

**ICANN
Transcription
IGO-INGO Protections Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group
Wednesday 5 June 2013 at 15:00 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 Wednesday 5 June 2013 at 15:00 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-20130605-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Attendees:

Jim Bikoff – IPC/IOC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
David Heasley – IPC/IOC
David Maher – RySG
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Judd Lauter – IOC/IOC
Thomas Rickert – NCA –Working group chair
Greg Shatan – IPC
Claudia MacMaster Tamarit – ISO
David Roache-Turner - WIPO
Mary Wong - NCUC
Mason Cole - GNSO Council vice chair – RrSG

Apologies:

Christopher Rassi - Red Cross
Wolfgang Kleinwächter – NCSG

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb
Brian Peck
Erika Randall
Julia Charvolen

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

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much.

Julia Charvolen: Good morning. Good afternoon everyone. Oh sorry.

Thomas Rickert: Please go ahead (Julia).

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Welcome to the IGO INGO PDP working group call, Wednesday, 5th of June 2013. On the call today we have (Jim Vikos), Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, David Heasley, Jude Laucher), Thomas Rickert, Greg Shatan, Claudia MacMaster Tamarit, Mary Wong and Mason Cole. We have apologies from (Christopher Ratti), Chuck Gomes, David Maher and we've received an apology from (Volken Klingworster). And from staff we have (unintelligible), Brian Peck, (Erica Lando) and myself (Gia Shavalin). May I remind all participants to please state their name for speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much. (Julia) my name is Thomas Rickert and I'm chairing this working group. Welcome everybody and as usually I would like to ask whether there are any updates to statements of interest. Hearing and reasoning none we can move to the next agenda item and that is again the review of the initial report. And I can't resist saying that I was very impressed with the amount of emails that have been exchanged and the level of activity.

So I guess that the group might be more productive when I'm on holiday rather than when I'm present. So maybe I should go back to where I was last week and have you guys work on this by yourself. So I guess this has been very encouraging. And since we only have one hour for today's call I would propose if you don't object that we discuss the recommendations matrix first because that seems to be the core piece of the initial report.

I see that I guess Brian, (Barry) is moving to that part of - or to that section of the document and I would like to ask whether anybody in the group would like to kick off our discussion by commenting on the first recommendation.

Brian Peck: Thomas this is Brian from ICANN Staff. If the group wouldn't mind one of the points that we discussed last week was the organization of the various proposals and trying to clarify that indeed they're not necessarily mutually exclusive. Some could be combined and so forth. So maybe perhaps we could start off the discussion by asking the group if as hopefully the group has noticed we've reorganized the matrix and also added a little more information in the introduction in terms of again, you know, clarifying the points I just made.

So again maybe we could get some feedback from the group if they feel the structure is more clear in terms of how to - how these proposals are to be presented in an objective manner and if they're fine with the structure then we can go perhaps into the substance, particularly the rationale and comments sections of each of the proposed recommendations.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks for that Brian. Any responses from the group? Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Not really a response. I'm the one who made the impassioned plea to fix it and I admit I haven't had a chance to look at the new version of the document so I will but I haven't yet. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: So Brian or (Berry) would you like to give us an oral overview of what you changed?

Berry Cobb: Yes. This is (Berry). So starting off in section 4.3 which is focused around potential recommendations for protections at the top level. As Brian mentioned we included a statement in here about the mutually exclusive components to these recommendations and/or could be made in conjunction with. So I do ask if members have any additional feedback for some of the

language in there that you do so. But I think we tried to capture everything that Alan had mentioned and others.

The second part of I think the confusion around how the matrix was set up from our last call was definitely the numbering scheme and the order of the recommendation options themselves. So this approach what we did is just did a straight numerical numbering of each recommendation option. And what we tried to do in terms of the reorganization is place them together or place them iteratively as though they can be considered together.

So for example, you know, we've - there's a discussion amongst the working group that the protection recommendation option should be exact match full name versus exact match acronyms. So, you know, a person if they wanted to could choose one or the other or both. That's a mutually exclusive component.

