

**ICANN
Transcript
IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group
Wednesday 7 November at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Teleconference on 7 November 2012 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-20121107-en.mp3>

on page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

Attendees:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Jonathan Robinson - RySG
Jeff Neuman - Registry SG group leader
Lanre Ajayi - Nominating Committee Appointee
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Osvaldo Novao -ISPC
Chuck Gomes - RySG
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Jim Bikoff – IPC
Catherine Gribbin – Canadian Red Cross
Brett Faussett – IPC
Kiran Malancharuvil - IPC
Donna Austin – Ausregistry
Osvaldo Novoa – ISPCP
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Christopher Rassi – Red Cross
David Maher – RySG
Donna Austin – RySG
Stephane Hankins - IPC
Elizabeth Finberg - RySG

Apology :

Mary W.S Wong - NCSG
Debra Hughes – Red Cross
Thomas Rickert - Nominating Committee Appointee
Wolfgang Kleinwachter – NCUC
Gregory Shatan – IPC
J.Scott Evans - IPC

ICANN Staff:

Margie Milam
Brian Peck
Berry Cobb
Glen De Saint Géry
Julia Charvolen

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process Working Group Call on the 7th of November.

On the call today we have Chuck Gomes, Wilson Abigaba, Brett Fausett, Jonathan Robinson, Catherine Gribbin, Jeff Neuman, Christopher Rassi, David Maher, Jim Bikoff, Lanre Ayaji, Osvaldo Novoa, Iliya Bazlyankov, Jim Bikoff, Elizabeth Finberg, Stephane Hankins, Kiran Malancharuvil, Alan Greenberg and Donna Austin.

We have apologies from Mary Wong, Debra Hughes, J. Scott Evans, Thomas Rickert and Wolfgang Kleinwachter.

From the staff we have Brian Peck, Berry Cobb, Margie Milam and myself Julia Charvolen.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you very much. Everyone welcome to the - this is a two part call. The first part of the call although everyone's welcome to listen in, the first part of this call's really dedicated to the Drafting Team to kind of finalize its work and to discuss the comments that were received on the proposals that the Drafting Team put out on September 28.

The commentary closed on October 19 and then the reply period started on the 20th. And actually the reply period closes on the 9th, but you know, we're going to discuss the comments that we've received all with an eye towards making a recommendation to the GNSO Council or the meeting that's next week on Thursday - I want to say it's the 15th. So on Thursday the 15th.

With all that said just to kind of take a step back as to where we are in the process because hopefully more people will join the call, we have recommended as a Drafting Team - so the Drafting Team was formed to guide or help advise the council on the proposals made from the GAC specifically with respect to the Olympic Committee, the IOC and the Red Cross/Red Crescent marks.

Although some other marks were discussed in connection with the Drafting Team. We limited the scope to really only helping to advise the council at both the top and second level. The drafting team did make a proposal at the top level that was recommended to the council. The council adopted it, sent that to the board and then the Drafting Team went to work on the second level.

Out of the Drafting Team's work the recommendations that came out of it which are posted were basically (unintelligible) recommend that (unintelligible) commence on the Olympic Committee, the IOC and the Red Cross/Red Crescent marks. The second recommendation was to have a temporary reservation of exact matches of the IOC Red Cross/Red Crescent marks at the second level listed in the guide in the six official UN languages. And the third recommendation really was about communicating our rationale to the GAC.

The first (unintelligible), the GNSO did adopt a PDP which obviously everyone knows that. That's why a lot of us are on this call and that'll take up the second half of this call. That real recommendation is probably (unintelligible) as the PDP has been initiated. So really what we're talking about now are the recommendations to have a temporary reservation of these marks until a PDP can be finalized and (unintelligible).

So if anyone can go on mute or if you have a question just let me know. Does anyone have a question or not?

Okay. So with respect to that the Draft recommendations went out for comment. There were some comments that were received and Berry Cobb has circulated what we call a public comment review tool which has all the comments that were received up through yesterday where a new comment was submitted by the Olympic Committee. And maybe we can spend a minute talking about that after we go through these.

But essentially it covers all those comments and we need to discuss those comments to see whether or not any of these comments provide any new information that will in any way get us to change our recommendation. If not, then I've proposed a motion that I need to send to council today in order to get it on the agenda for next week's meeting.

Any questions that we need to do over the next 45 minutes?

Okay. So a number of the comments if you've looked through the review tool, some of it is actually a private - well I wouldn't say private, but more of a communication back and forth with a non-commercial constituency or stakeholder group. I can't remember which one. But some of those comments I don't think were actually meant for the public comment review. I don't know Berry if you want to comment on that?

But like if you look at number 15 and 14 and 13 and so on, there are - and I don't even know - most of them I would think do relate to this internal conversation of what the non-commercial stakeholder group actually agreed to. So the purpose of this call - I really wish we had a few people from the NCSG with us. I don't know if we do. Have any joined from the NCSG or NCUC?

Berry Cobb: Jeff, this is Berry. Just to clarify Comments 12-15 are actually just from the NPOC and weren't necessarily a part of the NCSG dialogue in their official position.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks. Thanks for the clarification. We were internal - I think they were all meant for internal consumption within that group as opposed to because they all got posted on the ICANN list. So I think for the most part those can be ignored because there was no official communication from the non - or the NPOC.

Berry, I don't know if we have the ability to scroll through these? Is there a way you can give us all the ability to scroll through the comments?

Berry Cobb: I just flipped through a switch.

Jeff Neuman: All right, so if everyone wants to kind of flip those. Chuck, you have a comment?

Chuck Gomes: Yes just quickly Jeff. If I - I skimmed through these comments this morning and I got the impression that Avri's comment was in response to (Alan's). Did I get that correct Berry or could you tell?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I think it's actually kind of a combination of both. Her comment starts at Row #7 on Page 12 of the public comment tool. It was - there was actually two comments submitted by Avri; the first was denoting the difference between the NPOC dialogue and the position for the NCSG.

And then her second response is on Page...

Chuck Gomes: Five.

Berry Cobb: Yes thank you, number 5 starting on the bottom of Page 8. And I think was really more a restatement of the NCSG position more than a response to (Alan).

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes that was the impression I got. And looking through the comments I mean (unintelligible) that basically talked about what they argue with respect to the marks. I'm not sure whether people can - it didn't really call for a response on our part; it just really talked about what they are proposing to do.

But Berry, I mean as you look through these, are there really any comments that - the obvious comment as you said was more the NCSG position which they really discussed at length within the Drafting Team discussions. Are there any other discussions that you saw or comments that you saw that really needs some sort of response from the Drafting Team?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck Jeff. It seems to me that several of them are really comments for the PDP more than they are comments for the recommendations of the Drafting Team.

Did others get that same impression? Like for example the Red Cross Comment #1 looked at - is very good input for the PDP for the most part, but I didn't see it impacting the decision of the recommendation to the council.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Berry Cobb: And Jeff, this is Berry. I would concur with that assessment. Pretty much most of the comments were related to the PDP or certainly restating a position that has been discussed amongst the Drafting Team members.

Probably the only one that is a standout is the comment from Avri with respect to the Recommendation #2 and the possible moratorium or special reservation of the name and perhaps we may want to spend a little time on that. But other than that I don't think there was any substantial change or indication that would alter the recommendations that were posted by the Drafting Team.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So can you point to where the comments - or Comment #5 then.

Berry Cobb: In her second paragraph it starts at the top of Page 9 whether - it really starts at the beginning, but the sustenance is in Paragraph 2.

Jeff Neuman: All right, so basically there's a fear that Avri - and Avri did express this during the Drafting Team consultations that we have feared that a temporary policy becomes permanently just not intended, that you know, basically sets a baseline so the baseline will see that there's some sort of protection and it would be basically (unintelligible) to overcome that.

I think the Drafting Team did discuss that. They also say that it'll be probably - obviously problematic and that it didn't consider the position of the IGA's and it's only for these limited organizations. Trying to see if there's anything - there's no reason to rush. And she believes that the PDP can be done on time and if not, (unintelligible) just apply to the next round.

She then would like just as she had said to the Drafting Team that the abandoned Recommendations 2 and 3B really relates to communicating a decision to the GAC.

Again I don't see this as any new information that wasn't raised to the Drafting Team. The NCSG already did oppose their recommendations on the Drafting Team. Now is there anyone that's on the Drafting Team and (unintelligible) joining us? Is there anyone on the Drafting Team that as a result of these comments feels like there's more work that you should do or that they have not took the seated position that they took for when they recommended these proposals?

Okay and I'll also note that J. Scott who's a member of the Drafting Team (unintelligible) emails supported the recommendations and going forward with them. I don't think they were -- I'm just looking at my email now -- I don't think there were any additional questions or comments on that.

Kiran, did you just want to go over - or Jim, if you're now on - do you just want to go over the comment you filed yesterday?

Kiran Malancharuvil: Sure, so we - the IOC files - our comment yesterday that was in reply to one of these comments that was part of the internal NPOC discussion, Klaus Stoll who is in the executive leadership position with NPOC stated, "There was no reason that the procession of commercial interests to grant protection to the IOC should simply be taken off the table as it is wasting everybody's time."

