

Transcript
GAC/GNSO issues related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross (RC) names discussion group teleconference
05 September 2012 at 18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GAC/GNSO issues related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross (RC) names discussion group teleconference held on Wednesday 05 September 2012 at 1800 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-gac-ioc-20120905-en.mp3>

Attendees

Jeff Neuman - Registry SG group leader
Lanre Ajayi - Nominating Committee Appointee
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Debra Hughes - NCSG
Thomas Rickert - Nominating Committee Appointee
Gregory Shatan – IPC
Wolfgang Kleinwachter – NCUC
Osvaldo Novao -ISPC

ICANN Staff

Glen de Saint Géry
Brian Peck
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Chuck Gomes - RySG
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
David Heasley – IPC
J. Scott Evans – IPC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Jim Bikoff - IPC

Coordinator: The recordings have began. Today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Sandy. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IOC call on the 5th of September 2012. On the call today we have Jeff Neuman, Lanre Ajayi, Thomas Rickert, Wolfgang Kleinwachter, Greg Shatan, Osvaldo Novoa, Debby Hughes. We have apologies from Kiran Malancharuvil, David Heasley and Chuck Gomes.

From staff we have Brian Peck, Berry Cobb, Glen DeSaintgery, myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please say their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you very much and welcome everyone - it's this now weekly call. I think as we started - we'll start this week now having weekly calls through the month of September and at least the first week of October in preparation for the Toronto meeting that's in mid-October.

And the purpose is to hopefully get down to a final recommendation to the GAC proposal of - the second level reservations of the IOC and Red Cross meeting; present to the GAC in Toronto.

So welcome to the call everyone. I unfortunately had to miss last week's call but I did get a recap from Chuck and from looking at the notes and looking at the proposals that were sent back and forth. I appreciate that and the narrowing of the options down.

There have been - up until today there were no emails really that came through the list on the discussions that happened last week. So - but this morning we had a lengthy discussion in the Registry Stakeholder Group on

the different options. And I thought - and Chuck had drafted an email, sent it to the list, which you should have gotten in the last hour or so.

So I thought given that there's nothing else to, you know, draw upon we might want to start with the Registry Stakeholder Group position and if that's okay and kind of answer questions about that and discuss, you know, our thoughts on it and maybe work from that as kind of the basis.

Or if there's not agreement on it or enough difficult, then we can - then we can, you know, go somewhere else with it. But I thought it would be a good kind of way to start the meeting out.

So with that, any questions? All right. Welcome Alan as well. Okay. So I am going to with your indulgence take off the - take off my chair hat just to talk about the registry position since Chuck is having a dentist appointment and is not able to be here.

So if that's okay, I'm going to just discuss the registry position and why we came to this position and the significance and then I'd be happy to answer any questions regarding the registry position.

So as I said just a few minutes ago, we had a fairly lengthy discussion on this and there's been some great emails on our registry list for the last several weeks on the different positions. And I will say one of the good things of having the new applicants, we have observer group within the Registry Stakeholder Group make up of applicants.

And there's about 50 or so applicants that are now officially observer members. A really good thing is they've a big dimension to this discussion. And so a lot of this represents their input as well.

So with the Registry Stakeholder Group we really looked at the fact of we definitely wanted these issues to be finally resolved through a PDP. That

there's been enough raised in the last several months on, you know, the pros and cons of protecting these names or not protecting these names.

And, you know, there's - even with the un-redacted paper that was put out - (when) it was finally released by the ICANN Board dating back to June, there's definitely some legal analysis that's included in there as we heard from the registry call from the UPU, the Universal Postal Union.

(They) dispute a number of the things that are un-redacted papers and they're going to come out with a paper that's - very shortly. They've released it to the registries. I asked their permission to release it for this group but I've not gotten that yet. As soon as I get their permission I will release it to this group.

So with all of this going on, with the IGOs making a much stronger call for protection, well registries really believe that this issue along with the protection of the IGO names really need to go through a full PDP process. There's universal agreement within the Registry Stakeholder Group on that.

