

## Registration Abuse Policies

### TRANSCRIPTION

Wednesday 17 February 2009 15:00 UTC

**Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Registration Abuse Policies meeting on Wednesday 17 February 2009, at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:**

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-rap-20090218.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Present for the teleconference:

James Bladel - Godaddy RRC

Zahid Jamil - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Greg Aaron - Registry C.

Absent apologies:

Kristina Rosette - IPC

Olga Cavalli - NCA

Liz Gasster - Staff

Staff:

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery - GNSO Secretariat

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. Glen could I maybe ask you to do roll call.

Glen DeSaintgery: Certainly. We have on the call Zahid Jamil, James Bladeland Mike Rodenbaugh and for staff we have Marika Konings and myself.

Marika Konings: Well thank you all very much for joining. I think we have two points on the agenda for today. The first one is to review the draft program for the workshop in Mexico City and the second one is to look at some of the questions that came from the council in relation to the charter that was provided to them last week.

And as there are several members not on the call at the moment, I would prefer that we have a discussion within the group. But at least

give those that are not present today an opportunity to respond and comment to any decisions or discussions we have or changes we make to the program and/or the answers to the council.

Is there anything anyone would like to add at this stage?

So maybe then we first have a look at the draft program. I think the main objective is to finalize the text on the background and the different sections so we can actually post it on the Mexico City Web site so people know what this workshop is going to be about. And then I think internally we need to finalize as well the list of speakers and make sure as well that we get confirmation from those that we would like to invite that are not part of this group.

I think - (Greg) did you just join?

(Greg): Yes - I just joined. Hello.

Marika Konings: Hi (Greg). We've just started and we're basically sort of looking at the program for the workshop in Mexico City. Just to recap - the main objective on this point is to finalize the text on the background and the different sections of the program so we can actually post that on the Mexico City Web site. So people know what the workshop is about and we can start promoting it as well to make sure that we get people to attend this.

And then the second part is to get agreement on the speakers for the different sections so we can start as well reaching out to those that are actually not part of this group and get them to commit a time.

So maybe first looking at the text - I think this has already been reviewed a number of times by most of you. So I don't know if people want to have a quick read through it and see if there are any points or whether they want an additional day to read through it and make sure that they're happy with this being posted on the Web site. Is there any comments?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm happy with it generally. I do think that the first topic is maybe getting a short (shift) with 15 minutes and the second one getting 40 and the third one getting 35. I sense that it might take a little longer than that noting especially that, you know, the UDRP specifically calls out use as part of the formula in determining bad faith.

And that is of course the consensus policy that I'm pretty sure is from right around the same time as the RAA anyway.

So I don't know - I'm just thinking maybe bumping that to 20 minutes and taking 5 minutes away from the next section.

Marika Konings: Okay. Maybe Mike on the UDRP - maybe it's worth as well - separate note or discussion within this context because I did have a talk with someone on this. And they made the point that actually UDRP was introduced separately from consensus policy and more an establishment of ICANN as a concession or - you know - commitment to trademark holders of a process for them to address issues in that relation in that respect.

So there might be different views on whether UDRP fits within the consensus policies or not. And I'm not claiming here to have the answer to that but it's just some feedback I got from another ICANN

corner. So that might be something that needs to be looked at in further detail as all within this discussion.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You know I agree with that. It certainly is going to come up again. I believe it's listed on ICANN's consensus policy page and the world considers it a consensus policy. So I'm not sure who you're hearing that from otherwise but in any event, I agree with you.

If we added a sentence in here maybe - the second (unintelligible) sentence - furthermore or in addition, the UDRP contemplates that (unintelligible) use of a domain name - just something simple like that so it is on the schedule. That might be useful.

I understand though that we need to get this off and posted so I don't really want to go around and around on it either.

