

**Vertical Integration PDP Working Group  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 10 May 2010 at 17:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Vertical Integration PDP Working Group meeting on Monday 10 May 2010 at 1700 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:  
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-vi-20100510.mp3>

On page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:  
Contracted Parties House  
Registrars Stakeholder Group**

Thomas Barrett  
Paul Diaz  
Jeff Eckhaus  
Jean-Christophe Vignes  
Stephane van Gelder  
Michele Neylon  
Krista Papac  
Volker Greimann  
Statton Hammock

**gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group**

Nacho Amadoz  
Brian Cute  
Kathy Kleiman  
Ken Stubbs  
Jeff Neuman  
Keith Drazek  
Tim Ruiz

**Non Contracted Parties House  
- Commercial Stakeholders Group**

Berry Cob -CBUC  
Mikey O'Connor – CBUC- Co-Chair  
Michael Palage - CBUC  
Scott Austin IPC  
Kristina Rosette – IPC  
Jon Nevett -CBUC  
Ronald N. Andruff – CBUC

**- Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group**

Milton Mueller

**Individuals**

Roberto Gaetano – Individual - Co-Chair  
Katrín Ohlmer  
Faisal Shah  
Phil Buckingham  
Steve Pinkos  
Kristian Ormen

**ALAC/At Large**

Sebastien Bachellot  
Alan Greenberg

**Staff:**

Margie Milam  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White  
Marika Konings  
Mike Zupke  
Dan Holloran  
Amy Stathos

**Apologies:**

Vanda Scartezini  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
Siva Muthusamy  
Avri Doria  
Eric Brunner-Williams – CORE Internet Council of Registrars  
Liz Gasster  
Baudoin Schombe

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Mikey O'Connor: (Tonia), the other thing - could you stop the announcing now?

Coordinator: Sure. I sure can.

Mikey O'Connor: We'll just - we'll keep an eye on folks as they come in through Meeting View.

Coordinator: Sounds great. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Here - we'll do our usual routine. We'll take a look at the agenda and let last group of folks fight their way through the conferencing system and then get started.

Most of the call today is going to be devoted to the matrix, especially the one that Kathy developed. And so I thought what we would do is spend a few minutes just talking about the approach to the matrix for the table, and then spend most of the time on the content of it.

Eric Brunner-Williams had a proposal which I forgot about. And so part of the reason for the repeat on the list is because it was my bad. I left that off. So I've added a slot at the end of the agenda for Eric to talk a little bit about that. There's been some conversation on the list, and I think we should continue that conversation and then maybe carry it back out to the list.

And then - anything else? And so the question of the day right now - a couple of things has come onto my radar in the anything else. One is we've got constituency statements and now (unintelligible) comments constituency that we need to start rolling into the content.

And with your permission I'll take that to the leadership group and we'll work that out and bring that idea back to you next time. And is there anything...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...else?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can you hear me? Mikey this is...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: ...yes we're...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: ...having problems so, I don't know what question you're responding to.  
There's some dial-in problems.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not. I'm just going through the agenda, Ken. So I just want to see if there's anything that people want to add to the agenda. This is the any other business question. That's all.

Okay, I think we have an agenda. Gisella, why don't you go ahead and call the roll, and we'll get started.

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's vertical integration call on Monday, May 10.

We have Mikey O'Connor, Volker Greimann, Roberto Gaetano, (Christian Orman), Paul Diaz, Sebastian Bachollet, Kathy Kleinman, Jeff Newman, Jeff Eckhaus, Stefan Van Gelder, (Scott Austin), (Catherine Omah), John Nevitt, (Thomas Barrett), Statton Hammock, Barry Cobb, Faisal Shah, Allen Greenberg, (Steven Pinkos), Ron Andruff, Keith Drasek, (Nacho Amado), Tim Ruiz, Ken Stubbs, Kristina Rosette, Jean-Christophe Vignes, Krista Papac, Phil Buckingham, Milton Mueller, (Michele Neylon), Brian Cute, Michael Palage.

From staff we have Glenn Desaintgery, Mike Zupke, Margie Milam, Amy Stathos, Dan Halleran, myself -- Gruber-White. We have apologizes from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eric Brunner-Williams, and Siva Muthusamy

If I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, press star 6 to mute, and star 6 to unmute again. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Gisella. I guess we strike the Eric proposal from the agenda, since we just got apologies from Eric, so we have another 15 minutes.

So, you know, mostly today I think what we want to look at is sort of where we're at. And I am quite entranced with Kathy's summary of that. And so, Kathy if you would be so kind as to sort of walk us through what you've done, I think that's the place we'll start today.

Kathy Kleinman: Great. Thank you Mikey. I'm happy to do that. All what I've circulated is a table. And it started out just as a personal effort. I was trying to do a side-by-side comparison of all the proposals of certain issues like equal access. And the - it worked out for me. It was very useful to line everything up side by side.

And so I talked to Mike and Roberto offline, and just went ahead and spent an all-nighter putting it all together. On just some of the major issues - this isn't a final or a formal or completely formal by any means, but I did go through all the proposals and line them up.

And in the last called I'd mentioned flipping the axis, so that's what I did. So here down the left side you'll see all the proposals that have been cleared of the ICANN board resolution as a zero, and I've done all the way down through proposals.

The first column is percentage of cross-ownership -- if you're looking at the registry, how much you can own of the registry. Second column is percentage of ownership of the registry - of the registrar or the registry.

A question had come up - again, just reading across the top -- a question had come up about whether the ownership - the cross-ownership could be more if the registrar agrees not to distribute the registree's TLD. So I put that in.

The equal access principle - due - is equal access preserved in the proposal for whatever the mean model is. That's what we're looking at there. And then, going into the exceptions, there were various exceptions that were discussed. And not all proposals had exceptions, and not all proposals dealt with all the exceptions. So I just went through them.

Is there a single registrant exception? In some cases, like demand media, there were variations of that. If there's a threshold what is it? Same with the community gTLD, same with the (unintelligible).

Is equal access required in the exceptions? Here it's interesting, because the exception by definition is a suspension of the equal access. The registry is allowed to have - to distribute domain names directly or through a registrar up to the threshold 30,000, 50,000 depending on the proposal.

But the question here - the equal access apply - really applies to whether other registrars are allowed in. Can the community gTLD be exclusive and exclusively distribute up to 30,000 or 50,000, or is required to include other registrars that they want to distribute. So that's what that column means.

Certain proposals - the next column is back end registry providers and cross-ownership. Certain proposals limit the ability of a back end registry service provider to be fully vertically integrated with a registrar. And two columns because that goes in both directions.

