

**Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference
8 February 2007
18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 8 February 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-20070208.mp3>

On page

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

Attendance:

Working Group members

Marilyn Cade - acting chair in the absence of Chuck Gomes

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Jon Nevett - Registrars

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Greg Shatan - IPC

Dan Dougherty - IPC

Caroline Greer - Registries

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint G ery - Secretariat

Absent excused:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Coordinator: The recording has now started.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, folks, am I back on the bridge?

Man: You are.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

I'm going - this Marilyn Cade, I am acting as acting as chair today in Chuck's absence.

I'm going to work through the agenda that Chuck sent out and just make a couple of suggested amendments to it myself, and then open the floor to the group for changes. But before any additions - but before I do that, I'm going to - just do a role call. And if you'll give a minute, I'll get this up.

Remember that the call is being transcribed and recorded and if you object to that we need to ask you to leave the call because by remaining on the call, you're agreeing to that.

We're going to try to make sure that when we speak, we open our comments with our full name. So for instance, I will, in the future, try to say Marilyn Cade.

And I'm also going to try, various times, to go to the entire group of people who are on the phone and make sure that everyone has a chance to speak or to ask questions.

So let me start with the role call.

(Caroline Greer)?

(Caroline Greer): Yes, I'm here.

Marilyn Cade: (Caroline), excuse me.

Timothy Denton?

Timothy Denton: Here.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick Jones?

Patrick Jones: Here.

Marilyn Cade: Neil Blair?

Neil Blair: Here.

Marilyn Cade: (Greg)? (Greg), is it (Stratton)?

(Greg): It's (Stratton)

((Crosstalk))

(Greg): ...(unintelligible) Manhattan, where I...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Helpful, thank you.

John Nevitt?

John Nevitt: Here.

Marilyn Cade: And Alistair Dixon.

Alistair Dixon: Here.

Marilyn Cade: And as I said earlier but I'll say it for purposes of the record, we have apologies from (Mike Rothenbaum) and from Mike Palage and from our chair Chuck Gomes.

(Caroline Greer): (Kimberly) (unintelligible) sent her an email but 10 minutes ago saying he might not be able to join or at least he'll be half an hour late.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Man: And that's (Maria)?

(Caroline Greer): It's (Caroline). I beg your pardon. (Caroline) (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, (Caroline).

We have an agenda - one thing I wanted to point out to people is I did make one small change to the agenda that it's on the archive and let me just say a couple of words about how to find documents.

I did a couple of postings to the list because I know some of you are new to the working group process and even the taskforces.

So I did try to just provide a bit of road map on how to find where all the data or the previous emails have been sent. Everything should be on the archive except the telephone numbers for the calls, and we'll work through with Glen.

I'll talk to Chuck and we'll work through with Glen a better approach on dealing with the redistribution of the telephone calls on the future. This is just a little unfortunately glitch.

The change I made between what I sent you and what is on the archive list is I change the date. Chuck had inadvertently called it Thursday 01, February, 2007, and today's call is actually Thursday, 08.

So you have two agendas posted that have the same date, but we're going to work on the last one.

We don't have any new members, but we do have an acknowledgment from liaison. So I'll cover those in just a minute.

Let me ask if anyone wants to make other changes to the agenda or additions to the agenda?

I'm going to make one addition, and it's Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm going to add eight other business and other business I am merely going to reference posting that we received from (Liz Williams), which has the draft principle from the GAC for new gTLDs.

Hearing no other additions, then we'll just start going through the agenda.

I don't know if Glen is back on or not, but the next item is a status report on interest statements. And Tim, I think you can probably report on that.

Timothy Denton: (Unintelligible), now you've got me.

Marilyn Cade: I think we talked about - in fact we have all the interest state.

Timothy Denton: Yeah, I think we - tongue-tied for once.

Yes, we do so far as I know.

Woman: Okay.

Timothy Denton: And that's from a little earlier this morning.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I do think for the record that we'll refer back to Chuck to ask him to discuss with the liaisons as they join us, their development of a short

interest statement to add at the appropriate time. But we'll leave that for the chair as it follow-up item.

Timothy Denton: Yes, if I can add, I believe that there are some discussions that someone had sent in a generic statement -- interest statement where they needed to send in one of it personal to themselves. And I believe we just thought that that was to be addressed by Chuck.

Marilyn Cade: Right. I'll just say a word about interest statements. (Dan) - I see (Dan Dougherty) has joined the group.

Welcome, (Dan).

(Dan Dougherty): Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I am just going to say something to all of you. It's really important whenever you join a call that you announce yourself.

So in the future on future calls, do be sure that you take the first advantage to announce yourself so it's clear that we're building the participation of the group.

Let me say a word about interest statements. Interest statements are drafted by individuals. They're not - and they need to be written by you, about you and about what your interests are.

And because somebody else has a similar interest or a similar statement has to made some place else, you still need to submit an interest statement because it goes into the record and then it needs to be updated, if any changes happened.

We're kind of used to that in the council and in the taskforces. But I know for many of you on the working groups that this maybe - be a new practice.

Update on Chuck's action items. I'm on Number 4.

We do have a ccNSO working group observer. And I don't believe she has joined us on the call yet today. But we will have - that name has been officially announced, and I know that Chuck will be doing some follow-up, I see, with our observer from the ccNSO.

On the IDN working group liaison, my report on that is really from a conversation with Ram Mohan who is the chair of the IDN working group, who had indicated that he's working on that. It may be himself but in any case, he will be providing us with an observer relatively shortly.

We also have an update from Suzanne Sene. And if I can, Tim, not verbatim, but can you just summarize Suzanne's feedback to us in relation to the GAC?

Timothy Denton: Yes. She said she was not going to be participating herself, but she would take the issue up of observer from - with the GAC appropriately and that she would report back or the GAC would report back with the representative.

Marilyn Cade: Fabulous.

Okay. I'm going to pause now and what I'm going to do now is go through a list of documents that will be helpful to you as we work through Item Number 5 on our agenda.

So I'm going to point a couple of things out.

Tim posted a document called Comparison of gTLD Registry Reserved name Version 3 that numbers the pages of the previous document. I might call that document the Rainbow document for its vast array of different colors.

You're going to find that document very, very helpful as we do the rest of our agenda today.

So if you're close to a PC and it's feasible, would be good to have that handy.

The other document you're going to find handy is, again, a posting from Tim where he posted last week's agenda. And we are going to refer to Item Number 7 in last week's agenda later in our working agenda.

The final documents that you will find helpful are the written reports -- actually there's three more -- the two written reports submitted, one by Chuck and updated by Patrick Jones on tag name, reserved names, report for reserved name working group and a report from Tim. And, Tim, the name of your report is...

Timothy Denton: ICANN and IANA Reserved Names.

Marilyn Cade: And I think it was - it may - the subject might have been memorandum for reserved names working group.

Timothy Denton: And may have across that, (right). I have. It is ICANN and...

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Timothy Denton: ...IANA reserved names in my files.

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Timothy Denton: Which I believe was sent out as...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, fabulous. The...

((Crosstalk))

Timothy Denton: There was also...

Marilyn Cade: Please?

Timothy Denton: Madame Chairman, excuse me, there was also a table that I have just recently prepared and sent out to the working group, which was a classification of all the types of reserved names against the three categories of difficulty.

Marilyn Cade: Fabulous. Thank you.

So to the extent you can if you can have those handy and since Tim and I are both going to do reports at this phase in our agenda, we'll

give you a few minutes as well if you don't have them handy maybe you can grab them.

I don't know if we have Glen back yet.

I don't believe we do. So she is still trying to find a few of our colleagues.

Tim, if I might turn to you to do your report on ICANN and IANA-related names, I'll just preface this by saying although we had expected to have five reports today, three of our reporters are not able to - they still have more work to do, they've indicated, and they're not on the call.

So we actually are going to have, I think, enough time to leisurely walk through these two reports and then move on to the next phase of the work.

