

Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference
Monday 12 March 2007
18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 12 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/rn-wg-20070312.mp3>

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

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Neal Blair - CBUC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Jon Nevett - Registrar c.

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Coordinator: This is the recording of the ICANN conference call, held Monday, the 12th of March, 2007 at 6:00 pm UK Time. Call ID is 6391425.

Man: That to the list, I would say some time, hopefully within the next, say, 12 to 24 hours but...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's probably all I want to give you. Twelve to 24 hours - when I talk about the agenda today.

Man: Well unfortunately, we didn't have any help a little - we didn't have some help from...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...from what is it...

Man: Yeah, I'm not being critical (Mike), I'm just telling you.

Man: Hey listen, I appreciate the test master role that you're in. You've done an excellent job sharing. So I appreciate it.

Man: So anyway, I want to welcome Tamara and (Neo) and Greg. I have a question for Greg. Have you sent the revisions to the recommendations to the list?

Greg Shatan: I unfortunately have not, although they won't be strikingly different from what (Mike) sent around at all. So if there are any specific comments to (Mike's)...

Man: What (Mike sent)...

Greg Shatan: ...recommendations.

Man: For a third level domain?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Man: I'm - I guess I'm blank right there on...

Greg Shatan: In the last call, (Mike) kind of proposed something orally and then followed it up with an email version...

Man: Okay. Okay. Got you, got you. Okay, all right.

Greg Shatan: So that is basically what I will be saying anyway. I unfortunately had a weekend encounter with an intestinal virus...

Man: No.

Greg Shatan: ...not belabor the committee with.

Man: Thank you very much. I appreciate that, so.

All right.

Woman: I hope you're feeling better.

Greg Shatan: I am. But it kept me from the more fruitful work in this organization.

Man: Okay. Well, that was a nice thing to say, the more fruitful work, so...

Tamara Reznik: This is Tamara. Unfortunately, I have a dentist appointment so I just want to let you know I'm only going to be on for about half an hour.

Man: Okay, thanks Tamara.

Greg Shatan: Hopefully this is more fruitful than a dentist appointment.

Man: It depends what the dentist is doing; but...

Woman: (Let's hope it's) less painful.

Tamara Reznik: Yes, exactly.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

Okay now, to the extent that you can bring up any other reports that have been distributed most in the last 30 minutes or so...

Greg Shatan: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...that would be helpful to follow along because I'm sure they won't - there - they can't be posted on the site that quickly. But if you can look at the email list, the product you have and so they are available and we'll be talking about those.

Let me go to right to the agenda. I think we're ready to start. So let me hit star 0 and get this thing going.

Okay. I'm just waiting for them to start the recording.

Coordinator: The recording has begun, sir. You may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Remember, the meeting is recorded and transcribed. I think everybody knows that. I did send out a few revisions to the agenda. And I've made a few since then as well, that I don't think are problematic. But anyway, just to let you know there's a few others that I've added in that came to mind after I sent that out this morning.

The - let me start off by thanking everybody for all the work because I know this has been a lot of time that all of you were volunteering for and let's see as we wrap it up here, it's been really tough, so my thanks and appreciation for that.

Coordinator: Excuse me Greg Shatan joined.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, weren't you with us before?

Greg Shatan: I fell off.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

I was wondering, wasn't I talking to you before. Okay, welcome back.

Remember the - if you're using a speakerphone, to use the handset when you're...

Greg Shatan: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: ...speaking, so. I wasn't saying that to you Greg. This is my general instructions at the beginning, for everybody.

Any problems with the agenda? Any questions, comments?

Okay.

Now, we have a lot to cover and what I want you to do if you have the agenda in front of you is move to Agenda Item 6, so that everybody has the proper context of what we need to get done today. And you'll understand why I will push a certain direction on certain things today.

I'm going to take the action item of distributing a final working group report to the list, not later than close of business Pacific Time on Wednesday, okay? That's kind of a target that we all need to keep in mind and one that I will have to do kind of last minute.

Man: Mr. Chairman, you've got that Tuesday, the 14th of March.

Chuck Gomes: I've changed it to - and I guess it was in my later version. It's going to be - I thought the one...

Man: Okay, fine. Good, got it.

Chuck Gomes: Did you look at the one I sent this morning?

Man: No, I just looked at the - typed at the other and printed at the other. All right. Fifteenth of March, great.

Chuck Gomes: No, 14th of March.

Man: It is the 14th.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

It should be Wednesday, the 14th of March...

Man: Wednesday. Okay, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

And - which means, I need a - I'm going to be working on that after I get all the information from the rest of you.

Tim Denton will be editing the full working group reports and tracking any changes he makes - editorial changes he makes, he's not going to be dealing with content unless he sees something that the working group didn't agree to, something like that which I don't think will happen.

He's going to do all of that by noon Eastern daylight Time - excuse me - he's going to edit, and I think you already have maybe, I don't know, the draft that I sent around a week or so ago on that report.

So that - none of you need to worry about that so much but he's going to get me any edits that he has to the base report without the individual reports in there by noon tomorrow. And he will track any changes, et cetera, too.

He is going to review all of your reports, ensuring common format, editorial quality, et cetera, and use a tracking function to highlight any thing that he changes.

Send those edited versions to the list as soon as possible. In other words, don't wait for all of them - Tim - but as soon as you get one done, send it to the list.

And it's the responsibility of the subgroup members to take a look at what he's done and make sure that there are no problems with that. And then - and that all needs to be done at least on Tim's part by noon, Wednesday the 14th, okay?

That then will give me everything I need to put the final draft report from the whole group together, the rest of the day on Wednesday and send it out to you by close of business on Wednesday.

Now, they're - there may only be one report that's totally finished after today, okay? For all of the rest, this will be your tasks with the time frames I'm going to give you here.

Now, accept any changes that are made today and then use the tracking function in Word to make any final actions. When we go through each one, especially the recommendations today, we're going to either agree to some things or whatever, some changes.

All you're going to need to do between - to now - now or this meeting, and tomorrow close the business is to edit your reports, probably the recommendations portions of the report to correspond with what we talk about today.

And then prior to the meeting on Thursday, which means you'll have to do it probably early Thursday morning because we have an earlier meeting, remember it starts at noon Eastern Time, 1600, I think UTC, correct me if I'm wrong with that Glen, because I'm not looking at it right now.

But you - do your best to review the full report before our meeting on Thursday. Our main agenda item on Thursday is to approve the final report, so - and that can include some edits.

And it also can include some last minute edits with regard to the individual reports because there's a chance some of them may not get in. But no substantial changes to the recommendations because we have to have a full working group input on that.

So Thursday is too late to consider the recommendations. It's just tweaking in so that we've agreed at what we're reporting.

So, the - and that would be the last opportunity to talk about any edits that Tim may have made in going through the reports as well.

Now, let me stop because it's really important that everybody understands the time frame because it is a context as to, you know, that we're going to - that will be behind what we're doing today.

Okay.

Then - so with that in mind then, let's go to the - looking back to the front of the agenda - let's go to the tag names report.

Now, I sent that out earlier in the weekend. If you have that in front of you, it's very easy to see the changes that were made. You only need to go to the recommendations section.

And I made those - I don't think they're substantial. One of them - using the word must was important for the sake of making it easy for Liz Williams to be able to cut and paste the recommendations into the new (TLD BDC), and the other one I just kind of change the order of suggestion by Avri, so I think it - I thought it flowed better.

Are there any questions or comments on the changes that were made in that report?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, it's Tim Denton.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Timothy Denton: In relation to the recommendation, when you mean without standardization activity, as you quoted, does that mean in the absence of standardization activity?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that might actually be a better way to say it. Avri, what do you think about that?

Avri Doria: Yes. Now, I - yeah, I was going to say...

Timothy Denton: Because that's the edit I made and sent back to you just now.

Avri Doria: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Good. And I haven't had the chance to look at...

Timothy Denton: Right. That's all I want to say about that.

Chuck Gomes: I did see that it came in. Let me capture that one real quickly.

So it will say - and everybody just - okay. So in the absence of instead of without, okay?

In the absence of standardization activity, that's very good. Okay.

And let me get it down here as well. That's in two places, right Tim?

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you for that. I like that - I was struggling a little bit with that wording but I didn't take the time to try and come up better. I appreciate that very much.

Timothy Denton: I have other (settles); but I sent them to you and they don't - they aren't policy (settles).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Don't worry about those now. I'll get those in there.

Any other questions or comments on this one?

Any objections to approving this one with the edits that were just made?

Okay. We've got one then guys; only seven to go. Thank you.

All right.

Now, going on then to the nic/whois/dubdubdub for registry operations that Tim just sent a few minutes ago, let's take a look at that. And Tim, I'm assuming that we only really need to look at the recommendation section, is that right?

Timothy Denton: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: No changes in the rest of it?

Timothy Denton: Let me get the - no, just a second, I'm just getting it.

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me.

Timothy Denton: For some reason, I shut the file. Okay. Here it is, yes.

The - as I said, the basic thing was to finally place the rather irrelevant discussion of HTML, HTTP, and HTTPS in the IANA and ICANN and note that it had been removed. And there's no changes at recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So your recommendations for the whole group consideration is that they - the - that nic, and whois, and dubdubdub remain as a - excuse me...

Timothy Denton: Remain reserved...

Chuck Gomes: Remain reserved at the top level.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Timothy Denton: Remain reserved at the second and as relevant, remain reserved at the third.

Chuck Gomes: And that's all for ASCII.

Timothy Denton: It's all for ASCII.

As regards IDN, I use the formulation that Mr. Karp suggested on the assumption that they would remain reserved, the names should be kept as integral designators without translation.