So the IOC just felt that we would use the reply comment period to just correct the misstatement of fact that was made by Mr. Stoll and to clarify the status of the IOC as a non-commercial organization.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Well again that's not really - that's good, that's good for the PDP, but I don't think that's - so that's in line with our recommendations. That doesn't go against any of our recommendations.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Right, absolutely. We just wanted to use the reply comment period since the statement was made publicly, to just correct the statement of fact.

Jeff Neuman: (Alan), were you able to get on?

(Alan): Yes I'm here.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Good. I just want to check because I saw your notes in the chat.

(Alan): Yes I don't think there's anything that was mentioned in the comments that we did not discuss including that last point that was just discussed because that was one of the positions that some people in At-Large took.

You know, D meaning the Olympic IOC to be a commercial organization because of their commercial activities associated with things. But so again

there's no new - nothing new here that we did not discuss. So I don't think - I didn't see anything in reviewing them that warranted a - you know, rethinking the position which, you know, everyone had agreed with as a compromise. Not necessarily everyone's ideal world, but that was the terms under which it was agreed.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks (Alan). Any other member of the Drafting Team want to comment?

Okay. So then if everyone could then turn to the motions. I prepared a motion. I know Chuck's comment is on it. There's a little dialogue to Chuck and (Alan). So if everyone wants to go open that up, I sent that out 11:29 am my time. So it was about three hours ago. No sorry, that was (unintelligible). I sent it out at 10:04 am, so about four hours ago.

And Chuck, did you want to - so Chuck's comment, if you open it up was really to further clarify that this moratorium would only kick in if the PDP -- and I'm calling it a moratorium, it's actually temporary reservation -- would only kick in if the PDP wasn't finalized. And (Alan) said he thought - well the people said that they thought that was kind of implicit in that and then Chuck said maybe it should be more clear.

Chuck, do you have any suggestions as far as the wording of what we can do?

Chuck Gomes: Well thanks Jeff, it's Chuck. And it may be just me, but it doesn't seem real clear. Basically what the recommendation was is if the PDP and any policy recommendations are not ready in time that there would be, you know, a temporary reservation or whatever we want to call them.

I'm not sure pending the outcome of the recently launched PDP really says that clearly. Now if everybody else thinks it does I can live with that, but it

almost sounds, you know, like until the outcome of the recently PDP maybe that's okay. So I'll go with what others think.

I think we want to make sure they understand that the results of the PDP will take precedence once it's finished whether it's before new gTLD's been introduced or after. But if everybody else is comfortable with the language I can live with that.

Jeff Neuman: I'm trying to think of a different way to word it. So...

(Alan): Jeff, this is (Alan). Could I get in?

Jeff Neuman: Oh sure, sorry (Alan).

(Alan): Yes. Just one comment and then on question for Chuck. First of all, I think we need to remember that the launching of new gTLD's is not a one-time process. You know, the first one may be in N months from now. We don't know what N is. The last one may be three years from now.

So there's going to be a stream of them and our wording needs to address, you know, the first and the last because the first - you know, it may well be the PDP is not completed in time for the first one; it may well be that the PDP has been long dead and completed by the time the last gTLD is launched.

So our wording has to cover those, but I guess my question for Chuck is what - how else can you interpret that pending sentence if it doesn't mean, you know, what I thought it meant and what Jeff thought it meant when it drafted? What is the other interpretation that it could mean?

Chuck Gomes: Good question. This is Chuck. For some reason it just didn't seem clear to me and maybe that's why I say maybe I am just missing it. So as long as others think that it says what we intended, I'm fine with that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Anybody else have a comment on it? And frankly I'll open that up; you don't have to be on the Drafting Team to comment on it. If anyone else on the call has a comment on the language of the motion, you don't think it's clear, you have any suggestions, please, you know, join the queue.

Because I can't stop as well. Margie, do you think it's - between you guys, Margie, Berry, Brian, do you think it's clear or see any other ways to make it more clear?

Margie Milam: Hi, it's Margie. I think it's pretty clear.

Man: Yes I agree.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

(Alan): It's (Alan)...

Man: We do have until the council meeting to change it if the wording needs to be tweaked. Getting it in, in time for the deadline is the critical issue at this point.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So I will then (unintelligible) or I will get this motion is as (Alan) said we do have the ability to withdraw the motion, modify some words. If there's a huge amount of comments in the next two days before the reply period is done, you know, we can always pull it.

But I think the goal is to get this in for the November meeting which is I have to get this motion in today.

So with that really there's not much else for the Drafting Team to do.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi Jeff, it's Kiran. Sorry, I hand up in Adobe, but I just had a question.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, sorry. What?

Kiran Malancharuvil: Sorry, for the record, so this is Kiran Malancharuvil. I have a question on the language of the motion in the I guess the first paragraph after "Now therefore it be resolved." There's a reference to Section 2.2.1.2.3 about the Applicant Guidebook and which lists the languages and the translation to the words to be protected and then there's a reference to the six official languages of the UN.

The Applicant Guidebook actually protects the UN6 plus German, Greek and Korean. So those little bit of a disconnect in that paragraph about what are you protecting, the names that are listed in the Applicant Guidebook or just the UN6.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That's a good question. Let me - I'm going to pull out my copy of the Guidebook. Sorry.

(Alan): Jeff, it's (Alan). My recollection is that our original discussion of this proposal made reference to the GAC letter which did cover those other languages.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Yes this is Kiran again. Our recollection is well so we agree with Berry's suggestion in the Adobe Connect room that we just remove the language about the UN6 and just make reference to the Applicant Guidebook. That's our preference.

Jeff Neuman: So then all of those marks that aren't listed in the 6 UN languages wouldn't be protected in those? Right, so for example Red Lion and Sun, I don't think that's in there in all six languages in 2.2.1 and whatever. Sorry.

Kiran Malancharuvil: I can't speak to -- this is Kiran again -- the Red Cross stuff. So sorry, I'm only pushing this from what - from the Olympic perspective. So that would - I'm not the person to answer that question.

(Stefan): Jeff, this is (Stefan Henkins). Can I chip in? I don't know how to put my hand up on the machine.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

(Stefan): It's - good evening. Well I think the easiest way would be to revert to the (unintelligible) that is in the Applicant Guidebook or else we would need indeed to clarify, you know, because it is the case that for example the Red Lion and Sun is not protected in the six.

And the (unintelligible) is also not protected in the six UN languages. So, you know, there are two options; either to take, you know, the exact listing that is in the Applicant Guidebook or to say that, you know, all the wording including the Red Lion and Sun and the (unintelligible) they're protected in all six languages.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think the easiest option is just to remove the reference to the six official languages.

Chuck, do you have a comment?

Chuck Gomes: Yes just a question Jeff. Did I understand correctly because I haven't looked back at the GAC language, but what's in the Guidebook is what the GAC requested? Is that correct?

Jeff Neuman: The GAC has additional marks on there.

(Alan): Well it's (Alan), I think there is a striking difference between the two.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

(Alan): I don't have the GAC one in front of me right now, but my recollection is what we put in the Guidebook is a subset of that.

Chuck Gomes: Well okay, this is Chuck again. So I guess I raised the question, considering our intent of doing the temporary reservation is to avoid any registrations that might happen and might not later be allowed. It seems like we'd be better off airing on the broader list for the temporary reservation than the narrower list?

Jeff Neuman: Yes so what it says now is that Section 2.2.1.2.3 of the Guidebook and for the GAC recommendation of September 14, 2011. If we just left the language that way I think I could do that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yes that works for me; this is Chuck.

(Alan): It's (Alan). It may be useful prior to the council meeting if we actually do the research and see what the superset list is if it's not the one in the Applicant Guidebook just so people know what it is they're approving.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That's a good recommendation. (Stefan), you have any other comment?

(Stefan): Yes I had another comment. I just wanted to make sure that, you know, the manner in which the temporary reservation is phrased is sufficient. I think I recall that there is an issue of implementation at the second level

So and that, you know, what ICANN can do is call upon whether these registrars to implement the reservation and to take, you know, also ICANN stuff to take all the necessary measures to implement the reservation or in this case the temporary reservation.

So I would just - I just wanted to chip in, you know, that we need to make sure that simply saying that it's sufficient or whether it should say and invites, you know, ICANN to take, you know, the necessary measures so that a temporary reservation is implemented until such time as, you know, the results or the PDP are known.

Because I don't know enough, you know, the technical aspect. That is my only comment. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. (Stefan), I think that language in there is really more for the ICANN board than it would be for the GNSO Council. So you're saying that there should be a temporary reservation is enough as a policy body or to actually instruct ICANN staff to implement it in the Guidebook or however they're going to do it?

I think saying anymore - and then I'll turn it over to (Alan), but I think saying anymore on this is just too - kind of goes beyond what the GNSO Council should do. I know the GAC sometimes has much more instructive language, but I think as a policy body taking this approach of just saying there should be a reservation is probably the way to go.

(Stefan): Thank you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes (Alan)?