So then the question was well what do we do with these IOC and Red Cross names up until the point that a PDP is finalized? And we discussed all the options there. Do you just maintain the status quo, which is no protection and allow the registrations to occur if the PDP's not finished? Or do you reserve them now and then wait for the outcome of the PDP?

And the registries on the call today decided to err on the side of caution. Discussed basically that it's essentially I guess the J. Scott compromise although maybe not quite the same rationale. But the rationale the registries used was that, you know, it's much harder to - it's much harder to take back names or create a reservation after the names have already been handed out.

In fact it's pretty much impossible to do. So that just out of the abundance of caution it will be to take these names out of the pool of registrations up until the time that a PDP is finalized and the results are - I guess the results of the PDP are final.

It's not necessarily siding on the side of - but the merit protection. It's just much easier to release them than it would be to reserve them after they're registered. And I know Thomas you have some questions on that.

But that's essentially the registry position. It was more out of practicality and to also emphasize the point that we have every interest in wanting to do a PDP as quickly as possible because as long as there's PDPs out there, there's no ability for these new names to be registered. And so that gives us an incentive and it also sends a clear message to the governments that we're not just initiating a PDP just to delay a decision on this.

Fact the governments now believe that PDP is synonymous with delay. And anytime you say you want to do a PDP, it means you're just delaying it. And actually that view is not just held by the governments. It's held by a number of people in the community in a number of groups.

So we think it sends the right message that we're not going to allow registration at this point but it's all fully depending on the PDP. If the PDP finishes before the first TLD launches, then great. If not, it'll stay temporarily reserved until the outcome of the PDP.

So any questions on the registry position?

Thomas Rickert: Jeff, this is Thomas.

Jeff Neuman: Yes please Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I have some difficulties with this approach. I mean at first sight the approach looks quite charming because we can respond to the GAC's request. However, if we look at the current status, I fully agree with the part where the registry is urge the GNSO Council to have this resolved within a PDP. I completely subscribe to that.

At the same time I think that within this PDP legal protection for both organizations would need to be looked at separately because the legal basis for protection is different for each organization.

Yet if we follow J. Scott's approach and reserve our names, there is no such demarcation between the different legal reasons for protection. At the same time we found out that protection is not necessarily granted per se but that there's also legitimate use.

And my feeling is that we would be responding to sort of an informal GAC request and granted protection but there's no protection for the GNSO in return for taking these steps.

What I mean by this is the following. When we started the discussions with the GAC, the GAC had claimed that for these two organizations there would be unique tapestry of the legal protection.

In the - if I'm not mistaken, the latest GAC communique, the GAC spoke of organizations such as the IOC and RCRC. Does that mean, you know, talk about (unintelligible), you know, when the GAC dilutes its own language that it might informally ask for similar protection for other organizations and if so, will we respond in the same way by granting protection or having the name reserved without any (extension) policy (saved) until the PDP is done.

So I think we in discussing this proposal we would need to consider the broader side affects which go far beyond (unintelligible) question about these two organizations.

Jeff Neuman: So thank you Thomas. I apologize. My phone's ringing in the background so I apologize for that. But yeah look, I think Thomas, the registry did consider all of that. And the - right now there's a lot of talk that's going on but there's nothing official from the GAC on the IGOs or anything else.

There's just - so what happens in the future? Obviously I - none of us know whether the GAC's going to come to us and ask for other needs to put on that moratorium I guess if you will on the second level names until the PDP is done.

All I know is that at some point in the next few weeks, hopefully sooner, the final issue report on protection of the IGO names will come out. And the Council will be in a position to hopefully initiate a PDP if that's what wishes to do.

But on the balance of harms at this point again was focusing only on the current request that's out there from the GAC with taking the limited number of names, put a moratorium on them until such time that a PDP can be finalized.

We understand there'll be additional (unintelligible) coming forward that are IGOs that say we should get those protections too. Nothing we can do about those other than to address those at this time. I just think it's not appropriate for the GNSO to quote send a message to the GAC or to anyone else for the purpose of sending a message.