Chuck Gomes: Now, to me that's not at all clear and it's just probably no fault of yours because you are using something like (Harry) said; but does - do other people on the group find that one to explain what we're doing?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I have a question too.

Does that mean with transliteration, without transliteration; I really don't know what it means.

Chuck Gomes: I think we need to be - now Tim, I - let me just pull up here other report...

Timothy Denton: There are many things just to understand what you mean by transliteration so I can attempt to see - Cary Karp.

But basically I was getting into the - what I got out of that and what we discussed previously in relation to that was that they just would not be translated, they were simply kept as what they are. The Latin letters nic, whois, and dubdubdub. There was no attempt to make - to translate them into any other languages or format.

Avri Doria: In other words, they wouldn't turn into a (unintelligible), they'd still be a WWW.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So, this is what we're recommending here basically that IDN versions of these three strings would not be reserved.

Timothy Denton: IDN versions of these strings would not be reserved.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct, right?

Timothy Denton: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Isn't that a lot more direct than what's there?

Timothy Denton: Well, of course. But I thought we were, you know - the last time we were talking about it, we were using Cary Karp's formulation. This is fine.

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Timothy Denton: This is fine to change it. So what you...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Timothy Denton: ...what you would suggest then is - say it again.

Chuck Gomes: That IDN versions of these strings not be reserved.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

There may be a complication.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay.

And I'm not clear, and this is from the IDN Group. So anybody that's more officially, a liaison or something from the IDN (1) Group, they'll bring it up. But there are cases that seem within the IDN Group that say - are talking about the introduction of or the inclusion in...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...label of ASCII - of (LDH) characters. That indicates that (LDH) characters are included as possible characters within an IDN than - I'm not sure what we're saying.

But it's a complication. I'm not saying I understand how it affects us one way or the other. It's just that a presumption I've had has sort of been pushed aside that there are pure script labels.

But now I've been given to understand that that's not fully accepted and that there may be exceptions or multiple script labels or some other word for labels that contain characters from different scripts or from the (LDH) set.

Timothy Denton: Okay. But Avri, just - let's just think about the terms of (practicality). If we make some recommendation that isn't completely up-to-date with some IDN Working Group (and things); so we have at least said something clearly that can be expressed, you know, in plain English. IDN versions of these strings not be reserved. And people, I think, to some extent will understand that.

And, you know, if the IDN Group have other indifferent views, that's fine. But they can at least weigh in on this and at least we have been clear. It seems that, you know, the kind of formulation that you were talking about was not some things that could be, you know, easily expressed, you're not entirely clear what it might be, and we got both from Ram and from Cary Karp, these things not be reserved.

So I don't really know what...

Chuck Gomes: Well, there may be a way to deal with Avri's concern. But let me get a little more clarity from her.

Avri, and - is there a chance - do you think there's a chance that whatever this is would relate to these three strings -- nic, whois and

dubdubdub -- considering that they are not words, they're, you know, special names like whois or abbreviations like nic and dubdubdub.

Avri Doria: I guess - I want to say two things. One, I have absolutely no problem with not reserving these in IDN. In fact, I have no problem with not reserving them anywhere.

However, I do think that there could be a complication in IDN. So I'm arguing a complication that is actually countered to the position I just want to make sure we cover everything.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Timothy Denton: Well, the point...

Chuck Gomes: And that's where the compromise, I think, Tim, we could simply state that recommendation as just repeated by Avri, with the assumption that, you know, I guess - I mean, all of our recommendations are subject to things that are found out technically later on. So whether or not we need to state it or not, we could probably put a little qualifier on it if you think that's helpful Avri.

Timothy Denton: The - Ram Mohan said that (unintelligible) should not be reserved in foreign languages or scripts.

Don't try to translate and he said referring to the acronym.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And I'm just - and I understand that. That's why I suggested the simpler language.

But I'm just - Avri, do you think it's useful to put a qualifier in there assuming that no technical developments occur to the contrary or - is it even necessary at this point.

I don't want to spend a lot of time on this.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I brought up the issue because I think there's an issue. I wouldn't know what we need to add. I just want to make sure people were aware of the possible issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Mike): Chuck, this is (Mike).

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead (Mike).

(Mike): Just a comment not too much about the recommendations, just the wording in Section 2 regarding the role. If I can, this is just a proposed wording. I just want to sort of put it out there.

The rationale for the reservation of these names for use by the registry operators based upon long-standing and established use - well-established use of these strings by registry operators, both (GTLDs) and (CCTLD) in connection with normal registry operations.

Now the reason that I think that is important to note is when we get to the ICANN and the IANA names where I have significant reservations about why those reservations exist, I don't have those concerns in connection with these names because there is well - long - there's longstanding and well-established use of these strings by gTLD and

(CCTLD) operators. And I think that is important to note in this section for why we're reserving them.

Because whenever we take a string and pull it out of use, there needs to be a basis for why we are taking that action. And I don't think we really articulated that here. We just said they should just be used for the registry operators. I think we need to provide a little more depth.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. (Mike), can you again state - in other words, you're suggesting language that would be different than what's in it now for role, is that correct?

(Mike): That is correct...

Timothy Denton: I didn't have a problem with his formulation.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I want him to read it one more time.

(Mike): What I could do is I'll just send it to the list.

Chuck Gomes: No, but I do want you to read it one more time...

(Mike): Okay, sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...because I'd like to finalize this report on the call.

(Mike): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So - and not later. So if you would read it - I do want you to send it to the list...

(Mike): And I will read it...

Chuck Gomes: ...if you would read it one more time, please.

(Mike): The rationale for the reservation of these names for use by registry operators is based upon longstanding and well-established use of these strings by registry operators both gTLD and (CCTLD) in connection with normal registry operations.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Now, does anybody have any questions or comments or objections to that language?

Okay. If you'll send it, Tim will incorporate that. And you already said Tim, you're okay with that. It certainly sounds fine to me. But it's got to be our whole - total decision; so very good. Thank you (Mike) for that.

(Mike): Thank you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Now - so, is anybody - with regard to the IDN recommendations for this - is everyone okay with the language that they would not be reserved for IDN - any problems with that, any questions? And that's true with all levels, right? The top, second, third...

Timothy Denton: All levels.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay.

No problems with that?

Now, then the last suggestion Tim, for the report, in finalizing it, keep in mind, and I'll communicate this to everybody to affect all the reports, to the extent that we can word the recommendations in ways that they can be cut and pasted into the new gTLD report, it will greatly facilitate Liz's work and that was one of the comments that she basically said in the email she sent in the last week, I think it's when it was.

So what I will suggest, instead of saying remain reserved on the top ASCII, right?

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Actually state the reservation requirement and put must - use the word must so that's very clear in cases that - you know, obviously it's not our final decision.

The council will look at this and ultimately have to be approved by the board in any new (TLD) introduction but I think that would be appropriate to use the word must there.

Timothy Denton: So nic, whois and dubdubdub must remain reserved.

Chuck Gomes: Or must be - you just need to say must be reserved for registry operations, okay? And you can - okay?

And in fact, our language maybe should be a little bit more precise than the languages sometimes in existing agreements. And note in

some cases it's not a full reservation requirement. And so, to the extent that we can improve on that, that's good.

And follow that through on each one rather than saying as above and everything I think it will make it real easy and real clear and it won't be - less chances of confusion or people going up to the wrong thing above or something like that.

Timothy Denton: Okay. So then, that would now read nic, whois and dubdubdub must be reserved for registry operations in each case.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes. That's my understanding, correct.

Timothy Denton: Fine. That is now being done.

Chuck Gomes: And then similarly with the IDNs it would flow down the same way.

Any questions or comments on that?

Now, you'll all get a chance to see Tim once he makes these edits, he'll send it around to the list for everybody to take a look at and highlight, just the changes that were made.

So it will be real easy to scan the report and see if you catch anything and please respond on the list if you do because the sooner we get them fixed, the sooner we'll - the less edits we'll have to make after our meeting on Thursday. So if you'll help us on that; that will be great.

Any other questions or comments on this category?

Okay. Two down.

We're now on another one for Tim, which is the ICANN and the IANA-related names. And - okay, I have that in front of me. I hope some of the rest of you do as well.

And we will do a - hold on a second, I want to do something before I lose it. All right.

The next - in that category then, again, Tim, is it correct that we can focus just on the recommendations. Have any other changes been made on the entire report?

Timothy Denton: The only final change with the - finally, I hope settle the discussion of HTTP, HTTPS and HTML are now finally here in this section. And we've looked at them and decided to do, not change the status, not reserve them, and - that discussion...

Chuck Gomes: Now, where are those in the - where's that discussion in the report? Is that up in the background?

Timothy Denton: That is up in background, it's the last section in background before Number 2 role.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I see it. (I note on each). Okay, very good, okay.

Timothy Denton: So rightly or wrongly, that we finally got them there rather than registry names and just said, okay, it was phrased. And back and forth between the two documents and now they're finally here and I want to

keep them here and I want to basically do and make a - you know, we are going to do nothing about them.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And that's your recommendation.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now, does anybody not have Tim's latest version of the report in front of them? So there's no need for him to read that addition in the background section. Okay.

Unless - if somebody wants it read, please say so.

Now, because we're - his suggestion is that we don't make a - that we do not recommend that these additional strings be reserved. And so it won't come up in Section 3.

Does anyone have objection to that approach?

Okay with that?

Timothy Denton: So the question is we're not objecting to HTTP, HTTPS, and HTML not being reserved that's...