(Richard Tyndale) has told us a lot about the reseller concerns, so I included a column with resellers. The next column is review later. There are certain proposals that say, "Well, let's start with certain models, a main model, but

let's review it at 12 months or 18 months." And then Column O is emphasizing sections.

Each proposal seemed to have one or more things that it really wanted to focus on that were a little bit (unintelligible) a little tweak, something important to the proposer. And so for us - for PIR for example is the efficient marketing idea that we treat the equal access in the main model so that registrars can present a registry with certain very specific marketing proposal.

But some proposals have these things some didn't. But what I did here with the emphasized sections is try as much as possible to take direct quotes so that I wouldn't misrepresent or summarize or come to some conclusions that were not in the original proposal.

And so I presented to you, I share it with you. I would prefer not to take on the editing responsibilities, especially if the group wants to use this in some way. I think somebody neutral should do that. And since I presented the PIR proposal, I'm not neutral.

But I do try to be very neutral in just lining this up, because I was hoping it might help us move forward. Thank you. Thanks Mike.

Man: Thanks (Roberta).

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Kathy. (Jeff), I see your hand up.

(Jeff): Yes, thanks Kathy for doing this. I think it's a good way to look at it. I will note that I think we just need to all kind of look at this from our proposals, because I'm not sure - I'm looking at the JN Squared and I'm not sure this is fully accurate.

But, I mean it was a - obviously a good start, and I think each sheet's proponent needs to go through it and kind of change it to what it is. I also

notice that the ICANN board resolution - I'm not sure where things were filled in as, you know, like for the third column, which is if registrar agrees not to distribute registries TLD, more cross-ownership allowed, it says to the ICANN board resolution no.

But I don't think the board resolution actually addressed that, so I'm not sure it's a no. I'm not sure it's a yes. I just - I think it wasn't really talked about. So if we do decide to use this, you know, then I just think that each of the proponents needs to go back and revise this chart.

Man: Thanks...

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, (Jeff).

Man: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: My - well any other comments on this before I weigh in? I guess I'll finish the thought that I had, which is that it - maybe what we can do is hand this off to the analysis team as the folks who keep it current, and they can be the scribes and the scrubbers to keep, you know, to keep it sort of separated that way. That would be certainly one approach to handle that.

The question I've got for the group is, you know, I find this very useful, because it gives us sort of a snapshot of where we are all on one page, and really tips us over into the conversation that we need to have, which is determining, you know, where we can find consensus on these issues and how.

And that's - that was the intent of that extremely detailed matrix that we sent - that I sent earlier, to which I received precisely zero responses. So that - I put up in the swing and a miss or save for later column. Maybe it was a bit too granular.



Tim raised the issue -- and I understand that point on the list -- that the language was open to misinterpretations, and so, you know, there was discomfort with filling it out.

So if this approach works for folks, I would be pretty darn excited about that, but I really want to have a conversation about it to make sure that this is going to be okay. And if it is okay, we'll spend the rest of the call maybe working on some of the columns. But let's go to John.

John Nevitt: I was just going to talk about the column. So if you want to...

Mikey O'Connor: That's fine.

John Nevitt: ...fine...

Mikey O'Connor: That's absolutely fine.

John Nevitt: Okay. So I think this format is very helpful. I think it was - it's the simplified version and easy to read, so thank you Kathy for doing that.

On the columns, the one thing that I found confusing, and especially in Kathy's description, is the equal access piece, because there's really three concepts in there, and we might need to divide those out.

One is use of registrars so that's the Recommendation 19. One is equal access, and one is non-discrimination. So we, you know, we've talked in the past about use of registrars begin one thing, and then on the other hand can a registry select among the registrars? So that might get into the equal access.

And then when you select a group of registrars to distribute your (string), can you discriminate between one or the other? So it's really three, and Kathy has them folded into one.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks John. Go ahead, Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: My - John that's really helpful. As I reviewed the proposals, often all of these concepts were folded into one under equal access or equivalent access ideas. But breaking it out makes a lot of sense. It makes some of the other evaluations, especially in the exceptions, easier going forward. So that sounds great.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Thanks. Yes, I think John made a good point there in that regard with that column. And just in general I think that - I hope that the - I like the matrix, but also it doesn't (get used to restrictives), that as we see, you know, more granularity like that John pointed out, that, you know, the matrix can be modified, and that if overall - or if new ideas, you know, should crop up, that this doesn't limit us to discussing new ideas or maybe some more morphation, if you will, of a number of ideas, and that in general we don't, you know, not just not get restricted to these things, but that we're careful how we use this to gauge consensus.

Now with my bigger issue with the previous one that you had sent and (unintelligible) applies to. It just concerned me the way it was constructed that it wasn't flexible enough in the way that it was - I wasn't sure how it was going to be used and I didn't feel it was flexible enough to be used appropriately to try to gauge consensus.

And I didn't want to, you know, respond or comment with something and then be stuck with, "Oh well," you know, "Tim or GoDaddy agrees with this, so, you know, it's sort of (unintelligible). Next we have consensus on that issue, so we're done with it."

Want to be careful with that, because if things change or we come to some agreement on something else, that might change the way we feel about another issue. And I want to make sure that we stay flexible enough to address that and we don't (just), you know, paint it into a corner, so to speak, by our responses or replies to these kinds of things.

So that was my main concern with what was presented previously, but as a tool to get us to some sort of consensus, I think this is great.

Mikey O'Connor: That's terrific Tim. And, you know, my approach to things where we're on such a compressed time table, you know, I do have to remind us that we're driving through a process that normally takes 400 days and something around 50, is I'm happy to try lots of stuff and also happy to change the way that we use it, especially in the situation like that.

I certainly don't want to put people in a box. We want to use these tools to help us arrive at consensus as quickly as we can, if we can. And so, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: And I, you know, I guess just in general, I mean I - Mikey I just have an issue with it regardless, that - and not that I intend to try to delay anything or slow things down, but this is a huge freaking issue. And for us to say, "Well here's our deadline, we've got to have something by then," now I think that's dangerous.

And, you know, sure, you know, let's not try to drag this out longer than we have to, but let's take whatever time it takes if what this group is going to come up with is going to affect the market forever and a day. I don't want to be rushed to some judgment here. I want to take the time we need so that we're all comfortable with whatever we come up with.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And, you know, to that point, Tim, at least for me, I've always been thinking that we've really got two waves of this. We've got a wave that really is under a pretty severe time constraint, which is the first iteration, and then a broader discussion over a longer time period that has more degrees of freedom.

And to the extent that we can come to consensus on something quickly, I think that's useful because otherwise what happens is we go into the first round of the, you know, this next round possibly with the board resolution standing.

