The Working Group to Protect the Rights of Others (PRO)
Tuesday, 13 March 2007
19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Working Group to Protect the Rights of Others (PRO)   teleconference on 13 March 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made by the Chair, in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/PRO-wg-20070313.MP3

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

Attendance:

Kristina Rosette - IPC Chair of the working group

Peter Olson - IPC

Lance Griffin - IPC

Kelly Smith - IPC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Margie Milam - Registrar c

Jon Nevett - Registrar c.

John Berryhill - Registrar c.

Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registries c.

David Maher - gTLD Registries c.

Jon Bing - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Eun-Joo Min - WIPO

ICANN Staff:

Liz Willams - Senior Policy Counsellor

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Vice chair of the working group

Philip Sheppard - CBUC

Mike Palage - gTLD Registries c.

Coordinator: This is the recording of the ICANN conference, held Tuesday, the 13th of March 2007, at 7:00 pm, UK time.

The call ID is 6391443.

Excuse me, (Kelly Smiths) joins.

(Kelly Smiths): Hello.

Kristina Rosette: Oh I think we probably should go ahead and get started.

Operator, if you could start the recording and, Glenn, if you will be so kind just to (take roll), I very much appreciate that.

Glenn Desaintgery: Yes. Certainly, Kristina.

Have you asked for the recording?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Glenn Desaintgery: Okay.

I'll do the roll call.

(John Bennett)…

(John Bennett): Yes.

Glenn Desaintgery: …(Redding), committee.

(John Bennett): Yes.

Glenn Desaintgery: Nevitt, registrar constituency.

Jonathan Nevitt: Here.

Glenn Desaintgery: Kristina Rosette, IPC, and chair.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

Glenn Desaintgery: Avri Doria, NomCom.

Avri Doria: Yup.

Glenn Desaintgery: (Hyoon Jue)…

Woman: Yeah.

Glenn Desaintgery: …(unintelligible).

Woman: Uh-huh.

Glenn Desaintgery: Margie Milam, registrar constituency.

Margie Milam: Here.

Glenn Desaintgery: Lance Griffin, IPC.

Lance Griffin: Here.

Glenn Desaintgery: David Maher, registry constituency.

David Maher: Here.

Glenn Desaintgery: (Victoria McKedy) - (McKennedy).

(Victoria McKennedy):   Here.

Glenn Desaintgery: …noncommercial.

        John Berryhill, registrar constituency.

John Berryhill: Yes.

Glenn Desaintgery: Peter Olson, IPC.

Peter Olson: Yes.

Glenn Desaintgery: Tim Ruiz, registrar constituency.

Tim Ruiz: Here.

Glenn Desaintgery: And (Kelly Smiths), IPC.

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Excuse me…

((Crosstalk))

Glenn Desaintgery: And we've got Liz Williams, our staff member, and Jeff Neuman has just joined from the registrar constituency.

And that's it so far. Thank you, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you.

I don't know whether everyone has had a chance to take a look at the agenda that I circulated and I apologize for doing that on such short notice.

But one of the first things that I wanted to just touch upon briefly is whether in connection with preparing the summary analysis of the TLDs if anyone had come up against a question that was not covered in our explanatory discussion last week or had noticed something that they wanted to raise with the entire group.

Jon Bing: This is Jon Bing.

I have (unintelligible) extremely stupid observation, but I noticed that in what - some of the things that have been field in, the (top LCD) is still just TLD. And I'd like you to spell out which TLD you did.

Woman: Okay.

Jon Bing: …(or your first), otherwise it becomes slightly difficult to imply from the text.

Woman: Okay.

It's whoever is posted so far to just check and make sure that they filled that in. That's a great idea. Certainly going to make it easier to keep track of.

Anyone else?

(Kelly Smith): This is (Kelly Smith). I have a question regarding the challenges section.

Woman: Uh-huh.

(Kelly Smith): I assume that it's challenges based on a trademark or other name right and not, for example, (unintelligible) (to know the) (CEDRPED) - I don't remember what it stands for, but basically for an sTLD that the applicant doesn't meet the eligibility requirement.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: That was my understanding, yeah.