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Timothy Denton: ...that's your question.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct. So I didn't word it very well.

Timothy Denton: Sorry, just...

Chuck Gomes: That's all right. No, I don't...

Timothy Denton: Speak now, forever hold your piece, so.

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely. That's what I want you to do, so.

So, is - does anybody have a problem with that? In other words, we're not intending right now. If we approve this report, it will contain no recommendations on that, we will have the commentary on it if we look at it. But just leave it at that.

Okay, I don't hear any objections. So now let's go - now...

(Mike): Hey Chuck, can I just - not to be difficult; one question; we said our recommendations are in connection with reservations at the second level. But since Liz is looking for guidance regarding potential strings at the top level; do we - are we going to apply on whether they should be reserved at the top level or are we just at the...

Chuck Gomes: I think the position - that's interesting. Should that be considered differently? I really haven't reflected on that. That's a good point (Mike).

(Mike): Because if you recall during the consultation, we were...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Mike): ...worried about certain strings that may have technical implications, .EXE, and stuff like that.

It is possible at the top level - sort of - I'll defer to the experts; but I just want to know whether we are providing any guidance at the top level.

Chuck Gomes: That's a good question. Let me open that up for the group discussion. Anybody have any thoughts on that?

Timothy Denton: I would prefer that we not further complicate it by having a - this is in relation to HTTP and the other three.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Timothy Denton: Yeah, I would prefer to just close that discussion and get it off the books.

Chuck Gomes: We can do that. But let's not do it too quickly. Let's make sure - does anybody see any possible concerns of not reserving these three strings -- HTTP, HTTPS, and HTML at the top level.

Avri Doria: I have a question.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean, if we go on a notion that these things should be reserved at top level, it would be on the basis that anything that can be the extension on a file name could be problematic and I wouldn't think we'd want to go that file to create a new class of reserved names.

Now I know .EXE may stand out as so bad; if people live in a PC world, that would be problematic. But I don't think we'd want to; and so

therefore, I would think that we wouldn't want to make such a statement about (these three).

They don't know what the difference of these three than at .PDF, than a .XML, than a (.XGML), than any number of possibility that I can come up with.

Chuck Gomes: Good point.

Any other thoughts on this?

Okay, then...

Tamara Reznik: ...Tamara, I just want to let you know I have to hop off now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you Tamara.

Tamara Reznik: I'm out of the office since Friday so unfortunately I also haven't had a chance to look at what Caroline sent around.

Chuck Gomes: Please, if you can send us anything, an email today on that, that will be helpful because we're going to - does that mean we're not going to have anybody from that working group on this call because...

Tamara Reznik: Yeah, we may not if Caroline and (Mike) aren't here. I haven't seen anything from (Mike). Either I know that he's been out of the office and he returns tomorrow.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, let me tell you how we're going to proceed on that.

Tamara Reznik: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We're going to have to - as a working group today make some decisions and it's probably going to be more work. It's going to be the recommendation...

Tamara Reznik: Yeah, I mean - I think that we all basically agreed on Section A, on the language that was - unless you made any drastic changes.

Chuck Gomes: Let's see, I've got that - hold on, I've got that one here. Let me grab it real quick if you've got just a couple of minutes because it would really be nice to - here we go...

Okay, so on Section A...

Tamara Reznik: I'm already late, so I have like two minutes...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. So - but there were three alternatives on Section A. So what did you agree on?

Tamara Reznik: I think we just agreed to include those.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that's what you meant.

Okay and then, jumping to Section B on registry specific names, again, there were three alternatives - that that one still kind of - not done in terms of even the alternatives?

Tamara Reznik: Yeah, we have not come to further agreement.

Chuck Gomes: Okay...

Tamara Reznik: I think part of it might just be that both (Mike) and I were out at the office.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. And...

Tamara Reznik: And then on Section C, you know, as you know, I think that Caroline seems to have captured things well.

I do think that - the suggestions A through D should be made at the contractual - during the contractual period...

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Tamara Reznik: ...with sponsor (TLDs). I think those things should be required. And, you know, perhaps we should be recommending that, you know, another group we formed to deal with these issues.

Chuck Gomes: To deal with what issues?

Tamara Reznik: To deal with premium names further.

I know that you felt like someone just went beyond the scope of our working group and if that's, you know, the direction that we go then I think that we should recommend it and other working group look at it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay well - okay, that's helpful input. And...

Tamara Reznik: But I do think that at the minimum, we still recommend that contractually at the time of, you know, that - sponsor (TLD) contract is proposed that they include, you know, the proposed procedure for opposing reserved names and premium names...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, okay, good.

Tamara Reznik: Although...

Chuck Gomes: All right, that's helpful. And please watch - look at the transcript or read the - or listen to the MP3 when it's up for this meeting because we're going to go ahead as a working group and try and come to some conclusion on each one of those.

Like I said, it may just be more work if that's as clean as way to go...

Tamara Reznik: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...we're done at a point that - where we just don't have time to consider and continue to debate the things, so.

Tamara Reznik: Yeah. I mean, I just think, you know, I mean, one reason there should be reason given as to why names are being reserved because that goes towards the - are these trademark terms that are being reserved or are they - you know, why are these names...

Chuck Gomes: The trademark issues are going to be handled separately, I think; but - and that's not the focus of this group because there's a separate group working on that; but...

Tamara Reznik: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...but - so I don't think that's certainly not our task in doing it in this group.

Tamara Reznik: But I think our task does include things like making the recommendation that at the time to contract it being negotiated and at the time that they're proposing what names are reserved as premium names, that they explain why those things are being reserved for the community.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Anything else before you jump off?

Tamara Reznik: That's all.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Tamara Reznik: Okay, thank you so much.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Bye.

(Mike): Chuck, this is (Mike).

Based upon Avri's comments and as I think she articulated the potential dangerous precedent for extension, I think I will, if you will, withdraw my previous comments and go with, if you will, Tim's thing about trying to sign this off.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, in other words - by the way, I still think it's - I'm very happy that you raised that question, because it's better that we have discussed it at least than to have a, you know, not discuss this. So that's okay.

And so, you're comfortable with not putting anything in there about these three strings, the HT - et cetera, strings that - with regard to recommendations.

(Mike): Yeah. I agree with the recommendations with the second level. But the - with regard to top level, I think, you know, that's something I think could just - if you'll be worked out at a later date in connection with the new RFP; but as I said, I agree with Avri and Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Anybody object to that approach?

(Mike), were you okay with the roll on this one?

(Mike): Let me see.

Chuck Gomes: Speak now or forever hold your piece.

(Mike): Let me see nic, who - you want to move on...

Timothy Denton: Which one are we back on now?

Chuck Gomes: ICANN and IANA.

Timothy Denton: That's what I thought.

(Mike): Okay. We haven't gotten to the recommendations where I have.

Chuck Gomes: No, no, but you're okay.

I thought, since you brought up role and the other one that you might have a - you're okay with role, okay.

I'm supposed cover that on a previous meeting but it's an important part of our task as a working group, so.

(Mike): Well, as I said, I do have an objection to the role because - and it goes more towards the legal basis. Unlike the nic, dubdubdub, and who is where there is long established precedent within the community, the IANA and ICANN appear to - for lack of a better term just, you know, been taken out of thin air particularly when you look at some of the other...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. But let's be clear on what I'm asking. What I'm asking...

(Mike): Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...is the statement of role in the report okay the way it says. I'm not asking you...

(Mike): If I agree with it.

Chuck Gomes: ...as whether you agree with it. Is that an accurate reflection of what we believe the role is and the way it's functioned in the past?

(Mike): Based upon representations made by ICANN staff, I would agree with that role.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, very good. Let's jump - by the way welcome Jon Nevett, I see you've joined. You probably joined quite a while ago; but I...

Jon Nevett: Yeah, I'm the one who interrupt. But thanks Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

It's okay, by the way, people to interrupt when you jump in. It's probably better people know than not. And I understand the awkwardness; but it's probably just a good thing to let us know. But I'll try to periodically look at my joined conference report here so I can save you from that awkwardness.

Now, the - okay, so now that the straw recommendations table for ICANN and IANA name; the first one - and by the way Tim, a general editing thing on these reports; they of course won't be straw recommendations on any of the reports in the versions that we've finalized in the next couple of days...

Timothy Denton: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...recommendations, you understand that.

Timothy Denton: (Done).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

The - now we have - then for the Top 10, the recommendation is that ICANN and IANA reserved names should continue to be reserved, pending a decision of the GNSO to vary the status.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I think that there are some debate in that regard. So let's open - this is for ASCII, okay?

ASCII top level is where we're at; let's open the discussion and be as free as you can, okay? That will certainly help us.

Man: I guess I'll go and keeping to this brief as possible; ICANN has provided no evidence of confusion regarding use of this string in the legacy gTLD. They provided no documentation on why they need to continue to be reserved.

The reservation of these names constitute - generous protection by ICANN which denies trademark owners would have trademarks in these strings, the use of that string in the domain name system, and it's, you know, it's just now smart.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody...

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri, can I comment.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: This might be even briefer. I think that while the discussion is open on whether it's appropriate or not, it shouldn't be, I guess, it should be more work required.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...no, until more work, you know.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

Man: No, they should not be reserved?

Chuck Gomes: No, I think what - let me take a stab at it, Avri, but you just jump in if I get it wrong. I think what Avri is suggesting is, is that the recommendation here; instead of saying that they should continue to be reserved is we should recommend more work on this one.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: I got it, see.

All right.

And that's not a - by the way, you're going to see that that's kind of my approach today rather than having a lot of debate. If we're not quite sure, I think it's probably better to go - do exactly what Avri is recommending and that's not bad, people.