(Alan): Yes we can certainly do what we tend to do in all PDP's these days of adding a statement of saying the GNSO is willing to convent an implementation review group if necessary or if appropriate.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I don't - sorry, this is my personal opinion. I don't think we need to do that.

(Alan): I don't think so either, but we could cover it that way if we have some worry about it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I mean we could bring that up with the council, but I just - I'm not that concerned about it. I think it's pretty clear how to temporarily reserve a name.

(Alan): Yes I'm not worried.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Any last comments?

Okay...

Berry Cobb: This is Berry.

Jeff Neuman: Yes hey Berry.

Berry Cobb: Just real quick, something that we may want to touch on, is the balance actually drafting the communication to the GAC? I'm not sure exactly the structure, the substance of that communication. And should we put - spend any time on that?

Jeff Neuman: I think that's probably an issue that we could talk to the council on. Probably want to do that. I'm not sure we need the Drafting Team for that.

Berry Cobb: Good, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Man: And the communication would come from the council itself, not necessarily the Drafting Team I believe, right?

Jeff Neuman: Right, that's correct. Okay. I know we're a couple minutes early for the next session. I don't know if we want to start that going or...

Man: Sure. I mean is there any other comments or questions from the Drafting Team or...?

Jeff Neuman: Let me just as a last - just thank everyone on the Drafting Team for all the work. It's been definitely an up and down group. It's very passionate and hard

working individuals on it and we've sort of like I said our ups and downs, but I think that we are now - we're all glad that we're finished with this part. And a lot of work around the PDP.

I just want to thank everyone for their time and their effort.

And with that I will turn it over back to Brian.

Man: All right, thank you very much Jeff and thank you for your services, the share of the Drafting Team. We appreciate all your time and efforts and thanks for that. So thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks.

Man: Yes. Hey just to confirm, Jeff, you're going to be submitting the motion to the GNSO Council today?

Jeff Neuman: I'm going to do that while we're on the phone through the next part.

Man: Okay. Okay. All right, well thank you and as Jeff mentioned we'll now transition this call to the meeting of the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group - or Drafting Team Working Group, excuse me. So (unintelligible) initiative matters to take care of and then we'll move into the discussion.

First of all, I guess - I don't know whether we officially need to do - me to do the role call for purposes of this section of the meeting. I'm assuming that everyone that is on the Drafting Team is also at least at this point volunteering for this phase of the Drafting Team or working group. If so, then I think the role call we had at the beginning is sufficient.

Any objection to that?

All right, a reminder that all who volunteer we do need statement of interests and so if you've not had an opportunity to submit that, we ask that you do so. The link for that submission is in the notes on the left-hand column there. So again if you have not had a chance to submit your statement of interest, we ask that you do so as soon as possible.

Okay? Any questions on that?

All right, the next order of business is to determine a chair for this group. As of last night at least or this morning I think we had one nomination potentially I think from Chuck Gomes nominating Thomas Rickert. Is there any other nominations or any other volunteers that we'd like to bring in?

Is someone typing in a name?

No?

Chuck, did you hear from Thomas?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Berry. Only just briefly because he's on vacation.

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: He is considering it, but he has not made a decision yet. So we can't really pursue it at this time. I'm hoping early next week he will let us know. So in the meantime if anybody has any other suggestions or a volunteer, that would be fine.

That's all I have right now. And he did give me permission to at least say he's considering it. So that's about all I can say right now.

Man: Okay. Thanks Chuck. Again, any other nominations or volunteers that we're going to submit them in at this point?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. It was I think suggested by one or two people that we consider having co-chairs. So if somebody wanted to volunteer as a co-chair and not just a single chair, I'd just throw that out.

Man: Thanks Chuck. Okay. Given - currently we have one nomination and circling him out he's considering it at this time, I would suggest that we then postpone the selection of a chair until our next meeting. Unless someone else has an alternative suggestion?

Would anyone like to...?

Margie Milam: Hey Brett?

Man: Yes. Hi.

Margie Milam: Brett, it's Margie if I may. Since we don't have anyone - looks like they want us make the decision on the chair issue right now, perhaps someone might want to volunteer to chair this meeting for, you know, on a temporary basis.

Man: You just took the words out of my mouth.

Margie Milam: Oh I'm sorry.

Man: That's okay. Again, you know, certainly would anyone be willing to volunteer to chair this particular session?

Any objections to having staff chair this discussion?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. No objection from me.

Man: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. No objection from me. I think that's fine.

Man: Okay. All right, then why don't we go ahead and move forward. I think - I am pleased, you know, for those members that are on with the group feel free to step in or take a minute if you feel I'm missing something or going down the wrong path.

Our next order of business is to - and I think everyone would agree the permanent objective of this session to the extent that it's possible is to work on the Draft Working Group Charter and if at all possible as Jeff noted in the prior session of this call the deadline for submission for the council consideration of any document is today.

So if at all possible, you know, come to a consensus or agreement on the Draft Working Group Charter in time to submit it, I think that would be the primary objective of the meeting time of our call to the extent that's possible.

And so we did circulate a fast generated - initial draft last week. There was an initial discussion on that draft. There was some concerns expressed to the terms of the initial suggestion of, you know, dividing the proposed working group into two sub-groups. One focusing on the recommendations for the IOC Red Cross which in a sense was to pick up the work of the Drafting Team recommendation.

The other group would work on the broader issue of the - which would be the main focus of the PDP and that is to, you know, determine what appropriate protections may be recommended for the purposes of protecting IGO and INGO names at the first, top and second levels in all gTLD's.

So there was some concern expressed about that breakup. Since that time we have received a submission from the Registry Stakeholder Group - on that group by David Maher. We appreciate that. And that is currently what's up on the screen. And so that is one proposal we have before us.

And so this is open up for discussion. I don't know, David, if you wanted to quickly go through it to try and explain the position of the Registry Stakeholder Group and the reason for the proposed revisions?

David Maher: Well, you know, I just very briefly, the principle change on the original charter is to get rid of the idea of having two separate working groups. We believe that the various issues are so intertwined that that really wouldn't be practical.

And I think at that point I'll open it up for any other comments or questions.

Man: Okay. Thank you David. Chuck, you had your hand raised.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Berry. Just to point out, if people would take a look at number 1 because there was a little bit of discussion in the registries with regard to this one. Assuming that the recommendations are going to be approved by the council reference to motion that Jeff's going to vote forward today, so because that kind of impacts what we're going to do.

Because if they don't, you know, number 1 may have to be changed. But for simplicity in getting a charter on the table we thought that was fairly safe to assume. Not automatic, but fairly safe to assume. And then I think, you know, if for some reason that doesn't happen, then obviously the charter would have to be modified, but at least we'd have a charter in place. Charters can always be changed.

Man: Thank you Chuck. Any other comments or observations or questions?

Berry Cobb: Brian, this is Berry. I'd just like to point out to the group that Avri had sent a few suggestions as well and I posted them over on the left-hand section of the Adobe Connect room for the members to review.

Man: Okay. Yes thanks Berry. Wanted to see if we would have any more comments or questions on that and move them over to Avri's request as well.

Kiran, you have your hand up.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi, thanks. Yes this is Kiran. I wanted to say that the IOC supports the division of the sub-groups. We have always said that the work has already been done primarily on determining the rationale and the justification for protections of the IOC and Red Cross names.

And we think especially for the purposes of expediting at least that part of the PDP, we need to keep the issues separate and we need to keep the considerations separate.

Thank you.

Man: Okay. Thank you. Chuck, you had your hand up. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I was on mute.

Man: That's okay. Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Question for Kiran. The - I don't know how you keep them separate. Maybe they can be separated; maybe they can't. The Working Group - even if it's not on the charter, the Working Group could still make the decision to form some separate sub-groups as was proposed by staff.

So it's not as if that's still not possible, but to say that's the way we have to do it and lock that in the charter didn't seem like a wise thing to do because as David said these things aren't just totally separate and some people may think they are and maybe they're right. But I think that working groups should decide that on their own rather than locking that into the charter.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi Chuck, this is Kiran. I don't know that I have - I can come up with like an off the cup response to that question, but I will say that the legal basis for protection of the distinct groups, the IGO's and the IOC and the RC are all very different and separate issues.

So I don't really see how you wouldn't separate them especially since we've spent really since 2008 outlining and discussing with various groups in ICANN the IOC's legal position. And I think it's just - I think it's important to separate them and I think it's important to not go backwards and waste the time taking out the consideration of the sub-groups just to have to revisit and discuss it within the context of the Working Group deliberations.

I think that is to be honest with you a waste of time to not just establish that separation up front and then move on.

Thanks.

Jim Bikoff: Hello, can anybody hear me?

Man: Yes. Who is this?

Jim Bikoff: Jim Bikoff.

Man: Yes Jim.

Jim Bikoff: You know, I just want to second with Kiran is that I think that a lot of the legal work has already been done on the IOC RC as evidenced by not only GAC's efforts, but also the efforts of the General Counsel of ICANN and also the outside counsel. And we've had reports on all of these.

And it would be I think somewhat going backward to have to redo or have to do that again in consideration of IGO and other international organizations whose interests are going to be different and different statutes involved. So I

think that we should keep these separated. That would be my recommendation too.

Man: Any other comments or responses?