I think there is a deadline there, and so we have to balance the size and import of the issue with the circumstances we find ourselves in. And, you know, we'll do our best. Allen, you're next.

Allen Greenberg: Yes, two comments -- one philosophical, one very mechanical. The philosophical one -- excuse me -- in relation to what you just said, I think indeed we may have to soon start looking at, are there things that we want to recommend for the first round, because we do not believe the board alternative is acceptable, and can we find things that all of us or most of us can live with to address what perhaps are believed to be crucial problems, and then look at a long term one.

That may relieve some of the pressure regarding what Tim said of whatever we do we're going to have to live with forever.

Purely mechanical one is I note there's already a number of entries in the table where this applies, but I think it's going to grow in that the answer varies depending on the aspect you're looking at.

So, you know, is there equal access to registrars? Well, it depends on whether we're talking about a single registrant case or not. So a number of the proposals are bifurcated or trifurcated that they have different sets of

rules for different groups of registries. And the table may get a mite complex of - when we do that. That's it.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Allen. All good points. And I think that as these things get complex, it'll partly be up to the analysis group to figure out ways to keep it from putting us in a box or getting so complex that we can't figure it out.

But at the same time, essentially this is a large and complex negotiations, and we need to put every tool in places that we can for the people who are engaged in that negotiation so that we can get to the best outcome. And so I love this as a tool, because it helps summarize. But if it gets in our way, we need to immediately stop and makes sure that it doesn't take us in a bad direction.

Man: Talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) way, can whoever - thank you - put Note 14 in front of the chat, move it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, things got really complicated. I think (Milton)'s hand was up, but right now the attendees aren't - oh there we go. Yes, so Milton I think you're next.

Milton Mueller: Yes, I was - just wanted to comment on the chart that Cathy did. I think this is a real step forward in terms of clarity, and I really appreciated - even though particular boxes might be filled out wrong, this whole approach of having the proposers, you know, lined up going down rows, which - where you can see, is just a tremendous improvement. So thank you Kathy for doing that.

I had a couple questions about what you meant by certain things. When you talk about transferable, what do you mean by that? For example we have a

community gTLD exception, an orphan gTLD exception, and you say yes in transferable for the MMA proposal. I just don't know what you mean by that.

And then, one of the ways that this chart might be used to further simplify things is to put indications in each of these cells, which positions are inconsistent with the others, in a simple kind of a black and white fashion, if that's possible, so that for example you know, this business of registry and registrar cross-ownership, it - according to this chart, it looks like nobody disagrees that that should be reciprocal, that those should be the same limits, if any limits, placed on both sides of that equation. If that's the case, then we can kind of tick that issue off of something that we agree on.

Another example is, you know, single registrant. Let's say there are people who think this should not be a - an exception, and there are people who do. Those are where the differences kind of jump out fairly clearly.

So I think what we want to be looking at now are not so much the details of proposals, but the areas of agreement and disagreement where we have fundamental disagreements in areas where our positions could be reconciled. That's all I want to say right now.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Milton. I agree 100%. I hadn't seen that first agreement that you found, which was that the first two columns are reciprocal, is a terrific observation of something where we agree. And I'm all for finding those right now, because of the - I think that it's on that that we can build some stuff fairly quickly I hope.

(Scott) - well, hang on a minute. Kathy, Milton had some questions for you. Do you want to answer those or should we just record them and address them later? Either way is fine.

Kathy Kleinman: Thanks. I actually just pulled up the MMA proposal, and the concept of transferable in certain exceptions is in the proposal. Exactly what that meant

isn't well defined. So I just wanted to say I found it in the proposal, but defining it or explaining it, that - I - it's definitely something that should be - should happen going forward.

So I thought it was an interesting concept, but I'm not actually sure exactly what it means. But I took the language from the MMA.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, cool. (Scott)?

(Scott Austin): Yes, thanks Mikey. Just a couple of questions actually. I noticed that in the equal access principle preserve, all of them are the same it seems, except for PIR has a slightly marketing variation. I don't know what that means in terms of (unintelligible). I've been trying to keep up with the emails.

The second thing is that at the bottom the (GNSO) council and references Recommendation 19. Should we assume that Recommendation 19 is included in all of the others? And if not, sort of, you know, what's the distinction there?

And then I guess the other questions I had was in equal access required and exceptions under that column. There's one under demand media that says, "Yes, SR" which I assume is single registrant, but then it says, "No (MR)." And I wasn't sure what MR referred to.

And then there's a - my final question is on the back end registrar column, the very next column, under MMA it has the policy or the. And I just wasn't sure what material was supposed to follow the.

Mikey O'Connor: Kathy do you want to tackle those? I can do some of them.

Kathy Kleinman: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: For example I can do the last one...

Kathy Kleinman: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...while you're cogitating about some of the earlier ones.

The last one is just that that cell has been truncated. The whole cell actually reads, "Fifteen percent of registry operators/RSP controls pricing, policy or the selecting of registrars for the TLD." And it's just that when it was put up on the screen in Adobe it got chopped off.

(Scott Austin): Okay. Then it just duplicates the one above it for JN Squared.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Kathy Kleinman: For everyone looking at it this way, you may want - in the Excel I had actually taken boxes that had too much text in them and made the text smaller. So if you go back to the original Excel that was circulated -- or we'll recirculate it again -- the Excel will have the full text.

Let's see, regarding Recommendation 19, it comes from the (GNSO) council report. It's been referred to many times whether the - whether every proposal that talked about equal access being preserved meant to do it exactly the same way as Recommendation 19 phrased it. I don't know.

What we're - what - just as John Nevitt pointed out that there's a granularity there, it's unclear. But certainly the embracing of the concept of the general principle seems to go all the way across the proposals.

(Scott Austin): Well, I guess my follow up question would be - is should we - should each of them tell us their stand on Recommendation 19 -- if they're within it or if they're opposed to it or they've expanded upon it? That may be something we need to report on when we deal with a (GNSO).



Kathy Kleinman: Well I think we would need to circulate Recommendation 19 for everybody. I know that when I joined the group I was certainly wondering exactly what that referred to, having come in in the middle of the discussion. So I think we should circulate that...

Allen Greenberg: Recommendation 19's just a little wider than just equal access. It says, "Registrars must be used." That was Allen Greenberg, by the way. Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I - right at the top of this conversation, one of the things that came up was the thought that maybe each of the proposers ought to go through and just touch up their column or their row to make sure that Kathy and her all-nighter got it just right.

And maybe what we should start doing is kind of developing a list of clarifications for folks so that when we send it out to get brushed up, we give it that kind of refinement. And then people can just go ahead and say yes, that Recommendation 19, or more or less as you suggested, (Scott).