It was expected in - when the statement of work was drafted and when the council approved it, that there would be cases that required additional work.

Now, this may be one that possibly could be worth enough in the 30-day period, if the council extends our time to work that out.

So, is there anybody that's opposed to Avri's suggestion on this one?

Timothy Denton: Well, all I can say is that I've, you know, received clear indication that I - that from ICANN staff that they would prefer to keep this reserved and that I don't think that this is particularly a useful expenditure of our time to dispute it; but that's...

Chuck Gomes: And you've documented ICANN's position in the report.

Timothy Denton: I have.

Chuck Gomes: And so, that's good.

If nobody is opposed to recommending a follow-on work on this, then I think - unless - and let me ask at a different way; are there people that strongly support Tim's straw recommendation here because if there's a...

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...significant portion of the group that really support that, then we could approach it with a minority statement in here instead of this.

So to be fair, I should open it up. Are there those of you who strongly support Tim's recommendation over recommending more work?

Timothy Denton: So don't speak at once.

Chuck Gomes: Tim, you didn't do your politics here, and draw them up support.

Timothy Denton: Well, it does have ICANN support that's pretty good.

Chuck Gomes: That's pretty good. Yeah well, have you - and these being paid by ICANN. So that's probably is one thing to do.

Timothy Denton: Yes, I have my client support, which is doing what I'm concerned with in this regard.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Of course, I was being fictitious on that, so.

(Mike): And Chuck, let me answer this question, and in an effort to sort of, if you will, close the book on this one and sort of move forward, would it be possible in - if you will, as Avri said, potentially recommending more work, if in fact I could just provide, if you will, a brief summary of some of the legal concerns that I have previously raised to - if you will, just append that to this so that the council is at least aware of some of the legal considerations.

Because right now, the representations by ICANN staff are the only ones that are included in this report and it might potentially be, if you will, one-sided.

Chuck Gomes: I think that will be very good and it fits right in to what I was going to - any time we make recommendations for more work, we should at least provide some guidelines of what the work should entail.

And so, I think that fits in that category. And if you could provide that to Tim so it can be included. And I think it should be included in this section after the table with regard to - and it either can be done with an asterisk, with asterisk below or something, and your commentary and any suggestions for what the follow-on work would be; would be very helpful for the council when we have to decide, you know, whether to proceed with further work on that.

(Mike): And that's exactly what I'm thinking. I mean, part of what I had alluded to with some of my previous correspondents to the list is that ICANN, I think, should at least reach out to some of these organizations and ask them, do they in fact want this reservation to be - continued to be, if you will, maintain - have they had any...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Mike): ...if you will, cited instances of confusion with the legacy gTLD so...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Mike): ...that's what I would be coming from.

Chuck Gomes: Now, you need to understand, Tim have the deadline of finishing this report by tomorrow; where did I say, close of business or midday on that; but if you could get it...

Timothy Denton: Midday.

My concern of course is that we just - this thing doesn't turn into the pillaged document carrying on his (Jihad) with ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it needs to be brief but it needs to be clear too.

(Mike): Well, I put it this way. I would sort of object to a (Jihad) with ICANN. All I want ICANN to do is follow its by-laws and not agree to generous protection. I don't consider that (Jihad).

Chuck Gomes: Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I just - yeah, I don't because I had mentioned that - work, I didn't get into reasons why I would - that's needed in our work. It isn't only, you know, my - I look at these things and see them as falling into the same category as many things else with. The comment period and objections made during the comment period could be adequate.

So if it is (IRTS) that wants to apply for job (IRTS), it goes through normal. If it's somebody else and (IRTS) is wait a second, you can't do that for the comment period is adequate and that they don't need special protection.

Chuck Gomes: So Avri...

Avri Doria: So I would have a different - in other words, you know, I'm saying they need more work...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...but I have a completely different set of reasons. And I don't believe that I don't know whether someone wants to accuse (Mike) of (Jihad). I certainly don't have a (Jihad).

Timothy Denton: Okay, so...

Chuck Gomes: Hold on a second Tim.

Avri, would you document your issues there as well...

Avri Doria: Sure, I can send you a paragraph...

Chuck Gomes: ...and send them to Tim by as early - you know, before midday tomorrow.

Avri Doria: Of course.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

Timothy Denton: Well...

Chuck Gomes: Now Tim, jump in.

Timothy Denton: All right.

So, what are we now left with recommendations; recommendations that more work needs to be done on this...

Chuck Gomes: We'll go through each one of the rows on the recommendations but let's make sure that we understand - for top level ASCII, more work is being recommended and there's going to be some comments below the table that we'll talk about the issues that need to be considered.

Timothy Denton: So that's just - that is the sum of the recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: For the first one, yes.

Now that may flow down but let's take those one at a time, okay?

Timothy Denton: Okay.

So, that's more recommend - so we're not letting this up for - so to vary the status.

Okay - so you just want more work without...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah (unintelligible), you know, decide to - the council could decide to change the status, I don't think we're limiting that in any way.

Timothy Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Or just saying for right now the recommendation is this one needs similar work.

Timothy Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And there are some discussion below that gives at least a couple arguments as to why more work is needed and what might be considered.

Timothy Denton: And that will be as a consultation with expert?

Chuck Gomes: We don't necessarily have to say that. In fact, I think it's going to be hard for us to get down to that level of detail in the short time that we have.

It would be ideal to give us much direction as possible for the additional work, I just don't think we have time, nor do we have time in this meeting.

Okay? Is that clear on the first one, Tim?

Timothy Denton: More work is recommended.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct.

And please see below for some discussion of that work or what that work could entail.

I'll help you individually if I can, in terms - you can bounce your wording off of me if you like before we finalize and so forth. And then ultimately then, all of these modifications to the recommendations are going to be sent to the full list so - in highlighted form in the report so that everybody has a chance to look at them, okay?

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now, IDN - the - you're recommending no more work with except of example.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now, and - so let me just look - so, it's for - it's very similar then to the recommendation that we did for dubdubdub and nic except for example, which is consistent with our expert consultation - now, what work would you be recommending - what additional work would we recommending for this, for example?

Timothy Denton: Maybe suggested that this word might benefit from being reserved in (ace) encoding was what I got out of the...

Chuck Gomes: So if we're recommending; what would be - I mean, do we want to just - I mean, should we just recommend that - the word example, the reserved and IDN versions and that the Unicode versions as well?

Timothy Denton: The - example was capable of being used and translated form in many languages. What that translates to technologically and techno-speak I don't know but that's what we got out of our advice.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Well, I think it's true of most words that they could be translated or transliterated and so forth into scripts in IDN.

So I think our thing here - if we - now, just recommending more work - I mean, we could recommend something like that the whether or not the Unicode versions could be - should be reserved in addition to the ASCII version example, we would defer to the IDN Working Group, I

mean, that would be - I - if we're going to recommend more work, who's going to do that work? I don't think it's something that this group necessarily would be able to do.

Timothy Denton: I quite agree. So what would you like it to say.

Chuck Gomes: Well, and by the way, this is open to everybody to jump in; but just off the top of my head; the first time I thought of is we could say that we recommend that - consider that the IDN Working Group be consulted with regard to whether it would be a good idea to reserve the IDN versions of the word example at the top level.

Timothy Denton: We recommend that the IDN Working Group - say it again - we recommend that the IDN Working Group...

Chuck Gomes: Be consulted with regard to whether or not the term "example" should be reserved in IDN or Unicode. I guess we should use the standard terminology in corresponding Unicode versions of the new code, right...

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...of the term "example." Whatever. You can clean up the language, you know, make that perfect here.

Timothy Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, does anybody oppose to that approach? Is - anybody have an alternative approach that you would suggest there?

Avri Doria: I don't understand it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me see if I can...

Avri Doria: And maybe I'm the only one.

Chuck Gomes: The - in our - you recall on our consultation that Cary and Ram, basically, pointed out that all the other names in this - in the IANA and ICANN category are basically abbreviations, acronyms, et cetera.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So, you start translating or even transliterating those. You get into a huge...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...that issue. I don't understand the recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Man: So, what would you - what language would you prefer...

Chuck Gomes: So, they made one exception. Okay? You understand that. The word "example."

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, the word "example," not a translation of example. So, not "dugma" in Hebrew.

Chuck Gomes: Is - does that mean, example?

Avri Doria: Exactly. Yeah. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: So, it would be that.

Avri Doria: So, it would be - we would allow "dugma" in Hebrew script.

Chuck Gomes: No.

Man: We would recommend to the Working Group that they examine this question.

Avri Doria: Okay. Now I understand. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay? Whether or not "dugma" should be reserved as well as in other scripts, right? Does that make sense?

I'm sorry about that.

Avri Doria: Okay, I understood until you said, as well as in other scripts.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, in other words - and...

Avri Doria: In other words, the translation of "dugma" into some other language in its appropriate script.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, cool. I'm...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. Sorry, I didn't make...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Right now, it reads, in the case of "example," we recommend the IDN Working Group to be consulted with regard to whether the term "example" be reserved in corresponding versions of Unicode.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay? Avri, does that make sense?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I understand now. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

All right. Now, I think we've covered all of the ASCII ones, right, Tim?

Timothy Denton: We had - no, we haven't. We did - we haven't gone down at second level and third. I guess it's the same as more work as recommended for each of the...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I believe so. Avri and Mike, isn't that true?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): I would agree.

Chuck Gomes: And, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And then, I think you have the same thing for IDN at the second and third level. Is that a correct assumption on my part or conclusion?