Jim Bikoff: Can I say one other thing?

Man: Sure. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Bikoff: I just wanted to mention there's something in the PDP that also involves whether or not this protection should be extended to existing GLD's like dot com and dot org. And I think on that issue, you know, perhaps there has to be further consideration because that's not the subject that we're dealing with or have dealt with since we've been restricting our comments to the new gTLD's.

So I just wanted to make that point.

Man: I think if I may - and Margie and Berry, please again step in. But I might - if I could speak on behalf of the staff who drafted the original suggested draft as a starting point and just to clarify the purpose for dividing a sub-group. The first sub-group was to address the need to carry on the work or recommendation of the Drafting Team.

And that was to address the protection of the IOC and Red Cross names in the second level of the first round of new GLD's prior to the delegation sometime next spring. So, you know, does the staff envision the separation to address - I mean that first sub-group wasn't so much to separate the Red Cross and the general broader question of permanent protection beyond the first round and/or whether it include only new or all gTLD's, but rather just specifically carry out the work of the Drafting Team.

And that was, you know, the intended purpose of separating them out given the basis necessary for that. So it was kind of recommendation of the Drafting Team and of, you know, the real practicality of the delegations of these sometime in the spring.

So I think - I don't know if that clarification helps, but you know, the second group was meant to design to deal with again permanent protections for all these organizations including the Red Cross and IOC beyond the first round and then of course as the PDP has been initiated by the IGNSO Council does include consideration for all gTLD's and not just new gTLD's.

So I think that given also what I think, you know, some agree here is that, you know, Working Group Charter, you know, you do have the flexibility of certainly of having once the group is established and then you've got the charter being adopted by the council, it could certainly be, you know, if indeed the work seems to indicate that perhaps it would be better to just agreeing that you have the flexibility of doing that.

But again the original proposal of the staff was, you know, more along those lines.

Okay. We have Chuck, Kiran and then (Alan).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Brian. Jim, just a quick response on the existing TLD's. I think you saw probably on the list, I pointed out that a PDP if there are policy recommendations - consensus policy recommendations that are approved by the board out of the PDP, they will affect existing and new gTLD's, all of them.

And that includes even if the PDP finishes after some of the new gTLD's are delegated. So I don't think it needs to be stated that way, but I think Avri made a good point that there may be some issues that we have to talk about in terms of implementation because you have legacy registrations and things

like that. And there's precedent in terms of how those kinds of things were handled in various areas including IDN's as the protocol changed.

So I don't think it's necessary to say that. If somebody wanted to say something about dealing with the implementation of any policies that might be recommended, that might be okay. But I think it's covered by the very definition of a PDP already.

Man: All right, thank you Chuck. Kiran?

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi. Brian, I just had a question. This is Kiran. I - in your earlier statement you said that we would - the Sub-group A would come up with recommendations on the second level for the first round. My question is why would you then revisit protections for future rounds if you came to a decision via PDP that protections were warranted in the first round?

Does that question make sense? Sorry.

Brian Peck: Sure. No thank you. I meant it basically was to pick up the work of the recommendation of the Drafting Team and you notice we have the (unintelligible) part of the session.

You know, the Drafting Team recommendation was again focused on addressing the GAC concerns or the GAC, you know, advice of, you know, providing protection for the IOC and Red Cross is at least in some format at the second level of the first round prior to the delegation in the first round new GLD's delegation.

So, you know, with that in mind the regular conditions of the Drafting Team were, one, this issue should be dealt with through an expedited PDP, but in lieu of any PDP not being able to get completed in time and/or some other board resolution, then you know, this temporary reservation would be in place.

So it was mainly to pick up those, you know, to pick up the work of the recommendations of the Drafting Team and that was to again try to facilitate - because we know obviously that the work of the PDP, you know, as we say will incorporate - more organizations will probably take more time. So the idea was to be, you know, as (unintelligible) within that sub-group.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Right, I guess I understand the rationale for providing temporary protections until the results of Sub-group A consideration which would feasibly be a PDP consensus policy recommendation on the IOC RC issue specifically.

I just don't understand why you would then have to revisit the IOC RC issue within the context of the IATO INGO -- oh there's so many acronyms -- IGO-INGO considerations for future rounds.

Brian Peck: Well I think that's up for the, you know, the PDP and Working Group to decide whether indeed, you know, the protections that were determined for, you know, at least the second round of the - excuse me, the second level of the first new round of gTLD's is indeed appropriate for all future rounds whether there would be, you know, some other policy basis or legal basis on which, you know, permanent protection would be extended.

You know, that's I think for the PDP Working Group to decide.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Okay. Great, thank you. That answers my question perfectly. I appreciate it.

Brian Peck: Okay. (Alan), sorry to keep you waiting.

(Alan): Thank you. I guess I'll introduce what I consider practical issues. The work of the Drafting Team looks like it's going to be complete and go to council and make recommendations on an interim basis for the first round.

Let's not revisit that. We have enough real work to do. So that's number one. And we don't need to keep on looking at that. And second of all, the concept of breaking up into two groups, I understand from the point of view of the representatives of the IOC and Red Cross movement that may be nice that they only have to participate in one of the groups. But for most of the rest of us I suspect we are going to be interested in both of those.

And to schedule two things that work in parallel which may well mean two meetings a week I think is close to abusive at this point. If indeed the overall group needs to meet twice a week to get its work done which has happened in other PDP's, so be it. But let's not presume that we need that level at this point until we at least understand what the differences or similarities are between the two sections.

So I'll make the same comment I made last time. The PDP may decide to split into two groups; it's happened before as part of its work effort. But let's not presume it from the charter point of view because that sets a workload which I think is far and above what is warranted at this point. Those of us who are participating in these groups and others have a heavy workload as it is and let's not make it heavier than we need to because of artificial constraint.

Thank you.

Brian Peck: Thank you (Alan). Any other comments or responses or questions?

Jim Birkoff: Yes. Jim Birkoff.

Brian Peck: Yes Jim.

Jim Birkoff: I think - I mean to respond to (Alan's) point. First of all, I think we are definitely interested in being on both groups if there are to because we have other clients too. So we're interested in each of the groups, but secondly I'm

not sure why you couldn't structure the meetings the way you did today and have the first, you know, 45 minutes or hour on the one group and the second on the second group.

It doesn't seem to me that it would have to necessarily be two calls a week.

Brian Peck: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I don't think we're making very much progress on getting a charter that can be put in front of the council today. And I think we need to zero in on that. Obviously there's disagreement in terms of the division of the groups.

Like I pointed out before it can be divided that way. The Working Group can decide it be divided that way on its own without it being in the charter and that's the approach that the registries took in recommending this. Now if we can't - if that approach is not acceptable and we can't get agreement, then we're going to be putting the charter off maybe as much as a month.

Brian Peck: Thank you Chuck. Any other comments or responses?

I think as Chuck mentioned as (unintelligible), I think obviously the priority is to try to get a charter that we can agree on that can be submitted by its deadline, you know, so this Working Group can indeed start working as soon as possible which of course I think everyone realizes the importance of things going (unintelligible).

So it seems to be from the impression that, you know, you have the flexibility of maintaining one group or splitting into two groups with, you know, without restricting or having the more restrictive language in the charter itself where as if we have the charter language as it currently stands having the two sub-groups makes it more constricted and more difficult.

Or that's the basis I wanted to be able to start. So, you know, I think here we've got two points of view. One approach seems a little more flexible in accommodating both views than the other. I don't know how much more I can say as a staff member. So would anyone like to propose that the proposed revision as submitted on behalf of Registry Stakeholder Group be considered as an appropriate version for the current draft as it stands?

Brett Fausett: I'm sorry, were you asking for a motion?

Brian Peck: Yes. Sorry.

Brett Fausett: Well this is Brett. I'm with the registries here. I'd be happy to move that the registry constituency proposal be adopted as the new charter for the Working Group.

Brian Peck: Okay. For the section (unintelligible) involved and the variables and time frames?

Brett Fausett: Yes.

Brian Peck: Okay. We have a motion. Does anyone - would anyone like to second that motion?

Jeff Neuman: I know on the registry - this is Jeff. I'll second it.

Brian Peck: Okay. Do we have a motion before? Chuck, you have your hand raised.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I want to bring us back to Avri's suggestions.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Because I think that when it gets to the council that the charter would probably have a lot broader support if we address the suggestions that Avri

made. Now I'm speaking for myself personally because David will be our primary spokesman for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

But I would suggest that we add those suggestions that she made. I think they're fine. I certainly don't have any problems and then I'll let David speak for the Stakeholder Group. And then I think that we'd be further along in terms of getting support on the council eight days from now if those are in there.

Brian Peck: Okay. All right, thanks Chuck. Anyone have any additional comments or responses to that?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. I would just suggest that - in other words I'm suggesting that as a friendly amendment for our Working Group right now to Brett's motion and Jeff's second.

Brian Peck: Okay. I appreciate it. I was going to go to Avri's comment after this, but I agree it's probably more efficient to add this to the different amendment.
Okay.

David, I saw your hand briefly go up in the chat room. But I also just saw your note that you're unable to speak. Is there anything that you maybe want to present in the chat?