So I'll alert you to Item Number 6 so that you can start preparing yourselves.

In Item Number 6, following the two reports, I'll be soliciting for volunteers and our chair did publish a - email to everyone reminding people that we really are looking for you to pick one of these topics and do some real work on it.

And so we're going to ask for volunteers and then, if we don't fill enough of the slots or don't get everybody allocated, we can go back and try to make some assignments.

But do be thinking about which of these topics that you might be able to volunteer to be of assistance on in the next phase of the work.

And with that I will turn this to you, Tim, if I might, for your report?

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

I had a very simple task with the (note describes) the rationale for the reservation of certain names (unintelligible) to IANA and ICANN and (unintelligible), which names have been reserved.

It creates a table based on the Rainbow document, which shows the small number of reserved names to ICANN which were ASO, DNSO, ICANN Internet (PNSO) and ccNSO, very few (of them), about six of them did the same thing with IANA-related name.

And then I - basically, what I did was to seek from IANA the nature of the justification. The truth of the matter is that a simple glance at the table in the document shows that for instance with IANA-related names, they're all intimately related to the institutions or name servers or whatever that IANA runs, such ietf, istf, lacnic, latnic, et cetera.

And that you will have to find - you have to almost go back into history to find that the exact justifications for them, but the justifications as far as I'm concerned are self-evident.

They relate to the institution's processes and functions intimately connected with both the structures of ICANN and the structures and functions of IANA.

And I concluded that as I said, though it is quite likely that early participants in IANA and ICANN could testify to the origins of these reserved names, it's quite obvious that these would be of historical which is only as the justifications or self-evident and not controversial.

Inquiries in both organizations did not - did produce more - much more paper for justifications than I - than is reported in - they produced no more verbiage than is actually found in my rather short three-page note.

I think that really concludes what I wanted, like to say about it, unless you have questions.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sure we will. And I - Patrick, I want to just be sure that you're still free to jump in with other comments as well.

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick.

And I actually work with Tim earlier in the week to, you know, come up with an answer on some of this research so, you know, (unintelligible) with.

Timothy Denton For which I thank you very much. I appreciate your - the help of you in ICANN and IANA.

Marilyn Cade: So I want to point out a question that I think has implication to some of other categories if I might. And that is under - it's on Page 2, 3 Rationales A, IANA, going to over to Page 3 where we - and I think it's very helpful that you and Patrick did this.

You provided for us the standard answer that is given when a request is received about reserved name. So it reads -- thank you for inquiry -- domain names reserved by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority, are not available for sale, registration or transfer.

These have been reserved on policy grounds and include single-letter domains, domains with hyphens in the third and fourth position and other reserved words.

Should the policies regarding this will change, they will be released from IANA's registration according to the revised policy.

I call everyone's attention to this because it's going to be helpful for you when we talk about tag's name and single-letter and two-character name. So just keep in mind that this document prepared by Tim will probably be - and by Patrick will be an ongoing reference for us to come back to.

Any other question, comment?

(Caroline), any question?

(Caroline Greer): No, I think all seems clear.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, Neil, (Greg)?

Man: I think it's pretty clear.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: I agree.

Marilyn Cade: Let me go on then to - I'm going to report for Chuck on - report that he prepared and Patrick, you updated. And I apologize, I'm working from marked up copy, which I've done before you made your additions. So I'm going to need to turn to you to chime in when I - if I omit any of the additions that you made.

Patrick Jones: Sure my additions were minor and in only one location.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So it's Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm reporting on the tag names, reserved names report for the reserved name working group prepared by Chuck.

Basically what this report addresses is the requirement in all existing ICANN registry agreement to date that required the gTLD registries to reserve all labels with hyphen in the third and fourth position.

I just want to pause and say that in this working group, we often used the term "top level" and "first level" interchangeably and that means after the last dot, we used the term "second level" meaning after the second dot.

But here we are talking about the third and fourth position, so that is in a string, the third and fourth characters in a position - sorry, the third and fourth characters that are in a string.

So this requirement is drawn from the approved technical standards for internationalized domain names. And Chuck goes on to explain that there are limitations in the DNS, which limits characters to the letters A

to Z, the numbers 0 to 9 and the hyphen-dash. And that there's a restriction that prohibits the hyphen-dash from being the first or last character of a domain name.

So there have been standards developed in the IETF that (NAP), international script to strings of ASCII characters. And these standards require that the ASCII representation of IDNs begin with the four-character prefix with hyphens in the third and fourth positions.

The current prefixes X (and) dash, dash. His report goes on to show that there had been some other problems with speculators registering ASCII names with other prefixes, dash, dash. And so the decision was made to reserve all prefixes with dash-dash in the second and - sorry in the third and fourth positions.

So, the rest of his report basically begins to discuss the summary of relevant documents that I'm not going to go through in detail there because you guys can certainly read that for yourselves.

One point that I want to call your attention too because it's an action item for us is that in most of these topics we are going to be identifying, A, is there a need to hear from "experts;" B, who might those expert be, and then how do we get those consultations quickly scheduled with the expert.

So one of the topics on the table for us to come back to on this topic and on the previous one is, do we need to hear from an expert.

Chuck proposes that we could start out initially Ram Mohan, who is the chair of GNSO IDN Working Group in order to get a good basic understanding.

And then if we agree we're going to do that, we could decide whether we need to add other experts and what the questions are that we would want to ask of the experts.

I'm going to pause and, Patrick, ask you if you want to add any comment?

Patrick Jones: Okay, I have two points.

In Chuck's document, I added earlier today under 5 ICANN registry agreement requirements.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: He was missing that ICANN has either ccTLD sponsorship agreements or MOUs with 12 CC managers, and all of those agreements have an identical provision on tag names.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: So that's now been added.

And the other point is Tina Dam has been asked to also participate in this working group, and she apologized she had (unintelligible) working group going on a call right now, but would be available next week.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Then I'm going to ask people to please keep track of that and when we talked about experts, we ought to include Tina's name in our list of experts to include in our discussion.

We're using the term "experts" here as we will all recall according to the statement of work in a flexible manner that if someone who had particular expertise who can help to inform us and -- welcome back, Glen -- that doesn't mean that they maybe an expert for a day or an expert for a subject. That doesn't mean we're picking an expert that's going to touch on all topics.

So I'll just plug that and, Patrick, thank you.

Let me turn to the participants on the call and ask if anyone has any questions about Chuck's report.

This is because everyone is saving up their questions for - when we get to choosing the experts, right?

Okay. What I'm going to do now, I think, is suggest that what we ought to do now, Tim, and I just want to do a real-time consultation with you if that's okay. I think it'd be helpful now to walk through your chart before we talk about volunteers for each category of work.

Timothy Denton: You want to alert them to the dangers ahead, do you?

Okay. I would be pleased to do so.

Marilyn Cade: Can I - before I do that, can I just pause and ask Glen?

Glen, thank you very much for making those phone calls. Do you - are you okay with our proceeding now? Were you able to leave messages for some of those folks?

Glen Desaintgery: I was able to leave messages for (Tim Louise) (unintelligible).

Woman: Uh-huh.

Glen Desaintgery: John Nevitt and (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: John's with us now. Tim will be joining in just a few minutes, we've heard. So I think that we're okay then.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: ...(unintelligible) on the (call matter), (unintelligible) on the call.

Woman: Right, (that's right).

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible) has (Greg) (unintelligible) (and turning in) (unintelligible) is through (Dan Dougherty) (unintelligible) was he on the call?

Marilyn Cade: (Dan) is on the call.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay good. Okay (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Avri Doria: This is Avri just joining.

Marilyn Cade: Avri, welcome. Thank you. We'll...

Avri Doria: How did this get earlier?

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Or did you guys already resolve that?

Marilyn Cade: We already resolved it. It had...

Alistair Dixon: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: It had to do with nine people thinking one thing, eight thinking another and neither one of them being aware of what the other group was thinking.

Avri Doria: Cool.