Marika Konings: So maybe we can leave it off for now but internally we address that or, you know, I think most of the speakers that we've listed for now are internal so it's something that, you know, we'll need to raise I think in the discussion then. So I mean - if you have a specific sentence that can be added, you know, if we can get that sent around to everyone, you know, within the next 24 hours, I don't think it's a problem.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right - I'll have it sent around in the next 24 minutes. That's not a problem.

Marika Konings: Okay - yeah but we just need to get it out and I'm, you know - I think after this call, we can give everyone 24 hours to review, you know, what we discussed today and have it hopefully signed off and posted.

So if you want to circulate a suggestion that would be great. Does everyone agree as well to add more time to the first session? The only concern from my side would be there that we have quite a number of speakers listed for the best practices current experiences. So the question there would be do we limit the number of speakers so everyone can speak a little bit longer or do we really reduce everyone to two to three minutes.

What are people's views are there? I know (James) - (Greg) - you're listed there. How much time do you think you would need to talk about your experiences in this area?

James Bladel Well there's.

(Greg): Go ahead (James).

James Bladel Well I was just going to mention just that - be as much or as little information as we want to dive into in that session. I think that one thing more than focusing on the presentations might be to - and this is in the third section - to put forward a call for additional participation. Is that done at these workshops? Are we - or future PDPs.

Marika Konings: Do you mean participation in the working group or participation in the workshop.

James Bladel Participation in - I'm assuming there's a PDP on the horizon - PDP working group on the horizon.

Marika Konings: Well I think for the moment we're looking at a working group.

James Bladel Okay.

Marika Konings: As we discussed within the draft (unintelligible) - recommendation at this stage to have it more as a pre-PDP that the group would actually (unintelligible). But you would like to include here or just for an internal note of...

James Bladel Yeah - I just...

Marika Konings: At the workshop at the end we ask people to participate. Because there will be a working group formed and I think that call - you know - provided that the council adopts the charter tomorrow on its call. I presume a call for participation will follow shortly after that.

James Bladel Okay - well maybe just some call for involvement or instructions on how to - I don't want to hold ourselves up as the comprehensive experts in this area. I mean I'm sure there are folks in the audience that have something to contribute.

Marika Konings: Well maybe that's something that we can add as well once the council adopts the charter and calls for volunteers to circulate it. Maybe we can add in that a reference to this workshop and, you know, get people as well making the link between the workshop and the working group and as well - at the session itself. Make again that call to sign up and participate in the working group. Does that make sense?

James Bladel It does and then - I'm fine with the amount of time. I don't know - (Greg) and (Christina)'s not on the call but we're - I think the concern is that, you know, we want to have a nice balance between presentation of best practices and opening up the forum for questions.

(Greg): Yeah - I think probably - yeah - the meat of things will be in discussion because it's actually unclear at this point which best practices might be applicable to anything. Because we don't know exactly which topics will come up during the course of our working group?

So I'm happy to keep things relatively brief in the interest of keeping time for questions and discussion.

Marika Konings: Okay - so then we can shorten the best practice section. I think Mike you were proposing to have then the first session - the registration be as a finish for 20 minutes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well yeah but I guess that would include questions and answers on that topic as well. Yeah.

Marika Konings: I think as well - I mean - and then I think the timing here is sort of flexible because of course the workshop ends in principle at seven but I mean if there's really engaged discussion, I don't think there's a problem to continue. Of it there's one area that shortened, I think that's probably for the moderator or whoever's going to lead the meeting to see a bit there where more discussion is needed and required than where maybe less discussion is necessary.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Marika Konings: No but I'll make those changes here.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I just think - I don't want the moderator or anyone else to get a short trip to the first topic because I think it's critically important to what this group is going to do.

Marika Konings: Absolutely. And there I can just maybe note as well - because we had as a potential speaker there (Dan Halleman) from the legal team but I checked with him and it's not sure whether he's available. So alternatively, there will be ICANN staff representation and we'll prepare a presentation with consultation with legal counsel so we're sure that we have their views as well.