(Kelly Smith): Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Would that - is that a different understanding from what anyone else has?

(Kelly Smith): Okay thank you.

Kristina Rosette: All right great.

One of the things that I would like to spend the bulk of today talking about is dividing up into the project teams that I think will need to have in place in order to complete our (statement) of work and to have a report in the general (May) time frame that we've talked about.

What I would like to do first is just run quickly through what my ideas are in terms of what the project teams - what the four project teams and (I've known) that I'd only identified three on the agenda but I now have four.

Just what each generally will be (tasked) with accomplishing and then if we could just circle back and discuss each one in turn.

The first is, would be kind of a problem analysis, the (rather) issues analysis team and that will be the team that will be responsible for not only identifying and with preparing the part of the report that discusses the issues that these protective mechanisms were intended to address.

But we'll also be responsible for preparing that part of the report that talks about whatever issues the implementation of these mechanisms may have - have themselves created.

With regard to that latter category, I realized, obviously, any kind of definitive analysis and assessment will need to be (pending) the receipt of constituency observations and comments.

But I think it's probably fair to say that we all, just off the top of our head, could identify at least a couple of things that we would consider to be (issued).

(Unintelligible) possible to certainly get started…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: …second half of it in the meantime as well.

The second project team would essentially be responsible for the TLD analysis in the sense of ensuring that everyone has completed the TLD analysis that to the extent that there are any questions or uncertainties or clarifications that those are resolved.

The goal of that project team will be to not only prepare essentially a composite document that will consist of all of the individual summaries, but also the section of the report that will be (identifying) what the commonalities are and what the key variances are.

And to the extent that it's possible to highlight what the key commonalities are that might be, at least, based on some other information, something that could be adopted on a scalable level.

That part of the report would cover that as well.

The third project team, which I think in a way has got one of the complicated task is really to handle the constituency outreach in the sense of we had talked in one of our first calls that it's really critical that we get the input from, you know, all members of the community and including the constituencies that I should note that we probably need to make this more broader to not only cover constituencies but general Internet community.

And that group would be tasked with putting together a survey form that would be distributed to the constituencies with, hopefully, the composite TLD summaries attached.

The goal being that the survey would be kind of a yes/no rank on a scale of 1 to 5 type thing in order to ensure more participation, but it would really be targeted at getting all of the information that was identified in the statement of work as more along the lines of the qualitative information, you know, what do these particular constituencies view as some of the issues arising out of or related to the mechanisms, what did they believe - what was the impact on their constituency, what is their preference going forward, that type of thing.

And I realized that obviously there won't be an opportunity to really go for that full scale until the TLD summaries are completed, I think it's probably something that could get a good start.

Finally, the fourth project team would be half was not only addressing (incoming) (unintelligible) from other workgroups, but also to the extent that they are needed.

And I guess one point that we can talk about in a minute is what to - whether to have a separate project team for identifying alternative mechanism but this other request consultation of workgroup would really be responsible for assessing and developing drafts, responses or comments or whatever, another working group or - and in fact I know that this is hard to (new) TLDs as (we) (unintelligible) speak to you in a minute, there are some questions and concerns and (unintelligible) that had been raised to the council.

In terms of timing, I think ideally it would be great if we could make sure that we're in a position that enough work has been done on all of these (unintelligible) project teams so that we will be in a position during the (Lisbon) meeting to really get into kind of some of the hard questions.

I mean what do - and, you know, particularly with regard to some of the survey, the constituency outreach forms to make sure that we're in agreement as to (wording) of questions and that type of thing, assessment of commonalities, those types of issues.

In terms of composition, ideally and I realized that by virtue of just - the composition of working group, we might not be able to do that. But ideally, we would have at least one constituency member on each project team and of course, each working group member could be on as many type of change as they wanted with the understanding that

what you are committing to the (other) project teams, you in fact (unintelligible) responsible for that output, as well as (unintelligible) we need to have a leader of each project team.