Right now we need to respond to the request that's in front of us. The only one that's in front of us is the request for the Olympic and Red Cross names. Again, we're not saying as registries that we believe they ultimately deserve protection.

All we're saying is that it's much easier to release the names later on than it is to take the names back because then you're talking about a whole bunch of other legal rights of now the right of registrants to keep names that were legitimately allocated to it.

And so, you know, there's a whole bunch of other decisions that need to be made there. We want to be cautious. We want to be safe. And we want to basically, you know, let the GAC know and others that we're listening to them and that we think the balance of (pause) in that case really of just not letting these registrations go through if the PDP is either ongoing I think send the right message and a message of a multi stakeholder process.

If the governments come to the GNSO later on and ask for the IGO names well then we'll deal with it then. I don't know how the registries would respond. But at this point, you know, we've only dealt with these two names.

So let me go to Alan and I'm sure Thomas you might want to follow up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Jeff. I guess I agree with you completely. And I'll give one or two other rationales. If the GNSO is - and if we in the GNSO are now going to start worrying what happens if someone does something and how will we respond to it in the future, we'd never pass - never change any policy. There are just too many variables in the future to worry about that.

This particular request has been on the table well over a year. Was it June of last year that the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...Board gave preliminary approval?

Jeff Neuman: It was a year ago September. It was this month. A year ago.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I thought it was a bit earlier. You know, yes, if indeed in Toronto or afterwards the GAC comes out and says we need additional protections, then the GNSO will have to consider it. It will probably take another year. And by then there may well have been, you know, the fact that the imminent release of the first TLD may be soon after that, will govern how we respond.

And there are just too many variables to consider that. I'm speaking on my own behalf by the way, not on behalf of At Large or ALAC. I haven't put this to them in this form.

But my personal belief is the - J. Scott and the registries' position - I like the registries' rational for it; I think is a reasonable thing to do given that, you know, this has been going on for a long time. We have to make some recommendation. And this is a reasonable one which does the minimal amount of projected harm regardless of how the PDP comes out. And, you know, I think it's a good middle ground position to take. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Alan. Thomas, you want to follow up or...

Thomas Rickert: If I may yes. I started off saying that this idea that J. Scott (unintelligible), which is not supported by the registries looked very charming. And I subscribe to it being charming at first glance. And it looks very forthcoming and that we're willing to (assist).

But Alan, let's not forget the GNSO and the GNSO Council is a policy making body and we have been asked for policy advice on this. And policy is always abstract and general and not necessarily to be dealing with individual questions for individual organizations.

Now the question we face was specific but the policy recommendation should include for contemplation of the broader picture in my view. It is certainly unfortunate that our discussions have taken so long. But I think we could

achieve something up to now and let me quote (Favi) on this (affair) that he's a defender of the (most) stakeholder approach and its speed.

So I think the mere fact that our work has now continued for a year and that we have not been able to achieve it should not make us rush into confusion and to decisions that might be wrong.

When we had our call two weeks back, I asked Jim Bikoff how we should respond to potential question by third parties making the allegation that the GNSO Council is bypassing its own policies. And Jim responded, and I hope I'm not misquoting him here, that there is protection by law or by treaty for these organizations and that it's the duty of the registries to follow the law.

Now this also looks very charming but at the same time it sort of puts our traditional legal mechanisms upside down because the infringement would be conducted by third party registrants. And let's just assume for a second that it was the duty for registries to prevent infringement of applicable laws from happening. That would be almost like putting a policeman next to ever car driver to prevent them from speeding in the first place.

So I think that this argument is not enough justification for reserving names. And it is not so that there is no policy. There is existing policy on reserved names but this policy does not grant such a protection to special - to specific organizations or groups of registrants.

And bearing that in mind, I think one can very well go back to the GAC and have a well written rationale explaining this and also explaining why we need a little bit more patience until the PDP is concluded. And let's not forget we're talking about the first round now.