But that name still needs to be filled in. It might be (Maggie Meilin) who will stand in if (Dan) is not available there if the group agrees.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah - so I'm sorry. I missed the last call and I'm not really up on who he suggested as speakers for these groups. Is that in one of our documents?

Marika Konings: Yes, that was in I think the last one that was circulated. Not the one...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Because I took out the name but...Do you want the date of when the email was sent or what helps you to find out? Or you want me to quickly send it to you now?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I'm looking at the draft program from the 13th and the names are not in there. Oh - here it is. Okay - on the 10th you have moderator. Okay. Got it. I have it now. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Okay. So if we don't move to any of the speakers - the first person up there is a moderator for the session and I think we spoke there about maybe having either (Unintelligible) from the drafting team or the chair of the registration abuse policies working group provided that it's formed at that time which...

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's not happened.

Marika Konings: Yeah - I guess it's too short time to actually have that group formed and met and elected a chair. So then there will be a representative from the drafting team I guess unless there's a preference to have ICANN staff perform that role. I don't know what the preference of the group here is.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You know - I would volunteer to do that if people are okay with it.

Man: Does that represent a conflict for you Mike. You're the one who's raised the motion in council.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No - I don't think so. I'm just moderating - trying to keep people on schedule. But you know if anyone's uncomfortable with it, you know, other volunteers are welcome or I suppose if Marika or someone from staff wants to do it, I'm comfortable with it.

James Bladel I'm also comfortable with staff taking that role. I think the concern is that as we get into the presentations but also the questions and answers - that I don't know if it's typical for a moderator to also speak on a particular subject so - or there's the desire there to remain somewhat objective.

Man: Yeah - it's just difficult for a moderator to speak on the subject so - I mean - I'm fine if a staff member can help us in this way.

Marika Konings: If that...

Man: That would leave you open to addressing any of the questions that came up as well.

Marika Konings: Okay - if that's the consensus, I'm happy to take that forward and I guess it would be either me or (Margie) taking probably on that role. Mike is that - are you comfortable with that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes - I am. I would say though in the first topic, that we probably ought to have two members of the drafting team, you know, available to speak on that rather than just (Greg) so that there's a little more balance there. Either pull me or (Christina) in the first topic as well.

(Alex): Hi this is (Alex). Can I say something?

Marika Konings: Of course.

(Alex): Yeah - I think that's important because I mean - if at least - and I thought there should be a second person from the drafting (game) - it will be a balance - I agree with Mike strategy I think.

Marika Konings: (Greg) - (James) - are you okay with that suggestion as well.

(Greg): Sure.

James Bladel Sure.

Marika Konings: I think the idea behind it is though that the statement or the presentation is here made on behalf of the registration team should indeed reflect the discussion, and indeed I agree there were of course two views there. But to make sure that both does a common denominator - one against the other discussion but to indeed reflect what was discussed in the drafting team and the challenges that the group sees going forward for and the task that the group sees going forward for this working group of course.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So I mean I guess - we should talk about this for a second - the format. You know I'm envisioning basically we'd have kind of a PowerPoint - you know - really a couple of minutes at most. And then open it to the floor for discussion. Is that what everyone else is envisioning on these topics?

Marika Konings: I think especially on this first part - at least speaking from the staff's perspective - I think it would be good as well if the staff prepares a few slides. Just you know - with some bullet points on actually the issues report to make sure that people that didn't attend - didn't read the report - that they are aware of what were some of the issues that you know were discovered and investigated in that report. So that might be a sort of introduction from a staff perspective to the whole workshop as a background.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Absolutely - that's a great idea. But then you know when you tick off each of the individual topics, I would say - you know (Greg) talk for a minute or two. I talk for a minute or two. If staff has a minute or two and then, you know, it's open to questions for the bulk of the time.

So we have really an open and engaging discussion rather than, you know, a panel lecture.