Marilyn Cade: But - so we'll try to address that at the end of the call and make sure we have clarity.

Thank you though, Avri.

And let me now turn everyone if I might, Tim, if I might turn to you for reviewing your chart which we're going to treat as a working document.

Thank you.

Timothy Denton: Okay.

Good morning, evening and whatever everyone.

What we did this morning was to go down a list that had been created in the agenda for today and to get out somewhat into an increased number of categories, which I believe I've captured but - which I may not have captured them all.

And so that is by type of name, down one column. And I measured 14 such. Then to simply a create chart against the decision criteria that had been placed in the agenda, Marilyn may recall exact - which one exactly, but this was the notion that we could look at making decisions about the relative difficulty of deciding where things might go.

And this was - so we had the three - decision criteria, low hanging fruit relatively easy to decide one way or another. So in other words it's, you know, it's either (dead sort) that they should not be reserve or (dead sort) that they should continue to be reserved, the decision criteria and was not - which way they should go but that it would be relatively easy.

The next category over was very complex and maybe controversial but workable as I did, you know, as you can see there in the chart expressed like W.

And then extremely controversial and may take considerable time I put G. And then, whether we needed further comments from experts is a sort of yes, no.

So I did not fill those in. I - just first cut through this was to - I wasn't going to substitute my opinion for those of others, but to try who sort of explicate all the possible variations there can be and so going down one side we had ICANN and IANA-related name.

Then we broke out into four categories that have previously been expressed as one, single-character first level, single-character second level, two-character first level, two-character second level.

Then tag, the second level reservations for registry operation. Eight was geographic and geopolitical; 9 was reserved third level; 10 was others at second level gTLD string; 11, others and second level ccTLD string; 12, others and second level registry specific names; others at second level, other, whatever that might be; and 14, was controversial.

So, no great work of science, but it just sort of helped us to start thinking about this in an organized way.

I think that's all I want to say.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Tim - it's Marilyn speaking.

I'm going to suggest for everyone's ease in using this and I really appreciate your getting this together so quickly. This was a last-minute idea that Tim and I had, and I think it's going to be very helpful that on - if you created column to the left, just for your own purposes...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Marilyn, just - sorry, (unintelligible), which document you're referring to here? I'm just a bit...

Marilyn Cade: It's front Tim.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: It's from Timothy Denton and it is a...

Timothy Denton: The name of the document is Typology. Level...

Man: Oh I see.

Timothy Denton: Yes.

Man: Yup.

Woman: Okay. At some point can we ask questions about the categorization...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Of course you can.

I'm just going to do something to just make it - (unintelligible) on the left-hand side, and again Tim and I didn't have a chance to - on the

left-hand side next to the 1 should write the letter A and next to 2, 3, 4 and 5, you should write the letter B, next the 6, you should write the letter C, next to 7, the letter D, next to 8, the letter E, next to 9, the letter F, next to 10,11, 12 and 13, the letter G and then next to 14, the letter H.

So when we flip back and forth between our two documents, you'll be able to easily see what we - with - what the category is on the agenda that is now 5A through H.

Secondly, on the agenda, if you go to the second page of the agenda, 7D, you'll see 1, 2, 3, and that is begin to group categories of reserved names as Tim said, and we just took the categories from the agenda that the chair sent out.

So - yeah.

Timothy Denton: Thank you, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: So I just want to be sure you - and then Tim and I thought that we added further comments to the column. We think they're - that could be a place to take notes or say expert needed or no expert needed, et cetera, that we were just trying to give everybody, you know, kind of an easy way to kind of organize this.

And as we talked about for instance, B, single and two-character labels, the initial thought that I had is, it may be less controversial to deal with single characters at the second level than it is at the first level.

So we did not, for purposes of this discussion, lump them together. But this is the working document. It's intended to be a tool. And so at that point, let me just pause. And, Avri, put you first in the queue and then hear from others.

Avri Doria: Okay hi.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: First of all I must apologize. I don't have the documents in front me since I didn't plan to be in front of my computer until 2:00. But in looking at the - or talking about the first category of the ICANN/IANA.

When we come to - I'm not sure that those (unintelligible) are in the same category because when talking about IANA, you've got (assessment) put in by the ICANN/IANA, which you've also have the possibility of an IETF RFC action putting things into IANA's list.

Now, I'm not quite sure where the balance between IETF putting domain names in and IETF not putting domain names in would count. But for example we've got the stuff going in IDN, where the protocol may make certain things legal and illegal and I think that we might just needed just category for that.

And so I'm not quite sure that, for example - sorry, easy in my mind to say sure, anything that's on the ICANN, you know, reserves like the NICs and all of that, it is easy decision. But if we get to talking about what may or may not happen from an IETF/IANA then it might be harder.

Timothy Denton: Avri, it's Tim.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Timothy Denton: If you have to look at what names are reserved and when you have the document before you, if you still maintain that opinion, okay, but I think...

Alistair Dixon: No, I don't really have the opinion with names that are currently reserved, but it's just in defining a category, we don't know what's going to happen in the future or is that not an issue.

And as if we say that any names that IANA has this reserved is reserved and that hold for the future as well, then I may have an issue.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Can I ask a question of you then?

On one possibility, you know, I think I kind of pointed this out when I said in Tim's report, for instance, IANA, we have a - we've referenced single-letter and second - sorry - single-letter and two-letter names as a separate working category.

And yet, they are IANA-related names because of the way that they're reserved. The one possibility, and I'll just thought this out, Avri, for all of us to think about is to do - is to divide this into A1 and A2 and have A1 the ICANN-related names and A2 the IANA-related names.

And then to see if there are - if they fall into a different category or there's different work or some of the work is going to be done in one of this other category such as B or G.

Is that another possibility, Avri?

Avri Doria: It works for me as a start. I was certainly - yeah, I was taking about putting them in the separate categories and whether it's separate category or separate sub-categories is, you know, (unintelligible) the same.

Timothy Denton: Denton here, again.

What is - is there some process - let me try it, again. Backing up, I don't mind a separate category, but I think that - I think this is a distinction without a difference.

I don't see IANA being able to create new reserved names and then have ICANN impose them, you know, just like that without further ado, okay. And secondly, I think in - relative to the enormous amount of controversy we're going to have on other things I think this one is a slam dunk.

But anyway...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Timothy Denton: I'll shut up now.

Marilyn Cade: Let me hear from others, and then I just want to give an example.

But let me - it's Marilyn speaking. Let me actually say that, actually in some cases, it isn't that IANA created the name, is that a registry

contract created the name and that registry contract led to names being reserved at the IANA level, I believe.

So maybe that's another clarification (unintelligible) and, Patrick, I'm just going to ask you to take a note on this, if you would. Could you help us with what the IANA definition of how it creates names happens?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Not right now, but if we can just come back to that because that might answer Avri's - some of Avri's question like what is the procedure by which names would go into the reserved category, the IANA-related names reserved category.

Man: (I would)...

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, can I - sorry.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I do want to take a queue, so I have...

Man: Right.

Marilyn Cade: I heard Alistair and who else?

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick replying to what you were asking me.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to put you in the queue first then, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: So Patrick first then Alistair.

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: Marilyn, I will do my best to try to find an answer on this, but just to give everyone a heads up, there's not a lot of information on what the requirements are. So I'll see what I can find.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. And it's Marilyn, again. Patrick, I know it may be anecdotal, that's okay, you know, we're trying to not be - we're just trying to educate ourselves.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Thanks, Marilyn.

I would support the suggestion to just (unintelligible) right out IANA and ICANN-related names. I just know that if you look at the ICANN-related names, I'm wondering whether there maybe (some there) that I'm not - can't - don't currently or don't relate to current parts of ICANN. I'm thinking, do we still have a DNSO, for example?

Marilyn Cade: We don't have a DNSO, but we still use the name in our archive process.

Alistair Dixon: Right.