We're looking at future rounds where depending on the outcome of the PDP protection might or might not be in play. But not like we're - or the organizations in question are losing everything for good. But it may be

confronted with the situation. But they don't get special protection the first round and that they're sort of limited to using the RPMs that other rights holders are also (unintelligible) (a force to believe in).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Thomas. And again, I'm keeping my chair hat off because actually frankly it's more fun. I'm just kidding here. But look, I think Thomas, you know, nobody's saying and the registries are not saying that we have some (legal ability) to protect trademark owners at all.

But using your rationale Thomas, there would have never been any protection at all for trademark owners. There would never be a clearinghouse. There'd never be a sunrise. There'd never be an IT claims or trademark claims process. There'd never in fact be necessarily a UDRP or a URS.

There is no - registries believe that there are no legal obligations on registries to do any form of protection of trademark owners. But that doesn't mean that it's not necessarily a wise idea or it doesn't mean in our society in order to live together that we're not going to make certain accommodations because it's in the interest of the global Internet community and because it's just a generally accepted practice.

So I mean I hear what you're saying and you're holding steadfast to a legal theory, which may or may not be true. But in the end it's all about the what if scenario and the harms that could be caused if what if it is determined through a PDP that these names should have been protected for whatever reason.

If that occurs, and I'm not saying it will occur, but if it does, then I'd rather have those names have been left out from the 1400 TLDs that launch as opposed to now being in a situation where they'd be delegated in 1000 TLDs or more and now going crap, we got to figure out a way to okay, once these names are deleted then the registries are required then to make sure that it reserves those names once it's deleted.

So it creates a whole bunch of coding development to make sure on the registry side that those names once deleted don't go back into the general pool of available names. And the uh-oh, what happens if a registry accidentally releases it back into the pool? Again, I mean it's just a straight practical approach.

Now until a PDP is done, you keep those names out of circulation. And I'm not going to call them reserved because that kind of tends to say - imply some sort of protection. Just keep them out of circulation. That's it.

If the PDP comes out just like you believe it should, which is your legal theory of the organizations' don't deserve any additional protection, great. Then the registry it's easy to figure out a release mechanism for the registries to release those.

So I mean you obviously have your own legal views and they may be correct. They may very well be correct. But we don't know that until we have the full PDP and that's why we have the full PDP to find it out.

And maybe we could say all we want about this. It's just the first round. But this is 1000 TLDs - more than 1000 TLDs so it's fairly significant. You know, from the registry standpoint when we've looked at all of these things, it just came down to the fact that it's better to just not distribute these names in the general circulation than it would be to release them and then be faced with the situation of having to pull them back.

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yeah. Thanks Jeff. Let me just clarify that I'm not saying that there shouldn't be any protection for the organizations. What I'm saying is that there shouldn't be any protections without conducting - or without having conducted a PDP on that. That's the fundamental difference.

And I think that looking at the applicant, and this goes back to my original proposal where I tried to analyze and look at the various categories of applications. I'm not completely sure whether we're talking about 1400 new TLDs where there is an actual threat for these organizations. Because we have a lot of brand owners.

We have a lot of applicants that have put their own mechanisms in place to protect certain names. There might be a couple of applicants or a lot of applicants if we're lucky that are willing to voluntarily keep the names on the list till - it's not like there were no other options. And also this would not be the first case in which policy comes later than names have been delegated.

You know, but let's not dwell on that too much. I think we're exchanging these thoughts also in order to - or at least my purpose of bringing this forward is to bring my reservations or my concerns to the attention of those that have to go back to their groups and decide which path they want to pursue. So I think I'll leave it at that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Thomas. I mean that's important. And really what we all need to do is go back to our groups and figure this out. I mean Thomas you're in a unique situation where you don't necessarily have a group to bring it back to as a Nominating Committee member.

But, you know, your views are incredibly important and I mean I think they should be considered by all of the groups. I know that I could speak for registries and we did absolutely consider all those. But I think the other groups need to as well.

