

**Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Meeting
in Marina del Rey
Saturday 24 February 2007
8:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group meeting in Marina del Rey, 24 February 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made by the Chair, in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Audio recordings are available at:

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

24 February GNSO RN Wg meeting Courtyard by Marriott, Los Angeles - Marina del Rey

[Mp3](#) [SAT-FEB24-07.rm](#)

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

Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

The package that you have in the blue folder was finally put together by (Victoria). And the documents in there should be pretty much in the order of the agenda so that if you don't shuffle them or something, they should be on the (unintelligible).

The first thing you have is the agenda. I've made a few minor (adjustments) to the agenda. The basic order and numbering for the

most part will stay the same; you'll see the changes that I made on the screen that's in front of us here.

I want to welcome everybody to the meeting. This is, I think, our - is it our fifth meeting? I'm not sure. I see this as a fourth or fifth. And we're moving very quickly. We're going to move very quickly in the agenda this morning so I want to...

Coordinator: Caroline Greer joins...

Chuck Gomes: ...about that as we go.

Just who that was that...

Woman: Caroline Greer.

Chuck Gomes: Who was it?

Woman: Caroline Greer.

Woman: Caroline Greer.

Chuck Gomes: Got it. Welcome, Caroline.

Caroline Greer: Thank you, Chuck. Hello, everyone.

Chuck Gomes: Can you hear me okay?

Caroline Greer: Yeah, yeah. I kind of (unintelligible) I can make it up.

Chuck Gomes: You are coming through loud and clear.

Caroline Greer: Great, no problem.

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Excuse me. (Greg Shatan) joins.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, (Greg).

(Greg Shatan Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck and we appreciate you calling in.

(Greg Shatan Sure. I'm envious since I'm sitting in a hotel room walking where it's about five degrees.

Chuck Gomes: Better you than me. But we're glad you joined us.

Okay, we are going to start now. Again, the people on the room have the agenda. The people online should have received the agenda as well with our few minor changes that I've made the last couple of days.

Remember the meeting is being recorded and transcribed. Make sure that you identify yourself (for the team) in the room and remotely so that the transcriber can record the proper person for the transcript. And also, so that those online know who's talking in the room.

The remote participants, please feel free to use speakerphones while you're listening. But when you say something, it would be helpful if you use your handset directly; it will come through much clearer.

I want to welcome two members who neither one of them are with us. Yes. Sophia Bekele is the - is an (unintelligible) but she in particular is serving as a liaison from the IDN Working Group. For those of you who that are in the subgroups, keep in mind that you can use Sophia in her liaison capacity, as well as contacting the IDN experts that we've identified so far as well.

A new member of the...

Coordinator: Excuse me. Daniel Dougherty joins.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Welcome, Dan.

Daniel Dougherty: Hello.

Chuck Gomes: Can you hear me okay?

Daniel Dougherty: I can hear you fine, Chuck. Can you guys hear me okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. You're coming through loud and clear. I appreciate you joining us, Dan.

Daniel Dougherty: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: The new member that joined just yesterday, (Victoria McAvetti). I'm not sure - I'm sure I'm not pronouncing that right from the MCUC.

(Unintelligible) as of yet but I don't know whether she will make it or not (unintelligible).

Man: You get introduction for her Saturday morning call.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yeah.

And you will find out that we're moving very quickly and have a short timeframe that we'll talk about later.

Any - I'm not going to go over to the agenda because it's surely - if anybody have any changes (unintelligible) anything like that on the agenda. Okay?

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: (Unintelligible). I appreciate it very much. (Unintelligible) through the project.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Thank you for that and we will make every effort to make it as straightforward as possible to be incorporate. It will have a - the general report that will have all of the individual reports by category attached and I hope it will be really straightforward for you.

Liz Williams: I appreciate that very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

And for the people on line (unintelligible) here, Liz, okay on that?

Caroline Greer: No, I wasn't able to. It was kind of cutting in and out of it.

Chuck Gomes: You'll have - just for the people on the room.

Caroline Greer: Sorry, it's Caroline.

Chuck Gomes: Did you not need to be on top of the mic like yesterday but you're going to have to be a little closer than you were. You probably have to be within five or six inches to match the mic, okay?

Caroline Greer: Yes, because Liz couldn't be heard at all.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, yes. She is a little bit too far from the mic.

