bruce, as Chair and Avri and her term and how is all. So that the reader as I really want to get to the bottom of would be able to understand who was doing what.

So that Avri clearly had taken over as the chair and she would be making it will using where the individual comments. But I think that some clarity about the language is helpful wherever I have received the constituency point of view for example from you I assumed that it's not just Philip Sheppard speaking that it's Philip Sheppard as - in his role as business constituency effort to address particular exercise.

Philip Sheppard: Right.

Liz Williams: And so and just to be very clear so that everyone knows, nominating committee members were asked individually if they would like to submit comment and Avri was the only one that did. If the other had wish then I could obviously have done if they want to.

So I haven't referred specifically to anything for example from (John) and his discussions about the international law and enforceability and all the things order the things he is interested. I haven't captured that in the text because he asked me if hadn't specifically offer me to that.

Chuck Gomes: And Avri that's the end of the comment that I want to throw out.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: The rest of them I think are all fairly trivial.

Avri Doria: Yeah, the rest of them were, very much. Okay. Do we want to walk through Kristina's. Was there…

Chuck Gomes: I think except for the one comment that we've already discussed…

Avri Doria: They were all editorial.

Chuck Gomes: They were all editorial?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Woman: That's correct Avri.

Avri Doria: I had only one comment that I think wasn't editorial and maybe even was editorial. I had sent and in fact couple of my editorials I had just sent directly to Liz, you know, letters being backward in the Hebrew name and such. And that was my issue with the replacement of recommendation 20 under term of reference 4.

And so perhaps that - I (unintelligible) on the term of reference three. And, you know, that wasn't in the numerical order, because term of reference for referred to contractual condition and three can turn to sort of the allocation, methods and procedures. And 20 having been relocated 11 really belonged I thought I thought more with term of reference three than four.

And I don't know if anyone else cared, if I was being pedantic, whether it should moved but it just seemed that way to me.

Chuck Gomes: Actually I think it's a good catch Avri because if we look at it from the point of view of totally new people coming in and looking at this, I think it is better that it be in the appropriate place. Otherwise, it might cause confusion.

Avri Doria: It certainly confused me when I saw it and I said wait a second. I went back to thinking about the terms of reference and it just doesn't make sense to other people that we move it to term of reference three, even though in numerical order it will be obvious. But I think it's better than renumbering that it just be listed in its proper place.

Does anyone have an opinion? Liz do you have one?

Liz Williams: If we shifted - the way I structured the document is that it ties together terms of reference with recommendation underneath in specific section.

Avri Doria: Yup.

Liz Williams: I think that if you did shift it from recommendation 20, it would actually bugger up the arrangement. But what I suggest we could possibly do is look under term of reference three and say this does relate to allocation - recommendation 20 which was a recommendation does relate to allocation and methods.

And just as the way that you referred to recommendation 11 which is being removed but we are not re-numbering it because of all the cross referencing number problems it would create. We could probably do it that way if you wished.

Avri Doria: But why would you move it from the term of reference four chapter to the term of reference three chapter?

Liz Williams: And still have it written in under recommendation 20?

Avri Doria: Oh, most definitely.

Liz Williams: Oh, okay. Sorry I thought you were trying to …

Avri Doria: No, no, no, no. I'm keeping numberings strictly fixed.

Liz Williams: Oh, so not...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...locating it in the documents.

Liz Williams: No problem. I can shift it. Absolutely no problem.

Avri Doria: Does anyone think this is a bad idea? Okay. Great then thanks.

                Are there any other issues that hasn't come up either in Chuck or Kristina or my notes that we need to cover on this document before we - it's ready to send on to public comment and then n to the council from there?

Ute Decker: Hi Avri this Ute and may I have a…

Avri Doria: Hi Ute.