Man: Right and I agree Mike. I think I'd like to see it as more focused on the true nature of a workshop as opposed to a group presentation.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Marika Konings: And I think it might help if some of you maybe put some challenging questions on your slides or you know - get the group - it's always difficult as well to get you know maybe the audience engaged but indeed ask some questions that will get people talking. Because you know the main objective of this workshop is indeed to provide as well information for a working group going forward in this area.

James Bladel Yeah. I have a kind of a strange question for the staff and maybe Mike if you can help me out on this. But we're assuming that the proposed charter is going to be accepted by the council intact. I mean is it possible that there will be some modifications to that and we may have to adjust some of the topics based on what comes out of the counsel.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes - it's possible that there could be some friendly amendments made but it seems pretty well baked. At this point I don't envision there being a problem in the council meeting tomorrow. I think that it will be approved pretty much as submitted.

James: Okay. Thanks.

Marika Konings: The only thing I could maybe foresee on this question on what the working group is supposed to deliver us in 90 days - I mean it's

possible that there is someone would like to clarify that a bit more, what that means. Or what the working group is supposed to deliver but otherwise I think indeed Mike - I agree with what Mike said.

So maybe then looking at the next section - the best practice and current experiences. We have there listed already a number of speakers and still a number of TBCs.

What are the views there? There are a number of groups that haven't really been involved in the drafting team and we would need to reach out too. Should we pick one of these - all of these? What are people's views? There's as well a TBC for a BC representative. Mike is there - is there anyone there that wants to speak or do you prefer others to speak in this section?

James Bladel I had just a thought of this. In the interest of time and I would run this past (Greg) - the APWG best practices are in many ways - are comprised of most of the best practice by registries and registrars. So I think that it's a big component of what we would - excuse me - of what we would put out there. So I don't know if that's a separate group or if it can be mentioned in one of the other sections.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Of course both (Greg) and I at least are quite able to talk on the APWG's best practices having been involved in their drafting. So I don't think we need special representatives from either of those last three organizations.

Marika Konings: Does the rest agree with that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Then of course - then you know if we don't get other representatives, it looks like really just the four of us talking on everything.

(Rod): Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: But that's not necessarily bad - you know - to start because again, we don't want to be talking much. We just want to be setting up the discussion for everyone else in the audience to talk.

(Rod): Is there any way we can request or require them to be there for the Q&A because I think I'd have a lot to add.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I'm certain the APWG folks - you know (Rod) and some other people will be at this session - new (John) I don't know anybody there. I know (Greg Agort) from (Savalense) will be at the meeting in Mexico and probably will be at this meeting but I doubt that he would want to be on the panel speaking.

(Rod): Yeah - I don't think (Savalense) would probably want to be there. This section is about policies prohibiting abusive registrations and/or abusive usage. I'm guessing - let's have (Rod) - I imagine (Rod) will be in the audience.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

(Rod): He could get involved in conversation at some point during the course of the workshop. I think we've got the other - we've got the

constituencies on the list and as long as we have some time for questions from the audience, then we might be okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes - (Rod) are you happy with me to be our representative on this panel?

(Rod): Of course.

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Rod): Is (Chris) - it's the indemnity - okay. And then (Christina) will be there. The only party we don't have on here would be the ISPs.

Marika Konings: Well if you look at the constituencies, it's NCUC as well.

(Rod): Yeah - I'm wondering if we should maybe give an opportunity for all the constituencies to be there.

Marika Konings: Yeah that falls in as well with the next session where you know they will need to be approached to see if they indeed want to have someone on the panel and maybe we can do that in the same well and as well for the best practices session.

I don't know - maybe Mike that's something you can already raise on tomorrow's conference call and then we can follow that up with an email to constituencies - maybe.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that's a fine idea or even better, when we finalize this thing or let's - or even sending out a draft after our call today and say that it's, you know, pending final from a couple of other members of the

team. But send it around in advance of the meeting tomorrow and specifically ask for reps from the NCs seeing the ISPs.