Okay, intro statement. There is still a few - a group (unintelligible) that have not submitted the intro statement. We have - Sophia has not, (Victoria) who just joined has not. And then - who did I leave out, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: (Edmund Chung).

Chuck Gomes: (Edmund Chung) has not - I should have bugged him when he was here yesterday because he will not be able to join us because he's traveling.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes?

Marilyn Cade: I was trying to get the (unintelligible) - I just had a question of clarification because it didn't come across from the agenda as clearly

as - and as we go through this report, as I understand the progress on work that we're doing and some like statement of work, we assume that some low-hanging fruit might be identified and some recommendations might be even perhaps completed.

This is to go in to most of them. But then many of the subgroups might have to continue work or make the recommendation that someone else, some other bodies continue (with them).

Chuck Gomes: That is correct. And for those who haven't been involved in the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is Ram Mohan joins.

Chuck Gomes: We will quite likely have some very specific recommendations for the new TLD process. And there are some others that will probably say something like, "We recommend that another group be formed to work on this topic and maybe even make some suggestions on that regard."

But, in fact, the agenda today, Marilyn, is ordered in a way that we're going to try and tackle some of those what we believe as low-hanging fruit first and then we'll go on to some of the more complicated ones. So there maybe one or two of the categories that we actually get very close to closure on today.

Coordinator: Excuse me. Tamara Reznik joins.

Chuck Gomes: So any other questions or comments on that regard?

I want to welcome Ram and Tamara. I appreciate you joining the call. Please, when you want to speak, speak - use your handset using the speakerphone just for listening is fine.

We're going to move quickly. I've warned you on that. If I move too quickly, stop me but we have a lot of ground to cover and a short timeframe to complete our task, less than four weeks now.

So, all right, the - we do now have the Reserve Names Working Group liaison. She hasn't joined us yet this morning in the room.

Okay, yes, she just went to get some breakfast, okay. So she is here, Ram, you'll be happy to hear. And we have not heard anything further on our GAC liaison.

With regard to the IDN liaison, please, like I said earlier, please feel free to ask for Sophia's help in that regard and she can help you in any connection you need to the Reserve Names Working Group.

Okay, our big task today is to review the latest status of the various small working group report for the different categories of Reserved Names that we have. And I apologize, you know, if I have all the time in the world I would go through and summarize those categories and everything for you but I'm not going to take that time because of that short time that we do have. You will see what the categories are as we move through them today.

For those that are giving the report, I'd like to give you some guidelines. Remember we want to - the report should be quite brief. No

more than five minutes. And that's separate from any questions and discussions so that it doesn't have to be included in that.

What I would like you to do is to highlight only the new info from any previous versions that you (spoken) to our group. With regard to the background and the information resources, we're not going to spend a lot of time on that because we can all read those in detail.

Certainly if you have - if people have questions, they will be able to ask those with regard to those or make other suggestions in terms of new information resources or additional informations or background.

I would like folks giving the report to focus primarily on the role and the expert consultation sections. And then, if you as a small group have (unintelligible) consensus on the (straw) recommendations, go ahead and share those. If not, I would rather that you hold off and talk about the recommendation (unintelligible).

For those that did not submit reports, I have - I'm going to juggle the agenda a little bit and click those off to the end so we can focus on the ones that were distributed. I realized that many people have not had time to review the reports. All of them except for three categories are in the blue folder, okay? And thanks again to (Victoria) for doing that.

We're going to start off with the category of Reserved Names called - for three names, (Nic), (Whois), and (Dub-Dub-Dub).

Now, I want to call your attention in your folder for those that are observing, visiting today. And you may want to pull out what we call the rainbow document and it's really easy to identify, (unintelligible) color in

your packet and the - what it is a comparison and summary of all of the reserve name requirement that are contained in 16 registry agreements.

Now, 14 of those registries are live with their TLD who are - have not gone live yet but all the requirements, any kind of reserved name, is included in this document. And so, you might want to look at that. I don't have time to go through and explain this to you but hopefully it's relatively self-explanatory.

One of our (unintelligible) was to review all the existing requirements and that's a result of that. And thanks to Patrick for considering significantly in that regard.

(Sam Denton), you have the category of (Nic), (Whois), and (Dub-Dub-Dub) as the requirement for registry - the reserve for registry operation. Would you please give us a brief summary of how that report has changed?

And again, that's in your folder if you want glance at that.