Is there any comment from any of the other - so Alan you said you weren't speaking on behalf of the ALAC. All right. Well let me go to Greg and I'll come back to Alan. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg Shatan and I'm not speaking on behalf of the IPC; I'm just on my own and would say that, you know, I do agree that un-ringing the bell if these names were delegated and then un-delegated - had to be un-delegated later, you know, would be a nightmare.

In contrast, if there are entities that believe that having a name - a domain name that is close to one of the set aside -- I won't use the term reserved -- set aside domain names or strings is worthwhile, they can - since this is only about identical protections, choose something similar. So at the injury that we know would befall these as yet unknown third parties I think is modest compared to the kind of nightmare scenario of un-ringing the bell.

And I do agree in terms of the number of applicants that, you know, applications that are out there and roughly 1400, not all 1400, you know, will raise an issue. I looked at this issue earlier of how many of the 1400 are actually open. I don't have the number in front of me but it's 7 or 800.

So even if it's 7 or 800 instead of 1,400, 700 delegations times, you know, multiple strings could still be potentially thousands of delegations. So I think that the point well taken is not really a difference of any magnitude.

I think it is - since unfortunately the PDP, you know, almost certainly will not be completed before the first of these TLDs goes live, it really seems that the only prudent thing to allow the PDP to be meaningful at least with regard to these two organizations is to set aside the domain names so that the bell can remain un-rung from the beginning.

And then only later on if it turns out that it's determined that there should be no specific protections it can be - the names can then be delegated through mechanisms that, you know, should not be difficult to come up with since that's really a business that these registrars will - and registries will be in. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Greg. So and I don't know Alan if you want to speak but - and Greg you had mentioned it too. So what can you do - because we have been saying for weeks now that we want official input from the groups and we haven't been able to get it?

I think we're coming down very much so to crunch time. What can we do to encourage and get the groups response on this proposal or frankly on any other one just to get a definitive response so that we can go back to the GAC in Toronto and have a concrete position?

Actually I should say we have to go back to the Council first and the Council will then need to go to the GAC. And I'd be fine too with maybe trying to get a call with the GAC much like we had a call for the last ICANN meeting or (then) for the Costa Rica meeting maybe getting a call with them and go through our position if we have one.

So let me go to Alan and then Greg.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, a couple of things. No, as I said before, I'm not representing the ALAC in what I said. We've been overwhelmed with a number of higher priority issues and I haven't raised the issue. I will be raising it in the, you know, probably later this week.

And I don't pretend to know what the outcome will be. The ALAC has been pretty rigid. On the other hand, I think the arguments that are being made right now are strong.

It almost goes back to the statement that's somewhat incorrectly attributed to the Hippocratic oath of do no harm. You know, the real words are something like do good or do no harm.

In the absence of knowing exactly where this is going to go, we should take a path which will not put the organizations in a worse position should the PDP

come out and decide to protect them. So I think it's a reasonable path to follow and I will try to get an ALAC, you know, a formal ALAC position on it. It may take a little bit of time.

My advice at this point is we've had a number of statements from people on this call and you're representing the registries who may not be on the call. I think as Chair you need to put out a consensus call and try to gauge the overall feeling of the group.

You know, the workgroup will specifically say you can't make decisions like this on a conference call. You must involve the other people in the group. And I think it's - I think we're now down to one recommendation which seems to have a fair amount of support, may have a lot of support, may not.

And let's decide quickly if - do we go forward and look at other alternatives or have we identified something for which there is consensus if not unanimity. I don't know the answer to that but I think it's a reasonable thing to try to gauge at this point. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Alan. Let me go to Greg and then I'll weigh in.

Greg Shatan: I would say that I think that the, you know, we have arrived at a point right now where we're considering, you know, either one or a very limited number of proposals, which I think is very helpful. And I think that, you know, just with Labor Day weekend at least here in the U.S. interceding it just was difficult to, you know, get word out and back from the IPC.

But I think that the, you know, it seems to me that what we're considering is either what's being called the J. Scott proposal, which is to set aside the names temporarily pending the outcome of a PDP and to have such a PDP.