You had two other questions in your list, (Scott). Can you remind me of what those were? And maybe what - they may fall into the same category that we can just...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...send clarifying notes.

(Scott Austin): One is already answered in the - it was PIR, and that was - the question was is slight marketing variation efficient. And, I think that as you go to the last - the next to the last column, it says - it defines efficient marketing means that registrars may. So, I think that covers at least the efficient aspect of that. And, I'm assuming that's a slight variation.

Then, the only other question I had was the meaning of MR. Again, I'm trying to keep up with the alphabet soup, but I'm wondering...

Mikey O'Conner: I can do that one. I'm like the little kid in class sticking his hand up and saying, "I can answer that." That's multiple registrants instead of single registrant.

(Scott Austin): Okay. Great. Thank you.

Mikey O'Conner: Thanks, (Scott). Jeff Neuman, you're next.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. At the beginning of the discussion, and we're already falling into that danger. So when people look at that column on equal access, everyone's going, "Oh, yes. Everyone agrees its equal access, so we can tick of the box." My - well, I emphasize, and I think what (Keith) emphasized in the last column, and what I think what I've written in a number of emails is that if something changes - an assumption of the proposal changes, then that column may change.

So for example, with the (unintelligible) proposal right, we have the 15%, but it also really should be controls opposed to a percentage number. But putting that aside, if that change - so if the group agreed that Demand Media's proposal of 100% was the way we were going to go, then - at least (New Star), so the one part of the JN Squared would say, "Okay. Then our position on equal access changes to a no."

So, I think what you've got to ask the question of is do each of those proponents - like if we say there's common agreement on something, you need to send that question out. You can't just assume because you read it in the charts. So, there are a lot of assumptions that go into a number of these positions. And once you change the assumption, because you change an answer or you - then the others may change too. So, I just don't want to be in

the position of being stuck because it looks like in this column we have a consensus.

And, Alan had just called tentative consensus. And, I don't even think it's tentative consensus until you decide - at least from my perspective until you decide the first most important question, which is what percent of ownership are you going to allow - or control are you going to allow? Then, the other things fold from there in my opinion.

Mikey O'Conner: Jeffery, I really want to jump on that last thought, because that was exactly what I was thinking about as you were talking. Can we take a slight detour from the queue just for a second, and throw out ideas as to what things have to be decided first so that those tendencies can then fall in place. Because, I think - for example, if there's really only one - I don't mean in any way to diminish it, but if there's really one primary dependency, which is the percent of ownership, it would help to know that sequence so that we could tackle those centrally driving decisions first, and then have subsequent (divisions) fall in place afterwards.

So, are there others...

Jeff Neuman: So...

Mikey O'Conner: Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: So, I was going to say - I mean, like one question you could ask people, which is a question I - you know, most people - a lot of people have written 15% or 0%. I'm ignoring the 100% for now. But of the people that said 15%, was the issue the actual percentage or is the issue control? And then, if people say it's more control as opposed to the specific number, you know then a number may not be as important. Or, some people may actually mean the number and not the issue of control.

Because - but there's two issues, right. There's legal ownership, which is defined in terms of percentage, but then there's also direct or indirect control, either by contract or otherwise. So, you've got to start with that. But, I do think that's actually a threshold question that everything else fits into. Because if you - for example, if you said if everyone went along with Demand Media's proposal, then it doesn't matter. I mean, you wouldn't need exceptions because it's 100%. You may not need exceptions, right. So, that is a threshold question, I think.

Mikey O'Conner: I just want to take a quick sense of the group and see if indeed there is essentially one or maybe one - maybe one and a half - the ownership/control question, is that a driver? And if it is, would it be a good idea - not on this call. I think that's too ambitious, but would it be a good idea to target the next call to try and drive that issue to ground in the - you know, this week on the list to sort of have that argument again? Really try and dig into that, because I think that if we could get to a conclusion on that, the rest of this could then fall in place.

And, I agree whole heartedly Jeff with your point that people need to have the ability to change the rest of their proposal. That you shouldn't feel that you're locked into a statement on this matrix, because it's just essentially the current status of things. But, if there's really a gating issue like that and we could drive that to the ground, I think that that would make the rest of the process flow more easily.

I'm not hearing a whole lot of squawk from the contrary. I'll give you one more chance to just squawk to the contrary. And if not, then I think what we might try to do is really focus in on that issue for next week's call, and try...

Tim Ruiz: Mikey, this is Tim. Can I squawk a little?

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead and squawk. That's why I'm asking for it.

Tim Ruiz: Yes. I'm not really opposed to the idea. I guess I'm just not sure what it is we're doing. I mean, you know 15% in JN Squared means a different thing than 15% in some of the other proposals. And then you know, this concept that's introduced now about - you know, back-end service providers are, or third parties that are providing some of the back-end services, whether that's database or DNS services, or whatever. You know, and how does - you know, and 15% might apply differently in that regard.

So, I guess I'm not sure what it is we're trying to come to some agreement on.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: Just one aspect of that, or all of that altogether?

Mikey O'Connor: Well, to the extent that we can - hell, this is the - an iteration of Mikey's approach of you know, let's iterate our way to success if we can. I think it would be useful to narrow our conversation for awhile. I'm not sure that I know exactly how much to narrow it, but we could have that conversation on the list. And, I think that the points you're raising Tim have to do with that.

Presumably, we could come to a conclusion about that, and then having arrived at sort of the width of our target, try to come to at least a tentative - nobody's casting stones, but maybe possibly tentative way forward fairly soon. And, recognizing that we've got really these two time periods. We've got the very near-term time period defined by the Board resolution and the TAG, and then we've got the longer time period where we can explore perhaps a broader range of issues.

But, if we could focus on the gating item in the near term, can try and really hammer that one at least to a preliminary conclusion fairly soon, then I think that we simply this - the job for the rest of this pre-thresholds conversation

that we're having. How about that for a ramble. I'm going to shut up now and let the guy talk.

(Scott), why don't you go ahead.

(Scott Austin): Mikey, I think that was from my prior question, so I'm...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay.

(Scott Austin): (Unintelligible). Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: I just wanted to kind of pick up on something that I think (John) and well, the two (Jan)'s both said, but differently in the sense that I really think that (John)'s idea about breaking down what is viewed - the interpretation of the Recommendation 19. It's really going to be very, very helpful in trying to figure out where we have consensus and where we don't. And simultaneously, I think that will give greater precision to the extent - as (Jeff) points out, certain changes will affect what that position becomes for different proposals.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alan. You're next.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I just wanted to reiterate or expand on a comment you just made of the two focuses of short-term and near-term. The answers may well be different. Certainly from my perspective, I might answer differently on what I can live with on the first phase, you know, in terms of the initial release in new gTLDs, but it might not be the one I want to live with for the rest of our lives, you know, to paraphrase Tim.