(Sam Denton): The only way I think it is changed in any material is the fact that the question of how to and whether to pull the registry operators as to whether they wish to continue to have these three names reserved. Everything else stays the same as it was then presented in mid - early this week.

And if you go on - but I think that's all I need to say.

Chuck Gomes: What's your recommendation with regard to whether registry needs to be pulled. Do you think that's useful?

(Sam Denton): I think it would at least be polite since their interests are affected. And they're not absolutely essential if we decide to keep them reserved.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And as you come up with some (unintelligible) recommendations that you're comfortable with?

(Sam Denton): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And you're one person subgroup?

(Sam Denton): In my one person subgroup, I consulted it myself extensively and me, myself, and I just have proposed that these three names stay reserved until the registry indicates otherwise and as the registry, the impression should be (hold it) to their opinions on the reservation of these three names.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And is that for the (first and top) level?

(Sam Denton): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And the last question I have then, what about IDN implication, any regard to those?

(Sam Denton): I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Is it correct then to assume that probably we would benefit - I think it's going to be true just with every subgroup except the tag name that you would be - you would benefit from a working group consultation with (Tina) and Ram.

(Sam Denton): Correct.

Chuck Gomes: And Ram, you're on the phone. You did respond the email. I think you're available next Thursday when we have our regular meeting and (Tina) indicated that she should be able to be available on that call as well.

Is that correct, Ram?

He's probably on mute.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome, (Suzy).

The goal is to really ask Ram and Tina to, you know, answer some questions for us with regards to whether or not IBM, in other words, IBM versions of (Dub-Dub-Dub), (Whois), and (Nic) if there are any

uncertain script, could be reserved as well and whether that makes any sense from a technical point of view and so forth.

So, we're really looking for some technical advice there but if you would love to be involved in that, just let Tim know and he can coordinate - well, actually, you're going to be involved because you're part of the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I'm not involved here. I'm just saying I'm the liaison (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind that what we're talking about doing is a consultation with them, with the whole group, so you would be involved.

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Sure. Avri?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Avri Doria.

I didn't quite understand when you said reserved for registry operations at the first level because you asked the question whether they were going to pull, whether that was true for both the second and the first level, I didn't understand that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I didn't speak real well on that because the current requirement was the second level, what Tim - and Tim, correct me if I say this

wrong, is recommending to the whole group with consideration is that those ASCII terms, ASCII names be reserved at the top level as well. That would not be for...

Avri Doria: But not for the (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Correct. That's what I must say. That's what I'm saying. Okay?

And then we haven't considered the IBM implications, we're going to need some expert advice on that regard.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I think we are going to need to go back to - we are using appendix fix as a sample that tells us how they (unintelligible) the present determination of reservation is, right, that's our example.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, a few exceptions that aren't attending folks, but yes.

Marilyn Cade: Right, right.

So, in this recommendation, I guess, two things and Avri took - addressed one of them which is we make the recommendation, it was under 3B. I think Tim has captured the rationale for reserving them at the top level. They're used by others as domain names, could result - could entail an expert confusion and possibly inappropriate usage because they are used by the purposes rights.

But the big question I had really was we are consulting the registry to our - under contract recommendation is really - and broader than that

is to continue reservation and extend it into the future (unintelligible), not just themselves the present registry about change.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And, in fact, the consultation with the registries and I think that's probably something that Tim could do directly within them via email and so forth. We don't need to do a group consultation. It would be at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So, under 3E where it now says, "These three names should stay reserved until the registries indicate otherwise." I think it would just be, "These three names should stay reserved until other policy decisions are made," or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Except until other policy decision...

Marilyn Cade: Right, because it's not - because the registries would say, "Hey, we know at this point..."

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you for that.

Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: This is Mike Rodenbaugh.

This feel like - also we may want to make a distinction between reservations and existing TLDs, obviously, with - we're dealing with now versus going forward new TLDs.

I think, it might be beneficial to look at how these are actually being used or (unintelligible) as well, just to see if, in fact, the purpose of having them, using (dot com), it does not appear too and they appear to be private Web sites and all of these things.

I'm sure that that exists but I just want to (stick) for (whois.org) as well or actually redirect to (whois.net). So - but they're private companies.

Chuck Gomes: And what we're dealing with there...