Seems the only - if you kind of consider what the alternatives to that are, the only other alternative is - two alternatives are to have a PDP but not set the

names aside and then deal with the problem later if it turns out the PDP says they, you know, should not have been delegated or should not be delegated or to do nothing at all.

It seems to me - I guess the fourth alternative is to reserve the names period but then I think we've gotten away from that to reserve them and have no PDP. So it seems like there's really only three alternatives, which is do nothing, have a PDP but don't set aside the names and have a PDP and set aside the names.

I think that's kind of simple enough for - so I agree with Alan that I think that we could either have a call for consensus on the J. Scott proposal or we could go back to our organizations and see which of the three, the J. Scott and the two alternatives, which are to do nothing and to just have a PDP without the set aside. Get more traction.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Greg. And it's interesting because, you know, ultimately the GNSO Council is going to decide whether or not to do a PDP on this after the issue report is raised. We will just be doing a recommendation.

So I really see - what I'm starting to see as a consensus - I don't think anyone disagrees with the recommendation that there should be a full PDP on this issue. Putting aside whether there's a full PDP on the IGOs. I'm getting the feeling that we have, excuse me, consensus or even unanimity on the fact that a full PDP should be done on this.

So then the question is like you said, what do we do with the names pending the outcome of the PDP? And then there's two options there. And there may be others that we just haven't considered.

But what I'd like to do is in line with your comments and Alan's comments is have a week to go back and I'll write this up on email. But essentially have a

week to go back to consider the J. Scott proposal and the alternatives and come next week to the call with just a discussion on things that we've heard.

Then after next weeks call assuming that things are pretty much the same as where we are now, is to issue the consensus call and give two weeks to finalize those votes on the consensus call or the - shouldn't call them votes; whatever we call them. That on - during the consensus call and maybe even during that two-week period trying to set up a meeting with the GAC representatives to walk them through our thought processes on this.

Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Thank you. I realize as we're having this discussion I'm not 100% sure when we say reserve the IOC and Red Cross names whether we are talking about the specific list in the GAC request or honoring the words that went along with that list saying it is representative and therefore had to be enlarged based on other languages and things and we have follow on lists to that.

So I'm just not sure which list we're talking about. And I think we need to be careful and make sure that we're all using the same definition. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Well the most (unintelligible) proposal at the second level was only the exact matches in the fixed UN languages.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. But I thought the GAC words - the words said that it was a representative list.

Jeff Neuman: I think that was with respect to the top level.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'd have - I would have to go back. Okay. As long as the - as long as we make really clear which list we're talking about when we ask the question. I don't really care which way it is. But I think we need to make sure that we're not - that everyone knows exactly what we're talking about. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. We can be - we can be very specific to that as well. I think you're right. We need to be - we need to be specific in the proposal.

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Jeff. I'm just wondering whether we have a week - if we have a call in a week from now whether all the representatives will have had the chance to talk to their groups. I mean is that realistic? You know, rather than going over the remaining proposals again and again, I'd rather like to hear from the individual groups and ask them for statements.

You know, you know, just maybe as an encouragement to you as Chair, you know, maybe we should actually have a definite deadline for the group to specify whether they would like to propose other options rather than the two options that we have just flagged.

And in the absence of that, we're just talking about the two and then actually have an agenda...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Thomas Rickert: ...where the individual groups are required to report on the feedback.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Thomas Rickert: You know, I don't know how we can grab the momentum on this but, you know, it's - I think we need to make sure that we get some tangible feedback. Certainly that doesn't preclude in any way the discussions at the GNSO level and there might be other proposals introduced then. But I think we need to bring this to close in this group. We've just started to move in circles.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. So I agree that we need feedback from other groups. The only difficulty I have in the statement you made is getting other proposals. We've had months for groups to get in other proposals. So I think the time right now is to just to try to wrap up our group with - we've spent a lot of time narrowing the options down.

So my goal for this group is to narrow it down to one proposal, maybe two if we're split and then put that out for comment as opposed to just creating an open proposal.