But yeah, I mean it just seems to me were - and when I look at the IANA-related names and it looked to me that they are just - those - a lot of those names are sort of reserved for technical purposes and...

Timothy Denton: Well it seems to me that - look, it's Denton, again. I think it's very simple. I'll do what you ask. I'll rate 1A, ICANN; 1B, IANA, done.

Alistair Dixon: Okay.

Timothy Denton: Let's not waste any time on this. This is great fine, done.

Alistair Dixon: Okay, cool.

Marilyn Cade: Okay so, I have a follow-on question.

And that is, it's just a question for us to take for the record, Patrick, but I noticed that we have reserved DNSOs...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: But I don't see that we've reserved GNSO and there maybe a reason for that?

Patrick Jones: Well, this is Patrick.

And the reason is probably most of these agreements are - that they were written when there was a DNSO.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: And when the process of renewing, so many of them have been updated (unintelligible) GNSO maybe reflected or it's in the new agreements that have come in since 2005.

But I don't think that GNSO has been added as a reserved name to, for example, biz, info, org, any of the others.

Marilyn Cade: I think though that illustrates and would be helpful to us to understand how a name might go on at ICANN-related reserved names list.

So then I'm going to go over to IANA-related names, Table 2, and ask that we take as a working question to come back to because I do, you know, I tend to, at this point, support what Tim is saying that his initial review is author is that this will be a (unintelligible) controversial.

But I do have a question for us to address. And we raised it before, that is, as new labels are registered at the top level, will they automatically go into an IANA-related reserved list?

And that I think is just a question that we want to put in the comments column.

Timothy Denton: Can you - it's Denton, again. Can you say that question, again?

Marilyn Cade: As new strings are registered at the top level that would include (ideas) and ASCII character, will they automatically go into future registry agreements and be added at renewal to existing registry agreement?

So the example that we would have would be - we see here on Page 2 that .jobs, (.moby), .travel, .tel, (.cut), et cetera, are now reserved at the second level and all other levels within the TLD, with registry operators make registrations.

So let's say we have a .marilyn, well that's a joke everyone. Will .marilyn...

Man: We thought it was a completely serious proposition.

Marilyn Cade: Would .marilyn go into the future registry agreement?

Avri, anything - any other questions that - because you - you had a question related to IANA-related names, could we capture your question?

Avri Doria: Sorry, I was on mute and it takes so long to switch with them talking.

Not at the moment. As I say I am going to the Web site now looking at how the various IANA names are in. The only issue I might have is if RFC action can put names in the IANA reserved list then that needs to be thought of separately.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry, I didn't capture everything you said, (it's) who?

Avri Doria: I said if RFC action...

Marilyn Cade: RFC?

Alistair Dixon: ...by the IETF can put names in the IANA reserved list...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: ...which I'm not sure it can, but I'm not sure it can't.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: Then I would have issues because there are really two IANAs or two paths into IANA and if that's the case they need to be considered separately.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, I think we can capture that and then move, if we can, to - now, what I'd like to do at this point is actually do it in six.

And then move back to filling in the blank on Tim's chart, because I want people to take some ownership of the digital work that needs to be done.

I consider one pretty much done in terms of the reports that have to be done, et cetera, so I'm not opening that up for additional volunteer. I am looking for volunteers on B2, B3, B4, B5. And again they maybe collect, but I'm looking for volunteers on those categories.

((Crosstalk))

Timothy Denton: Question. Denton here. You're referring to the typology?

Marilyn Cade: I'm looking for - if you look at the agenda which said, obtain additional volunteers for each category to work with existing volunteers?

Timothy Denton: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I'm looking for volunteers for anyone of those four categories on the typology. So someone could volunteer for B2 which is single character first level or B3 single character second level.

Neil Blair: This is Neil. I'd be happy to assist (Mike) on the signal - single characters at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Would you also do two characters at the second level so we could do the second - with second level at the package?

Neil Blair: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Anyone wants...

Neil Blair: Marilyn, I'm happy to do on some character (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Neil Blair: (Okay).

Marilyn Cade: Than I'm (unintelligible) (to go up to) in just two characters at the first level as well then, can I?

Neil Blair: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: That is going to be heavily related to another topic, and I'll make that clear later.

Tag names, I consider that Chuck and Patrick have concluded the background document on that. So I'm going to skip that.

Second level reservations for registry names needs a volunteer. And it is a relatively simple - it is specifically limited to operations. It's actually similar in work to G, but it is, I think, a relatively limited and technical (write-up), very similar to what Tim has done for Item A.

Man: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Can I get a...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: So for instance that www.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Can I get a volunteer for that?

Chuck is going to make assignments if I don't get volunteers.

Let me go to Item 8, which is geographical and geopolitical names. I'd really like to get another volunteer to work on that. I'm wondering if I could volunteer John Nevitt by any chance. Or someone else, but it's a pretty robust topic and I think it needs a couple of people working on it.

Avri Doria: Can I - I couldn't...

Marilyn Cade: Can't hear you.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. This is Avri. Can I ask a question about what's expected in the - in the work item on the geographical?

Marilyn Cade: What we're looking for is the same kind of report, Avri, that has been done on - for instance tag names report.

So you will provide the background and explanation of what the current status is similar and what (unintelligible) documents exists, what the summary of what's in the existing contracts, et cetera. It's really analyzing the current situation.

Avri Doria: And when are these needed by?

Marilyn Cade: We need them by next week if at all possible.

Avri Doria: Okay. So yeah, I'd be interested in helping in that one, but I know that I'm totally incompetent to getting anything done by next week because I'm totally filled up so I'm - so I'd be willing to help on that one, but I don't think I could do that much.

Marilyn Cade: But can I put you down as maybe helping...

Avri Doria: Sure, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: It's just that I'm going off to actually work for a week.

Marilyn Cade: I think I'm going to come watch you work if you're talking about Geneva.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. And item - the (Number) F, which is names reserved at the third level. This is a kind of a unique situation so far. The names reserved at the third level adopt (unintelligible) is the most useful example we have.

Patrick, I think I'm right that that is the existing example, is it not?

Patrick Jones: I believe so, but maybe there are others out there that we haven't uncovered yet.

Marilyn Cade: Right. So I'm looking for somebody who could just do a report on names reserved at the third level. And I'm going to open up my list of names.

(Greg), I'm staring at you and (Dan), (you know).

(Greg): I was just about to volunteer. It reminds me of my third grade report on the presidency of William Henry Harrison. If there's only one, I'll have to look for others, but...

Marilyn Cade: And that's (Greg), right?

(Greg): Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Hey, (Dan), can I throw you into that?

(Dan)?

Man: (Dan)?

(Dan): Sorry, I was on muted.

My apologies. Yes, you can add me to that along with (Greg).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Dan): And the question - I have a question on this single letter. Is that that (Mike) - who's working on that is (Mike) - is that (Mike Rothenbaum)?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

(Dan): Okay, thank you.

Timothy Denton: Okay. It's Denton here.

I'd like to intervene at this point.

Mr. (Rothenbaum) seems deathly to believe he's handed over this to me because I offered assistance. He believes that offering assistance was in fact doing the work for him.

I just wish to be clear that unless I am assigned by the chairman to do something I can offer, you know, basically the research assistance that I've got out of ICANN itself, but I'm not writing a word for these things.

So in case he has left you or anyone else with that impression, it is not so, end of statement.

Marilyn Cade: And that's why I think I'm trying to recruit additional help. I can help a little bit on B as well. But I'm going to volunteer for another one a bit later on. Let me go to others at second level.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: And we divided those, again, because we think they may be a little more controversial. Hold on just a minute, guys.

(Louise), I'm starting another meeting and I'm just trying to get it launched without me.

Others at the second level gTLD string, ccTLD string, registry specific names and other, any volunteer for any of those?

(Mike) is working - (Mike Rothenbaum) is working on them already, so whoever volunteers is really just joining (Mike) and helping out.

(Caroline)?