Man: So, Mike, I take that the questions need to be asked of the registries include the question how are these things being used by them at the current time.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct. And whether they've experienced any problems along the lines that we are, you know, A through E or A through B - well, most specifically B and there's product recommendation, I guess, whether they experienced unnecessary confusion or inappropriate uses.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes, go ahead.

Man: Just one suggestion that concerns with providing clarity because I know that you're talking about top level, second level, and those some type of third level, you know, I think it's time - it's probably a bit hard to understand the difference between those levels or what - being which level.

I want to suggest today is in addition to this rainbow document that she has which is kind of the - I said, two descriptions of all the differences but it's to kind of create a (straw) documents which should be a spreadsheet which will have one column which is the first level, one column which is the second level, and one column which is the third level and actually just list in each of those columns what is the (status quo).

So for the top level at the moment, you probably only have two or three names which come out at the (ITFRFC) then the second level, you have these things like (Nic) and (Whois) and then the third level, you've got some other things maybe related to IBM.

But just useful to just kind of have a (unintelligible) first column as top level, second column as second level, third column as third level and just what being - what's the current status if you like, obviously, can be edited by (unintelligible) to help provide clarity, I think.

Chuck Gomes: That if fact - it seems like that would be useful (unintelligible). One of them for existing requirement and one of them for our recommendation.

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So, Tim, you've got that.

And, by the way, for those who don't know, Tim is the consultant that ICANN hired to provide (unintelligible) to our group so (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: I've got one other...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn.

I thought that we heard some (unintelligible) and you're going to ask a few other country codes and I think that's really helpful, the kind of - we've had information about how can - are treating it.

But my question really goes back to, although there are legacy situations where the names are not reserved is it - and so you're not going to take them away - I mean, you're going to take them away. Is it (unintelligible) recommendation (unintelligible) can be reserved?

Chuck Gomes: I believe that is already the case but that would be a good thing to shift on that.

Did you understand that, Tim?

(Sam Denton): That if they were to (unintelligible), then be reserved.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Sam Denton): And the question is it - the two levels of question. One, is it now the case and secondly, if it isn't the case, would it be a good idea?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. That is correct and I believe and it's been quite a while since we dealt with a reserved name for the first time for (unintelligible)

first time and - but I know that (unintelligible) our process was to - you know, if they, did - and also the - they cannot do anything really if they're transferred or if they're deleted and we put them into a reserved (center).

Okay. Any other questions, or comments, inputs for Tim?

All right.

Man: ...the device just to have...

Chuck Gomes: I think I have it.

So, it's really looking at a table, the summary - some of the other things...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...the engineer is now doing a graph on the chart for this.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We do have one mic that is portable so let's move that when needed.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...what I'm thinking is something like at the second level, we might say example of, you know, the letter I, the letter B, the letter C, so just kind of the list of things that are reserved particularly sort of test as a reference document I would pick probably say (unintelligible) and

something that's relatively new rather than simply getting into the (unintelligible) difference between what we did with (unintelligible) for errors and it doesn't exist the jobs now.

So that document would just - (unintelligible) try and capture everything. So just take pretty much one of the most recent (unintelligible) agreement like an ideal (unintelligible) or something like that.

And then make sure the columns are pretty much - could just have a list of what is currently reserved at the second level. Top level obviously, the only thing - only document that governs the top tier levels at the moment is (RSP) and say - and if you got - reserved the (RSP) (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, (unintelligible) and ICANN related now at all levels. But...

Man: Okay. So, they put ICANN (unintelligible) and so on. So just a table that kind of (unintelligible) like that or just sort of a status quo and then as the working groups considering that, it might want to add reserved words...

Coordinator: Excuse me. Cary Karp joins.

Man: ...and that's, you know, or subtract whatever the situation is. So I think just give us the clarity so everybody understands these columns.

Chuck Gomes: Any questions there?

Man: Well, I have (unintelligible) but that seems perfectly fair.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah. Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, (Bruce), good suggestion.

Tim, you, I guess, have your (marching) orders there. Any questions from anybody?

(Sam Denton): No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you very much.

Let's move on to the next category in the agenda which is the tag names category and Patrick Jones and I worked on this one together and I'm going to - now, again, it's in the packet and those that are online that are regularly a part of the group should have received an email copy of this earlier in the week.

But let me just put it on the screen. I'm not going to go through it in detail. If you want to read the background, you can do that maybe - again because of time, I'm not going to be - do what I would normally want to do for those that are new to this and give you more information. You're going to have to read it on your own.