Man: At the second level, the IDN recommendation is the same as for the top. As to the third level, we had same as for top level as appropriate to the registry model.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right, which basic - and you may want to say, for registries that register names at the third level rather than saying, as appropriate. Okay? Is that - it's more specific. So, the same thing in our minds, but to a new reader, it would be less clear. That'd be more clear.

Man: For registries that register at the third level.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Any other questions on this or comments? Anybody in agreement with the recommendations as they've been drafted? Again, Tim, will...

((Crosstalk))

(Mike Rodenbaugh): I wish to say that I think this is a - I don't think - I do not think that further work of any kind is going to change ICANN's view on this or IANA's view on this, and I think it's a needless sight, which is not going to go anywhere, and that's what I have to say about it.

((Crosstalk))

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Excuse me, and, Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Hold on a second.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Let me get on the queue, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm not going to let anybody get in the queue...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): No.

Chuck Gomes: ...on this...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Excuse me, Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Chuck, Chuck, as chair...

((Crosstalk))

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: We don't have time.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Chuck, you cannot let someone who's supposed to be working to support this group make a position that is deferring to ICANN's statement on the record that totally compromises the integrity of this process. Sorry, unacceptable, Chuck. Unacceptable.

Chuck Gomes: Mike, Mike, I'm not deferring to anything. I'm just saying, let's...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): We have the last word.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm not worried about the last word. Obviously, ICANN board will ultimately decide what they want to do. But we're putting some - forward some recommendations as a Working Group.

Tim, as a member of the group, I don't care if he disagrees with what the Working Group wants to do, ultimately. I do want his input, though, and...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Is it his input or ICANN's input? Because clearly, he said, his client is ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): That's what he said on the record. That's not my word. They're his words.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Timothy Denton: (Mike), I will (await) your comments and I will put them safely and represent a view of the group.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. The - so, again, guys, we have a bunch more to cover, and so, let's be constructive here and use our time wisely because we're already behind schedule on covering all of the things we need to cover. Okay? I think we know we have - and by the way, Tim.

Timothy Denton: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: You're - I don't have any - although, let's see, as a consultant to the group, I guess that wouldn't really work, would it? To allow you to write on minority opinion.

Timothy Denton: No, I'm not - no, it's fine. The groups will prevail, and that's the only point to represent it safely.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Very good.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: All right. Now, let's go to other names reserved at the second level. And we don't - and I - we don't have anybody from that Working Group. Caroline was on - excuse me, Tamara was on earlier. Caroline is biking around somewhere.

And so, we're going to get to do this work for them. If you would find that report, which I'm trying to do right now - here we go. All right, so, now there are three categories here. We're probably going to make this one fairly simple unless people object.

The first category of names for other names at the second level is the gTLD strings. Okay? Aero, arpa, et cetera. Now, this particular one, obviously, is not applicable at the top level.

So, it's real easy to fill in the table at the top level. And by the way, this is a report that we'll need to be at least in Category A. It will need to be put on the table for that, Tim. But I don't think that'll be too hard for the first one.

And on - this one, the recommendation, they gave us three alternatives. Okay? And this is the one I think that Tamara said that they - that they were united in giving us three alternatives. Obviously, they didn't agree on one.

Man: Excuse me, Chuck. I hope I'm looking at the right one. Is this the version of the 5th of March 2007?

Chuck Gomes: Well, it says, the meeting on the 13th, which is obviously wrong. But the title of the report says, "Summary Report on Other Names Reserved at Second Level Meeting," 13th March 2007.

Man: Okay. I just got...

Chuck Gomes: The one that Caroline sent. I don't know if it was earlier today or yesterday.

Man: I'll get it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And the recommendations are: the first one was, the provision be retained in order to avoid consumer confusion. The second one is, the reservation requirement is overly restrictive and seems to create an unfair advantage for some existing registries over new registries, thus, the reservation requirement should be removed.

The third one is, the reservation requirement should be retained unless the two registries and question come to agreement between themselves to release the name.

The subgroup recommends that the reservation requirement be removed since there is unequal treatment amongst registries that regards the restriction requirement.

Now, that's a little bit confusing to me because I - if they reached consensus on that recommendation, I don't know. If you look at the feedback and there's a little bit more at it from a few registries, there's a mix from registries in terms of their opinion on this one. So, even registries aren't in agreement on this one.

My inclination on this one but I'm throwing this out to the group, I'm trying to keep this thing moving without taking too much control. So, don't let me go beyond what I should go.

But my inclination on this one is that, this one probably needs more work. But does anybody feel differently about this category? Remember, they've got three categories within that report.

Nobody disagrees with that. Does anybody favor one of these alternatives over the others?

Man: We're on Number 3?

Chuck Gomes: We're - what do you mean by, Number...

Man: Well, I'm just - I'm reading...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Their report is the divided into Sections A...

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...B and C. A is gTLD string.

Man: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? And we're in Section 3 of A, which is straw recommendation.

Man: What do you think, Chuck? I mean, what's your opinion...

Chuck Gomes: I just told you what I think. I think we need to probably - this one is going to need a little more work. They, you know, they obviously put three alternatives, not one. So, they even had trouble I think defining. And when you look at the feedback they got from registries, including VeriSign...

Man: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...okay? It was mixed, you know, .biz and VeriSign, you know, NewStar and VeriSign both had - we think that - well, Veri - actually, the VeriSign view, when I check with the business unit, they said, well, for a sponsor, it's a little different category than for for sponsor. We felt like for our sponsor, the requirement could go away, but for sponsored, it might still have some value there.

And if you look at some of the sponsored people who responded, you know, they did tend to want to keep the requirement. So - but there's nothing conclusive in what was found.

That's why I was saying that my feeling is that, probably, at this point, because we have to finalize this thing as to recommend more work on this particular category.

Man: Thanks. That was helpful, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And does anybody recommend a different approach?

Okay, Tim, I'm going to need your help on communicating with them. And I don't - unfortunately, I don't think we can wait for them to get this finalized in the short timeframe we have.

Caroline is on the road on her bike all this week. Michael is not coming back from vacation until tomorrow. And Tamara, it sounds like she was pretty busy, too.

Timothy Denton: Well, I'm available to help. I just wanted to say that, as far as (unintelligible) files gone through everything and all I can find is a version of it called, 7th March 2007, so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...what I can find, too.

Timothy Denton: Oh, really?

Avri Doria: Yes, I didn't...

Timothy Denton: Oh...

Avri Doria: ...find the...

Chuck Gomes: Caroline not - hold on a second. Bear with me, folks. I will - I may need to send it. She may - I thought I sent it this morning.

Timothy Denton: Yeah, you sent it this morning because I'm looking at second level for 13th March submission. It came under your...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay. I was looking for Caroline...

Timothy Denton: Yeah. No, no, Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. Thanks for raising that, Tim and Avri, both.

That's right. She didn't send it to the whole Working Group. So, I responded to them with some comments and told them, I was going to send it to the group.

And then, I did that with some - with a qualifying statement that I don't even think they're in agreement on everything here. It was helpful that Tamara was able to give us some input earlier on this call.

But - so, I did send it, Tim, so...

Timothy Denton: I got it now. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Sorry about that.

Okay.

Timothy Denton: So, what we do - sorry, but just to be - this homework is going to fall to me. What would you like me to do in relation to that, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. In - the straw recommendations for Section A.

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: They need to be putting the table format.

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: For the top level, both ASCII and IDN, the recommendations, it's going to be not applicable.

Timothy Denton: Sorry, for top - say that again.

Chuck Gomes: For top level...

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...ASCII and IDN...

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...it's NA.

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Obviously, nobody can have those names.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? They're already taken...

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...at the top level.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Now, for the second level and the third level for registries that - well, actually because this one is - this category is specifically at the second level, so I think that third level - and correct me if somebody thinks my reasoning is wrong here, at the third level, I think it's NA as well because that's being covered, and we may want to say this: it's

being covered by the work - our little subgroup that's working on third level reservations.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: But I would state that, specifically.

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Now, so really, all you have, then, on this one, Tim, is at the second level...

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...for ASCII...

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...we're recommending more work...

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...and for the IDN version, we will recommend more work as well, but we should qualify it with some of the language that we had for the ICANN, IANA names and www names, right? Because if it's decided to - I mean, the principle of - if for abbreviations and acronyms, it obviously doesn't work. I think we're pretty clear on that.

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Any terms that are reserved that are actually not abbreviations or acronym, then I think we would need some input from the IDN Working Group.

Timothy Denton: In terms of return on acronyms, we need advice.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think so.

Timothy Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense to everybody? This report is coming from all of us.

Okay. All right. Now, going on, then, to the second category, which is Registry Specific Names. This is the one where they really didn't even reach agreement on any - even the alternative recommendations, apparently.

So, you know, this one, I - this one, Tim, the table format, I don't think works. Okay? So don't worry about the table in this one.

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: A general recommendation for IDN is needed. Again, there does need to be similar language I think with regard to IDN and consulting with the IDN Working Group. And...

Timothy Denton: At the ASCII, what would you prefer propose?

Chuck Gomes: More work.

Timothy Denton: Okay, ASCII is more work. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I don't think we can go anywhere else. I mean, even the work - even the subgroup wasn't able to come to agreement here.

Timothy Denton: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So, I think this is clearly more work. And with regard to guidance for more work, maybe the simplest thing to do is to refer it - this can apply to Section A, above 2.

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: They can refer to the subgroup's report for guidance on that regard.

Timothy Denton: Who can? I'm sorry. Who can...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. After the - any table that we have or we recommend more work...

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...we should provide some guidance as to what that work might entail.