I think the biggest change for the top level though is for the no top level protection. We went ahead and moved it down to the bottom. I think what we tried to do is float the recommendation options that had more traction within the working group to the top and whereas the no top level protection has been moved closer to the bottom. And instead of - our discussion from last week was to separate out the no top level protections across the full name and the acronym. Instead of doing that I just included the language for the exact match acronym in number four for just to classify that, you know, one of the options is that no top level protections are afforded at all.

And then lastly the last recommendation is, you know, if there were no protection granted could a recommendation option be considered for NEP waiver or funding for objection filing and the like. So mostly I think what we are hoping to get out of this call is just to review through the comments and rationale of these four recommendations up here and if there was any other feedback about some of the wording.

And I do sympathize with the working group. We're dealing with a rainbow of colors now given all of the edits. And what we hope to accomplish after this call is to start accepting some of them so that we can reduce the color scheme and then really start focusing in on the structure of the content itself and correct wording and the like.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks (Berry) and with that I'd like to open up the discussion. Alan I'm not sure whether that's and old hand.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. Old hand.

Thomas Rickert: And a new hand.

Berry Cobb: So this is (Berry). If I may recommend shall I just read through the comment rationale for each one of the recommendations very quickly and if anybody has any other suggested edits or concerns about what's in there. If not then we'll quickly move onto the next one.

Thomas Rickert: I guess that's an excellent idea. Just wanted to give the group the opportunity to comment on the overall approach and then your suggestions. So please go ahead with this.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. So for the first recommendation option which is top level protections of only exact match full name identifiers the comment rationale is it must be noted that this option is not entirely consistent with the ITM Board actions and GAC advice for IOC and RCRC. It is only - sorry I lost my space. It is only partly consistent with GAC advice for IGO names and acronym comments in here that will need to be removed out. But basically a GAC advice carrying IGO names and acronyms must be protected. I'm trying to review this without any of the rainbow stuff and our language is pretty bad in here. I'll carry on past the comment.

Rendering a (string) and eligible for delegation without a mechanism to remove what's the name and acronym. Hold on just a second please.

Jim Bikoff: Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Yes (Jim)?

Jim Bikoff: Just a quick comment. Since we're down to 45 minutes almost of the hour and when none of this have read this since it's all new shouldn't maybe we discuss some of the things instead of just reading these things because none of us, you know, again this is all new? And I think reading it out will take out most of the time of the meeting.

Thomas Rickert: And what would be the subjects that you would like to touch upon in the remaining time?

Jim Bikoff: We had an agenda. I'm looking for the agenda. I think there were four or five items on the agenda. Let's see.

Berry Cobb: (Jim) I think you're - the only agenda item is just to review the initial report. I think what I included in the email was just a high level summary of the main areas of the report that had been changed from last week.

Jim Bikoff: Oh okay. I'm sorry. I thought there - I see now what you're saying.

Thomas Rickert: So (Berry) I suggest...

Jim Bikoff: I withdraw my comment.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks (Jim). (Barry) please continue.

Berry Cobb: I will have to agree if nobody's had a real chance to read these I'm not sure reading it here is going to do us much justice until we get this a little bit more

cleaned up. I guess in terms of the interest of time are there - does anybody in the working group for what you've read now is there any big show stoppers that we need to deliberate on the phone today, such as the order of the recommendations options itself? Or is there any new components to the paper that need to be discussed so that we can take that feedback and put it into the report. Or is everybody generally happy with what's been listed so far?

Thomas Rickert: I see Claudia's hand up. Please Claudia.

Claudia MacMaster Tamarit: Hi, Claudia. First I'd like to say thank you very - that this really reflects quite a lot of effort from Brian and (Barry) and from everyone else. And we've been slowly going through the rainbow. It's pretty impressive actually that we've been able to continue in one pass.

So for that I'd like to say thank you. Also I'd like to say that for the - at least for my part the introduced sentence about the options being sometimes mutually exclusive or sometimes working in tandem. I thought that was very good. I think that'll help the regular public to understand a little bit, you know, what they're looking at.

And then my final comment is just actually it's on the screen as CNT-62, a suggestion. In places where maybe there is a lot of contention or just a lot of language on the rationale and comments I wonder if we would consider maybe just press - putting in links to the relevant documents, especially where we might have sentences that sort of contradict the sentence before it.