But I will briefly talk about the roles. I think this report is real close to being done, okay?

The role of the tag name reservation is to be able to provide a way to easily identify an IDN label in (IDNS) and to avoid confusion of non-(IDNSC) label. (Unintelligible) the need to reserve tag names for future use and safety as the (IDNC list) have changed.

Now, just a couple of comments in that regard. We've consulted two - we've used (Tina Dem) and - who is ICANN program director for IDN and Ram Mohan who is the Chair of the IDN Working Group and of course Ram is going to be involved in development of IDN. He's on the IDN President's Committee, et cetera.

Both of them have good technical understanding of what a policy understanding of this issue and they were both comfortable with this definition of the role and this is one of the main tasks of the working group is to define role, okay?

And I would like to note that neither one of them thinks that the (unintelligible) would ever change the (unintelligible), okay. But there is a possibility that it would be changed. So probably it would be changed (unintelligible) and reservation and so forth but that's (unintelligible) is intended for that reason.

Now, any questions on the role?

Okay. And then in this case, because I think we're fairly close to - yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I have a question on the role. That is indeed the role for the (X10--). But it's not necessarily the role for anything new that somebody may think of someday to do with the tags. So, if the role is

accurate in so far as it goes, that is the role for which they've been used to date specifically only the (X10--).

Should there be another use for tagging then that will - would be a sub role?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Yeah.

Avri Doria: And so, that's the only, I guess (unintelligible) I've got with it is that's the role to date.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And because we don't have any insight in to what any future roles might be, this could not - the role we're filling here could be - it could be - a new role could be added in the future. I don't think that's (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yeah. No, I'm just basically sort of - but our (straw) recommendations followed from that being the only role. So, that's why I sort of looked for minor modification because the current role is - because it's - that's not the role of tagging in the role of all possibilities, that's just the use to which tag has been put so far as far as we know.

Chuck Gomes: So, what you would suggest then on a recommendation is some statement to the effect that the tag names could possibly if needed be used for a different reason.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Any comments on that, Ram? Are you back on?

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I am back on. And that's fine, I reviewed Avri's comments as a qualifier and the way that is written right now does not preclude it in any way. So, I'm fine with that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Ram.

Okay, any other comments or questions on this and then I'll go through the (straw) recommendations.

Okay, let me start a little note here to add a comment and then I'll probably email it to you to see. Did I see a (unintelligible)?

Woman: (Unintelligible) to the microphone.

Chuck, just a question, clarification with respect to the (ERP's) report. Just to - it seems to me that you're making your recommendation with tag names (unintelligible) reserve for the consideration of uTLD.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm just getting ready to go over the recommendation.

Woman: Okay. And so, then in the recommendations the uTLD's report, one would expect that there would be a footnote that says, "In the case of tag names, refer to this recommendation," and it means that reserved names with the (X10--) prefix will not be available in any uTLD situations.

Chuck Gomes: Right. That's right.

Woman: So that's the clarity that we made around that piece of it because yesterday we had some (unintelligible) international reserved name, some names - some things that are reserved and we have to link the two things.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And this - unlike the other categories of reserved names, it doesn't make any sense to - we're really talking about the (TNF) when we're talking about tag names. So, talking about an IDN version of some script for the tag doesn't really make any sense.

Woman: Yes. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Cary Karp: Chuck, if you'll forgive an intruder. Can I comment for a moment.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Cary, please do. I forgot to say welcome.

Cary Karp: Thank you.

In the next draft relevant to this was released a couple of hours ago. So a lot of the terminologies that you're using and a lot of the situations that you're speculating about are discussed in some detail in terms of the intent of the protocol revision.

So, the IDN working group received a copy of that URL. I'm not on this group's mailing list so I can't send it to you. But Liz had and Liz, can simply forward that to you.

Liz Williams: Yeah. I'll do that when it comes in here.

Cary Karp: Okay. Great. But you already got it; you should already have it.

So, if you can just forward that to this group. Again, it's not a normative document, it's just informational but a lot of the things that you seem to be wondering about are taken up in it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Cary. Thank you for sharing.

Okay, so - and the reason we're on the (straw) recommendations is because they have not yet been approved by the (full) working group. The - it's a small group. There's two or three of us working on this category. We are asked to make a stab once they did their other homework to what they might recommend to the full groups and then the full groups and in fact it's probably - on this particular one, we may even take some action on this today.