Marika Konings: So I'll add them as well to the list to BC's in the best practice - current practices section so that they can fill that in and I'll take out for the rest all the TBCs because people are on the call here and confirm that they want to speak. And I'll take out the (APWG) (New Yanan) and the (Savalense) from the list.

(Rod): And Marika what I might do is - I'm pulling the members of the registry constituency. I might not speak in all of these slots actually if there's interest in any of my colleagues. And I should be able to get back to you pretty quickly I think with some specific names if that's okay.

Marika Konings: Yeah - that's fine. I mean I can leave your name for now and that's easy, you know, to switch to someone else or if you prefer to leave it blank.

(Rod): Well - let's see. This is just for the Web site so it's easy to change.

Marika Konings: Well I think for the Web site, the idea would be anyway not to put any speakers yet.

(Rod): Okay.

Marika Konings: Because you know we'll need to see as well with (Christina) an attorney who will present - the idea for now would be just to put the descriptions on line. And put the speakers at a later stage once we have the raw feedback from the ISP and NCUC so we can really put up, you know the final program so people don't get confused

beforehand or worried that certain names are not there. So my idea - you know - for the Web site just to put the text and leave the speakers out for now.

(Rod): Okay - that's a good idea.

Marika Konings: So then for internally because I did do for the positive response of the council - I did prepare like a clean version of the program without speakers which can be used as well to circulate - then to the council, and as well for the Web site.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I would encourage you to at least put in, you know, registrar representative - registry representative.

Marika Konings: Okay - just no names. Okay - that's fine as well. I'll just take out names and just have the listing of which sectors are going to be represented.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Ideally we can get the names up and locked in there by Monday - it'd be great. At least a week in advance.

Marika Konings: And then the next one is the - well, we already spoke a bit about it. The way forward would roll for ICANN - is there anyone that needs to be added here. I said we need to reach out to the NCUC and ISP to see if they're willing to have someone on the panel.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Also ALAC.

Marika Konings: Yeah - good point. And I can check there with (Boe Brendner) if he would be willing to - or if he would reach out to ALAC to check who could be - who would like to participate there. I don't know how it fits

with their schedule because I know that they have a lot of stuff going on at the same time. But if everyone agrees, I can check with (Boe) if he or someone else from ALAC would be willing to participate as well in that panel session.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No harm in asking.

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Rod): Okay.

Man: Sounds like we're pretty close.

Marika Konings: Yeah - I think that's it for the programs though we still need to fill in a few blanks especially relating to the constituencies and the - I'll send this around later today so the others can have a look at that. But I think for the text, there were no further comments and we can get that posted relatively shortly on the Mexico City Web site.

So then turning to the next point of our agenda - there were some specific questions that were put forward by (Chuck) in relation to the charter. I don't know if everyone had a chance to look at those questions and in order to help the group formulate answers to those, I prepared some draft responses.

I think (Greg) already provided some input there and (Christina) just sent around a note as well. So maybe the easiest thing is just to go question by question and see what modifications need to be made.

Everyone fine with that approach? So the first question was - is additional research supposed to be done before the working group finishes its work. And the draft answer I had put was - this will be for the working group to determine as it depends on the scope and size of the research that needs to be undertaken. The working group might decide to pause until the necessarily information has been gathered to make an informed recommendation to the council.

One comment from (Christina) was that she wasn't comfortable adding that second sentence to it as that might give too much leeway to the working group to actually - you know - stop doing their work. What do others feel about this answer?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that's a legitimate concern of (Christina)'s - that I share.

Marika Konings: So if we just take out that sentence, would that...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah - that'd be fine.

Marika Konings: Everyone comfortable with the answer if we just leave the first sentence.

James Bladel Now does that - that then kind of drives the need for more flexibility in the second question. If I'm reading that correctly that it would be more dependent upon the size and scope of the research would be whether the work would be finished or if it would be a progress report with a 90 day (unintelligible).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah - I think the way it's written is very flexible though - don't you agree?