Maybe it's better to not add any characterization and just include, you know, for example in this - in number one the GAC advice itself instead of the sentence that's in the brackets and then a relevant person could just get in there and see what was said. A suggestion. I don't know if that would help but just trying to cut down on the language so that most people will be able to go through this matrix and really get an idea of what it is saying at the top level

and then if they want to get into the details can look into the actual letter, document, report at further detail.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much Claudia and maybe other members of the group would like to comment on that. My personal view is that it is quite likely that a lot of community members will only look at the recommendation section because they might perceive that being most relevant. Maybe it would be beneficial for them to have the main points exactly on the same page without being forced to use links.

Also before I move to Alan and Avri, I responded to Avri in the chat that I think that her suggestion is a good one to continue moving through the report. Certainly most of us have not seen the latest changes because they didn't have time but I guess that particularly the recommendation section is the core piece of the report and could we get that adopted in the remaining time of this call. I think we would have made a huge step into the right direction. Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. With regard to the comment on putting in links instead of text I think putting in links is fine for people who choose to reference it but I don't think pointing to what is often a ten page document really will get the gist out that we're trying to put in these kind of parenthetical remarks. However, I'm a strong -- and it's a matter of style I understand -- supporter of taking things out of parentheses and putting them into footnotes.

You know, we can elaborate some issue in a footnote. It's readily accessible to someone who's reading it, certainly who's reading it on paper, not necessarily in a web version. But we tend to do things in PDFs. But it doesn't distract from, you know, reading the recommendation quickly. But the elaboration that we feel is important for a user who may not be aware of it is available in a footnote. So I think you may want to consider doing it that way.

In terms of what to do with the rest of this meeting the last meeting we spent pretty well completely talking about my comments and Chuck's comments. And we did not look at any of the other comments. We just passed them by. And it may be worthwhile doing the equivalent this time with the other comments that were not discussed at all previously. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay yes thank you. And again apologies for having missed three weeks and being so late with my comments. When you asked about show stoppers - oh first of all I wanted to agree completely. I think footnotes are better than parentheticals and I think using as much URL linkage as possible for those who do want to dig deeper is a good idea. In terms of the only - I thought it was a great report.

I had minor comments. The one major one I have is a - the use of value judgment words throughout this. And so I think that the report could be somewhat more neutral. I understand that that's in our contributions. We always add our value about how bad things are, how good things are, how much it is, how little it is. And I think flatter statements make for a better report.

In terms of the rest of this meeting I do value the walk through but perhaps if we want to take high points as Brian or (Barry) probably knows the nexus point where comments are somewhat in contradiction. And so perhaps in the walkthrough taking a quick pass at those important sites might be useful. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Avri and both to you as well as to Alan's comment. Certainly it is not the intention to suppress discussion about other people's comments and apart from Chuck's and Alan's. But you will remember that during the last meeting it was Brian who advised you that we might need another telephone conference before the report is finalized.

And therefore we thought it might be beneficial to look at the set of recommendations including their rationale first and then go through the individual comments because, you know, just to create a priority. But your points are well taken and I'm now virtually looking at (Barry) and Brian to maybe identify some of those high level points maybe starting with the recommendation section that we could address rather than walking through all those individual items individually.

Brian Peck: Thomas this is Brian from ICANN staff. I think again part of it goes to - at least on the top level was clarifying, you know, what the options would be and whether they could be in combination, whether they were the single set. So I think, you know, that was kind of the main point at least at the top level. And Avri you have your hand up still. Or your hand a holding.

Avri Doria: Sorry no. It was just the music's going.

Brian Peck: Yes there's some music in the background, someone.

Thomas Rickert: Classical music is nice but not in this venue.

Brian Peck: Yes.

Thomas Rickert: For those who are not speaking can you please mute your microphones. Thank you.

Brian Peck: Okay. So in terms of the top level that was one point. The other point was as you can see in the -- as (Barry) puts it in the rainbow of colors there -- was, you know, what exactly is - I think there is some distinction or nuance between what is consistent with the GAC advice and what the board has done to date.