So, to avoid user confusion that might result in not being able to tell the difference between a legitimate IDN name and an illegitimate one and to provide maximum flexibility in the unlikely case that the (X10--), that should ever needs to be changed, we recommend the following.

No changes be made in the tag names reservation requirement at the second level. Also names starting with (X10--) may only be used if the current IDN guidelines are followed. So, keep in mind that the tag names are reserved but registries are allowed to use the one tag, (X10--), if they submitted to follow the IDN guidelines with ICANN, okay?

So, it's unlike other reservations where they may not be used at all; a specific tag that represents the current - it happens to be (unintelligible) right now, the current protocol is usable by registries that are following the guidelines.

Second, for any TLD for which registrations occur at the third level. The current second level tag names whether that's a requirement apply to third level.

Now, I would like to ask Ram and Cary both to comment on that. Does that make sense, that recommendation? Cary and Ram?

Cary Karp: Given the line and I'd say just sort of just cuing over the shoulders (working up). Can you read that wording again for me.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. And keep in mind that what we're really talking about here is registry (pro) and (DNR) that these - that gTLD uses as third level.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And so, this recommendation says, "For any fixed gTLDs for with registrations occur at the third level, a current second level tag names (residential) requirement should apply at that level."

Cary Karp: Yeah. But is there - are we talking about (unintelligible) one came into and out of. One of the main concerns in all of this is given that IDN can appear on any level in any domain, the issue of propagating policy down the (three) becomes a very, very intricate one.

Ram Mohan: And I think though, Cary, in this case, the way, it's been worded - this is Ram. The way it's been worded, the policy opt to be propagated the way it is worded because in the case of (dot pro) and (dot name), the registry is the (unintelligible) to allocate IDN for that - at that third level.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And that's the only case, Cary, that this recommendation applies to.

Cary Karp: But there's a problem, it should be possible to propagate all the way down the (three), it's the true - it's all of the potential of IDN as we realized it because there's no obvious way to do that, then we got a problem.

Chuck Gomes: I agree. We're not going that far in this recommendation.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Of our limited time on this. Okay.

Ram Mohan: Hey, Chuck. I'm okay with it as you have read it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Ram and thanks, Cary, for the question.

The third recommendation, it would be, "The current second level tag name (residential) requirement that all label - (unintelligible) and the third and fourth character position apply at the top level with applicable acceptance made for ICANN approved IDN, gTLD."

In other words, they could use the (X10--) as we're using right now, if they're TL - IDN TLD is approved.

Then the fourth recommendation is, "For each IDN, gTLD proposed, the applicant must provide both the ASCII compatible form of an (IDNA) valid string. And the Unicode version of the top level domain."

Ram, you were involved with Patrick and I and so as (Tina) in that; you want to - would you be willing to provide a little basis for that?

Ram Mohan: Chuck, no problem. If you would not mind rereading that last one, then I will go (bring that).

Chuck Gomes: I will. For each IDN, gTLD proposed, applicants must provide - you know, this is in the application process for gTLD. Okay?

The applicant must provide both the ASCII compatible form of the (IDNA). So, right now, that would be the Unicode version. Okay? And the Unicode version of the top level domain.

The purpose for this - and Ram, you can comment more, is make sure there's a one-to-one mapping in the string that has made - the IDN string is being proposed by the applicant.

Ram Mohan: Yes. That's exactly right.

And in addition to that, what it also allows is, when - should there be protocol changes, et cetera, that change how a one name is converted into an ASCII form. You still retain a one-to-one mapping. So, this is an appropriate recommendation to have.

Now when it says Unicode, I think the implied meaning also is that it will be - you have it shown in the local script. So, that in other words, you have a local script representation which is, you know, via Unicode and its equivalent maps ASCII Unicode's representation tag tied one to the other.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And do you think the wording this is sufficient right now or it should be modified slightly?

Ram Mohan: I just worry about Unicode versus ASCII because some could say that, you know, since ASCII is, you know, represented in Unicode, you have a subset and superset issue here.

I'm kind of coming up with this on the slide, but the only suggestion I would say is, put Unicode in parenthesis and put local script representation as the main text.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ram Mohan: It would be effectively local script representation within brand Unicode.

Chuck Gomes: One second.