(Caroline Greer): Yeah, I'll take a shot at gTLD and ccTLD strings.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(And really) (Mike) to deal with those on the controversial. And has Tim joined us yet?

I don't see him on my list. I'm going to volunteer to work with him on the category of controversial names. And so I'm convinced those are going to be the most interesting. I hear no laughter uh-oh.

Okay.

(Caroline Greer): Marilyn, sorry, it's (Caroline), again. (Unintelligible) am I - was I choosing one of those three or the three bundled together?

Marilyn Cade: What I was going to do is suggest - because (Rothenbaum) is already working on those bundled together.

(Caroline Greer): Sure.

Marilyn Cade: If you could just contact Tim and then you guys might subdivide them between you on some of the research and then do the writing (jointly).

(Caroline Greer): Okay. No problem, (fine).

Marilyn Cade: Fabulous.

Okay. Well I feel like we're just making great progress here mostly in my helping fulfill the chairman's assignment.

Let me now take us back to Item 7 on our agenda and for the next call.

Man: (I don't know) (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: There's a description here, what it is you're going to try to do. You're going to try to get a report similar to the one that Tim and Chuck wrote.

But you need to include in your report a draft statement of the role of domain reservation for your category.

Why should these names be continued to be reserved? What's the value of continuing to reserve them or do you think they should - they no longer need to be reserved. So we should think of this as a name could be in a reserved category, but it makes sense to unreserved it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: A name should be in a reserved category, but there ought to be a process by which it goes into the reserved category.

Secondly, I want you to think about and we're going to talk a little bit about this on today's call. What are the additional information sources that need to be reviewed and summarized? What are the experts we need to talk to if applicable? And how do we begin to develop question for experts?

So those of you who haven't completed your reports, you're trying to get a brief written report for next week's meeting and then you'll be ask to provide an update on it.

Now, I'm now going to move us back over to the agenda from last week's call that (unintelligible) and call your attention to Item 7 on the agenda, Item 7C.

And under Item 7C, we have small Roman ii, where we are going to talk about the identification of experts that can help us in understanding the background or the issues whether they're technical or other that may relate to...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade:the particular category you're working in.

So we're going to try to walk through - now, let's do that (unintelligible) - that Chuck and others have already (unintelligible) and see that (expanding) that as well, okay?

Everybody okay with that?

Man: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So, let me say a couple of words about the experts that he has already identified. I also gave him the name of two experts that we hadn't added in, and I want to put their names (forward) as well. One of them is (Patrick Falstrom). And the other is (Lehman) and I - Patrick, (Lehman) the root server operator that is with autonomics, is that right?

Patrick Jones: Yes, he's one of the (unintelligible) members?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Can you tell us his last name?

Patrick Jones: If you give me a quick second, I can.

Marilyn Cade: Is he the (Lehman) or another executive in his company because I think we need to add in a root server operator that we could talk to as well.

Patrick Jones: (Lars Johann Lehman).

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Okay. So (Patrick Falstrom) was the name I wanted to add in and (Lars Johann Lehman) (is a possibility).

We have recommendation of (Paul) (unintelligible), which I think would be excellent to have (Paul) come and talk to the group, my conference call, by the way. (Limon Chapin) would be - he is happy to talk with us, and I think it's - I think (Limon) would be a good addition to hear from.

If we need to hear more from the GNR registry, we have a recommendation here of volunteers from GNR related to that name. I don't know that we need to really dig into that particular TLD, but it's there and we ought to raise the questions and walk through our categories if we do want to take up some of their time.

Tim was going to try to explore, but (David Conrad) had been able to verify his status with the ICANN general counsel as whether he could

act as an expert. I think, in the future we're going to be quite - we're going to just refer to this as experts in (quotes) not as expert witness.

Man: I made that inquiry this morning by email and have not yet heard back.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So I (unintelligible) up two names. Do folks have other names that they, right now, think would be helpful for us to talk to?

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick, again. I mentioned Tina Dam would be...

Marilyn Cade: Yes. And I...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I've added her. Yeah, thanks.

And so we should add Ram Mohan, Tina Dam. And I've suggested (Patrick Falstrom) and (Lars Johann Lehman).

Are we okay for right now with those names with the - I'll leave a category that says, other to be determined. Is that okay?

Okay. Hearing no objections, I'm moving us back to the typology document. And on our agenda, we're skipping past the question of developing a list of questions because I wanted to see if we can go through the Number 7 - sorry, the prioritization exercise more completely.

Right now we have subdivided category A into one ICANN names and IANA-related names. And I heard a proposal to put both of those in the low hanging fruit category, not that some work wasn't needed but compared to others, they would be relatively simpler to resolve.

Can I hear supporter objection to putting both of those in the low hanging fruit category?

Man: (Unintelligible) that seems sensible to me.

Marilyn Cade: Okay?

Timothy Denton: Okay, so L, H, F goes into 1A and 1B.

Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Do we hear any objection to that?

Avri Doria: Question.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

I didn't understand what it meant, goes into 1A and 1B, is it 1C?

((Crosstalk))

Timothy Denton: No, (unintelligible) it's - excuse me. It's Denton here.

You got it reversed. The notion is that 1A and 1B ICANN-related names, IANA-related names go into the (unintelligible) low hanging fruit easy - relative easy...

Avri Doria: Okay, okay.

Timothy Denton: ...category.

Avri Doria: I agree with 1A, I don't agree with 1B.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Let me...

Avri Doria: I agree 1B still going to have the question.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So let me provide a little bit of verification and maybe I should have done this before.

One thing we're trying to do is to prioritize the work and then allocate resources to achieve work by (list band) and identify what work cannot be concluded by (list band), but it's going to have to have a longer work initiative.

So we're not trying to say that low hanging fruit is done or isn't going to have work. We're trying to say we ought to be able to get it done on a shorter timeframe.

Does that change your view at all, Avri?

Avri Doria: No.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So I have Alistair saying, yes, you think both can go in. Avri, would you just state your proposal, again?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, I certainly agree that 1A is low hanging fruit.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: I think if we spend a little bit of time looking at what 1B really means, we may decide that it's low hanging fruit. But if there is a complexity, then it won't be.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: And I'm just not sure yet whether there's a complexity there or not. I'm asking the question.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: And the question that's pending is, what does it mean to get into IANA's list and what are the different pathways into its list? If there is only one pathway...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: And that's ICANN's decision, then it is low hanging fruit.

If there are multiple pathways in...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: ...then it isn't.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So I'm going to put - Avri, I'm going to put both of them in that category, but I'm going to put a big asterisk and condition besides your accepting that.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: Okay?

Anybody else have an opinion one way or the other?

Timothy Denton: I would just - it's Denton here.

I'll just put in in relation to 1B, I put (unintelligible) further comments. I just put reservations-Avri on the Column 4 under the Further Comment.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Timothy Denton: So...

Marilyn Cade: Good. Then let me just tell folks that if you don't speak, you're going to be recorded as supporting the proposal of where this is - whether this particular topic is allocated.

So I, in the interest of not - there not be confusion about this, (Caroline).

(Caroline Greer): I (unintelligible) they were both low hanging fruit.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Okay, Neil.

Neil Blair: I - my position is the same as (Caroline). They appear to me to both be low hanging fruit.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Greg)?

(Greg): I would agree.

Marilyn Cade: John?

(Dan)?

(Dan Dougherty): Oh, I'm sorry I agree, both low hanging fruit.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Then I think what we have here is low hanging fruit with this condition to resolve, and we're going to move on them.

Did I miss anybody?

((Crosstalk))

John: Marilyn, it's John (unintelligible). I missed the - I agree with the group on that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Good.

Then let me move to 2B single character first level, and I'm going to lump single letter - single character first level. We'll try to walk through this relatively quickly.

(Yeah). I'll give you my initial view on this. I think because I've done a lot of study on single characters at the first level and the second level, I think single characters at the first level are much more controversial than - and may have technical questions that I haven't found at the second level.