So, I think when one phrases the question, you have to ask it carefully to make sure that you know what the answer means.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that's a good point.

Okay. We've exhausted the queue. Here's several conclusions that I draw from the conversation so far, which is hats off to (Cathy) and the all nighter. We're finding this a good, useful thing going forward. We'll figure out a mechanism whereby proposers can refine their answers, but we will also figure out a mechanism whereby some of the somewhat ambiguous parts of the table so far can be made more clear, like the example of the Resolution 19.

We'll try and pick a gating item - we'll try and frame a gating item conversation quickly on the list and start having that conversation on the list, then trying to spend most of the call next week -- all my remaining fingers are crossed -- driving it to ground. That would be I think another huge step forward. And...

Tim Ruiz: (Unintelligible) -- this is Tim. Can I just make a request, please?

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Let me - in that regards, just quickly. That when we do that, that we try to keep that thread focused. And, if someone wants to bring up a topic that's you know, not really related, or may be related but not directly, that they do so in a separate thread. Because, sometimes these threads get crossed over and then you end up with two or three different things being discussed in the same subject thread, and it gets really difficult to try to follow or maintain any kind of cohesive thought (unintelligible). Because it keeps changing.

So to the extent possible, if we could keep the threads separate, boy that would really help. At least me.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I want to second that. You know, I have to admit there was a higher volume of email than I've coped with, and I'm having a tough time too. So, maybe what we'll do is have a few folks kind of be vigilant, and everybody should sort of feel to chime in and say let's start a new thread on that, and keep the one pure. Because this is hard enough without having you know, incredibly complex threads to read through.

I don't know. The queue's starting to build up. Christina, is that left over from before?

Christina Rodriguez: Oh, it is Mike.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. And then Kathy, your hand's up. You go.

Kathy Kleinman: Yes. I agree with the last comment about keeping the threads separate. And, wanted to echo with the table about keeping the columns simple. So as we go into more detail - more granularity, I'd love to see just that you create - whoever winds up keeping the table -- whether it's me or others -- work really hard to keep the columns as simple as possible and not build up lots of detail in it. Break the columns out instead so that it remains easy to compare across the columns.

So, if there's a granularity of equal access, create columns for it. That's my recommendation.

Mikey O'Connor: That gets me to a question. You know, the rule about participation in the Analysis Team. I -- Mikey -- made up the rule out of (whole cloth) that said people who present the (total) shouldn't be on the Analysis Team. I'm not sure that that rule is necessarily important or necessary, and I think Kathy's work demonstrates that maybe that was a dumb idea. And, I guess the reason I'm raising it now is because I hate to lose Kathy's energy and skill at all this stuff just because of this stupid, arbitrary rule that I made up.



So, I'm curious if anybody feels really strongly about this, or whether I could just forget that rule. Does anybody got opinions on that regarding - because I would like to have Kathy remain involved in this, since she did such fabulous work on the first try. So, Jeffrey?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes. I actually think that - I wasn't even sure what the purpose or the need of the Analysis Team was. I think the most important thing is now that we have you know, some sort of grid or column. And you know, once we get everyone opinions and the columns sorted is for - really for those people who put together the proposals to work together towards some sort of joint or analysis, and figure it out and see where there could be common thread, versus other people who are not proposers to come in, analyze it, try and figure out what was in the proposer's mind, put it together.

And, I think it's - you know, you're taking out a bunch of cycles by actually having the people who propose it working directly on it and working together versus having separate people working on it and trying to figure out what the proposers meant. So hopefully, it's - I think that it would actually make sense of the Analysis Team was the actual proposers and not other people.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, yes. That's another - actually, the Analysis Team has been asking Mikey that question, too. And it - I agree that...

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes. (It's not I) think that it should be barring anybody. I don't want anyone to think that. That if you weren't a proposer...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: ...you couldn't participate in the Analysis Team, but it should be comprised you know, mainly of that, is sort of - was my idea.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. No, I think that's well (picked).

Milton?

Milton Muller: Yes. Jeff said almost exactly what I was going to say, although I may want to emphasize another point, which is I'm not sure what the point of the Analysis Team is at this juncture. We have a matrix. We can work on it. We pretty much agree with the format. We're going to quibble about particular columns, and of course each proposer is going to quibble about what - how their proposal is characterized, but they're going to be pretty much in control of that anyway.

So, what exactly is the point of having a separate Analysis Team at this point? I don't see there's any. And I think our task, which I think we're maybe getting a little hypnotized by the sort of formality of getting this stuff onto a matrix. But the point is of course to come to an agreement or to rule out certain options and to leave other options on the table.

So, what we have to be doing at this point is looking down those columns and seeing where we can come to an agreement and where we can't.

Mikey O'Connor: In the defense of the Analysis Team, the Analysis Team is also an idea that came from the head of Mikey out of (unintelligible). And, I tend to agree with your point - well, the point that I really want to emphasize in what you just said, Milton, is that this is all about coming to agreement. And, I am perfectly happy to simplify that process by essentially saying that at this stage, the analysis team may not be needed, and might even get in the way. So, there's that thought.

Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Yes, Mikey. As a matter of fact, I'm going to follow-up with what Milton said. I'm getting concerned, or was getting concerned about the optics that goes with the term Analysis Team, and the fact that there might be implied more weight in value to any product that the Analysis Team would put out. So, I

would be more inclined to do what you said, and that is I question at this point in time whether we really need a "Analysis Team" at all.

I think we're moving in the right direction, and the only thing you end up doing is punting something over to a smaller group that really doesn't have necessarily the depth that it would have if the proposers were involved. And, I'm afraid we really need to stay focused, and the Analysis Team could almost be a distraction in terms of time. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm perfectly comfortable with where this is headed. You know, I'm delighted with the progress that Kathy's matrix has made for us, and perfectly fine with the notion of taking every obstacle out of the way of the main conversation, which is getting to that agreement and getting the folks who need to talk to each other talking to each other.

To that end - so I'll take that as a - A, if there is an Analysis Team, anybody can be on it. And B, maybe we don't need an Analysis Team at all, conclusion out of this. And, we'll leave it primarily focused on the proposal advocates and ascribe to keep the chart up to date.

Kathy, would you mind being the scribe, or would you like to hand that job to someone else so that you can focus on content? Because, we can certainly find a scribe if you would rather not.

Kathy Kleinman: I would be happy to be the scribe, Mikey, but I'm also a proposal preventer. So, if that's an area that you and the group would like someone more neutral in, I'd be happy to give that to someone else and then comment like everyone else about what goes into the squares.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. You and I can talk about that off line and figure it out, and...