Okay. Does anyone - would like to second Chuck's amendment to the motion before by Brett and Jeff?

Chuck Gomes: In terms of procedure, Brian, I think you can just ask whether Brett and Jeff...

Brian Peck: Agree with the friendly amendment?

Chuck Gomes: Yes as friendly. Yes.

Brian Peck: Okay. Thank you for that. Brian and Jeff, do you accept Chuck's proposal amendment as friendly?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. I mean I do, but Brett's the person who made it. So as a secondary I'm okay with it.

Brian Peck: All right. Brett? Brett, are you on the line?

I'm not sure if we lost Brett or Brett, are you on mute?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Is there anybody on the call that would - is opposed to adding the suggestions that Avri made?

(Alan): Chuck, it's (Alan) speaking. It may be helpful if you summarize what they are for those who don't memorize every email.

Chuck Gomes: Staff, can you put those back up?

Brian Peck: Sure. It's actually - sorry Chuck. It's in the notes on the left-hand side of the Adobe room. If you scroll down under the GNSO resolution it has Avri's suggestions to IGO-INGO Charter.

Chuck Gomes: And (Alan), do you want me to go through those or did people want to just read them?

(Alan): I remembered what she said. I was pointing it out that it might be useful. That's all, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And again, if somebody wants me to, I can't claim to be authoritative to speak for Avri, but I think her suggestions were fairly clear.

Brian Peck: Does everyone on the call have access to the Adobe room to be able to see Avri's suggestions?

Jim Bikoff: It's Jim Bikoff. I'm in a taxi, so I don't have it.

Brian Peck: Okay. Chuck, would you mind going through them or?

Chuck Gomes: No and Jim, was that your hand raised there with Kiran there or did Kiran have something separate?

Kiran Malancharuvil: I am not in the taxi. This is Kiran. I'm in my office. I am not with Jim, but I will wait to speak Chuck if it's okay with you until after you summarize for Jim.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, sure. Okay. Let me scroll down here. So she said as kind of an order of work I think is first of all we need to establish the bases under which ICANN should expand its reserve names list or to create a special reserve names list to include IOC, IFRC, RCRC, IGO and INGO related names. That's her first suggestion in terms of order or work is the way I'm describing it.

Second was decide on whether the name should be added to the existing reserve names list or a new list should be created.

Third, develop a policy recommendation on how determinations can be made concerning which organizations meet the bases recommended above.

Fourth, this is in addition to the two I already recommended, something like this - and this was a separate email that she had sent earlier. Do an impact analysis on each of the recommendations if any for rights, competition, et cetera as defined in the PDP. And those are her suggestions for the charter to a little bit further describe the paths that need to be done under - by the Working Group.

Does that help?

Jim Bikoff: Yes it helps. I think it sounds to me like she's looking to open this up to a lot of area that's already been covered as I've mentioned in previous legal analyses and also recommendations by not only the GAC, but you know, as commented by ICANN General Counsel and outside counsel.

It seems to me you've got different considerations here with respect to IOC, ROC and everybody else and I think that adding that language really is not helpful. I think we should leave it where it is and discuss that within the PDP. But I don't think it should be in the charter.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm -- this is Chuck again -- and I'm willing to - if others feel that way I'm willing to withdraw the suggestions. To add those I was just trying to hopefully make it easier for the council to deal with this. I think most of those things are things that will have to happen in the Working Group anyway.

I agree Jim that some of the work may already be done for some of those sub-categories. I was just trying to accommodate a suggestion that I thought pretty much covered stuff that if we're doing our work properly we would have to do anyway understanding that a lot of work has already been done for - in terms of information and so forth, gathering with regard to the IOC and Red Cross.

Jim Bikoff: I understand that Chuck and I appreciate that. I think you're right; I think these points will definitely come up with the Working Group deliberations, but I think rather to pre-determine that this is the mandate in the charter, I think it's better to have it brought up during the addressing team or discussion group conversations to decide whether or not some of this has already been done and can be, you know, the focus can be on the other organizations for these issues or not.

And I think that's up to the team, whoever's on the Drafting Team to decide as they go through their negotiations. So I'm not trying to avoid the question,

I'm just saying that I think that preferably put into the Working Group rather than into a charter.

Chuck Gomes: Can I respond to that Brian just real quickly?

Brian Peck: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: And then we need to get to Kiran and (Alan). Is that all right?

Brian Peck: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and Jim, I think as I already demonstrated I like the greater flexibility in the charter anyway and then the Working Group can decide. So I'm perfectly comfortable with withdrawing my friendly amendment, but let's hear from Kiran and (Alan).

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi Chuck, it's Kiran. I just wanted to concur with Jim in his entire statement and also just to add that in the recommendations we promised to make a sincere effort to expedite the PDP and I think the addition of these things to a charter rather than letting the issues come up naturally has been suggested within the discussion of the Working Group is really going to affect our efforts to expedite.

Thanks.

Brian Peck: Thank you Kiran. (Alan)?

(Alan): Yes thank you. I have some problem with the wording in that. I think, you know, there's overlap in the first bullet, in the second bullet. And as I said in the email list when Avri first posted that, I would not really want to see these prescribed as a serial list of things we must do in order, but I have no problem including them.

And I think Chuck's original motivation was if putting them in will help this go through council and get approved quickly instead of having a significant debate of council and having the amendment done then, I don't see the harm in it. If the work has already been done, then it's on the table and we can bring it up. It doesn't say we need to redo it.

And I'll point out that all the work that the GAC produced and the evidence of laws and things related to that indicate that these cannot be used as domain names, not that they can't be registered; there's a subtle difference between the two and I know Jeff has brought that up a number of times. And this group does need - the Work Group will need to address why we are putting them in the reserve list, not only why the usage is not allowed.

So I have no problem with putting this in and I think Chuck is right that it may well go through council quicker if it's in then if it's not in.

Thank you.

Brian Peck: Thank you. Any other comments or responses?

I guess Chuck - I guess the question would be whether you want to maintain your submission as a friendly amendment or acceptance by Brett or whether you (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Yes that's an honest and legitimate question and I'm hearing two sides of it. Can anyone else chime in to help us out here? Do you have strong feelings? I'm willing to go with the stronger sentiment. Like I said it's not a huge issue for me personally, but (Alan's) point is well-taken.

I think if we add these - in fact maybe I'll ask while others are thinking about commenting, maybe I'll ask Jim if there's some changes - simple changes to Avri's language that would make you feel a little more comfortable.

And then please others chime in. Again I'm just trying to make this thing move forward quickly.

Brian Peck: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck - Berry, thanks. It's Jonathan. I mean I guess my - I've really been listening in with the main purpose of being well-informed rather than necessarily making any kind of significant contributions at the moment.

But it does strike - I wouldn't mind if Jim or others could come back on this point. I mean it strikes me - the key objective of Chuck as supported by (Alan) is to try to ensure that the expeditious nature of the PDP or this work - Working Group work is upheld.

So I'm just wondering if having heard those rationalizations if those opposed to the changes proposed are perhaps reminded to either as you said Chuck accept some slightly different wording or even accept them as suggested by Avri given that context that you described Chuck of trying to make sure that we keep this process on a very fast track.

So that's really my two cents worth. Just a question to those opposed - if those rationalizations make any difference.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. I'm not seeing anybody jumping up with ideas or compromises. Is there something we could - notice what if we said like Avri says in her preface that these are suggestions for the IGO-INGO Working Group to consider?

Brett Fausett: I think I saw in the chat that Kiran suggested that that was acceptable language - can consider the following things. I think that's fine. This is Brett.

Chuck Gomes: We're glad you joined again. I'm okay with that. And Brett and Jeff, worded that way you would both accept that as a friendly amendment to your motion? This is Chuck.

Brett Fausett: I was answering Jeff. Yes I don't see why not.

Jim Bikoff: Hello? Is anybody here?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jim Bikoff: It's Jim Bikoff. I was cut off. I was asking whether we could have 24 hours to comment on that language because I don't have it in front of me and I need to look at it again.

Chuck Gomes: Let me suggest this Jim. It's Chuck. Sorry Brian for jumping in, but it'll help here.

Brian Peck: No. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: The problem is we don't have 24 hours to meet the deadline for information like this to be considered by the council next week. It literally has to be done today.

Jim Bikoff: Okay.

Chuck Gomes But as I think (Alan) pointed out earlier a motion once - you know, a motion or -- and then I guess it would be a motion to approve this charter -- it can be modified. It can be amended in the next eight days before the council meeting.

So in essence you would just need to see that information and I'm sure any of the counselors that are working with us here including the chair who is on

with us could - would be willing to put your information - your suggestions forward.

Jim Bikoff: Okay. Could you read it again then?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well using Kiran's language it was - the group may - I'm going to change it a little bit Kiran.

Kiran Malancharuvil: That's fine.

Chuck Gomes: The group may consider the following; establish the basis under which ICANN should expand its reserve names list or to create a special reserve names list to include IOC, IFRC, RCRC, IGO and INGO related names.