So now I voiced that out, let's go back if we could and if anyone would like to talk about kind of the issues analysis in terms of issues that (unintelligible) mechanisms were intended to address in those that (unintelligible) created.

Is there anybody that has any questions or comments or thoughts on what their project team might also want to do, if anybody wants to volunteer for it or volunteer to (beat it), that type of thing.

Liz Williams: Kristina, it's Liz here. I just want to address quickly something that we - you and I had been (unintelligible) between each other that that person I want to share with the group, but when you're ready on (unintelligible) you talked about that?

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

All right. Does anybody want to volunteer to a - I guess, we need volunteers to be on to the issues analysis.

David Maher: David, I'll volunteer to be on the issues analysis group.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, thank you.

John Berryhill: John Berryhill, I will volunteer to be on the issues analysis group…

Woman: (Unintelligible) let's step up to the play and lay (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Well I might just (unintelligible) eeny, miny, moe it. So let's see where we are.

Margie Milam: This is Margie. I'll volunteer to lead that one if you need a leader.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you, Margie.

Man: We do.

Kristina Rosette: Not anymore, (we don't).

Man: Yeah, (we do).

Kristina Rosette: (That would be a) Margie, all right.

(Kelly Smith): I'd like to get on that one as well. This is (Kelly Smith).

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Man: Was that the first group?

Kristina Rosette: Yes, it was.

Man: Okay, great.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

(Peter): I'm saving myself for the fourth group. This is (Peter) (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

(Unintelligible).

(Victoria)?

(Victoria McKennedy): Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: Would you like to be on that group?

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: …noncommercial (unintelligible) representation?

Woman: Sure.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right.

Woman: This is (unintelligible) from (WIPO) and I would be interested in the first group, the problems analysis.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Excellent.

Anyone else?

All right.

Next one TLD analysis, members and leaders.

Man: Can you just go over what these one does?

Kristina Rosette: (I mean), this one is really just intended to - the goal would be twofold. First to have one document (unintelligible) and appendix as it will be as I'm thinking about it to the report that would essentially consist of a compilation of all these summaries.

So that group who will be responsible for essentially kind of writing (her) on the various workgroup members to make sure that those are done to the extent that there were any questions or clarifications that are needed to follow up with the appropriate working group member and that once that, (you know), (filling) in the blanks is done to really focus on extracting from this what some of the commonalities appear to be and what some of the key variances appear to be.

You know, are there any patterns that can be drawn from these and if so, what are they?

All right. So we have no volunteers and no leaders. We'll come back.

All right. Next one is constituency outreach for community outreach, however, we want to call it.

Woman: Kristina, I just have a suggestion about that section.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Woman: I would suggest collapsing constituency outreach into the other two groups and having the two groups do that anyway because (both of those gentlemen) (are both) needed.

And unless there were something specific that you needed to - that group (seem) to do then it's necessary for both groups to do it anyway.

Kristina Rosette: The only thing that I was thinking that that group will be responsible for (uniquely) responsible with - for would be in creating the document or the - whatever form it is that we are going to be using as kind of a standard form to communicate to the constituencies that would identify all of the information that we're seeking to get from that in terms of, you know, both very basic, you know, yes/no answers as well as an opportunity to provide longer answers and comments.

Woman: It looks to me you're missing the (ISPs).

Kristina Rosette: We are.

Woman: (And this) and that's the only (formal) constituency you're missing that there is some necessity to do a (lack) outreach.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Woman: And I would suggest that a good discussion (with Tony Holmes), which you've done in the background would be hopeful with the chair of that group.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Woman: But I would urge the two previous groups to use the same format to collect their information anyway. And that the - and you've got NomCom people there already because I did hear Avri earlier. And (I've heard)…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …earlier.

                So you pretty well covered by the (ISPs) and the ALAC.

                And a direct mail to Alan Greenberg would be probably sufficient to deal with that for ALAC. But (your call) (I don't mind)…

Kristina Rosette: No, I guess I'm not sure I'm following you. Would it really just be that the folks currently doing the issues analysis and whoever ends up on the (team) analysis would be responsible for going back to their own constituency.