So possibly what I wanted to do for the next week was to just say okay, these are the - just get everyone's nod in the group that these are the - this is (what's for me), this is the narrowing down. This is where we're at. And then maybe even put it out to public comment. Believe to discuss that next week. I'm just not so comfortable doing that with so many people out right now.

Otherwise I would be much more definitive. That's my kind of view. I was like I want to give it the extra week so that other people could come and attend next week. It's just, you know, such a high rate of people that are out.

Thomas Rickert: Just to clarify. Don't get me wrong. I don't want to encourage anyone to come up with completely new proposals except to make sure that nobody wants a proposal back that we have reduced from the list, right, because there so few people attending.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I think there have been enough emails now across the list and enough discussions that we've narrowed it down what this group could recommend. And obviously ten people could show up next week and say no to that and then, you know, were back to the drawing board. But I think we need to kind of push it forward.

But let me go to Alan and then Greg.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Thank you. I - on that one point I agree. If someone comes up next week and says no, no, no, you misunderstood, I really want some - another one on the table, then we put it back. You know, so be it. It's not worth agonizing over. It's just nicer to have a shorter list rather than a longer list when going to all of our groups.

In terms of the timing, what you're suggesting of one week plus two weeks works perfectly for At Large. We have a meeting the day before what would be our scheduled meeting. So that works perfectly for the At Large. I don't know how well it works for other groups. I would think in the three week window pretty much all the groups are likely to be meeting or could hold a meeting if necessary. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Greg.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg and, you know, I would agree. We have an IPC meeting scheduled for the 11th, which is next Tuesday. So that works well in terms of trying to finalize a response to these proposals and, you know, perhaps make a last clear call for anybody to, you know, object violently that one of the proposals that just got taken off should be restored.

I think that we've now gone - we're out of the lazy, crazy, hazy days of summer. And, you know, people should be getting more focused on getting things done. I think we all kind of, you know, the entire world seems to sag a little bit during the summer with regard to vocational and volunteer type of things like this.

I think it's just time to kind of put this thing in the chute and get it done in terms of timing. And I think there's nothing like a series of deadlines to focus the minds of those who are now, you know, returning to their desks and put their fall hats on. Hopefully.

Jeff Neuman: And I think - I'm hoping that within the next week the final issue report will be out. I don't know if Margie's on right now. Or Brian can answer that question of whether the (unintelligible) report on the IGOs will be out in the next week. Brian.

Brian Peck: Sorry. I was on mute. We're - I mean that's our goal. Our goal is to try to get it published by, you know, middle of end of next week. So that's what we're working towards.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And that'll be good too because, you know, obviously the Council needs to have a discussion as to whether we're going to initiate a PDP. My guess is that it, you know, from just previous discussions that we will. Obviously if we don't initiate the PDP on the full IGO, it will still be our recommendation to do a - our group's recommendation to do a PDP at least on the Olympic Committee names and the Red Cross names.

But what I'll try to do is also set up a call with the GAC representatives on this issue for the next few weeks to go over it with them. You know, we do have some time with this issue. Just discussing with the GAC definitely in Toronto. But we'll also have to have a public comment period, you know, put it out for official public comment as well.

We were criticized the last time for not doing that. This time we don't have as much of a time crunch. If we have a proposal that we think most people buy into since the first new gTLD will not be launched until next year anyway.

All right. Anybody else with anything to add? Anything we missed that people want to cover? All right. It seems like I think we can end this call early. So anyone object to ending the call early? I will take silence as a lack of objection. So thank you everyone. I will send around an email to you updating the rest of the group on where we are.

And please come back in the next week or next weeks call with some more input from your groups and that's not final input but please have some more input.

Man: Thanks Jeff. Bye everybody.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: That's Jeff. Thank you very much and sorry for being silent. I will go through the transcript and make my comment later in writing. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Oh thanks Wolfgang.

Man: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: All right.

Woman: Thank you very much. (Unintelligible).

END