Kathy Kleinman: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...we'll either let you do it or we'll have somebody else do it, but options exist. But then on to my next little thought, which is I hope we have folks from the three constituencies that put in constituency statements on the call. I think it would be really useful to add three rows to this matrix, those being the constituency statement proposals, if you will. But, I just wanted to throw that idea out there to...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...get thoughts from folks. Tim.

Tim Ruiz: (Unintelligible) there's someone still in the queue possibly on the previous things we were talking about, if you wanted to catch that or not. A couple of them actually, I think.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, Margie just came up. Ken, I thought that was left over from last time. If I skipped you, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: No, I apologize. I didn't lower my hand, which I just did. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yes. There we go. Margie, go ahead.

Margie Milam: Yes. I just wanted to comment about - I think we've only received three new constituency statements, right? The IPC, the ISP, and the BC, right?

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Margie Milam: I'm just wondering if you're getting any other - I know we got the registrar one during the public comment period, but I know that the registry position was issued a while ago, and I don't know...

Brian Cute: This is Brian. Can I jump in and answer that?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure.

Brian Cute: If people in the queue don't mind.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Brian Cute: Yes. No, we actually circulated a draft. We came to some good faith disagreement about the matrix, and Jeff Neuman is on the line. So, I'm going to tell you Jeff that I ended up agreeing with your objection. If it's not an objection from the staff's perspective, I think the registry constituency may still come back with comments shortly. But right now, we couldn't agree on some key points.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'll just work my way through the queue, and then see where we wind up. Jeff, you're next.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: (Martin), unless you're...

Jeff Neuman: No, I was going to follow-up with what Brian said. So at this point -- and kind of what Margie said -- at this point, the statement that the registries had made a while ago, I think it was last April, is still the stakeholder group statement until something new gets filed. But you know, we didn't necessarily think it was that critical for us to file something new because that one was still out there, and at this point it hasn't changed.

Ken Stubbs: Ken Stubbs. What a great point of order. If somebody could send the BC comments back out, I know people didn't receive it.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay. It hit the list, I thought. But, we'll send it to the list. I think Glen sent it. I can't remember when. Recently, like today I think. But anyway, it that it...

Glen Desaintgery: I resent it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks, Glen.

Tim, you're up.

Tim Ruiz: Yes. Just in regards to the registrar statement. I mean, I just wanted to be - and maybe Jon Nevitt can help clarify, because I think he was instrumental in that. But, I don't believe that we presented that as necessarily a - like a consensus position of the registrar's constituency, but more a position that a number of registrars signed on to, but not necessarily an official position of the registrars constituency.

And registrars - another registrar can feel free to correct me if I'm wrong on that, but I want to make sure and clarify the character of that statement.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I...

Margie Milam: Hey, Mikey. I...

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Margie Milam: Okay. It's Margie. Tim if that's correct, you may want to have the registrar constituency or stakeholder group send in a clarification, because I believe (Clark), when he submitted through the public comment period indicated that it was a registrar stakeholder group statement. And so, absent some clarification that's you know, in writing, you know it seems like that should stand. But, I'm encouraging you to have a statement filed that clarifies that.

Tim Ruiz: Yes. I guess I would just want to find out what - when that vote took place, because I don't recall it. So...

Mikey O'Connor: I think the key on all of these is we need to make sure that all the Is are dotted and the Ts are crossed, because this is a pretty visible process and we want to make sure that you know, it's all very clear who was saying what and when.

Jeffrey, go ahead.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes. I just - I mean, Tim, we could take it off (one), but I believe that that was a statement. But here's a question. If we decided as the registrars wanted to send an update, is there a timeline on that right now where we stand? Because, I believe that as that one was submitted was our - the stakeholder position, but we may want to revisit that. Is there a timeline on that? I guess this is for Margie and others on - well, I know it's going to be as soon as possible, but is there you know, another deadline that you had imposed for other groups? If you could just let us know.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me rattle off sort of the situation. We had public comments and constituency statements kick off right at the beginning of this cycle. And the reason they didn't end on the same date is because the timing for one is shorter than the other. So, the official end for constituency statements was last Friday the 6th. And then I (unintelligible) there will be another round of public comment and constituency statements after Brussels because remember Brussels isn't really the fencepost for this. The real fence post is somewhat after Brussels.

And so there will be the second round of public comments and constituency statements. And that will open and close the usual way 30 day whatever it is period. But it'll be after Brussels.

Now Margie in terms of a clarify amendment comment statement...

Margie Milam: Yes if I can...

Mikey O'Connor: ...is there an avenue for that?

Margie Milam: Well Mikey if I can clarify, I mean it's not a fast thing. As the - you know, as the co-chairs you guys can decide to extend that date. It's, you know, and it looks like, you know, the registries are probably working on something as well. So it's - you know, you guys tell us that that's the new deadline and I think that's probably fine.

So, you know, and in fact most of - I think we got some statements late last week anyways after the date if I'm not mistaken. So, you know, that's certainly in your purview.

Mikey I can't hear anything.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, thank you. I was on mute.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I was very eloquent while I was on mute too. The goal here is to get to an agreement, not to necessarily follow precise rules that were laid down quite a while ago.

And so if Roberto and I probably need to huddle about this. But my immediate reaction is if there's more time needed to get that right, let's permit the time acknowledging at the same time the urgency of the situation that we're in.

And so certainly no more than is necessary, but if there is a way to clarify that quickly I think that's something that we can easily accept. Oh there's Roberto. Roberto what do you think?

Roberto Gaetano: Well I hope I'm not on mute as well but...



Mikey O'Connor: No you're good.

Roberto Gaetano: Now what I think is that we have put deadlines not because of chopping the discussion but to get this sense of urgency of the time table I think that if one day after the deadline a constituency presents, your stakeholder group presents a position I think that we are - if we'd be wise if we accept it.

Because in any case if a constituency or a stakeholder group has a view that is radically different from what we are building consensus on sooner or later it's going to explode. And so we might well know in advance if there are any views that may potentially be deceptive of the consensus.

So yes, let's accept what I can call late statement. But with the indication to constituencies and stakeholder groups to hurry up and present a statement and not wait too much.

Mikey O'Connor: Like he said. Jeffrey?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes thanks. I just wanted to get, you know, just offer to clarify that for somebody like, you know, the registrars, let's say the registrar stakeholder group.

You know, we can look at it but and it's - you know, maybe we want to just see something on the record. But I don't - as you said, I don't think if we come up with a, you know, official stakeholder group position that I mean maybe I'm wrong but I don't see that it would be a huge change to how we would try and get together on some of these.