Woman: Yup, I think so.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: I guess the only concern that I would have is that unless there are some agreement from the outset or just the - of standard collection of information that we may be getting, I'd hate to find out at the end that we don't have a comment from a particular constituency on a particular issue (because they weren't) asked.

Woman: But remember (also) that (unintelligible) that the working group is (unintelligible) into the new TLD committee.

Woman: Right.

Woman: And there is significant representation from all of the constituencies on that group.

So I don't think you should (overly) concern yourself.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Woman: But I understand what you're trying to get to.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

All right. So - all right.

Well, (Lyn), I'll - I guess, I'll talk with you offline, Liz, because I'm not entirely sure I'm still clear on it. But…

Woman: (Right).

Kristina Rosette: All right. And then the last area would be consultation request from other working group. And, Liz, if you would be so kind as to - jumping at this point that would be great.

Woman: Yeah. There are two things that I wanted to jump in (with) first of all, the production (of what) Kristina asked me a question earlier in the day about the way in which the group would (see) input into the final report.

The updated new TLDs report is almost finished and that I'll be relating that to Bruce and to have him go over it, probably, tomorrow (which

takes into account) (LA) inputs that we have had which (those on the) committee would understand.

And I'm sorry for the other, but I'm skipping over there.

However, the - what I've done is I've established a placeholder for reports from each of the Reserved Names group the (pro-group), the (get group) and IDN (unintelligible) mentioned, the (GACC) today, and the IDN working group, because these four elements of work that are going on will have a direct bearing on the new TLD, these reports.

So this group has, I think, until the 30th of May to submit its final report. And (until such time) that takes place, it will be a placeholder in the bigger new TLDs report.

So I am more than happy to integrate each project (to its portion), which is - it seems to me, Kristina, two things, one is a problem analysis and two is the TLD analysis into the report more generally as long as the group do a standard sort of format, not dissimilar to what the Reserved Names group had done in terms of their reporting.

So that's one section of it. The other section of it is the request for consultation with other working groups and (Christine) (I've been forwarding) new direct links (requests) particularly for the Reserved Names working group (unintelligible) this group particular questions.

And, Kristina, did you have a good idea now of what this group was being asked to do from other groups.

Kristina Rosette: No.

Woman: (That's complete) (bummer).

All right. What I'll do is (I now) have it in front of me but I don't want to take up time in the call identifying it. I'll send it to the whole group and part of it is - I'm trying to look at the common membership across the group and there's not much, except for two (unintelligible) (team).

(Tim), do you happen to remember off the top of your head there were two questions on the Reserved Names (unintelligible), (ICANN). I am thinking it was something about (geographic identifiers) that was also important for this group to consider.

Can you remember off the top of your head what else needed to be done?

(Tim), (Luis)?

((Crosstalk))

Man: I had been distracted by another call. I just got back so I might have missed something.

Woman: Sure, okay.

What I'll do, Kristina, is I will forward to this group my email that I sent to the Reserved Names group, which was, "Dear folks, please refer to these particular groups," and I'll just do that in one second while you are talking and then I'll come back at the end of the call before - so I can get through with everyone.

So go on ahead, Kristina, and I'll come back.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. I'm, you know, is there anybody who is willing and interested to be on that group?

Liz Williams: Kristina, I don't think (it needs) the special group. It's going to just cut across - it's going to be something that the whole group would do, which I think in the course of what you've identified in those two working groups.

But I'm finding that they (unintelligible) right now (unintelligible).

Man: What issues, Liz, we're talking about?

Liz Williams: It's the request for information from other working groups, most particularly the Reserved Names working group.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Liz, I'm working (through your mailed) Reserved Names. I can't find the one you need.

Liz Williams: Speak up (unintelligible), we can't hear you.

Kristina Rosette: I'm saying, I'm looking through your mailed Reserved Names group.

Liz Williams: Yup. And I've got it.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Here we go.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: I've got it right here.

Kristina Rosette: …(unintelligible).

Liz Williams: I'm just going to forward it to the whole group now.

(Let's see). (Okay there's a TRO).