So I think we can come to an agreement in clarifying that the GAC advice has gone beyond what, at least with a term of IGOs, has more in it than what the board has done to date so far and that there is still some discussion back and forth on to what extent at the top level acronyms would be protected. So we're trying to reflect that in the language.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks for that clarification and as far as I'm concerned I would just remove the brackets and have the additional information in the plain text of the cell. But okay. I would like the group to - or like us all to avoid that we're talking about what to do with - what to do best with the rest of the time and spend the rest of the time on this procedural aspect.

So rather than doing that I would like to ask whether there are any more comments to the first recommendation and in the absence of that I would like to ask (Berry) to maybe take us to the second point unless you have more overarching questions that you would like to pose to the group following last week's discussion. (Berry).

Berry Cobb: This is (Berry). So for recommendation one clearly the language here needs to be cleaned up. I think the biggest barrier that we've had so far is when it comes into this area of the report we've been apprehensive about trying to edit this from just a staff perspective or, you know, we - obviously we're trying to make this as objective as possible.

But we were apprehensive about taking strong edits into these areas because there were so many comments from various members. And I guess our hope was that we'd be able to come together to find, you know, to determine what is the comment and rationale for this recommendation in two to three sentences and then move onto the next one.

Obviously by me trying to read it without all the strikethrough and everything the sentences are so broken it didn't even make sense. So either we spend the time to talk about what we think that the comment rationale should be for

this recommendation and try to edit through it or staff can just go ahead and try to take another stab at cleaning this up and maintaining the objectiveness and trying to get the right balance for example of what is the proper component to the GAC advice versus what the ICANN board has done.

Thomas Rickert: I would like you to clean up the language after this call and certainly an update will be presented to the group for final review. So maybe we then move to the next topic. Alan you want to...

Alan Greenberg: Sorry to the general remark I was slow in raising my hand. I think not being consistent with GAC advice is something we can note. Not being consistent because board actions -- the board action was interim action pending us doing the work -- I don't think we need to note that.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. (Berry)?

Berry Cobb: Okay. All right we'll take a look at that and I'll go back to the transcript and...

Alan Greenberg: That's my opinion. Other people may not agree. Sorry.

Berry Cobb: And so in light of that I think what we'll be doing for the next version of where people comment is staff will take the action of trying to clean up the language here as best as possible but we're - in the next version we're going to send out the old version and the new version that hopefully is a lot more - has much more of the changes that are accepted so we don't have the rainbow effect here.

But if anybody questions what staff has done in terms of trying to write up the comment or rationale you can compare it to what was there previously so that we at least have a much cleaner version for us to move forward and say whether we give it a thumbs up or a thumbs down. So...

Thomas Rickert: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Go ahead Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: No just wanted to encourage you to move on.

Berry Cobb: Okay. So I'll go ahead and just quickly highlight. So for recommendation three at the top level it looks like this one's pretty much in agreement by the working group. There's one edit by Chuck and then Alan I think we still have your comment here but I think that we had addressed it in the lower text that had been offered up. And so we can come back to that one.

Recommendation four, this is a completely new entry when we did the reorganization. From the last call there was some concerns raised about whether there objection processes with respect to IGOs. That has been confirmed and we included the section 3.2.2.2 from the guidebook about the legal right to objection. And then it includes a cut and paste of what - from the guidebook as to what that component of the objection entails.

And then lastly again the recommendation here is if no top-level protections were granted, would we consider utilizing the current objection processes and/or fee waivers for those objection processes. I think one thing to note here and Alan you may have sent the note -- I can't remember when it was sent -- we did confirm with Legal that there are no limitations to the objections that can be filed by the GAC and ALAC and I think that that's pretty much the - that was the understanding that we got internally.

It was Chuck that had sent the note which is in respect to 3.3.2. Funding for ICANN for objection filing fees as well as for advanced payment of cost is available to individual and national governments in the amount of 50,000 with a guarantee of a minimum of one objection per government will be fully funded by ICANN where requested.

So I don't think that this was an objection on the - I'm sorry, limitation on the quantity of objections that would be filed but in terms of the funding that would be assisted with. So we'll be sure to pull in Chuck's comment here into the comment rationale to the group.