Second, decide on whether the names should be added to the existing reserve names list or a new list should be created - or lists. Develop a policy recommendation on how determination can be made concerning which organizations meet the bases recommended above.

Next was do an impact analysis on each of the recommendations if any for rights competition, et cetera as defined in the PDP.

And then the last one was determine how incumbent registration should meet the new policy recommendations if any.

Jim Birkoff: Could we add something to that that indicates that work that's previously been done by the Drafting Team that there'll be an effort not to duplicate work that's already been done as to the IOC RC names?

Chuck Gomes: That's all right with me. It's Chuck again. Anybody object to that?

Man: I'm sorry Jim, could you repeat that?

Jim Birkoff: Well something to the effect - again I'm standing outside a lobby, so I don't have anything in front of me. Something to the effect that an effort will be made by the PDP Drafting Team to avoid duplicating efforts that have already been made by the IOC RC Drafting Team with regard to those names.

Chuck Gomes: He's typing, so I can hear it. This is Chuck. I'm okay with that. Anybody object to that?

Jonathan Robinson: I've got no objection. In fact we might even strengthen that comment slightly along the lines of given the commitment to an expedited PDP process, encourage all efforts to take advantage of all prior work or something along those lines.

So that we actually make reference to the fact that this is a so-called expedited PDP.

Man: Yes I agree with that, but I think it should be limited to the IOC RC names since that's the only thing that the Drafting Team has discussed up to now.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, yes I understood that to be implicit. But yes I guess that's the case.

Chuck Gomes: I'm letting you take charge again Brian.

Brian Peck: Thanks. So perhaps we could use that language as a conclusion to the points or elements that Avri has suggested.

So we start off by saying, you know, the group will consider the following; you list the suggestions offered by Avri and then (unintelligible) and given the commitment to the expedited PDP process, PDP will exert all efforts to avoid duplicating the efforts of the IOC RC (unintelligible) with regards to those particular names.

Jim Birkoff: Yes.

Brian Peck: Are you okay with that Jim?

Jim Birkoff: Yes.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Except for - sorry, this is Kiran. Just really quickly, you said the group will - we want to make sure it says the group may.

Brian Peck: The group may consider. Is that the question you were asking?

Man: No I think it should be "will."

Kiran Malancharuvil: No "will" means that it's mandatory to do Avri's suggestions. We don't want it to be mandatory; we want it to be as they come up and organic.

Man: I meant "will" on the first part only. On the part I suggested.

Chuck Gomes: Yes this is Chuck; we're talking about two different things. The entry to Avri's suggestions is a may consider.

Man: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: The added language that Jim suggested and that Jonathan also chimed in on is what you're suggesting is a "will"?

Brian Peck: Yes the PDP. The people will make general efforts to avoid duplicating the efforts of the RCRT - RC Drafting Team with regard to those particular names.

Man: Yes that's fine.

Chuck Gomes: We have two hands up.

Brian Peck: Yes (Alan) and then Jeff.

(Alan): Yes thank you. I can live with these words, but I find it rather - I'm not sure what the word is. If the work is applicable and it exists under the huge crossover of membership between the Drafting Team and this group, I can't imagine we wouldn't use it.

But there can't be a presumption that the work is applicable in all cases. So the Drafting Team - the Working Group is going to have to have a mind of its own and make sure that the decisions it reaches are ones that are believed by the working group.

So I don't believe this really adds anything. We're not masochists who are going to do the work over again just for the sake of it. On the other hand we have a due diligence obligation to make sure that whatever prior work that we rely on applies and is the right answer to the questions we're asking.

So I can certainly live with it. I'm not sure what it asks, but many cases what it adds rather.

Man: Okay. Was anybody else's hand up?

Man: Jeff has his hand up.

Brian Peck: Yes Jeff Neuman and then Jim.

Jeff Neuman: So on - I'm fine with not duplicating the work in the sense there was some very valuable contributions from groups like the Olympic Committee and the Red Cross on their own legal analysis and some other points about their marks.

What I'm concerned about is that people will think that language to mean that the Drafting Team actually based its decision on something it may not have based its decisions on. So I'm very cognizant of the fact, you know, for example Jim made the point at the beginning - he said well the legal analysis has been done by the GAC and by the ICANN General Counsel.

And I actually disagree with all that. And Jim and I just disagree, but I actually think the legal analysis was closer to what - I can't remember if it was Chuck or not - I think it was (Alan) who said I actually don't think legal analysis has been done on whether a registry or registrar under the law has to protect these marks by reserving them. So I'm afraid that some will use that language in a charter to say well the work's already been done, so we have to take it as a given.

So on the one hand I totally agree that dealing with the committee and the Red Cross and all those, we shouldn't have to recreate some of the materials that they've already created. On the other hand I don't want that sentence to imply in any way that the IOC or the Red Cross or the Drafting Team made any conclusions with respect to that because I don't believe the Drafting Team did.

I hope that makes sense.

Brian Peck: Okay. Thank you Jeff. We have - as David Maher noted, he cannot communicate, but in the chat room he agrees with Jeff's point.

Man: I'm back on.

Brian Peck: Oh okay. Thank you. So Jeff, given what you said, would you prefer that the language not be included then?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I just prefer language that just says that the group can use the materials that were provided to the Drafting Team at its own deliberations as opposed to saying let's duplicate the work.

So I totally expect them to take advantage of everything the Drafting Team did, about the conversations they had, the transcripts and there was some very valuable sessions that we had and I don't think those sessions should be duplicated. But I don't want it to apply to the work itself or that there were any conclusions that were reached when they went.

Brian Peck: Okay. (Alan), I know you have your hand up, but just let me (unintelligible). So you - Jeff, you would say that rather than saying, you know, avoid the duplication of the Drafting Team's work is that, you know, again given for them to the expedited PDP process the Working Group will utilize the existing work or efforts of the Drafting Team's work?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I'm more comfortable with something like that and (unintelligible).

Brian Peck: Okay. (Alan)?

(Alan): Yes I'll add perhaps a bit of humor to this in that the end product of the Drafting Team's work was a stalemate where we couldn't come to any conclusions. And we put a compromise in of interim protection while the real people figured out what the long-term answer should be.

I'm not sure we want to replicate the work of the Drafting group in being able to come to any conclusion. So be careful what we ask for. That was introduced slightly in a sense of humor.

Brian Peck: Thank you (Alan). (Elizabeth)? Hello?

(Elizabeth Sinberg): Sorry, I was on mute.

Brian Peck: Sure.

(Elizabeth Sinberg): This is (Elizabeth Sinberg). I would say to that point I don't know if maybe it's too much words, but rather than say will utilize, maybe we should say something like may refer to or will consider.

Because again I don't think there've been any conclusions reached.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Man: You're still on; we can still hear you.

(Elizabeth Sinberg): Sorry. Well we don't want to duplicate work. I think we also don't want to commit to, you know, placing our stamp on it until we've had a chance to consider everything.

Brian Peck: Okay. So we have a couple options. One would be, you know, if the PDP Working Group will either avoid duplicating or the PDP Working Group will - I'm sorry, will make every social stride to either avoid duplication of, will utilize the Drafting Team's work or will consider the Drafting Team's work with regard to these particular names.

Jonathan Robinson: Will consider the documents I think she said.

Brian Peck: Okay. I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Since -- this is Chuck -- since I suggested the amendment my preference would be - I'm still open to discuss it - would be to say the Working Group will consider the work and documents produced by the IOC Red Cross Drafting Team.

Brian Peck: Okay. Anybody else with that latest proposed revision? Is that acceptable to all those who have contributed so far?

Kiran Malancharuvil: Can you type it into the tab box? This is Kiran.

Brian Peck: Sure, give me one moment here.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I can take that. So what I have right now is given the commitment to expedite the PDP process, the Working Group will consider previous - and Chuck, can you help me out with what you just said? Consider previous documents?

Chuck Gomes: Well consider the work and documents produced by the Drafting Team.

Berry Cobb: By IOC RC Drafting Team?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Berry Cobb: With regard to those particular names?

Chuck Gomes: Well that's all really that the Drafting Team focused on. So you can put that if you want; that's fine.

Berry Cobb: I think that was just what I had suggested before.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Brian Peck: Great, I just pasted the next version chat on the lower right. And it states for those that can't see this, "Given the commitment to expedite the PDP process the Working Group will consider the work and documents produced by the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team, but an effort should be taken to avoid duplication of past effort with respect to IOC/RCRC.

Chuck Gomes: Now this is Chuck. Jeff, are you okay with that? Because that seems to be heading back in the direction that you were expressing concerns about?

The duplication part is the part I'm talking about. Jeff, are you on mute?

Jim Bikoff: By the way it's Jim Bikoff. I just got back on; my phone went dead.

Brian Peck: Okay.

(Elizabeth Sinberg): This is (Liz Sinberg) here. Same just happened to me.

Brian Peck: That's fine. And David just mentioned that he thinks Jeff also dropped off.
So...

Man: Is the East Coast dropping offline?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'm looking at that last after the "but," but an effort to be.

I think and I'm trying to determine what I think - to accommodate Jeff's concern I think I would just stop at the comma and say, "Given the commitment to expedite the PDP process the Working Group will consider the work and documents produced by the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team" and just leave it at that.