(All right).

All right. Sorry, Kristina, I don't want to…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: No, that's okay. I'm just…

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: I'm sending it to the group.

Kristina Rosette: I'm just trying to go back through the - I'm cross-checking against the statement of work. And I think it will just really be important as the groups go forward to make sure that they were referring back to the statement of work and that to the extent that there are particular components in the outline for that - the ultimate reports…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: …they're taking charge…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …right now.

Kristina Rosette: All right. So (unintelligible) (through).

Now, I have a question and - that I don't know the answer to, but I know that somebody had said to me at one point, that anytime we are going to be consulting with the constituencies that we need to then follow on to whatever each (constituency) (unintelligible) have is kind of their formal comment period, which I think is 45 days. Is that right?

Does anyone…

((Crosstalk))

John Nevitt: (Christine), this is John Nevitt. Could you just explain the goal that you're trying to achieve with consultation from the constituencies (I mean) is it a formal response?

Are you looking for informal input because that will help guide what the - at least from a registrar constituency standpoint, the timeline on what we get back to you.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

I personally have no preferences to whether it's formal or informal. The goal really here is to get the information that is called for under the statement of work that was not otherwise be available.

For example, with regard to - there's an entire section of the statement of work or subsection talking about the impact on registrars and registry of the protective mechanism.

So we would need to know what that is and frankly, maybe that's something we can all talk about now as to whether anybody thinks that it needs to be either formal or informal. I realize if we go the formal route that there are certain procedural requirements and processes that need to be followed.

But…

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. This is Jeff.

I don't think we can do the formal impact of registrars or registry (until after these) recommendations made.

I mean that is really made for (unintelligible), once there's actual recommendation, then you'll go back to the registries and registrars and get the…

Kristina Rosette: No. The idea here was to look at the existing mechanisms that had been implemented thus far to see what the impacts had been.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: (You know), and obviously we can do it…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: …on the backend as well.

But to the extent and I think you talked about this in one of our earlier calls - I mean to the extent that there were certain implementations impact, you know, some of those are going to be (uniquely felt) by the registries and registrars.

Tim Ruiz: But - Kristina, this is Tim.

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Tim Ruiz: There is a, you know, probably - I mean (if you collapse) the group then, (there's still) probably like (200) and (these some odd) registrars (most of which are) members of the constituency.

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Tim Ruiz: And I would imagine everyone would have a different analysis of the impact.

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Tim Ruiz: No impact at all because you didn't participate (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Tim Ruiz: So I'm just wondering what you might want be just an informal survey that would allow anyone to respond who like to (and then collect those).

Kristina Rosette: I would prefer that. (If that is something that) everyone (in the group) - unless anyone disagrees and thinks that we need to have (something) more formal for purposes of the final report. I mean I think (having) the informal survey, people who care about this will respond and people who don't won't.

I mean that's true of anything really.

Man: (Right). And I think the timing (issue was trying) do something formal just didn't work out with (the time) we haven't worked with (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Right. I mean the goal that I was thinking in terms of - (I guess) when I was trying to plot out where we need to be by the end of May and working backwards was that I was really hoping that by the time we are done meeting at the Lisbon meeting, we're in a position where, you know, that informal outreach can start.

But, you know, there's been discussion and agreement as to what exactly the questions are that we want to ask, and how we want to go about doing that.

And of course, obviously, the TLD analysis would need to be done by that point as well.

Woman: Kristina, I think (unintelligible) out of it was what I would expect from my side because I think that's a bit of the puzzle.

I would expect that post the Lisbon meeting, I'll incorporate whatever the vast array of working groups have been able to incorporate for the committee as a whole to consider.

And then between the Lisbon meeting and the Puerto Rican meeting and board reports they prepared and prior to that board report being completed, the public comment period will take place, which really include outreach and constituencies.

So I'm not actually concerned about (formal) constituency (unintelligible) at this moment in the process but…

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Woman: …of course, what the people should do is make sure of (unintelligible) what (unintelligible) should do in this group.

Just to make sure that they have the authority to speak for the constituency.