Because you could see like there's as Kathy - as the four registrars, let's call it their position, Demand's position and GoDaddy's position, you know, they're all different. So it's not - and their - the registrars have been participating on this call.

So I don't think that - you know, unless - if we don't have the registrar's stakeholder position it's going to make a huge difference in the coming together and as we move towards Brussels which as you said is just one part of it.

So we can look at it. We'll look at it internally but I wouldn't say we can't have further discussions and move ahead until that's posted.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay that's great. Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Yes I don't want to raise the specter of future meetings in Brussels. But I'd like for us to spend a few minutes at the end of this talking about this primarily because a lot of people have plans and need to make sure that we can get rooms and tickets and everything like that Mike. So please that as an open item until the end of this call.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I will. We didn't have the right people on the call last Thursday to have that conversation. So we don't have a lot of news for you today but we can certainly talk about it.

Okay so back to the point that I was raising that sort of triggered that discussion. What is people's reaction to the notion of adding constituency statements as rows to Kathy's table just so we have those represented there in our snapshot view of the consensus?

Is there anybody that feels strongly that that's a bad idea? Otherwise we'll go ahead and get that organized?

Brian Cute: Mikey this is Brian. I'm not aligned so put me in the queue wherever I am.

Mikey O'Connor: You're in the queue and then off we go from there. So go ahead.

Brian Cute: Okay. I think it's a bad idea from this very simple point of view. What we're seeing today through Kathy's good work is a clearer snapshot of the proposals.

And, you know, again I - this is my own take, but I took the marching orders from the board effectively in Nairobi was for us to sit down at the table and come forward with a proposal, a consensus based proposal if we could achieve that and deliver it up to the GNSO.

I just think adding constituency stakeholder group's statements to this chart is going to muddy those waters.

Already we've identified with, you know, Kathy's good work. But the proposers still need to go back and maybe tweak here and tweak there for clarity's sake.

But we add more material to this I just fear it's going to become confused.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, thanks, Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: Not unexpectedly I disagree with Brian. And perhaps it's because in our circumstance, you know, the proposal that we put forth is a constituency supported proposal as opposed to me getting together with the other IPC members of the group and saying here's what the IPC members of the Working Group think is a good model. But this doesn't have the support of the constituency which frankly I think means that it doesn't carry or should carry as much weight.

So I would just - you know, if you want to include other statements or not I think, you know, that it's completely up to the Working Group's discretion.

But to the extent that a constituency or a stakeholder group puts forth as a constituency or stakeholder group a model, I think it's important to include it.

Brian Cute: This is Brian but can I just reply there Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Brian Cute: Okay I'd like to underline the fact that I am in violent agreement with Christina as I usually am with her compelling logic.

What I meant to say if I didn't say it was if it's a proposal, if it's a proposal that's embodied in the stakeholder group's contribution that can be mapped out on to the chart the way the elements of proposals from individuals have been so far, then that's one animal.

If it's comments of the stakeholder group that goes into rationales, justifications, historical fact, forward-looking conjecture, that was what I was just focused on, that not bringing that type of comment into the chart I thought would create - I thought that would create confusion. Does that help?

Christina Rodriguez: Yes it does. Thanks Brian.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that helps a lot.

Christina Rodriguez: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: And I think that what I'm hearing is that if - I saw (Berry) throw a disagree up. And so I'm wondering if we leave it like this.

If the repertoire for a constituency statement would like to have their constituency statement mapped into the matrix we'll do it. And if they would prefer not to or it doesn't really align with this structure we won't. How about that? We'll leave that as my working hypothesis and see how that goes.

I'm not hearing - I'm assuming that Ken and Jeff your hands are left up before right?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: No, actually I just wanted to make a comment on...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: ...it's Jeff here, on what you just said.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: And I think you sort of diverged a little bit. I was - I'm in agreement with what Brian and Christina said which was if there are proposals we should put that on the matrix but we should not put statements on there.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: And there's a distinction there and I - you kind of crossed over it a little bit. And I think we should not put statements on there. We should put proposals only on there.

And if it's a constituency proposal, yes we should put it on. But if it's a position or a statement then we should not put that on to the proposal matrix.

Mikey O'Connor: I stand corrected. I like that language a lot better. We'll do it that way.

Okay and (Berry) is saying plus one and so I think we have - I think we've gotten there.

We're getting kind of close to the end of the call. I think we've made a lot of progress today. So I'm willing to draw a line under the discussion of Kathy's table for today and move on to a very brief conversation about the face to face meeting in Brussels if that's okay with everybody else.

(Berry) is saying Analysis Team meeting canceled. Yes, let's - partly (Berry) is asking that because he's taking care of his mom and will be in a car. And partly it's because of the earlier conversation. But yes, I think let's cancel the Analysis Team for this time.

Let me tell you what I know about the meeting in Brussels which is I - I'm going to take my chair hat off for a minute and put on my Mikey opinionated hat and say that I would vastly prefer to not have a meeting, a face to face meeting in Brussels at all because - partly because of the logistical hassle but partly because I think we're doing better if we can get this done on the list and on the recorded phone calls. I think it's a more even-handed and equitable way to do it.

I think we have time given the progress we've made especially with Kathy's table to get our work done.

What we're going to be done in Brussels is giving people an update on our status. We're not going to be presenting necessarily conclusions. And I think that we can march into Brussels having done our work online and on telephone calls with a pretty good update.

The update will either be we were unable to arrive at consensus -- that's our status -- or we were and here's what it is at this point in time. And then carry on post Brussels with whatever knowledge we gain from that experience.

So my personal first choice is no meeting face to face in Brussels which I think makes it also much - it - the logistics are getting insanely complex to try and put us together face to face in Brussels.

That said, (Stefan) wasn't on the call on Thursday last week and so we didn't - we just didn't talk about it because we needed to have Stefan who along with Glen is really working on the schedule.

And so I'd just like to defer that one one week but sort of telegraph that inclination of mine. And now I'll put my icy com completely unbiased chair hat back on. Ken do you want to comment or is that left over from before?

Ken Stubbs: No I'd like to comment if I could. First of all...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Ken Stubbs: ...I was one who was concerned about the timing of Brussels. But I also have another concern. And I'm sure you're being very, how do I put it, very frank and short in the way that you describe what you might be presenting or saying to the community.

But I'm going to put my hat on as if I was a board member or somebody who had - who was looking very, very closely for some sort of a work product from all the effort that was put in. The only thing I got was we either did or didn't come to consensus on this thing and we're working on it.

And I was a board member and I had the pressure of trying to get new TLDs out and trying to get a very close look at what I was going to do with the original resolution I put in there.

I would want very much to be able to have some sort of a synopsis of exactly what were the commonalities what were - what did you see there.