Timothy Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: What it needs to discuss or whatever. What I'm suggesting in both this case and the one we just finished, A - Category A, that for guidance with regard to additional work, please refer to the report by the subgroup. That'll be attached as part of our...

Timothy Denton: Okay. Yeah. All right. Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Now, any problems with that direction?

Okay. Going to Category C, Other Names Reserved at the Second Level. Now, I got mixed messages from Tamara when she talked in this. She seemed to be - and from their report, it looked like they had a pretty solid recommendation for this category.

And yet, she seemed to be going a little different direction, and so I'm not sure. But if you have that, please look at that, and if anybody wants me to read it, it's a few - it's like three paragraphs or something.

But it looked like there's a pretty solid recommendation there. They recommended no further work. They talked about, you know, one size doesn't fit all.

They talked about - they gave a - they say the presented approach to these names could include any - the first step would be, any proposed procedure for opposing the reserved names.

For example, they used .mobi string in an application process for trademark holders, which is administered by WIPO. So, that needs to be made into a sentence, I guess.

But when - now, there's one applicant is applying for a new gTLD, they should, you know, propose a procedure for reserving names like this. There should be an overview as to why the various scripts of names are being reserved.

That was what I think Tamara was suggesting that, you know, some explanation as to why they want to reserve those that in the outer time limit as to how long the timing will be reserved should be communicated into the applicant's proposal. And allocation plan should be in there.

What their - so, I think what they're recommending, and correct me if somebody reads it differently, is that when a new TLD presents a proposal and application to ICANN for that new TLD, they should identify any names they want to reserve for their use in their business model.

They should provide an overview why they want to do that and outer time limit and maybe not to exceed, I don't know when you're done or not, but - and not to exceed time limit as to how long they will be reserved until they will be allocated, and then how they plan to allocate them as what they're recommending. And they, then, go on in the next paragraph to talk about there should be some flexibility and so forth.

And it says, future (unintelligible) TLD should be (unintelligible) to suggest reserved name. Now, this doesn't seem like a bad recommendation to me, but let's throw open the discussion.

Anybody see any problems with this? Another approach we could take, and I'm not advocating one way or another. It's just that this particular category is out of scope, and we don't need to make any recommendations.

Man: Chuck, that's what I've articulated in the past. So, I would support that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: But no need for recommendations in relation to category (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, but you don't capture that yet. Let's discuss it as a Working Group, okay?

Man: That's fine.

Chuck Gomes: What others think on this?

Avri Doria: I probably go along with that. This is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I'm sorry...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I would probably go along with that.

Chuck Gomes: With what Mike said?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I would tend to disagree with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And give us a little background (on why).

Greg Shatan: Well I think that these two functions at least as de facto reserve names need to be dealt with as such.

Chuck Gomes: And why is that?

Greg Shatan: Well, I mean - I think that - why do they function as de facto reserve names or why should they be dealt with if they are functioning as reserve names? I think if they are functioning as reserve names they're in scope.

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Greg Shatan: And the reason they're functioning as reserve names is that they could be off limits for so long as to be functionally reserve names for instance .Mobi has, you know, well over 2000 premium names they so far over released fewer than 10. I'm going to be dead and my children's children will be dead before last ones are released if they go with that pace, so.

Chuck Gomes: And do you think that they have an obligation to release them and their business model as they propose?

Greg Shatan: Well, I think that if they are becoming reserved names and then if they don't necessarily much where they didn't say have an obligation to release them but if they aren't going to release them at all, then they need to be dealt with it as reserved names and therefore there was (in scope).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I think they did present in their proposal that was ultimately approved and have public comment on this particular approach. You think that more than that is needed?

Greg Shatan: Well I haven't read their approach. I'm not sure what they say they are going to - how they say they are going to allocate them over what period of time and how they're going to ultimately exhaust the list.

Chuck Gomes: But you, as a community member, were provided opportunity to comment on the application that they submitted for their gTLD and before anything was ever finalized with ICANN, you know, public comments were taken and so forth so, are you suggesting that more is needed than that?

Greg Shatan: Well, actually yes. I mean when you look specifically - one of the big problems of what was put out for public comment or - really what wasn't, is that there was no list of premium names that was put out during the comment period.

The premium names list was not out until well after the launch - the initial launch as a matter of fact. And there was no sense of whether they were going to be 5500 or 2500 names that we're going to be put into that category.

So I think that was in terms of reviewing comment, that was a missing link in that particular issue.

Man: Chuck this...

Avri Doria: Can I comment?

Chuck Gomes: I heard - who is that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Avri could go and then Palage.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Avri and then Mike

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah.

I'm not arguing that names like this premium names might not be a category but the GNSO shouldn't discuss or that the new gTLD shouldn't discuss arguing that the reserve name category is not the appropriate category for discussing them that it's, you know, it's a wrench and hammer situation that they are not reserved name by any of the definition that I've seen of reserved names, they aren't yet another type of entity.

Now I'm certainly not against that issue of premium name set aside to use a word other than reserve by a registry isn't a viable or reasonable topic, I just don't think it's a reserve name topic.

Chuck Gomes: And in fact - sorry Mike, I'll get to you in a second, but in fact the - this particular reserved names are not in the reserved names appendices. And our statement of work definitely refers to those reserved names and appendices.

Okay, Mike.

Michael Palage: Thank you.

And again, I think Avri articulated my concerns, if you will, the wrench and hammer scenario.

That being said I do think that comments of Greg do deserve - you know, are important to take into consideration because the actual list and the mechanisms to provide trademark protection to someone who might have found themselves go in that list, if you were disclose after the execution of the contract.

So and Greg this is something I discussed with Tamara as well; but with regard to a registry that would provide such a service as this which I think they do they have the rights to do. If in fact they do do it, I do think there needs to safeguards to protect the rights of others.

So, again, it is possible that some of the protections and disclosures that you're looking for may in fact be in another group either they're protecting the rights of others or in other group that still has some work to be done.

So, I do agree with your points from - if you will an open and transparency and accountability standpoint but again, I go back to

Avri's comments that I think that your specific concerns are outside the narrow focus of this group.

Chuck Gomes: And I guess that's where I'm struggling a little bit Greg. If your concern is rights of others with regard to whatever names they are, that particular issue is covered by other things besides reserved names. It doesn't matter whether they are reserved names or not, there are other provisions in registry agreements to deal with the rights of others and of course the pro working group is working on that with regard to this in a - if for new TLDs and so forth.

So, whether or not a registry reserves names or not, doesn't seem like that is a meaningful issue with regard to for example IP protection. They would still come under - reserved names would still be dealt with which regard to any mechanisms that are in place like UDRP for intellectual property rights as it is.

So, I guess that's - my questions probably weren't really clear so why I was wondering why you thought that that needed to happen because I think those, the final concerns that I think you have is that intellectual property for example are dealt with what the other mechanisms whether they're reserved names or not.

Man: Well, I think there are two different types of concern that I have here. Concern 1 is around how these names are allocated and I think that is a protecting rights of others issue.

I think the issue of whether these names are for all intents and purposes taken out of commission and thus reserved name is not a

protecting rights of others issue but is an - instead an issue of allowing a reserved names class to be created...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: ...within this other somewhat nebulous framework.

Let me make a suggestion which perhaps is that this - rather than this that this debate be used to decide whether or not this part of the (sects) of this report gets deleted that this debate be encapsulated in a - introduction to this section of the report.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me make a different suggestion and I think it's clear to me that this particular category needs some more work. And so I think our recommendation at this point and Tim, we need to - I think we need to include what's in there right now.

Greg, if you want to provide him some text that he can add as well - a different, you know, then, I think that's okay but I think that we're at a point now where this obviously is going to need more work.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I would certainly do that.

Chuck Gomes: So there the text that is provided in the report now Tim...

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...should be left there but I would precede it with a clear recommendation that more work is needed some discussion from the subgroup report is provided below and where you can just refer to the

report itself or discussion on this topic and you can also if Greg wants to submit a statement include what his concerns are and that can be included as well but Greg he needs that by no later than noon Eastern Time tomorrow.

Greg Shatan: Okay, just Mike, provide a sentence or two that...

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: That's all I really - in spite of whatever else has been said I think it's just the concern that...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: If the - if we agree that these aren't reserved names and they need to be there needs to be a process by which they actually do circulate.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

So now we've got - so Tim are you okay on that one, again you don't need that table format for this one, it doesn't really fit. And we really can't talk about IDNs until we really know what we're doing at all in that.

Timothy Denton: Yeah, you know, I've done my notes here and we'll see with this (unintelligible) something can be piece together but that, you know, got them here.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Okay, now let's move on in our agenda and let me pull my - get my time (down here) and I just need to open up my window here.

Okay, now let me find agenda that I have back with all of these reports.

Okay, there we go. All right, now let's see that was other names. Now we come to controversial name.

Woman: Controversial, controversial, controversial.

Man: So that would be easy.

Chuck Gomes: And I think I have what's looking like a very good report people but let's jump over to the recommendations I got bunch of client pages...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I assumed I'm the one speaking for this. Do we want to jump on the bracket at paragraph for now in (1.1).

Chuck Gomes: And - well, I wanted to jump straight to the recommendation.

Avri Doria: Okay, fine yeah. So that means we jump high. The bracket at paragraph of what we do (or do not close some gap)...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...which is fine for us to resolve that in a later time.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we should talk about that today but let's jump right to the recommendation, okay?

Avri Doria: Okay, so I don't know if people have it in front of them, I can read it. We did come to an agreement between the two languages as a group had encouraged them to do. I can read that if people don't have it, should I read it (at somebody tells with)...