And (quote unquote) warn the constituency executives so to speak that (this work) needs to be done and that there would be (a forum) (public client) comment period that would take place between Lisbon and Puerto Rico.

Kristina Rosette: So Jeff (has written) - the answer to question is informal.

Man: (I think that was) John's question.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, John, I'm sorry.

John Nevitt: That would be my preference as well, so that's good.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

There's a number of people who are members of the working group that haven't really volunteered for anything.

Well for any of the project teams that we've talked about here. Is there anybody in that group that would like to do so now?

Jon Bing: Jon Bing.

I think that the group be the TLD analysis seems to be looking on documents, so that is perhaps something that might - I might be able to do.

Kristina Rosette: Oh that would be great.

Jon Bing: Rather than on (background knowledge) as to (unintelligible) you have so much so, and which I have so very little of.

Kristina Rosette: And (unintelligible) I could persuade you to be the leader of that group.

Jon Bing: That I do not think I'm ready to accept that responsibility.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, all right.

Right, thank you very much, John. Anyone else?

All right. I guess the only other question that I would have and I just want to warn everybody that I'll be in the - so I guess we've gotten the email from Liz. And we probably should - before we go further talk about that.

I think, Liz, when you had sent us, one of the things that I wasn't really clear on is what kind of the baseline names this was referring to.

Liz Williams: Say that again. Sorry, Kristina, I've got a very poor line tonight. (This)…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: I just didn't have a good sense as to - when you're talking about whether the group is suggesting that existing registry should be subject, you know, is the group suggesting that existing registry should be subject to the (tens) of registration and have to go through a UDRP to have a name returned if it were registered by someone else.

I'm not really quite sure I understand what the universe of names is that we're talking about here. I think it was part of my problem in the beginning, which is I…

Liz Williams: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Let me just go down.

Just so that the group knows, I've sent quite a detailed email to (Jack's) (unintelligible) and there was a bunch of reports that there was a - names group had done and I had gone back, so each and every one of them I identified (store) recommendations and page numbers and whatever.

And I had come up with a series of questions that needed to be tested with that group to make sure that we're not - I am not making assumptions about (unintelligible) new TLDs report that were incorrect.

Now, what I will - it is clear then that I'm not going to be (unintelligible) do this now because the registry specific names are the names and John - not John, Jeff Neuman, you can help me out here.

For example, .biz has registry specific names that I reserved a set of reserved names and .biz, for example, has quite a long list.

If the question was about if there's a need to (unintelligible) scenario, those (unintelligible) unreserved and how would the existing registry - excuse me - handle the different registration.

But what I'll do is instead of asking you, requesting that you (unintelligible) respond to on the fly, I'll prepare a proper (unintelligible) that puts us in its proper context at the proper places to report so that everyone can see what's going on because there's not a sufficient amount of crossover between the two groups (to see) and what (unintelligible) updated.

And I don't want to waste your time on doing that and I'll do that probably for you tomorrow.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

And, Liz, you and I had talked about, you know, I'm still with the view that it's perfectly okay to have that working group do it in the sense of, you know, they - I know that you got a lot of things on your plate right now and that, you know, it might be easier for you to have - and (unintelligible) seemed amenable to it to have the point person in that working group.

Woman: Yup, exactly.

Woman: …(unintelligible) the presentation. I mean, (you know)…

Woman: The ownership of the work is very, very important to - (within the group). They're actually doing it and (unintelligible) in the game.

I am a facilitator and I have to take responsibility for writing the final report and recommendation.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, all right.

Woman: And I will facilitate that process and make sure that gets done.

But if the group could take responsibility for writing its recommendations and being willing to undertake discussion, it might - will be (unintelligible) out by the community as a whole, then that's fine.

Kristina Rosette: All right. And what's the time frame for this?

Woman: You guys have got a time frame for the end of May.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Woman: The Reserved Names group has a time frame for the Lisbon meeting. I'd suggest that you take longer rather than shorter to do it. It's not inconsiderable amount of work. And I think that it's rather more complicated and the Reserved Names group has found that much of what they are doing is actually quite complicated and difficult anyway.