Brian Peck: Yes that was my understanding of the latest suggested revision was as you said Chuck to stop after the comma.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Brian Peck: Jeff, are you on the line?

Okay. Berry has just retyped in the chat. So again for those who don't have the benefit of being able to see it it's, "Given the commitment to expedite the PDP process the Working Group will consider the work and documents produced by the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team."

Is there - will that be acceptable to those who have previously offered some suggestions and contribution?

Jim Bikoff: It's Jim Bikoff speaking.

Brian Peck: Yes Jim.

Jim Bikoff: What I was trying to get at and I guess, you know, I'm not going to stand on the language that I suggested; what I was trying to do was avoid the - since we're going to have new people on this Drafting Team is to avoid duplicating things that have already been done and talked about over the last year or so, so that we don't - so that we do save time.

And the thought is to in order to expedite there should be some kind of a - I'm not sure I want to say commitment, but some kind of a best effort to avoid duplicating work that's already been done. I mean there have been a number of submissions, probably a number of parties, both the Red Cross and the IOC, things from the GAC, things from the board.

It would seem to me that to duplicate would simply slow down the process where as if people, you know, if these points are, you know, looked at as being points that were reviewed, it should help to expedite the efforts. That was all I was trying to do.

Brian Peck: (Alan), you have your hand up.

(Alan): Yes two points. Number one on purely grammatical. I think it should be produced/used because the Working Group didn't produce documents, but it did use documents. However on Jim's last point, first of all the group didn't come to any real conclusions.

Otherwise the recommendation would have been more substantive than it was. So I don't think we need to really worry about what decisions the group made and whether they could be used again. I think we need to really worry about what decisions the group made and whether they could be used again. But regardless even if the group had made substantive decisions, we can't bind this Working Group with is a significant superset of that one to honoring the thought processes and decisions that were taken by that Drafting Team.

But as I said I don't think the Drafting Team came to a lot of conclusions, so I'm not sure we really need to worry about it a lot.

Thank you.

Brian Peck: All right, thanks (Alan). Chuck, you have your hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I'd to suggest that we - if there's no opposition that we go ahead with what we have including (Alan's) latest edit on - with regard to the document. And send that to the council - one of the counselor's is going to have to propose it as a charter and a motion in that regard.

And with the understanding that all of us can feed in through our counselors additional amendments to the motion and the associated draft chart in the next few days.

Brian Peck: Okay. Thank you Chuck. Any objections to that proposal?

Okay. So we have a motion by Brett seconded by Jeff with the friendly amendment that has evolved from Chuck that has been I believe - just confirm with everybody here that has been accepted or approved by Brett as a friendly amendment that would basically include the language by Avri, proceeded by the language the Working Group may consider the following.

And then the list of items that Avri has suggested concluding with the language which we now have is, "Given the commitment to expedite the PDP process the Working Group will consider the work and documents produced and used by the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team."

Chuck Gomes: Just one correction there.

Brian Peck: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: I think (Alan's) suggestion - the work produced...

(Alan): Produced and documents used. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Used, not produced. I think just get rid of the word produced.

(Alan): Yes. Work produced and documents used. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes there you go.

Jim Birkoff: Can I add one thing?

Brian Peck: Sure.

Jim Birkoff: It's Jim. I think that last statement should be, you know, it should be restricted to the IOC/RC marks because the documents produced do not pertain to the broader sub-set of marks.

We didn't do anything on IGO marks or INGO marks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes that's a good addition.

Brian Peck: Okay. So by the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team with regard to...

Jim Birkoff: The IOC RC marks. I'm sorry, words.

Brian Peck: Words. How about terms?

Jim Birkoff: Terms, okay.

Brian Peck: Regards to the IOC/RC terms. How about that?

Jim Birkoff: That's okay.

Brian Peck: Okay. Okay so we have that. Again, we have that motion seconded. The friendly amendment also accepted with the language we just read.

(Alan): It's (Alan). I have my hand up.

Brian Peck: I'm sorry (Alan). I apologize. Go ahead.

(Alan): Yes David Maher in the chat asked are we going to consider the words that he had proposed on a request to legal counsel. I'm just asking the question out loud.

Chuck Gomes: Yes this is Chuck. (Alan), I think that's - we should deal with the - finish the charter issue and then talk about that. That's not part of the charter.

(Alan): I'm not sure if David meant it to be part of the charter. That's why I'm raising the question because he put it in the chat and it's rolled off the screen already.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm saying that it was - I'm quite confident it was not something part of the charter.

(Alan): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But something that the Working Group would be good to initiate right away.

(Alan): Yes. And David can just...

Chuck Gomes: That's a separate issue.

(Alan): David just confirmed that.

Brian Peck: Okay. Good, thanks. All right, I have one to Brett or Jeff or Chuck, one question just a matter of - and that is would this language, would this go into, you know, a charter itself? We already got you said the proposed revision to objections and goals and time frames provided by - on behalf of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

This language that we've just - is now before us, would we also put this in the deliverables?

Chuck Gomes: It could go either place. I think actually you have some deliverables under objectives and goals already, right? So maybe we could just - my suggestion would be that it be cleaned up.

First of all the objectives and goals - deliverables - you have deliverables under objectives and goals and they would more rightly be under deliverables and time frames, right? And I think probably Avri's suggestions fit better under objectives and goals because they're really not deliverables, right?

Does that make sense?

Brian Peck: Sure. Yes that makes sense. It's may consider rather than actual objectives. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But I mean yes that's right.

Brian Peck: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: But that's probably...

Brian Peck: Yes there are things that the group may consider.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Brian Peck: And it would also be an objective of the goal of the Working Group even with the last language, you know, not to - you know, as we said to consider the work and documents.

(Alan): Excuse me, it's (Alan). Could you turn the control of the screen over to us so we can scroll ourselves and see if it can fit somewhere better?

Brian Peck: Sure.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry; I'm just going to post the very next version. Give me two seconds please.

All right, five seconds.

Brian Peck: And Chuck, while we're waiting for it to come up, I apologize for broadening our new procedure, but my understanding would be that, you know, if we indeed adopt from (unintelligible), this charter for GNSO, does it have to be submitted from a member of this group to the GNSO Council?

Chuck Gomes: Well I don't know whether it does or not, but I think if we can get a counselor to submit a motion with this charter that was discussed on the Working Group call today, I think that's the really critical thing that needs to happen.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I have -- this is Berry -- I have Version 5 posted. Everybody else should have control. And what I did was move the Avri suggestions up into the objectives and goals still keeping the first paragraph that was there originally.

And then in the deliverables and time frames was the section requested by the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Chuck Gomes: And you still - you maintain I haven't found it yet - you maintain under - or you moved from what used to be deliverables into the deliverables section - oh excuse me, what used to be objectives. Because those were good things that were in there before, the initial report and et cetera.

You know what I'm talking about? I'm having trouble finding it, but...

Brian Peck: Yes but Chuck, I think you're referring to the development a initial report, a filing report regarding (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes that's it. Okay.

Brian Peck: We actually kept that in the objectives and the goals.

Chuck Gomes: Aren't those deliverables?

Brian Peck: Well I mean to be honest with you based on some previous PDP Working Group Charters...

Chuck Gomes: I understand, but aren't they deliverables?

Man: Regardless it's in the PDP rules. They have no choice regardless of where we put them in the charter.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It's not a big issue.

Brian Peck: Yes okay. I mean the goal would be - the ultimate objective and goal is to produce - or to develop at least an initial and final report. I agree with you, they are deliverable in a sense, but I mean I think all the deliverables are leading up to what would be in the ultimate goal and objective and that is to provide that initial and final report.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. This is Chuck again. And I would suggest that there's no objections that we go ahead and move onto the other suggestion by the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Brian Peck: Sure. So are there any objections to the current version of the Draft Working Group Charter that is now on the screen or that we've hopefully outlined verbally? Are there any objections for any of those on the call here?

Okay. I think we can say that the motion to propose or submit this Working Group Draft Charter can be submitted to the council today to meet the deadline for the consideration (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: And you'll just need to -- this is Chuck again -- you'll just need to get a counselor to commit to do that today.

Brian Peck: Okay. Do we have any counselors still on the line that are willing to do that?

Man: The only ones we have are - well we have three. We have Jonathan, (unintelligible) and (unintelligible).

Man: Yes I can do that.

Brian Peck: Pardon me? You can do that. Okay.

Man: Yes.

Brian Peck: Thank you.

Man: But I need someone to do the trust for me so that I can send it to the council.

Brian Peck: Sure. What's your - let me - what's your time frame at? And Chuck, I promise you we'll get to the other issue, but just quickly just for logistics, how much time do we have to get through that motion so that you can then turn this around and send it to the council?

Man: If I can draft right away, then I can send it to the council.

Brian Peck: Okay. So I think -- and Chuck, I apologize again for this -- but I think the motion can simply say that the drafting, you know, the PDP, you know, the IGO-INGO PDP Drafting Team has approved the following Draft Review Charter for consideration and approval by the GNSO Council.

Can it be that simple?

Man: Yes.

Man: Can you please send that to my email?