But that's my initial view that single characters at the first level are more controversial. I don't actually know that they're workable if there are technical questions.

Anyone else want to comment on just 2B, single character first level?

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, can I - sorry, it's Alistair here.

So are you - would you put them in the extremely controversial category (even)?

Marilyn Cade: I would.

Alistair Dixon: Like what you're proposal would be, right?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I would.

(Dan Dougherty): And this is (Dan).

(Can I speak)? Can you give me a little bit of background? I'm not familiar with the technical difficulty with respect to the second or single letter first level domain names?

Timothy Denton: It's Denton here. Can I just (unintelligible) make interjection, Madame Chairman?

Marilyn Cade: Please.

Timothy Denton: One of the things that would be, I would want this kind of voting that were to be - it would be more grounded if everyone had a kind of report before them in order to make this decision.

So if we're going through this, I think it's a good idea. But I think that it would have next week going to the same list or a couple of weeks from now, we'll have a much better idea. So I would take this as pretty tentative kind of discussion.

Marilyn Cade: Right, excellent. Thank you.

(Caroline Greer): Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

(Caroline Greer): Hi. It's (Caroline), sorry.

Yeah, I mean I agree I understood you. We're going to do this exercise after we have assembled the various reports from different people. So personally, I also find this quite difficult (today) not having the necessary background information.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. Guys, we're going to try to do a very rough quick (unintelligible) on this because we're just beginning to group them. This isn't definitive. We're going to go through the reports, and then we'll actually - the chair will actually do a more in-depth prioritization.

Let me say a couple of things (to that). There are five single letters at the second level that were accidentally released and there are single letters in use in many (unintelligible) in - sorry - in many country codes.

And there has been a preliminary report done by the staff and presented to all of you as one of the research document in the statement of work. It's simple, easy to read, et cetera.

So - but symbols, and the other thing that I should just say is symbols and numbers are much more controversial than letters. So I don't expect us to be able to, you know, do all this until we scramble through the reports that we're expecting to get from Alistair, (Mike) and Neil.

But - and I'm merely making a straw proposal in brackets of where I think it belongs. I'm going to work through each of this with that same concept of the straw proposal. But it is merely a straw proposal that we'll need to come back to.

John Nevitt: Marilyn, this is John. I'll just want to echo what some of the other people had said.

Maybe it's better instead of doing a straw proposal, at first, just to give a little more overview, a little more meat to the bones because, you know, I have a hard time just like the others, (Caroline) and someone (else said), I have a hard time (start) even pointing to where I think this thing should be.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

John Nevitt: So I think, you know, especially when we're subdividing single characters into two, you know, characters where - letters or some letters, maybe it's just better just doing overview first.

Marilyn Cade: Let me point something out, guys. If you don't deliver your reports by next week, we're going to begin to run into trouble on actually getting our work done, so why don't we walk through this.

I'm going to make a very high level overview statement of what I know or don't know and see if anyone else has information to offer and then offer just a very, very hypothetical of where I think it might go. We will consider it merely a working document, and we'll move on to trying to complete the rest of the agenda.

But we are going to have to prioritize the work and also come up with the plan or recommendation for can any work get done between now and (Lisbon).

And what are we going to recommend to the council that they do going forward because this work has to feed into the new gTLD work?

Avri Doria: Marilyn, can I ask a question?

Marilyn Cade: You can. I just want to...

Avri Doria: Okay. Sorry, I didn't realize you were finished.

Marilyn Cade: I just want to welcome (unintelligible) to the call.

Woman: Thank you.

Sorry, I'm a few minutes late, (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Avri?

Woman: ...(regional).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah.

The question I had is I understand the mappings, but - I mean, I understand the classification and I guess I would classify them pretty much the way I grade papers. Everything starts off with a C and then that gets better or worst. So everything starts out at the (medium) category and (unintelligible) (they move).

What I don't understand is how these classifications map to priority. And is it just because it's low hanging fruit, it's done first or is it just because it's low hanging fruit, we saved it for last when we're rushed. And so, I don't understand the mapping between...

Marilyn Cade: (Sure)...

Avri Doria: ...the level of difficulty and priority.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

I can share with you what Chuck and I talked about when we were drafting the statement of work. But I really feel I need to leave it to the Chair to elaborate for himself on any further thinking.

When we wrote the statement of work, we hoped we would be able to categorize work that could be done quickly - controversial but we felt could be achieved.

And then some work that might be very controversial and require a lot of research, it might take a lot of time and when would to be acknowledged as not being easy to - not being able to complete that without a longer term.

But I wasn't trying to say that we on this call we're going to then decide which of those we start working on according to our agenda. This at this phase in our agenda, we were just trying to (pull up) categories together.

I would assume, Avri, that the full working group would have to then figure out what the working priority was.

Avri Doria: Okay.

So, yes, my vote for all of them is middle level of complexity.

Marilyn Cade: Is what, sorry.

Avri Doria: Is middle level of complexity.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I will put Avri there. Would you put tag names there as well?

Avri Doria: At this point, yeah. At this point until we've seen the report, I think all of them - it's really difficult as other people were saying, are just basically filling your chart with a straw proposal is that they're all at a medium level of complexity.

And it's only with the analysis that we either see the monster or the devil on the detail.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Then let me offer - it's Marilyn speaking. Let me offer a couple of comments that, Tim, I'd like you to put into the comment section...

Timothy Denton: Noted.

Marilyn Cade: ...on (E8) geographic and geopolitical name. I'd like to offer a comment that this is going to require consultation with the government advisory committee, as well as review of what existing practices are.

But then it also is going to require consultation with the GAC, both in its principles and possibly in more detail. And I would also like to have that same comment under H, Number 14.

Timothy Denton: Just a second. I just have a (block and copy).

Done.

Marilyn Cade: My own view just - is that - unless anyone else wants to offer comments beyond what has been made?

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, it's Alistair.

My view is that's the geographical and geopolitical and the controversial would be in the third category that I would agree with Avri that pretty much everything else would be in the second category...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: ...at this stage.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Does anyone else want to (comment)?

Alistair Dixon: The one exception probably would be tag names or at least those related to IDNs, maybe they could be in the third category, too.

Marilyn Cade: In the extremely controversial and may take more time or in the low hanging fruit?

Alistair Dixon: Well I think they will take - it could be one or it could be the other, (I think).

Man: That's why it's in the mail.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, okay. I'll keep in the middle (unintelligible).

Patrick Jones: Marilyn, this is Patrick. Can I add something?

Marilyn Cade: Please.

Patrick Jones: If everyone hasn't had a chance to look at the - either Chuck's original report or the report that I updated on tag names, you know, suggest that you take a look at that before the next call because that may answer some of the concerns that have been raised about whether it's in the middle category or low hanging fruit or in other category, just general background information on why tag names were put into the registry agreements, either the gTLD agreements, the ccTLD agreement.

And I just think it's really useful background that we should all have before the working group goes forward.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. (Thanks).

I think if people get a chance to read this in - read that report now, I guess thinking about this, I think that will help them think about where that item goes.

Does anyone want to make any other comments about any of this before we move on?

(Greg Stratton): This is (Greg Stratton).

(Unintelligible) one thing I'm kind of wrestling with is what others at second level other might be and whether if it is - depending upon what it is, what category it might fall into. I realized that's sort of catchall, but maybe if we can put some meat on the bones, we can figure something out about it.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

I think, that's a good question to add. We need to capture that and ask (unintelligible) you were thinking about. I'm also going to ask to have a footnote added, (Jim), that when we say single characters, we have to keep in mind that that includes symbols and numbers.

And the technical issues related to symbols and numbers is different than the technical issues related to letters as has been illustrated in the initial staff report.

So we probably have to put a footnote there and ask a question of, is the single character here intended to encompass letters, symbols and numbers.

(Greg Stratton): And I supposed that would also -- this is (Greg Stratton), again -- also have to include the - and I mean, an IDNs none - things that are not letters but are ideograms or other characters.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: Okay. Just for your - what I'm saying here is under 2B and 3B...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Man: ...I have written in the further comment, I said includes symbols and numbers in both cases.