Chuck Gomes: It's pretty lengthy so unless somebody specifically request that I would say no.

Avri Doria: I can give perhaps the quick discussion of it.

Chuck Gomes: That would be great.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Number 1 proposal that there is a category called controversial name for use that we've given a definition of controversial name which is to qualify as a TLD under then (prevent) criteria, it's not (mainly) of the other categories and it's disputed for reasons other than reasons that fall under of the category or is that the legal rights of others (reason).

Okay, so we propose the category that there is - in the event that there is a dispute but these things go into what's being called this (unintelligible) we're actually recommending further that to be an external recommend -- as external review process.

Now, dispute is by either one of the supporting organizations or it's by form of statement of one of the advisory committees. Any one of the

advisory committees, not getting specific about it but are of course then included GAC.

That the dispute process should be at a limited time and then it should be a predefined external process and as such we if - it doesn't say if you know, perhaps should but it should be a proper ICANN process that transparent, that's open that subjective and all those, you know, appropriate words that of course any registering is subject to international law and being so far as there maybe an international law process that makes a registry of a different nationality subject to some national law that they're subject to that but that sort of external to the ICANN process.

It recommends that more work needs to be done in regard to that dispute resolution process and that's appointing (to) and yet to be determine if dispute resolution process that moving out, minimizing the ability for that process to be abused, for that process to become infinite in time et cetera and that's pretty much the recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, questions.

Man: I just - having just looked at this, there's a lot to digest to in that (2.a) and (2.b), you know, I just look at some of the treaties, you know, regarding the extraterritorial effect of national laws and stuff like that. I just have a lot of concern with how this potentially could be abused for lack of a better term?

Chuck Gomes: I noticed three where they do say that that particular issue...

Man: Yeah, you know, know yeah I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I understand that and I guess, you know, these controversial names though unfortunately become, you know, this that somehow become anything involving public policy which, you know, we - I think we've seen that in the most recent round...

Woman: Well, yeah.

Man: ...that that - I mean that's my concern there that controversial names where you if you wanted to take a dirty word or, you know, hate not to be something like that, you know, I just see controversial as being this event horizon to the public policy black hole in which nothing gets done.

And that's why, I just have a lot of limitations about - just have a lot of limitations about this.

Man: Okay.

And Avri, you want to respond to that?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean I think we're going (up) agree with that. My starting position was indeed in a way should be things be excluded. However, I mean the reality of the situation is that if a strong person is against it, it will be stop whether one has a process for doing it or whether one has the game the entire specific to do it as we've seen with Triple X.

So, that the reality of it is we have to have some sort of dispute resolution process. Now, I do not believe and I think this is one of the positions I've been arguing that the ICANN is in the position to do the (dedication) on these things.

By enlarge, it should be done in the National Court, in the international legal processes that may or may not exist that handle such the situation.

The compromise between - yeah but we do we just accept them and then turn them on to the court or do we have some kind of process that where someone and not one country and not one company and, you know, not one security expert but the whole committee as a - we've got an issue with this so already there's a certain threshold that says the committee itself has to be able to reach consensus that this is something they want to raise a challenge to.

And then, and this is what still open, then there is an external review process. This is not an ICANN process but a finite term limited kind of like, I mean similar but external to the new services type thing where there is a finite way to go and get a call on something.

That call can then still be challenged in courts later but at - but that we have a way to deal with these so that we don't end up within the permanent (unintelligible) of...

Man: In action.

Avri Doria: ...you know, well, you didn't let me comment, you didn't let me challenge, you didn't let me process so I'm going to use every possible to stop this from going forward.

Chuck Gomes: Well, okay let me make a - if you don't mind (Mike), I want to...

(Mike): Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: It seems real clear to me and in fact that the recommendation is for more work and rather than use the time now to, you know, continue debate the issue, it seems like this is my personal impression as if there were - the group has done a really good job of trying to think through some things and so forth clearly recommends more work and that our continued discussion on this would be much better than in that following improve since we have very limited time and still have two categories to cover because - is anybody oppose to submitting the recommendations as is, that would you suggest any changes to the recommendations realizing that they're essentially recommending more work but they are providing some ideas that could be used in that work?

Man: I guess Chuck, I appreciate more work needs to be done and I'd be willing to go along with that provided that the -- if you will -- the formal notice from an advisory committee or supporting organization, I would just ask or my recommendation for consideration to the group would be that it has to be a consensus position of the advisory committee or supporting organization.

As this is written now, it might be possible for a non-consensus group within that committee or supporting organization to potentially...

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Man: ...(effectuate) the hold status.

To me, if we are going to allow someone to evoke this hold status, we need do provide some barrier or at least some hurdle higher than just...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: ...one or two interested members. I would submit that it would need to be a consensus statement by the ICANN advisory committee or supporting organization.

And if that was there, I could - I think I could leave with this recognizing that more work needs to be done.

Chuck Gomes: I just on first glance or first hearing it, I kind of like that because as most of, you know, I've been concerned about the thing that is stated in Number 3 that this could be a game for abuse just to cause delays.

And Avri, very quickly, how do you feel about that change?

Avri Doria: I'm totally comfortable with it. I have been sort of making things (unintelligible) on this assumption that formal process was consensus, I think it's fine obviously (Mike) to, you know, co-group members aren't on the call so I have to confirm with them but I certainly...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Avri Doria: ...totally comfortable with it.

And (we'll) argue for within the subgroup.

Chuck Gomes: Good and if you would do that and then let us know in the list, that would be great.

Is anybody opposed then for the top level here with the recommendation as stated with that modification that (Mike) just suggested|?

(Victoria): Can I just make a clarification at (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

(Victoria): I know that there word is actually in there but in two A, I think it's important we just highlight that this is an external - I think - Avri - she got the word an external dispute resolution process is being discussed and I think she mentioned some wording, you know, with perhaps could for the resist to transparency and openness and have you I don't know if that typical that's necessary or not...

Man: Yeah, Avri, you could make that clear, right?

Avri Doria: Okay...

Chuck Gomes: I think you didn't state it elsewhere but that would - I think that's very helpful (Victoria).

(Victoria): Yeah, I will include some work in that section that the external press - should be and I don't see anyone on the subgroup objecting to that either. Of course, I'm speaking out of (unintelligible) but I don't think that would happen.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Moving along here, the - I didn't hear any (objection)...

Man: Mr. Chairman, do I have action in relation to this?

Chuck Gomes: No, no, Avri has got the lead and the subgroup does, so you're off the hook on this one until it's editing the final version...

Woman: Right, and we'll make the deadline of whatever it is - tomorrow.

Man: Tomorrow noon.

Woman: Tomorrow noon, yes...

Chuck Gomes: But thanks, thanks. Okay.

At top level IDN, they basically just say that these recommendations may apply equally well to IDN to the top level but more work needs to be done, I think that's clear. I don't know that we need to spend any time on that.

And then - but let's discuss the last - the second level and - second and third level are all kind of the same that it's basically left up to the

registry operators with the deal with controversial names and comply with local laws, et cetera. Is that correct, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody have any problems with that approach on those second level, third level, ASCII, IDNs?

Okay.

Then I think we're in pretty good shape on a very tough category, so my compliments to the group on that regard.

Woman: Thanks, (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Now - again, thanks, I appreciate that.

Now, we're to geographic and geopolitical names. Mike Palage, Avri Doria and Jon Nevett, all three on the call for this one. So, where are you guys at? I haven't seen anything.

Michael Palage: Well, and we circulated what we would call a near final draft this morning...

Chuck Gomes: Among your subgroup...

Michael Palage: ...among - yes, among the group.

Chuck Gomes: So, where are you adding recommendations?

Michael Palage: We'll sort of have to - a lot of this is going to be dependent upon the action or if you will, the inaction, it would be ICANN and IANA names because that was one of the triggering events for the specific recommendations that we were looking at.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We're looking at more work there and I'm sure we're looking at more work in your category.

Michael Palage: Yeah, I mean, what we've also done to is to help with the - what you would call more work scenario is we actually - we actually prepared a list of questions that we intend to submit to WIPO, to the GACs, to the ICANN General Counsel.

So, in trying to provide a framework for that additional work, we've actually come up with a set of questions to (throw out that) additional necessary information.

So, and that's where we're at. It's likely that more work may be necessary although - and Avri and I actually did have the constructed dialogue today on one of the two recommendations but we've not yet been able to get any feedback from Jon. Jon, have you been able to read the document yet?

Jon Nevett: The document you've sent around this morning?

Michael Palage: Yeah.

Jon Nevett: No.

Michael Palage: Okay.

So, that's where we're at. Jon said...

Chuck Gomes: Let's talk about a way forward here because we're in the awkward position with this one where we haven't seen a written report for - except for the very original version that you sent, Mike.

Michael Palage: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: And we need to get working group approval on it. We're obviously not going to be able to do that in this meeting. We don't have another meeting until Thursday and it's too late to approve it then.

So, we're going to have to do it on the list. When can you guys provide the document to the list so that everybody can review it and I'm thinking that we will try to get that taken care of on the list, can you have one tomorrow?

Michael Palage: Yeah. As I said, at the beginning of the call, we are looking forward 12, 24-hour turnaround. So, tomorrow, first thing, that's - yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And then if you would distribute that to the list, I will, you know, encourage everybody on the list as well to chime in on the report so that we can try the other list to get approval.

That may mean there'll probably be some questions although, since Avri is one of the best ones at asking questions and it's on your group, that will probably help.

Michael Palage: Yeah, considering we're the two most talkative at least on the last couple of call...

Chuck Gomes: There you go.