Ute Decker: ...comment but first I have a question. I know that neither Kristina nor Steve can be on this call so I just wanted to come back to the reference of the rights of other working group which is on …

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Ute Decker: I think page 32 from the document.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ute Decker: Where it says in the middle of the paragraph "mechanisms that may inform potential new TLD applicants" I've noted this in particular wanted to know where exactly in the report there was reference to the need for new applicant to have some sort of mechanism.

But I suppose this was the assumption for the work of the rights of others working group that there would have to do mechanisms. And where was this…

Avri Doria: Well actually I thought that - that conclusion had never been - that there had to be but …

Ute Decker: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: …but that it was something that one certainly had to consider getting in. but I thought that we have a conversation gotten to the point where there was never full agreement to every applicant had to. That it was advisable but they do but not that they have to. And I believe…

Liz Williams: That's the correct characterization of it Avri and that's what the right prediction mechanism little. Ad Hoc group which meets on a Friday every second or - Friday, every Tuesday on a second. Tuesday do develop some reference, implementation, guidelines.

And Ute just for you I can not remember that you're actually in the room when this discussion came about in San Juan. I can't remember if you were there or not. But Kristina and Mike - I think Mike is in the call he can speak to that group. From a clearly he and Kristina and I were on the phone last week.

And if they want to provide different text to what's in there - in the document then that's fine but I'm pretty sure that we're on the right wavelength here with how it is.

Ute Decker: Yeah so I just want - I could image that formula that may inform potential new TLD applicants has been - as result of consequences of consideration. Is there any room to change that to four potential new TLD applicants? In place of that may inform potential new TLD applicants.

Avri Doria: Okay, this is the language which is specifically on what page?

Ute Decker: Page 32 and the second, fourth - and the first four paragraph - the one, two, six line down into that paragraph were currently agreed on right to protection mechanism that may inform potential new TLD applicants where currently agreed on right to protection mechanism for potentially new TLD applicant. Will it be acceptable to change that to right protection mechanism for potentially new TLD applicant?

Chuck Gomes: Now what paragraph was that again?

Ute Decker: The first four paragraph on page 32.

Man: Ah, paragraph six?

Ute Decker: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yeah paragraph six is being referred to.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And then could you state that again. I'm sorry.

Ute Decker: Yes. If you look at - it's sort of on the left foot of the fourth paragraph on that page. The line starts with "on right protection mechanism that may inform potential new TLD applicant".

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ute Decker: Would it be acceptable to change than to - on rights protection mechanism for potentially new TLD applicant.

Avri Doria: So would that makes it read (unintelligible) protection mechanism.

Liz Williams: Avri can would you just say that again, you broke up in the middle of ….

Avri Doria: Basically my understanding of (unintelligible) form would basically be indicating that - which everyone did need to include a right protection mechanism. As oppose to …

Ute Decker: I wouldn't necessarily read it that way but I was like – I would just think that may inform on to the contrary indicate that there could not possibly be a requirement.

Liz Williams: It's not a requirement as all. Ute try to be extra clear. That is actually what the group determined there was no agreement that I would be an obligatory requirement at all. And that's why it says "may". That applicant may use the information that comes out of the reference implementation guidelines to help them in the application evaluation process to describe what about particular mechanism might used.

And I also it did might say that none of those mechanisms that has been supplied as reference implementation guidelines would suit that particular business model.

Avri Doria: Or (unintelligible) taken business model as I remember it was brought up. Or the particular model of TLD may not require any because it …

Liz Williams: Exactly.

Avri Doria: You know members of the Doria family.

Liz Williams: Yes exactly.

Woman: Okay thank you. That's helpful information.

Avri Doria: Any other comments? Changes, corrections things we need to do this document.

Okay that's good. So now Liz how does this I mean this is (unintelligible) very substantial modifications to your document. How long…

Liz Williams: You know Avri that's fine. Just for so that everybody will be aware I have sent around a note that we would try to stop public comment period on the 9th of August. You and I have discussed this last week Avri...

Avri Doria: Yup.