James Bladel Yeah - it's fine.

Marika Konings: And we're already on question two - does it leave indeed enough flexibility. Does everyone feel comfortable with how it's written in this way?

James Bladel Do we want to put the expectation that ideally the working group have finished its work by then or should we just say that - you know - if the working group is able it, it will report. If not, there will be a progress report.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay - how about if the working group has not finished its work by then, it is the expectation that blau, blau, blau.

James Bladel Yeah - it will prepare a progress report for council.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay - I'll change that. And it would read - if the working group has not finished by then, it is the expectation that the working group will present its progress together with expected end date of its work.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

James Bladel Yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay. Then turning to number three - is the working group supposed to attempt to make a recommendation to the council on whether to initiate a PDP or not? And the draft answer is - more specifically, the working

group is expected to make a recommendation about which registration abuse policy issues, if any, are appropriate for a PDP.

Are there any further comments on this one? Not - I guess that's agreement.

And then I would suggest that I just update the answers to these questions and just circulate them as well so (Christina) and (Olga) and (Boe) have a look, have a chance to look at these. And give them 24 hours time so then maybe after that, either Mike or (Christina) can send these to the council; together with the draft program for the workshop as well as the (ASAK) request so they have it in time for further discussion tomorrow evening - evening my time.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think we should really get that out right after this meeting even if we just send it along - I can send it along to council saying that - you know - it's subject to final approval by a couple of members of the team but this is what the group agreed to after our call this morning. That gives people, you know, 24 hours to chew on it.

Marika Konings: Everyone on the call fine with that?

Man: Yeah.

Man: Okay.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'll make those changes and get them to you shortly after this call Mike if that's okay so you can get it out. I mean these are relatively minor changes so I doubt there will be any objection from the others.

Especially - and (Christina) already commented that she was fine with two and three and we have considered her change for one.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. And you also should have - maybe we can just finish this last piece up too in the draft program. I sent around a sentence on the UDRP - you know - with a link to the consensus policy page. If (Greg) and (James) and (Zaed) - and Marika - have you received that?

Marika Konings: I haven't yet.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I sent it over 20 minutes ago now. Okay.

Marika Konings: Has anyone else received it?

(Alex): Mike - I haven't received it either - no - I haven't received it either.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Your mailing lists are working very slow. Okay - well, you should have it any minute I suppose.

Marika Konings: Oh - I mean we can leave it for now and it's something as well - I guess we can add later on if everyone feels strongly that it should be added here or if it just should be mentioned during the workshop

Mike Rodenbaugh: If you like I can read it to you - it's very short.

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Mike Rodenbaugh: In addition - this would go the second to the last paragraph in the first section of the program. And it would say - in addition, under the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), panelist consider purse

registration use of a domain name in their consideration of whether a domain name is registered in bad faith that's violating that consensus policy - and a link to the consensus policy stage - (unintelligible) - icann.org.

So anyway - if no comments on that - we don't have to spend time on it. I mean you haven't seen it with your own eyes - you'll see it soon and hopefully we can wrap it up on the list.

Marika Konings: Okay - so if people can have a look at that and let everyone know whether they agree or don't agree with it and then we can update the form accordingly.

Mike - I already sent you the version as it is now and then, you know, based on the feedback, you can add that sentence or not at this stage. Will that work?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Works for me.

Marika Konings: Are there any other issues that people would like to discuss at this point?

James Bladel Just a question - are we solid on that time - Tuesday - 17:30?

Marika Konings: I think so - Glen can you confirm that?

Glen DeSaintgery: I'm sorry. Just let me get the schedule - that is - Tuesday from 17:30 to 18.

Marika Konings: I think we're still 7.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yeah - until 7. Yes - yes it's on for 7 sorry.