Michael Palage: ...if we could reach (consensus) and that should be a good way of hopefully pushing.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay.

All right. So, that's excellent.

Again, it's not ideal but we can at least - but I think - anybody have a problem with that approach?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, what's going to happen?

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

They're committing to sending and this is going to be a little bit different on this one than some of the other, Tim, but they're committing to providing a full subgroup report to the less tomorrow.

It's everyone's responsibility to review that and communicate any concerns they have and in particular, any concerns you have with the recommendations because we need to as a group agree on the recommendations and Tim, we're going to try and do that on the list rather than what we're doing on the meeting today because we don't have them in front of us.

Okay. And I'll give you further direction as we see what happens on that.

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: This is going to be taken as probably write up well on Wednesday to give people a chance to get some feedback and so forth. And - but we really need to go on the Thursday, it was a very good idea that reports itself and the recommendation are - have the support of the full group and that is not what I wanted to happen in going into the meeting on Thursday but let's try and minimize the challenges of that as much as possible.

And Tim, you know, once you see that, you can go ahead and do your general editing of it even though some of it may not be final because if we wait until too late, you won't be able to - we won't be able to get a full draft report for the whole group to see before the meeting on Thursday.

Timothy Denton: Yeah, I just hope it doesn't - radical surprises.

Chuck Gomes: Well, with Mike and Avri on there, how do you expect that?

Avri Doria: Whatever it says we could expect it the same where work required...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right. That's right.

Okay. Jon will keep an end line, right, Jon?

No comment, huh.

All right. Let's go to names reserved on third level. Again, we have not seen - we're hoping and Greg was still - as he pointed out at the beginning of the call over the weekend, so was able to suit all it really needs to do. I think this is an easy category.

Greg, if you could just - you're not going to have any trouble getting the recommendations out early tomorrow or later today?

Greg Shatan: No, I have about 15 seconds but just didn't quite get it done.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. All right.

And then, my proposal is that we handle this one the same way that we're handling geographic names except that won't be quite as time consuming because we're basically seeing this report, we talked about it in our meeting either Wednesday or Thursday, I forget which one.

And so, it's a matter of just checking the changes that are being made to the recommendations and we discuss those on one of those calls.

Any questions on that?

So, again, please, there are two reports that you need to look for that we're going to get final approval on the email in the next two days hopefully by tomorrow.

Greg Shatan: And I've just sent out the third level report now so it should all be hitting your screens.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, if that's the case, it's real quick and of course, I have another meeting that I'm chairing in about 10 minutes, so I'm not going to have much flexibility there but let me get in my inbox here and just see if it hits and I haven't seen it yet but I'll watch for it.

So, let me go to the rest of the agenda and if that shows up and you see it on your screen, please pull it up and look at the - I think all we need to really look at is the recommendation sections, right?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And we might be able to take care of that one in the next ten minutes.

So, going on then - oh, I'm sorry - we've got one more, I slip the page and we still got single in two character label, let's - that's a very important although we spent a lot of time. I'm not going to spend very much time on this one today because we spent a majority of our call the other day on this one.

So, I still have that - was that one sent - was the new version sent? I think it was but they're not printed.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. I sent a new version this morning.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I just have to find it here, Patrick, I think I have it on screen but I forgot to print it. So, let me find it on the screen. It's not that one. This slide printed (unintelligible) I've got so many Windows open but I can't find them very quickly when I try to do it on the screen.

Not that one.

Okay. All right, this one. Oh, there we go, I got it.

Okay. Let's go very quickly on this one then. Patrick, are you the lead on this today again?

Patrick Jones: I guess that I'm the lead on.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Let's get down to the recommendation and...

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...see where were at.

Now Mike, I did get a chance to look at this one this morning. Okay, and let me just give - first of all, the recommendation need to be summarized in table format. You understand that, right?

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and can be separate table for each of the five or six categories that you have. In fact, that's probably good.

There needs to be IDN recommendations, okay?

Patrick Jones: I think that the IDN recommendations are across the board more work.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, but, you know...

Patrick Jones: We just have not had time to discuss them.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Patrick Jones: Someone else within the subgroup can speak to that, but my impression is not enough time, more work is needed and we haven't gotten to it.

Chuck Gomes: And then, you know what I was thinking when I - by the way again, I compliment you as a tough a category, it involves a lot. So each of you I compliment for dealing with the top category and spending a lot of time on it.

I'm wondering if in this one we want to make a general recommendation, this might not be one that fits in the table, but one that maybe proceed to table in this case that it might good to form a separate group for additional work to provide broader balance from the community.

And what I'm getting at here is people have noticed that the members of this little subgroup obviously have their own interest and I personally don't have any problem with that because it provides good motivation for working on this and Patrick certainly doesn't fit that category.

But this may be an area where it might be better that instead of the possibility of the (RN) working group working on this one that we recommend that a broader community group be formed. Please talk about that among your subgroup on that, see whether that makes any sense, but I throw that out.

You know, I don't think we have time to go through everyone of this. They're pretty similar I think to what they were when we talk; spend a lot of time the other day. Patrick, why don't you just quickly tell us what changes you have made, it looks like they're highlighted actually.

Patrick Jones: Oh, all the changes are in red line.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: Under symbols, I tried to pick up the language, but Avri raised about unless technology at some time permits. And then clarify that the dot symbol is a separator and that probably should not be in the recommendation, but put up more in the background.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Patrick Jones: We haven't had a chance to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's okay, okay.

Patrick Jones: Under single letter number TLD I put the recommendation that came from Mike and Avri that is an area for further work.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: And that's it. It's listed as all three.

Chuck Gomes: Yup, I see it.

Patrick Jones: Under two letter TLDs, I clarified in a bracket just to note for everyone that all two was what was discussed sort of the majority opinion the last call.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: On 3.4, I added IDN in here just to make sure that it always captured somewhere that IDN require further work.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And that will show up when you put all this in a table format because you shall have a separate row for IDN.

Patrick Jones: Under 3.5 I clarified a single ASCII letters and numbers at the second level.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: And added again under -- it's underneath all 4.5 recommendation from Avri, they also came from you and Marilyn and (Edmond).

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: And that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any questions or comments on this one?

Understanding that we're recommending more work and we've got to have table format, is anybody uncomfortable with the direction we're going on this one?

So we're fairly comfortable that we have a report that we're behind as a group.

Patrick Jones: Just as one - one more thing.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Patrick Jones: I think and from the last call, everyone was pretty much agreement on two letters and numbers at the second level and the majority wasn't favor of all two under two letter TLDs. So those two subcategories might be able to be included in the full report and then the rest refer to further work.

Chuck Gomes: Does anybody disagree with that? Unless be real clear - real quickly, which two were they in order of the report Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Under 3.3.

Chuck Gomes: 3.3, okay. That's two letter TLDs.

Patrick Jones: All two. This was the majority...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. Got you.

Patrick Jones: ...from the last call.

Chuck Gomes: So in other words, two letter TLDs would be reserved for ccTLD.

Patrick Jones: Using the (ISO) list as a...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Patrick Jones: ...authoritative lists.

Chuck Gomes: Right, okay.

Patrick Jones: And then, 3.6 two letter and or numbers at the second level and no changes at that one.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And that's the one that uses the - our step process, right?

Patrick Jones: Well, existing registry agreement and (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Any problems with those two? Is that okay? It sounds good to me, but I'm just on member.

Okay, then let's - if there's not, then let's assume that that's the case (Patrick) and you've been - when you finish this off, you can accept

that all two in the one case and the other recommendation. And it looks like we wouldn't recommend any further work on those, right?

Patrick Jones: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Very good.

Now, running out of time, so let me quickly get my agenda and thanks a lot for everybody on that group and let's go then to the timeline, we only got one meeting left, covered that already on the 15th, okay. And we've got approved the final report that day, so that any final letter that's going to be made then it can be delivered on the 16th.

We will - I've already gone over Item 6 on the agenda, which is action item for our next call on the 15th, is anybody not cleared on the deadline? Okay?

So we need - I'll skip over mine because I think I'm clear on those and Tim.

The - for each of the report except got the tag name, okay, which we finished, make sure you select - you accept all the changes that we've already gone over and that you already highlight changes made between now and the time you send it to the report follow up on any actions that we have and get them - Tim is going to be editing reports as well and we'll do that. So I think, you know, our work is in front of us.

Now, anybody that has a minority statement or any of the recommendations, we need you to submit that to the list not later than noon on Wednesday. Okay?

And so, we will be - any questions on that? And those who will be incorporated in the recommendation section, okay Tim?

Man: He said, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now, the last things then, we don't know whether it's going to be an (RN) working group in Lisbon. There's a chance that there will be. Some of you haven't responded to Tim, excuse me, to Glen with regard to whether you're going to be in Lisbon, please do so. That would be helpful, and if you haven't already done that.

And then finally, with regard to - at the council, extends us for 30 days, be thinking about whether you're willing to continue to participate in the working group for another 30 days of the council so decide. I don't need that right now, but we'll talk about that in our meeting on Thursday.

Any questions or comments?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, I will just a - I need to have call with you later today or tomorrow about the whole working report, but that's...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, give me a couple of hours because I've got a another meeting...

Timothy Denton: Indeed. I understand.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...that I'm sharing right now that I'm a little bit late calling into, so...

Timothy Denton: Yes

Chuck Gomes: ...that will be fine Tim.

All right, thanks everybody. We made it close to two hours and I think we accomplished a lot. Please use the list if there's anything that comes to mind that we missed, and don't hesitate to give me a call if we need to talk.

All right, thanks.

Man: Thanks to all.

Bye-bye.

END