You know, you couldn't write a consensus but, you know, I need something more than just a sentence or a five minute breakdown. I need something that I can take back and look at.

Because the board members from the very beginning when we had (Mike Silber) and we had George on the call it was quite clear that these guys are

looking to see if there is real sincerity in trying to accomplish something with - in terms of the vertical integration.

So I'm worried that we'll get all the way down to Brussels and we will have had - we won't have anything tangible. And I don't think it's fair to just dump it in Margie's lap or in Mike Zupke's lap and say okay fine, you guys write a report for us. Because this isn't their report, it's our report.

So that's why I have that kind of concern. It's not a matter of discriminating economically against those people who are on the call because by God you can participate teleconference-wise in Brussels (unintelligible).

But to just arbitrarily say no, we're not going to have a meeting in Brussels and then at the last minute wish like hell we had at least left a placeholder there. Thanks Mike.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, well there are a couple of things wrapped up in that so let me tease them apart. First of all, I haven't taken it off the table. That's not my job. It's above my pay grade.

But I did veer off and do a little personal editorializing. We are going to take it up next Thursday or this Thursday and see what we can figure out. So that's the status of that. It's not that it's off the table yet.

And then the second thing about the work product, I think that what you're seeing in front of you is the beginning of the work product.

You know, if somebody backed me in a corner and hit me with sticks and said okay Mikey we have to have a report ready, I could pull an all-nighter and write a draft that we could circulate to the list and beat up I'm sure in a week and get to the point where we had a report partly because we're making such good progress on this matrix.



So I don't want to sound Pollyannaish but I think that we are indeed making good progress. We have a heck of a email archive that displays unbelievable depth and conversation. And I think there's plenty of material to write a great report and time enough yet to do it.

Jeffrey?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes I'm - I - and maybe this is a question for Margie and ICANN staff. But given that the Guidebook is due out what, like May 31 or June 1 or somewhere around there, my guess is or maybe it's a question, ICANN staff is going to have some sort of proposal in there to deal with the board resolution in absent - in the absence of anything else. So Margie can correct me if I'm wrong.

But if that is the case then I do think we will probably need a face to face to discuss that and how to deal with it.

So if there is a - I think we should have the time because if there's a proposal I think we're going to have to meet rather than scrambling. That's my thought. So maybe Margie can answer that question.

Mikey O'Connor: Margie you want to have a go at that?

Margie Milam: Yes, unfortunately I don't know what the status of the (unintelligible) is whether it will have a placeholder for the board resolution or not. I'll take that as a - something that - to check with the Services Team on. But I don't know where they ended up on that.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: So given that Mikey, I don't think we should cancel. I do think we should find a spot where the team could meet and figure out how we're going to deal with that.

Because at least what the board said in Nairobi was that they're going to move forward on that proposal and it's got to come out now in this fourth guidebook because that's the last one before the final. So until we get a answer to that I think you should keep the placeholder.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, no I hear you.

Brian Cute: This is Brian. Can I jump in at some point?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Stefan's next and then you can jump in after him Brian. Stefan?

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Stefan?

Stefan Van Gelder: Thanks Mikey. I just wanted to add some clarification to what Ken said. Ken asked if we or suggested that we should keep a placeholder just in case. I just wanted to say that we do need to decide quite quickly if the group is requesting some time, some face to face time prior to the council meeting because Glen and I need to finalize that draft agenda very quickly.

So I'm not - you know, and I'm not arguing in favor or against. I'm just saying the group does need to decide quite quickly if it does want to request that.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Stefan. Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes I want to pick up on Jeff's point and Margie with regard to the next version of the DAG.

I think it was Version 3 where we saw that the staff inserted into the DAG for this question a placeholder of its own that in all fairness created a lot of dissatisfaction around a number of the interested groups.

I think it would be worthwhile -- I know we've only got three days here -- but it might be worthwhile for this group to communicate something to the staff now to prevent the staff having to try to grapple with revising their placeholder in the DAG and coming up with something new in the absence of concrete inputs from this group.

I just - I'm just concerned that if the staff feels it needs to evolve this again and we don't have a concrete proposal it will only compound the confusion that exists right now in this question and what the ultimate rules are going to be. What are people's reaction to that?

Mikey O'Connor: Let's take queue on that real quick and then Allen I'll get back to you if anybody wants to comment on that.

Allen Greenberg: My comment is half on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, go ahead. Do the half that's on that and then do the other half.

Allen Greenberg: Okay first the question for Stefan and Kathy asked it. When Stefan said the council meeting, do you mean the Wednesday council meeting or the Saturday or Sunday one? If you could just clarify what he meant.

Stefan Van Gelder: Sunday.

Allen Greenberg: Oh Sunday. Okay, thank you. My belief -- and I didn't even think about it -- was or my expectation was that the applicant guidebook would come out with a placeholder saying in the absence of some new and marvelous proposal out of the GNSO group we will assume the board option of zero integration and would define that in a little bit more clarity.

But maybe I was dreaming in technical or I didn't see what else staff could put in other than what the board said the default was. Sorry that's it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, we're out of time folks. Let's leave it like this. Margie if you could get a reaction from the group that's working on the DAG as to what's likely to be in there. (Steven), Roberto and the staff and I will work on a placeholder.

We had one and then we sort of touched off a firestone of protest when we said Saturday morning or whenever it was, Saturday afternoon. I can't even remember.

It's - we'll take a look at the schedule. It has many moving parts. We'll try and find a spot and put a placeholder in. I think Jeff's point is compelling that, you know, we may need the time to react to either that circumstance, the DAG placeholder or some other circumstance. So we'll put it in as best we can.

And I do want to set the expectation that we're not going to please everybody because we've got just conflicting meetings all over the place here. And we'll report back to you next week.

Thanks folks. It's one minute past the end of the meeting. I think we had a great conversation today. Oh Tim, you want to get the last word in?

Tim Ruiz: Yes (I mean) this is Tim. I just wanted to - because I raised the issue about the registrar statement so I was scrambling to try to figure that out.

And I just wanted to make sure and clarify that I was wrong, that we did do a straw poll and so that that was actually followed up with an actual vote within the registrar stakeholder group. So the characterization of that as a stakeholder group's position was correct. And I want to make sure and clarify that since I had kind of raised that question. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks. That's great to get on the record of this call. I appreciate it. Okay, that's it folks. Thanks a million. I think we're actually perking along just fine. Kathy gets the gold star of the day for her matrix. And we'll see you in a week.

Man: Thank you Mikey.

Glen Desaintgery: Mike? Mikey this is Glen, sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes?

Glen Desaintgery: Just to check that the Analysis call is canceled?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes we'll cancel the Analysis call.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much. Good-bye.

END