Liz Williams: …to run for 20 days between the 9th and 29th.

Avri Doria: Yup.

Liz Williams: I'm pretty sure that I can turn around - because I nearly competed (Chuck's) I mean except for those substantially things that we talked about today. I only received Kristina's less than a couple of minute before the meeting and…

Avri Doria: Mm-hm.

Liz Williams: …Avri received yours during the meeting.

Avri Doria: At the meeting yes.

Liz Williams: Yeah that's right. So and I've got to speak to Cary after this (unintelligible) asking me if I could beep him up. So I'll do that to make sure the IDN stuff is correct.

What I'm going to aim today because I can't speak for the webmasters (unintelligible) to how quickly they could turn into this an HTML document that could be used for public comment period.

I already have part B and that's well under way. So that's the vast of documents that can be provided to potential public comments would be really substantial and if you wanted to use they can. I'm going to aim for having this turnaround by the end of the day tomorrow. I have ad hoc right protection mechanism group meeting tomorrow afternoon.

So if I was able to do that then I can get that of to the webmasters guys as soon as possible but we have to start to the public comment and I think Craig you're on the call and …

Craig Schwartz: Yup.

Liz Williams: …can confirm this tonight. We're having a new TLD implementation team meeting and we have been putting together some ideas of how we get the best value out of the public comment period.

So that's a long way of saying. I'll of my best to turn this around immediately with everybody's changes which immediately means at the end of the day tomorrow. And then I will work with Craig and the other guys on the public comment period and have to start with that.

And then I'll work with (Mike unintelligible) to make his job as easy as possible to turn part A into pure HTML document that can be post to use in public comment period.

I would imagine but I'm not going to promise this because I can't predict what other people paper will do, is that by the 10th of the public comment period will be ads and which the day Avri that we sought so that may have…

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Liz Williams: …slip just in any way. So given some central time so that it equips like to make which I think the best for the document. That what Avri I'm aiming for.

Avri Doria: Anybody have an issue of that schedule. I mean if you invite the best one could possibly help for.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And that was given one week at the end of the comment before the GNSO counsel meeting when we have done it).

Liz Williams: Oh yes, thank you for reminding me.

Chuck one of the things that I had promised Avri that I would do is when the public comment period runs, I look at it a couple of times a day to see what's going on and who is putting things in. So that I am able to provide Avri as quickly as possible after the public comment had ended and so not for the public comment, so that they can implement this could have a synopsis of the public comment prior to them taking the vote, prior account will taking the vote on the September 6.

So I was going to put that into a special format. And those have to be included anyway in the Board report notes. So it's certainly not

something that, you know, it (unintelligible) to be done for one purpose. But that was my intention to do that once the public comment is running.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I do appreciate all your (unintelligible) to that.

Liz Williams: Thank you. It's my fourth file.

Avri Doria: I say when the crispy is not.

Liz Williams: No, no. no.

Avri Doria: Okay. So any other comments on the test of this before we moved on (unintelligible)?

Thank everybody for the review in the comments and discussion. Okay.

Liz Williams: Avri, would you mind if I have just one last comment, if you don't mind.

Avri Doria: Of course not.

Liz Williams: Given that I am making these changes on behalf of everybody, if anyone has anything that I want to get the other night, I'm happy to include it. If something picks, something picks me up telling this (unintelligible) points is not including it if would help the document be better. And I'll be favoring on an old day. So if anyone would be sending something that I miss call that someone else missed in pop in to me.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And we have restrict that to non-materials sort of thing.

Liz Williams: Oh, (unintelligible) whatever that it will be proof anyway before the end of the day will be proof probably being read through the public.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. Okay, now the thing I had on the schedule was as the quick goes through or has asked you to make sure that we will be getting everything where we're supposed to get done. And obviously the main item is an illusive has been for awhile.

But basically I don't think I have sent this one out sent just this last meeting.

Basically we've done we have to do with resolving recommendation. We held all the discussion on any (unintelligible) implementation issues that were there.