Any questions on the top level thus far? If not then we'll try to quickly review through the second level recommendations. Okay.

So for the second level, essentially again as noted from the last call there wasn't any introductory material to set up for the second level protections. So we had essentially started by copying what was there at the top level and applying it to the second level and then we also included some new language in here about the working group recognizing that in paragraph two that this is for all gTLDs and that if any consensus positions or recommendations were adopted by the working group for second level protection that the working group is aware that we need to consider how these recommendations would be - how they would affect incumbent gTLDs. But to date that's something that the working group has not deliberated on.

So that is noted there. And of course in our continued deliberations after the initial report, we'll be sure to pick that up. And Avri I think you noted that in the charter down in annex two as well.

The only other thing that I'll take note of right here is the fourth paragraph about the scope of identifiers being considered per the RCRC. What we have listed here of course is what's outlined in the current version of the applicant guide book 2.2.1.2.3 as well as I think members will recall that the RCRC is requesting additional designation for like a German Red Cross, et cetera and a couple of acronyms. We did include that as a footnote and of course that's something that the working group will want to consider after we've reviewed through the public comments for this initial report.

Moving on, so second level recommendations. Essentially we tried to do the same thing that we did at the top level. We did the renumbering scheme in numerical order 1 through X and then we organized the recommendations whereby no second level protections will be granted is the last entry. They're now linked together in terms of just like the top level with the full name and the acronyms.

Again I think the harder part here is for us to work on the comments and rationale and like I said staff will take another run or bypass these comments and rationale to clean it up and we'll supply both versions for comparisons. But at least we have a cleaner version for us to work off from at this point.

But essentially the recommendation options are still the same. They're only reordered in terms of how they might be considered together or individually depending on what type of the protection option that's listed there.

I think really for this page the one rationale for recommendation one is what probably has the most contention as well as recommendation two. I believe we're looking pretty decent for recommendations three and four -- I should say recommendation options.

And then moving on into recommendations five through eight, kind of the same as I mentioned. I think most of these are fairly agreeable upon the working group. We'll again we'll take in the comments over here on the right and make sure that some of that language is pooled into the text itself. But of course I think the most contentious here thus far is recommendation seven about the possibility for permanent claims notification and we'll have to digest all of those comments to improve that rationale for the recommendation seven.

And then moving on, I think recommendation nine is where a lot of the work will be. We'll have to clean up some more of the language here. I think for the most part this is probably the biggest unknown to the working group because

we're not really sure what all this will entail if this were to be agreed upon and recommended. But again we'll take an approach to make the rationales here as objective as possible.

Then recommendation ten we talked about fee waivers again for the URS and the UDRP and then we move into the registration exception procedure which directly ties into the next section. And that's probably the most contentious component in the report which we get into here.

And I'm not really sure how we're going to attack this one. There are competing positions about how this should be displayed. And so I do recommend that at our next call we spend a decent amount of time to walk through this line by line and make sure that everybody's in agreement.

Any questions at this point?

Again I think it's probably the most difficult since people haven't had a solid chance to read through and review.

Chuck please?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks and sorry for joining late but for a very rare occasion the registry meeting ended a little early.

I'm concerned that we're going to drag this initial report out and out until we get it perfect. I don't think it needs to be perfect as long as there are no gross misstatements. What we need is public comment and we need to get the public comment started on the initial report. We're not making any final recommendations in this report; we're just providing a collection of different things that have been talked about.

So why are we trying to make this report perfect? We've all had opportunities to provide input. Most of the input to me looks fine. I think we had

opportunities to make corrections where there was anything erroneous and that's the most important thing we need to do. So I'm concerned we're going to drag this initial report out and delay the public comment period further than we need to.

I'd really like to see us get this initial report posted within a week and get the comment period started. We will all have opportunities to participate in that public comment period ourselves so that's another avenue we have for dealing with it. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Chuck. Kirin?

Kirin Malancharuvil: Hi thanks, this is Kirin. I had sent a comment that I don't see in here and I just checked the list and realized that it didn't actually go to the list so I wonder if it's a problem with my new e-mail address and the list.