Woman: Yeah. (Unintelligible), can I add one comment to that?

I mean…

Woman: Sure.

Woman: …we've marked things as meeting more work. So it's quite probable that more work will be done in the names group - in the Reserved Names group.

Woman: Exactly.

Thanks, Avri.

Woman: (All right).

Kristina Rosette: All right. Does anyone have any questions?

Can we - when we are - I guess the next question is, where next scheduled meeting is on the 20th. And I think we're definitely scheduled for the 25th, Glenn, is that right in Lisbon?

Glenn Desaintgery: That's (in fact the day), yes, that's right.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Glenn Desaintgery: I mean the Sunday, yes.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Woman: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: So what I'd like to do I would expect is when we talk next week - I mean obviously, everybody who hasn't completed their TLD analysis, please do so and circulate that, when I circulate the meeting summary, email, I'll just allocate people to group to the extent that they were previously unallocated.

And what I would like to do is at least by next Tuesday, for the folks on kind of the issues analysis team to the extent that they could, you know, at a minimum have kind of an outline of what the general categories and issues are on those, you know, issues that the mechanisms were designed to solve and issues that may have developed with the understanding that obviously with the latter category, a lot of that will depend on what this community and constituency outreach brings out in terms of final forum.

And with regard to the TLD analysis, be in a position to at least have some rough outline of where the commonalities and variances seem to be.

And obviously, I think a lot of that will require, you know, (off) meeting, emails and that type of thing.

I leave it to November to the various groups and (Mike) (unintelligible) had indicated that he would be willing to head a group that no one did. So I'm going to put him as the head of the TLD analysis project team.

And leave it really to you all to decide whether you want to have separate calls and if so, kind of the mechanism for doing that if you want to really just rely solely on email.

But if…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We have a - just on that one, we have a free (consult) (unintelligible) that I can provide the details for anyone who wishes to have a little conference call that you didn't want to be (unintelligible) and that's very simple for me to set up. It won't be recorded but it really is (unintelligible).

Margie Odle: Yeah, that would be great if you don't mind sending that.

                This is Margie.

Woman: Sure. So just - if you could just send me - anyone who wants to send it to me, I (unintelligible) as a group (seem) that I will (unintelligible).

                  So, Margie, I'll just put you on the list (unintelligible).

Woman: All right.

Kristina Rosette: Liz, just to follow up on the Reserved Names working group question…

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Kristina Rosette: …and I apologize if you had already done this.

                  And the message that you'll be sending around to the group, will you give us some examples of that because I'm just still not frankly (unintelligible).

Liz Williams: Yes, I will.

Kristina Rosette: That would be great.

Liz Williams: I will.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: …(unintelligible) for you.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

                  Anyone have any questions, anyone have any suggestions?

Alrighty?

Glenn, the email that you had - I think, the most recent email that I had that has a list of members, is that - had there been any changes to that?

Glenn Desaintgery: Not to the best of my knowledge, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right. Well then (unintelligible) (I'll use) (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Kristina, this is Jeff.

I didn't sign up for a group. I'm going to be a little bit limited in the next three, four weeks at most.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So I just - we're having a - my wife is due with our second child in two weeks. So…

Kristina Rosette: Excellent.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So…

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I think you get a pass.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Woman: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: But I mean I'll help out in any way I can and certainly after the couple
                 of weeks (unintelligible) (then we're) more back to normal, I can jump
                 back in.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, thank you.

Woman: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Congratulations (unintelligible).

Woman: (I thought) you know that already, that these are completely
                 impossible.

Jeff Neuman: If you could do it with three, I can…

Woman: (Unintelligible), yes.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible), (too)?

Woman: No, no, no. I have four.

Jeff Neuman: Oh you have four. Oh my (God).

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Go for five.

Woman: No, thanks.

Kristina Rosette: Come on, we have working group (unintelligible).

                All right. Well, thank you everyone. I appreciate it. And I guess we will all talk next Tuesday unless you're going to be talking with your project teams before then.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

END