Did we ever get all the feedback on the reserve names her new gTLD on the IANA and ICANN name.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's done.

Liz Williams: It is done, yeah.

Avri Doria: I thought it was just consider...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, the final draft has been updated.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So wait, wait for a second on the ICANN/ IANA names, in other
                  distribution still going to be sending out request on that?

Chuck Gomes: Mike we're talking about just for new gTLD names right now. The
               recommendation is the reservation requirement stands as it was.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: That has nothing with back that some additional work is going to be
               done and we'll be updating that probably in the council meeting on
               Thursday with regards to I think Patrick is coming back with some staff.
               The staff has working on that regard.

               That doesn't mean that down the road and, you know, four months
               from now, if some changes are made that - they couldn't be new TLD
               process couldn't be updated. So that we have end place
               recommendation there it remains as it stands.

Avri Doria: I think it's pretty safe to say that, yeah, for the first round where we
                stand at that round at top levels.

                And we just finish now the sign of review the last proposal, whatever
                can get to loose today. But by enlarge were done. The only other
                pending saying was the wreath work in the middle of October on the
                working group with dealing with references but that will go to counsel
                not here.

So as far as I can tell, we have finished our work. Liz still has certain a bunch to do but this committee has basically finished. Does anyone think the task not a correct statement?

No?

In which case, "Does anyone else, can anyone point anything okay. I guess not, I just had includes the answer to no. No one complain anything that we still have to do that I have forgotten to Liz. That's include you Chuck right?

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: Nothing you can think of that we haven't done because you are usually good at thinking of (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: I think we're in good shape.

Avri Doria: Is there any new business on the new TLD committee that anyone wants bring up at this point?

Liz Williams: Avri, its Liz. (A word of) thanks

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay…

Chuck Gomes: …to everyone.

Avri Doria: Yeah, please.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: For you, for everyone, for (Bruce) who set the initial planning and did the majority of the work. It's been amazing.

Chuck Gomes: And I just - I'd just that - a comment, you know, the way we been incorporated this observers and let them participate, I think works very effective in the last year-and-half plus. So I think a compliment to observers and those who so many of them that constructively contributed even on our call today. I think that's great!

Avri Doria: Yup. I agree. I also want to thank, I mean, not only Liz who has done the fundamental listing on this particular project. But also the immense amount of work that the rest of staff has done to sort of keep up with ever allowing thought and, you know, with a perhaps Liz call moving target by a certainly call at that too. I think that is the way, you know, as and just to keep incorporating our news thinking into their thinking happen has been wonderful.

                So all that having then said, can this new gTLD committee be adjourned? Does there anyone want to speak to that notion? Does anyone want to speak against that notion? No? In which case, my (unintelligible) thanks for all of it, I think that this committee is adjourned and this meeting is too.

Chuck Gomes: I just want…

Avri Doria: And a puff bottle of Champaign if I had it.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, just one thing. I assume that list won't go away.

Liz Williams: No Chuck it won't at once.

Chuck Gomes: There could be use to just give status update to the people who are on the new gTLD committee.

Liz Williams: I'm certainly it won't to all distributing the documentations and all of, you know, stuff, public comments so lot kind of things. So it won't go away.

Chuck Gomes: All right…

Marilyn Cade: Avri it's Marilyn and I'm not on my behalf will say that probably those on the West Coast have down this friendlier time zone. That perhaps Adrian might not have.

Avri Doria: Yeah it's the see-saw that we have to play between the two streams, Europe and the East Coast renown.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And frankly I've been spending you buy this nicely. He doesn't (mourn) very much.

Avri Doria: Also there's a good thing about Dubai.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, (unintelligible) that's one. I challenge you to find another.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) you even try.

Liz Williams: Thanks everyone.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you all very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri.

Man: Okay, thanks bye, bye.

Man: (Funny) Avri.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye everyone.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END