But I only had a single comment and it was that I still think that the matrix should be priced out more and that we shouldn't be lumping IGOs and INGOs together because some of us aren't sold on the qualification criteria for INGOs and we would support some of these things for IGOs but not INGOs. And I think that needs to be presented to the community in the initial report for public comment that you don't necessarily have to take it as a package deal.

So I just wanted to make that on the call since it didn't go to the list. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much Kirin. And I would like others to comment or respond to that if they would to.

In response to Chuck's comment, Chuck as you know I haven't been joining last week's call but I have been advised by Berry and Brian that another call might be useful to discuss individual comments. But certainly your point is

well taken so I would like the group to comment on that. I guess that's certainly the recommendations and rationale should be very solid because that actually reflects the current status of our deliberations.

So I guess that if everybody is happy with that and I guess the least we should do then we can actually try to smooth out the bits, the last comments and proposed alternative language and put that into another report and discuss that on the list so that we can maybe get the document out for public comment earlier.

But I would like to hear more views on that and while you think about maybe we take the time and ask the question whether there are more suggestions to tweak or change the recommendation section in addition to the what Kirin has proposed and also I'd like to hear from you what your views on Kirin's view are.

Brian Peck: Thomas this is... Go ahead, Claudia has her hand up.

Thomas Rickert: Claudia...

Claudia MacMaster Tamarit: I definitely didn't mean to (unintelligible).

Brian Peck: I just had a -- this is Brian Peck from ICANN staff -- I had a question for Kirin, just a clarification. Kirin when you say to parse out, are you specifically on the qualification criteria or with regards to all the recommendations?

Kirin Malancharuvil: No with regards to all the recommendations. Sorry, the only reason I brought up the qualification criteria is that I don't believe that I'm alone in thinking that INGOs are equal to IGOs insofar as like you would consider them together for a certain set of protections if you know what I mean.

Because right now it says for example -- oh I can't scroll this down myself -- some of them, you know, protection for IGO-INGO or few waivers for IGO-

INGO and what I think needs to be presented is a fee waiver for IGO, a fee waiver for INGOs according to the qualification criteria that Claudia set forth. Fee waivers for IOC and Red Cross, you know, I think it needs to be separate categories so that if we're split on thinking that some groups have demonstrated a good qualification criteria for protection while others have not convinced us, then we would be able to say yes to some groups and not to others. I'm trying to preserve that option.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Kirin Malancharuvil: Does that answer your question?

Thomas Rickert: I suggest that Berry, Brian and I discuss how we can improve the format maybe without making it too wordy, taking into account your suggestion Kirin and get back to the group with that.

I have Claudia next.

Claudia MacMaster Tamarit: Hi Thomas it's Claudia. I believe I suggested something similar last week and what I understood was that staff had thought about that but then you had something like 40 different cells. I agree with the spirit of what Kirin's saying in terms of it's important for those who are going to comment to keep in mind there are various different kinds of protections and assistance that are being suggested or thought about and then there are different international organizations and different characterizations of those international organizations that are also being thought about and that the protected and the protections are two different things.

But ultimately, at least last week, the impression that I got was it would be too difficult to put it into an Excel type or this type of matrix just to parse out the RCRC, IOC, INGOs, IGOs and then all of the possible protections under that, that it would be something like 40 cells. I don't know if I'm mischaracterizing

what staff said from last week but that's what I had understood although I understand Kirin's point entirely.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you Claudia. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes I was just, you know, it will be a lot more rows I think to do that. I don't know if that's necessarily bad. But a lot of these we previously had the numbers followed by letters. In rows where the approach involved different variations isn't it just a simple matter putting below that the main description, Red Cross, IOC, IGOs, other INGOs. Now that does add a lot but not necessarily a lot text just a lot more options.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Chuck. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. What I think might be missing in this overall thing -- and I haven't gone back and read it so maybe I'm wrong -- is essentially instructions or questions to the commenters on what is it we're looking on feedback on. And if there is a preamble like that or a summary like that I think it would be important in that section to make it clear the work group has not decided to lump together any of RCRC, IOC, INGO, IGOs, that we are still amenable to having different criteria and/or different protections for each of those groups. And if we make that clear, we might be able to avoid having to have multiple lines which in many cases would be repetitive of each other just to illustrate the point.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Alan. Kirin?