Marika Konings: It would be a very short workshop.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes - no - no - that's fine. It's from 1730 until 7 - yes that's right - yes. It's been put on the main schedule. It's been marked as a room metered, et cetera - et cetera - so I think we can take it that it is.

Why - is the time not suitable?

James Bladel No, it's fine. I just - I noticed that some things were changing and I wanted to make sure that we were.

Glen DeSaintgery: Ah - yes.

James Bladel The time.

Glen DeSaintgery: I think we can take it because it's been quite difficult to fund these extra times.

James Bladel And it looks like there is a room assigned now - (Don Diego III).

Glen DeSaintgery: That's (unintelligible) - yes. But you know, this is still I think a flexible schedule that is up so if it gets put into another room, please don't -you know.

Marika Konings: I'm trying to find - the time is fixed unless the working group would decide or the drafting would decide that they prefer another or other time slot. But as we have discussed before, there's very limited choice

and I think the other options we had were seven o'clock in the morning which I don't think we'll receive a very favorable vote of members in the group. So at a glance - I think the only thing that might change is maybe the room.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right - well that is a problem also - and I know Glen is very sensitive to it but you know, bouncing rooms around all the time is just constantly a problem at these ICANN meetings so if we can please lock it down, at least by Monday when we post this thing, that would be ideal.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll try and see to that Mike as much as I can.

Marika Konings: And so maybe then one last thing is to see whether people would find it useful to actually meet before the workshop; especially as most of you will be speaking to maybe sit down just for a little bit. Just to go through what people will be covering and make sure as well that there's no duplication or things like that.

Do people feel that they would have, you know, 30 minutes time somewhere in the schedule before the workshop in Mexico City?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think it would be tough but if we could at least circulate slides, you know - well as soon as possible next week and deal with things on our list - on this little (trapping) team list - that would be useful.

Marika Konings: I think there's still potential that Monday morning's seven o'clock slot for breakfast - I don't know how people would feel about that.

Glen DeSaintgery: That's been taken up with something.

Marika Konings: Oh.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry.

Marika Konings: But this would be a relatively small group. I mean we could even sit in the lobby.

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh - yes - yes - yes.

Marika Konings: So I don't - is this something that would conflict with any of the people participating in this?

Glen DeSaintgery: Any of you know - yes perhaps (Zaed) - because (Zaed) is on the GO regions group and all the (unintelligible) as well.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: And I think that that seven o'clock slot has been put aside for a meeting with that group.

Marika Konings: Okay - well - maybe I'll have a quick look at the schedule and to see if I can find somewhere - like 30 minutes. We probably don't even need a room for that but just - you know.

Glen DeSaintgery: But what about meeting somewhere - just in one of those two DNSO rooms on the Saturday or the Sunday.

James Bladel: Yeah - I think folks that are going to be there beginning of the weekend - is that correct - or....

Man: No - I won't be arriving until the afternoon.

James Bladel Sorry.

Marika Konings: The Sunday would be an option.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sunday.

Man: Depends on when.

Marika Konings: Yeah - so maybe - well Glen maybe I can work with you to see on the Sunday schedule where there would be maybe a 30 minute - you know - even - it could either be - it could be as well on a break. I mean...

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes - exactly.

Marika Konings: If people would be willing to sacrifice their break to discuss registration abuse but it's just - you know - just to sit down and just to quickly go through what everyone will be speaking about and make sure that we are - you know - all aligned.

James Bladel Sounds good.

Marika Konings: So I will work with Glen there to find a slot and then circulate to the group to see if everyone can make it.

James Bladel Okay.

Man: Marika at this point, I have to drop off the call for a constituency meeting.

Marika Konings: Okay - great. I think we're done anyways. Is there anything else people would like to raise or discuss?

Okay - well, thank you very much. I'll send out an updated version of the program and we'll get on some times for the Mexico City meeting.  
Okay.

Man: All right.

Marika Konings: Thank you all very much.

Man: Thank you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Glen DeSaintgery: Bye.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Bye.

END