Marilyn Cade: And we could - I think we have assumed it does and then figure out whether we're addressing all of them for only letters or only - but I think we (unintelligible) to clarify that.

Man: We may have 2B and 3B broken down even further into different according to letter, symbol or number, you know...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: ...by next meeting. Who knows?

(Greg Stratton): And by symbol do we - are we including IDN type characters. I'm sorry.

Marilyn Cade: Actually, (Greg), I wasn't there. I think we need to be clearer. You know, for instance, the pound sign, the ampersand, the (bang)...

(Greg Stratton): Right.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, asterisk, I think we ought to have a different question for ourselves and ask (unintelligible) help on this.

This came up in the IDN working group. And we agreed that we needed to have cross-(collimation) and discussion between this group and IDN experts.

But to your question, (Greg), it is, how we're dealing with ideograms related to IDNs.

(Greg Stratton): Right.

Marilyn Cade: Is that right?

(Greg Stratton): That is my question.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So that can go in the comment or I think that probably goes in the comment category.

Are we ready to move on?

(Greg Stratton): This is (Greg). Just one last...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Greg Stratton): ...but maybe some point of clarification. On the others at second level other and indeed for this group generally, are we considering what that (.moby) has called premium names, names that are kind of being reserved for alternative methods of distribution other than, you know, the typical first come, first serve or (in sunrise) type registry?

(Caroline Greer): (Caroline) here.

(.moby) kind of categorizes the reserved names and premium names to different items. So...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: In the statement of work and I'm going to make a homework assignment, all of you need to read the original statement of work. I'm not suggesting it's your bible, but you need to go back and read it.

One of the things, the questions that is asked was, how do things get into a reserve list. And for - if you look at the Rainbow document, you'll see - you'll be very interested to see that.

And I'm trying to say this without prejudice. It's Marilyn speaking.

But you know, you'll see that for instance, info has list.info and mail.info and phone.info and register.info and search.info, site.info.

You go over to biz. biz has security.biz, servicemark.biz, services.biz, telnet.biz. You go to (find your biz), postmaster, helpdesk, go to - I'm just looking for one more example, affiliates, and you see affiliates has member.info - members.info.

So, you know, I think it's a legitimate question to ask and then you look at that name and you see some unique things there because of the issue of dealing with (their big) names, et cetera.

Maybe reading that document again after, you know, going through these two calls, may actually raise some more questions to you. But I think it's a fair question to ask how do - and that would be (G13), I think, (Greg), how do names get reserved at the second level, and how

do they get on reserves because if the name goes into a reserve list, in theory, there has to be a process to unreserved it before it's allocated.

If - to (Caroline's) point, I think, was - I think she was saying that premium names was not a reserved category. It was something else. Is that right, (Caroline)?

(Caroline Greer): Exactly, yeah.

I mean, we as a registry kind of categorize them differently because they're not in the reserved names appendix. They're actually in our product list.

And yeah, to allocate them, we do need to reserve them. So in theory, they are reserved names, but we would qualify those names. I mean, you know, happy to discuss them and yeah, we can add them on to the list, no problem. but just from our perspective, we would see them as different from reserved names.

Man: (I guess), I would suggest that they're kind of a separate category of reserved names but they in fact operate in a not dissimilarly from reserved names and really are reserved names and if other, you know, it's something for us to consider.

Woman: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And so...

Avri Doria: (Yeah), this is Avri. Can I comment on that, too?

Marilyn Cade: Sure. It's Marilyn.

I just wanted to say we did talk a little bit about the issue of - in an earlier discussion on the statement of work about how do names get on to reserve list, how they get off of reserve list, who has the authority to take someone off of reserve list.

So I just want to capture that question for us to come back to in relation to - not specific to any of these categories, but one of the questions that we always ask ourselves, let me ask ourselves the question about what's the purpose of reserve list, how do you get on it, how do you get off it, who has the ability to get to allow a name off of it.

And that makes it more a neutral discussion that we can have across all these categories. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think that I'm - in essence agreeing. I think that there is a category that we need to discuss that for want of a better term could be called local reserved name list and that we don't necessarily have to discuss the content of those list, but we need to discuss sort of the principles by which a TLD can create its own local reserved name list...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...you know, as opposed to the global reserved name list that are normally created.

And I think the subject of how one removes a name locally that is on the global list is yet another topic.

Marilyn Cade: I think actually, I just want to, Patrick and Tim, to take this as follow-up item. I think that the place we thought we were dealing with those is in the Rainbow document under other names reserved at the second level and then it has lots of different examples.

I think that's the - and I think that is the others at second level other category. That would be what I'm calling (G13) right now.

So, Avri, unless it proves not to be the place to deal with your question, that's...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah - no, I was thinking that this was the question others were talking about wherever it fits is fine. But I don't think it's a reserved name per se, it's (another) issue.

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick. I have something to add to this.

Marilyn Cade: Please.

(Patrick Falstrom): In with that (.cut), they have a special category that sort of falls in the others at second level other for community assigned names.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: And these would be names of, I guess, famous (Catalan) writers or other officials that they've included in this and it's part of their appendix F.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: It's not with the reserved names list, but there are, (for lack of) better term, they are reserved at the community level.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick, would you add that - is that (NR) (unintelligible) document?

Patrick Jones: That has been added into the document. It's near the end. I believe it's after the biz and affiliates and (pro list).

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to separately make a recommendation to you and Chuck, but not online about improving - enhancing the numbering of this document by paragraph so - because I think we're going to be referring to it a lot.

Okay. I'm now going to move us away from this document, if everybody is okay with that. We captured everything. Anybody wants to say about it?

Let me thank Tim for putting it together as an initial effort for us to help us move this along.

Now, let me bring us back to where we are on our agenda.

I want to go back on the working agenda for today to Number 7, action item to the next call.

Several of you have volunteered to help work with other colleagues on helping to complete a document. I am going to ask Tim to just post an email with the volunteer's name...

Man: In that case we're going to have to go over them again and I got to - hold on.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I captured them all.

Man: You did?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: Okay. Thank you because I have not got all the names who all the persons.

Marilyn Cade: It's okay. And whenever you see them, if Tim and I put you in the wrong place, you'll yell, I know.

Now, I noticed that, (Tamara), by being on the call last didn't get assigned to help somebody else with a report. But when you see this list, (Tamara), would you get some thought to whether you might join one of the groups?

(Tamara): Okay, definitely.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

John Nevitt: Hey, Marilyn, I'm not on a group either. It's John, and I'm happy to work with Mike Palage on the geographic name.

Marilyn Cade: That'd be great. Thanks.

Timothy Denton: Who was that speaking?

Marilyn Cade: John Nevitt.

John Nevitt: John Nevitt.

Timothy Denton: Thank you. I just need to recognize your voice.

Thank you, John.

John Nevitt: Sorry, Tim.

Marilyn Cade: So, you need to be working on your report. You've got an outline for the report, but you also need to look at (7) and (A1) and see if you can begin drafting a statement of the role of reserved names.

Why - for your category, why there should be reserved names, what's the purpose of reserving names.

And then thinking about whether or not you see the need for additional resources. We've already talked about some experts. If you feel the need for additional experts, I think you should use the - you should go back to Tim and to Chuck and raise the question of whether there are additional experts that Chuck might identify or work with the staff to identify beyond the folks who've already been recommended. And start

thinking about the list of questions you have for any experts on your category.

You need a (unintelligible) reports for your meeting next to the meeting next week. It may be a status report, but if there are areas you can't fill in, don't hesitate to ask for guidance on where to go.

And that's where I see Tim as being helpful in gathering the questions from people and then coming back to Chuck and maybe to me and a couple of other people and asking, you know, are there other - and Patrick, and asking are there other places to go, other resources we haven't considered. We feel the need to have our experts brief the group before we can go any further. Try to begin to narrow down those kinds of questions.