Kirin Malancharuvil: Hi. Yes I kind of agree with Chuck that it doesn't need to be complicated. I recall what we did with the IOC RCRC drafting team. When we put forth the recommendations, it was kind of like recommendation one and then it had A, B, C and you could say a combination of A, B, a combination of A, C and people can make their recommendations that way. And A would be IOC Red Cross; B would be IGOs; C would be INGOs and people could indicate.

And that's just a question of putting A, B and C in each one of these recommendations and it doesn't need to be its own separate cell. It could just be in the text. And then when people say they agree, they might say I don't agree with 6 or I agree with 6 but only for A and B or I agree with 6 for A and C or whatever. I think that it can be pretty easy and not too much of a burden hopefully on Berry and Brian but apologies insofar as it is. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Kirin and the others for their contributions. I guess that number of comments on this specific report shows that at least the report as it stands does not seem to be clear enough an instruction to the commenter as it should be. Certainly the message should be that the group has decided that the recommendations can be different for the different potential beneficiaries.

I would like to invite Brian or Berry to comment on that now if they wish to. Otherwise I would propose that we take this off list and come up with a proposal that does not make the report too complicated but still sends you the clear message which I think we have now understood from the group.

Brian Peck: Thomas this is Brian from ICANN staff. I agree. I think we have enough from this discussion to go back and work with on trying to identify those additional clarifications and we'll try to see what we can do reorganizing as well although in my mind I think there's still a way of maybe clarifying it both in where we ask questions to the community as well as maybe some sort of explanatory note in the table itself that could help address the concerns that have been raised here and help clarify those points that we all agree upon. So we'll work on that and come up with something off list -- I mean provide that on list.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Brian. We only have a few minutes left so I would like to hear some views on Chuck's proposal or recommendation not to try and make the report error free or, you know, 100% but rather get it out sooner than later for public comment.

I had responded to you Alan earlier that there should be room to go through individual remarks and comments in addition to the discussion of yours and Chuck's recommendations and I said that these shouldn't be suppressed or swept under the carpet. And I don't want to appear contradicting myself by picking up Chuck's point, but he certainly does have a point and therefore can I hear some views on maybe trying to address more comments by others in an updated draft and only do an additional call if we get the impression that this is actually inevitable for making progress?

Avri is sending a sign off, a signal of support for this.

Jim Bikoff: Thomas I think we support that too.

Thomas Rickert: Great (Jim) thank you. Anymore views?

I guess again that we should be very clear on doing the recommendations and the rationale for the recommendations, right, so that everybody's happy with them, that they appear to be unbiased if we take out strong language as Avri suggested. But in addition to that, I guess that all of us will have a chance to comment ourselves as Chuck said. And for the most part it's the presentation of the views which I think should not be that controversial.

So if I may ask you, please do, if you don't have the time to go through the whole report again, please do try to concentrate on the recommendations and rationale section and provide your additional comments as soon as you can so that we can close that. And I would like to follow Avri's suggestion that she made in the chat now that if you start screaming about the next draft, we're calling a meeting.

Unless I hear objections or hear you screaming now, I would suggest that we close this meeting and with a final encouragement to all of you to provide further input as needed and maybe you can limit your input to those points

that you really do find inevitably needed so that we don't have too many changes to deal with.

And with this I would like to call this meeting closed but before doing that I would like to give the opportunity to Berry and Brian who have been present during the last meeting and did all the preparations whether you would like to add something at this stage.

Brian Peck: No I think what we'll do is go through it because there's been some additional comments that came in after we sent out the most recent draft so we can compile that. We'll discuss internally maybe a timeframe of getting out a new draft so everyone can look at incorporate the latest suggestions and comments and then perhaps suggest a deadline of as you mentioned Thomas of receiving any further comments, after which we'll go ahead and put together a final draft that's ready for publication.

Thomas Rickert: Okay that's very helpful thank you.

So we can even end this call five minutes before the hour, or four minutes before the hour. Thank you all for participating and please do continue the great work that we've seen in the last weeks and I'll talk to you and read you soon. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you. Bye.

Brian Peck: Thank you Thomas.

END