Brian Peck: Yes (unintelligible) will do that within the next hopefully 30 minutes, an hour at the most. Is that okay?

Man: Yes it should be sent to the whole list, so all of us can send it to our constituencies even if we're not on council mailing list.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Brian Peck: So we'll get back to you within the next 30 minutes, 60 minutes most if that's okay?

Man: Okay then.

Brian Peck: And then if you could submit that to the council that would be great. Thank you very much.

Man: Okay.

Brian Peck: Okay. Thank you (unintelligible). Okay. All right, so we have one other item on the agenda that was also proposed by the Registry Stakeholder Group and that is the question of - which we briefly discussed last week as well on last week's call and that is the question of requesting - well funding a request from the Working Group to ICANN with regards to engaging or initiating a legal review.

And as discussed last week one of the initial thresholds in doing such a request which is what if ICANN needs a formal request. Or the other is to (unintelligible) on which the request will be based in terms of the scope for legal review. So there has been a proposal submitted by the Registry Stakeholder Group which was circulated by David I believe yesterday.

So I think Berry if we can get that up. And while we're getting that up, (Alan) your hand was raised.

(Alan): Yes I think the question that was raised that you're putting up now is an important one and we need to ask that, but I don't think that's the legal review we were talking about earlier.

Brian Peck: Oh okay.

(Alan): This is a legal review from internal council first of all on obligations of registries where as the legal review we were talking about ahead - before I think was the overall legal basis, you know, according to international accords and whatever of protecting IGO names.

I don't remember the exact words, but my recollection is that was a substantively different legal review than the one that the registries have proposed which I think is needed in its own right. So I don't think is the same one we were talking about before.

Brian Peck: Okay. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes this is Chuck again. Dave was unable to talk, so I'll talk to it. We had a lot of talk about that (Alan) and we were talking about there were some in the registries that thought we should request an independent, legal analysis and the point was made well who's going to be that? You can go to different legal people and get different opinions and so forth.

We weren't convinced at the end of the day that that was realistic, but the basis and I'm hope I'm communicating this correctly was that okay if as the GAC and the Red Cross and the IOC and the other IGO's as well - if they are correct that the law's already in place, international statutes and national law, to prevent the registration by registries and registrars of any of these names, then ICANN staff would just need to enforce the law.

Because all of our are required to follow the laws, applicable laws. And so it's a very appropriate question to ask the General Counsel's office and it was worded - there was quite a bit of thought put into the wording.

Now are you able to post that wording? I don't have it front of me. Of the question.

Man: Yes shortly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. It will be up shortly. Good. And so doing this is a fairly easy thing to do and the sooner we get a response from the General Counsel's office, the better because it impacts our work.

If in fact the General Counsel's office comes back and says, "Yes the law is sufficient to that we should prevent the registration of these terms or some sub-set of the terms" or whatever, then it becomes a contractual enforcement mechanism. We could still develop a policy to support that if that could still be okay.

But it's a very fundamental question and it could be that the General Counsel's office will say, "Well we need to get more legal research on that." Well that's fine. And the Working Group could still decide to request some independent legal research, but like Margie said last time we need to make sure that we're clear on what we're asking for.

Does that help? Any questions on that?

Jim Bikoff: It's Jim Bikoff.

(Alan): Yes it's (Alan). I had my hand up, but someone turned it to a microphone. I don't know who.

Man: Go ahead (Alan).

(Alan): Yes just to comment on what Chuck and David have said, I agree completely. This is an important question which we hadn't asked before and I think it must be asked and it must be asked first.

And I also tend to agree that the question that we were talking about before is a huge one and I'm not sure we're going to get a lot out of it other than having one more opinion which will say something and be contradicted by someone else.

I wasn't advocating that we do that; I was just pointing out that this legal question is not the one that other people had been talking about in prior weeks. Not that I was supporting the other one.

Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and this is Chuck again (Alan). And that's kind of what we - we came to that realization I think and so we went a little bit different direction intentionally.

(Alan): No I understand, but the introduction to it implied this was the question we were talking about last week and it was a very different legal question I think.

Chuck Gomes: So - this is Chuck again. The registry suggestion would be that the Working Group as soon as possible and because there's a lot of people missing from this call we probably ought to put this out on the list for a week or so or maybe up until if we're going to have a call next week, up until then.

And make sure there's no objections to this being put forward. I think they're pretty straightforward questions, they're worded fairly carefully because (unintelligible) we can get that process going. That would be the registry suggestion with regard to that.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Jim Bikoff: It's Jim Bikoff. Can I say something?

Brian Peck: Yes Jim, please go ahead.

Jim Bikoff: I just want to say I think the question's important. I agree with Alan and Chuck and I think we should maybe have it on the list for all the people who are not on the call.

Also the council's opinion may again since he's covered some of this ground for the IOC/RC names there may be a difference in, you know, he may have already established some of this on behalf of the two organizations, but not on behalf of the others. So there may be, you know, maybe the question should be divided in A and B or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I don't think we would have any problem with that at all breaking it up and maybe they could give us answers on the IOC Red Cross sooner than the others and I think that would be okay too. But the sooner we can get all the answers, the better because the answers will impact our work.

Jim Bikoff: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Man: Since we're using the term INGO which was coined specifically for the Red Cross IOC, I'm not sure we need to belabor the point.

Chuck Gomes: Well my suggestion right now is let's get this on the list, ask for people that weren't able to participate as well as those who have been participating today to comment on it and then hopefully not later than our next meeting which I'm guessing will be next week being in a position to submit it to the General Counsel's office.

And in that time we can break it up. Jim, for example you can maybe suggest a rewording that maintains the specificity of it while still breaking it up as you were suggesting. So...

Jim Birkoff: Sure, I'd be glad to.

Brian Peck: Okay. Okay so we'll go ahead and circulate this to the list and ask for comments and the point for discussion at the next scheduled meeting.

All right, any other comments or responses to this matter?

Margie Milam: Brian, it's Margie if I may?

Brian Peck: Sure, please go ahead Margie.

Margie Milam: Sure, I just wanted to provide a little bit of background as we've investigated this issue internally. Obviously we're waiting for, you know, a formal request from the Working Group on the legal question and we were very much in-line with the approach that Chuck just mentioned keeping the issue narrower rather than broader for the time being because a couple things.

You know, the timing, right. If you want to get it answered quickly that's something that, you know, it's the question, is it narrow as possible and something along the lines like for example the Registry Stakeholder Group came up with, you know, it'll be a lot easier to get a response that's quicker.

And also the other point that Chuck raised that if, you know, in-house counsel for ICANN doesn't feel comfortable with the answer they might just go to their outside counsel and have them provide some information and feed it to the Working Group. So that very much, you know, gives them the flexibility to do that.

To do a more, you know, general survey of international treaties and such for both IGO and Red Cross and IOC, that's a fairly substantial project that will take, you know, much more time and cost. You know, I mean for those of you who work with outside counsel you're talking, you know, when you're asking for a broad-based survey like that it could be thousands and thousands of dollars.

And so it's one of those things that if a Working Group really feels that that's required to do your policy work for this issue, you know, we just want to make sure that we're all aware of what that cost would be and the complexity associated with it. So just from a staff perspective, you know, going along the lines of what Chuck and the Registry Stakeholder Group for now, you know, it seems to be the right approach.

You know, in doing the policy work you still feel you need more information like a full survey, you know, of all these treaties and such, you know, that's probably going to take a lot more time and effort and maybe can be explored, you know, as we start delving into the issues.

Brian Peck: Thank you Margie. Any questions or comments?

Okay. We're coming up to the end of the scheduled time allotted for this call. I think our last order of business is to confirm our next meeting. Next step of course is you will provide (unintelligible) and the counselor the draft charter and then a motion that he can then submit to the council. We'll do that within the next hour to meet the deadline.

We will be circulating the question - I can't answer your - hang on for a second please. We will circulate this language posted to the list for comment and then put for discussion at the next meeting. So (unintelligible) and the last order of business would be to confirm if indeed we can maintain this (unintelligible) schedule for our time, 19:00 UTC on Wednesday's. And the next meeting would be next Wednesday.

Any objections to that?

Okay. Adjourned. Thanks for your patience.

Woman: Hi. Brian, I just had a clarification - seeking clarification - what happened on the sub-group issue? Was the registry language accepted and the sub-group's then abolished from the charter? I must've missed something.

Brian Peck: They're not abolished. I mean no the registry language was accepted and with the understanding that the Working Group if indeed the charter is adopted by and approved by the council and once the Working Group begins this work the Working Group certainly has the flexibility to establish the Working Group that indeed it feels would be most efficient in obtaining the objectives and goals of the charter.

Woman: Thank you.

Brian Peck: Okay. Okay. Any other questions or comments? Points to be made?

All right, thank you everyone very much for your participation and your time. We actually got all our objectives clean and that is to get a Draft Working Group Charter for the consideration next week. So we appreciate your time and effort and contribution today.

Chuck, thank you for your assistance in managing this meeting. And thank you to everyone.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Brian.

Man: Thanks, bye.

Brian Peck: Okay. We'll see you next week. Bye-bye.

END