I'm going to propose to Chuck that he begin to schedule in parallel the general experts such as (Paul), possibly such as Patrick, (David), if he's going to be available and that we devote a call to hearing and being able to ask questions of the general experts.

We'll need to try to do that relatively soon.

During the week of the 22nd of February, some people are going to be in L.A. at a policy development meeting.

Can I just ask who on this call is already scheduled to be at PDP '05 or PDP '06?

Avri Doria: Next week?

Marilyn Cade: The 22nd, Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh the 22nd. Yeah, I'm going to be there.

Marilyn Cade: Avri will be there.

John, are you going to be there?

John Nevitt: I'm 50-50.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, I will be participating remotely at least some of the time.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I will be there.

Neil, are you going to....

Neil Blair: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Greg)?

(Greg Stratton): I will be in cold New York.

Marilyn Cade: (Dan)?

(Dan Dougherty): I'll be in (balmy) San Francisco.

Marilyn Cade: I think you're just showing up there, (Dan).

So we've got Avri. (Tamara)?

(Tamara): Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: You.

(Tamara): I will not be there.

Marilyn Cade: You won't be there. Okay?

Who I missed here?

(Tamara): And did you want me to (lift) up with you after the call on which group I want to join?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

(Tamara): Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I think, do you happen to know, (Dan), if (Mike Rothenbaum) going to be there?

(Dan Dougherty): I don't think he is. Whether or not he'll be participating remotely, I don't know.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Yeah, (Mike) told me yesterday that he thinks he is going.

(Dan Dougherty): All right. Well there you go, (it shows you what I know).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

And Chuck Gomes is going to be there, I know, for Thursday and Friday and part of Saturday.

Well we are supposed to make a report, a mid-session report. And I had told Chuck I would ask about the possibility of trying to have a two-hour working session for the group possibly on Saturday morning with (Darlene).

Because it's on the West Coast, it should be - we should be interrupting your Saturday morning midday for some of you elsewhere.

But when we just take that as an action item and ask Chuck online whether he thinks that would be useful to do, it might be that it would be helpful to take advantage of Ram, you know, some of our experts might - it might be possible to take advantage of some of our experts for that call.

I'm going to pause. I'm going to close this call in about four minutes. So let me just point people to (Liz Williams), ICANN staff, posted to the group the present draft principles from the GAC on gTLDs. Those will be a discussion topic at another time not for today's call.

And I will go through them. I volunteered to go through them and do a mapping against our categories to see which of those - which of our category seem to be implicated by the principles. And there's a lot of

work to get done between now and next week, so we can have reports from folks.

Let me pause and take questions from anybody who isn't clear on what they're going to do between now and next week and what they're going to do on next week's call.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: This is next week's call you're talking about?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Woman: I won't probably be at that (unintelligible) I'll be at late because I do have a (Feb '06)...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Woman: ...call simultaneous with it.

Marilyn Cade: He had told me that he was trying to change that with you so that there wouldn't be an (unintelligible) of a conflict for me...

Woman: Yeah. We haven't gotten there yet. And at the moment, basically changing either call means reaching enough people and getting agreements and that's difficult. And as you know sometimes when you start that, you end up with half and half thinking (at that 1).

Now, you know, so there are been various suggestions, but we haven't managed to reach closure on any methods of getting out of each other's way yet.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Woman: So assuming we're still in each other's way, I obviously have to get several of these priorities.

Marilyn Cade: However, I see Alistair, John, Marilyn, Avri with direct conflict in...

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Can I just make a suggestion?

Avri, my - I would be willing to do the PDP aspects at 5:00 am my time, so that would be two hours earlier than this call status, if that would help.

Avri Doria: Okay.

I had been looking at two hours later at the end of this one knowing your restrictions, but you saying that - (oh that's) - it would be earlier one and the option was to see if that works.

But the problem is getting enough people from (Feb 06). Now, I expect the (Feb 06) meeting will be relatively process oriented and not that (contentful) so it may be able to be shorter, but I don't (know).

Marilyn Cade: Can I (add real) quickly on your behalf ask John, Marilyn and you've already heard from Alistair, I could go either way, Avri, for myself.

John, are you flexible to move either way?

John Nevitt: I have a meeting from 12:00 to 1:00 Eastern Time, so if we do it earlier - what 5:00 am your time, Alistair, what is that for me? Do you have any idea?

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Five am my time...

((Crosstalk))

John Nevitt: Okay. What's 1:00 pm...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: So it's 17 UTC. How do you calculate...

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, that's right, 17 UTC, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

John Nevitt: Okay. I would need an hour before - this single letter or reserved name working group starts at 1:00 pm my time?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

John Nevitt: So, I need an hour before that. So I don't know if that gets too early for Alistair. I'm very flexible after that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Why don't we leave that with (Lyn), and I'll be to work out and you've heard that people can be flexible after that or before that and we'll try to avoid the collision as much as possible, Avri.

So I am going to - Tim and I will walk through the typology of reserved names, get Chuck to propose either collapsing it or (unintelligible) in any way that seems useful, work that out with Tim.

And Tim and I will work together to capture what people have agreed to with populated working group, and I'm going to call the call to an end but open it for one final round of comments from anyone on any topic that's on your mind.

Timothy Denton: Denton here.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Timothy Denton: Have we agreed on a call-in time next week.

Marilyn Cade: Glen, Glen - Tim, that was the discussion we were just having.

((Crosstalk))

Timothy Denton: I know, but I didn't get whether there was resolution of it.

Marilyn Cade: No, there was no resolution of it.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Sorry, I was on mute.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Glen, would you take as an action item to follow up with Avri and help work through this collision issue...

Woman: She's already doing it.

Marilyn Cade: Pardon me...

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Fabulous.

And then just get back to the group because I just want to respond to Tim that we haven't resolved it. And so if we could try to resolve it by - Avri, do you think we can resolve it by Friday or do we need to go to Monday?

Avri Doria: I have no idea if we can resolve it. So, yeah. I mean, we're obviously going to try, and I just don't know.

Marilyn Cade: Well since...

Avri Doria: I mean, sometimes you can't. So now you moved to this meeting an hour earlier than it was. So already the conflict is only for first hour of one second hour for the other, correct?

Marilyn Cade: So let...

Avri Doria: Although by moving it earlier, you pretty much put John out of it completely or...

Marilyn Cade: John, who...

((Crosstalk))

John Nevitt: No, no.

Alistair Dixon: I'm so confused.

((Crosstalk))

John Nevitt: (Wherefore), I don't think it's been moved. I thought it was 1:00 pm Eastern from the start. So - but by keeping it the way we started today, you're right, it - Avri, there's only one-hour conflict so you only have to move the Taskforce 06 one hour further ahead, past, you know, later.

Avri Doria: That's true. I had never realized that this one was moved, so I keep thinking of it as what was it...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So we're going to see if Glen and Avri can work on moving PDP 06 an hour later, leave this one at 1 o'clock next week and then we have back-to-back calls to some people but we are not in collision mode.

I'm going to work with Tim and I'm filling in this the names of people who volunteered, and we will work with Chuck on any enhancements or suggestions (unintelligible) to the typology.

And if people want to talk to me on background about resources that if anything I could offer about where to find the information, do feel free to call me. My cell phone is 202-360-1196, and my email is mscade@cox.net.

And Chuck will be back next week. And in the meantime we'll be working on evolving an agenda with Tim and I working in the background to bring him up-to-date.

Let me recommend the transcript to all of you. Glen is going to pass this (job) as being a really good quality service on (unintelligible) turnaround really is very, very helpful as the resource.

We're closing the call.

Man: Marilyn, thanks for stepping in.

Marilyn Cade: Sure - everyone for being here.

And Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: (Yeah).

Marilyn Cade: We're all interested to know that you're with us in spite of the fact that you were (injured), and we'll look forward to catching up on how you do it.

Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you. Bye-bye.

END