Cary Karp: Another mild parenthesis. I mean, these are exactly the kinds of things that that informational draft goes into.

Woman: Actually you - (who) is talking about?

Chuck Gomes: That's a question for you, Cary.

Cary Karp: Yeah. This would be the...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: No. It's not. There is something that is not defined in the actually (IDMA) sequence and that's the local representation. A user hides what they believe is going to be their label and that may or not be represented locally in Unicode. It's transformed in Unicode that makes it a new label before being put into the two ASCII process.

But there can't be any reasonable expectation that all users know what difference is between single characters as they intend to see them at Unicode.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

So - and if either one of you have any other suggestions on that, if you would email it to me, we'll modify this accordingly and I'll run this by (Tina) too, not that I don't expect any disagreement from (Tina), but she was actually the one that came up with this suggestion for the application process. And so, I'll involve her in the loop as well.

Okay, Part B then of the (straw) recommendation. Of course we relied exclusively on Ram Mohan and (Tina Dem) as experts and do not believe at this time that additional expert consultation is needed for the topic of tag name reservation, but it maybe useful to schedule a working group consultation with Ram and (Tina).

And, by the way, we could include you too, Cary, if you'd like to be involved.

Cary Karp: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: So the system of finalization of report for other reserved names categories with regard to IDN.

And this is really a recommendation that affects most of the rest of you in the other reserved name category, I think we can all benefit from that and my intent is to try and schedule that next - in our call next Thursday.

The - you can see then for those who haven't seen our reports for next category that I'm not going to go into at all is the consultation with experts and what we did there.

And then the very last section is summary of relevant information sources and their links, their sources, brief summaries of this information sources, et cetera. And this would be the pattern that each of the report for the different categories would follow.

So, what I'd like to do with regards to the draft that the (straw) recommendation is to find out from the working group members, both on the call and in the room here. And I would invite comments from others if you have some better (pertinent) whether or not there are any objections with the directions we're going. We've got a couple little tweaks we got to make.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yup. This is just a replication of objection I've made before. I think we're going too wide. I certainly think we need to reserve the (X10--) report. And perhaps some other subset and I realized that the advice that we've gotten sort of says, "Well, keep it as big as possible to prevent (Charlton) from offering new notions of tagging."

But I think reserving all dash, dash and third and fourth is going too far. And at least at the top level, it should be possible for people to offer new tagging schemes and prove it. And if they have it at the top level, then it should be able to follow through to other levels.

So, I'm uncomfortable saying all third and fourth level dashes.

Chuck Gomes: And as you know, because if you've read some of the materials, I actually submitted that question and they did come back.

So, is there anyone else - yes, Sophia?

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Chuck, I'd like to be on the queue as well.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. Maybe can Ram or Cary address that concern that Avri has...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Sure.

Sophia Bekele: Because I don't think they were in the call earlier.

Chuck Gomes: But I went - what I did though was I went back to Ram and (Tina) and actually raised the issue. When you get the chance to look to the report and it (contemplates) on an expert section of the report, you'll see what their responses were; it's recorded in there.

But if...

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: Chuck, I'd like to be in the Q&A.

Chuck Gomes: ...and waiting to comment.

Ram Mohan: Thank you, Chuck.

Sophia Bekele: I think I could add on that saying that it was - I think the whole - when they recommended that, it was more of a conservative approach to go all the way to that level. And it was a - safer for both operators and regulators for IDN. I think that was the whole principle behind it. So, I just wonder what their comments were.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Ram.

Ram Mohan: Thank you.

I haven't been a participant in the ITF process in the, you know for (X10--) allocation itself.

What we do not know is what other dash, dash is going to be used. I certainly see Avri's point in terms of, you know, if there are other dash, dashes then, that ought to be allowed.

My response to that, however, is that, in the third and fourth spot, you know, so two hyphens in the third and fourth spot. My response to that, however, is the following, which is that, should such a tag be requested and determination made that it does not - it is not confusing or we don't have a problem, then certainly, I see that, between ICANN and other policy-making bodies, an exception can be made.

However, I do believe that in the - in terms of many surprise, we are better off staying conservative and requiring that (CCHH) be blocked, you know, from here on out. And if we certainly find need for it, you know, the policy process is open to making that exception. But I think in general, it ought to be the exception rather than leave it wide open and then later figure it out.

Cary Karp: Chuck, can you permit me to ask questions around?

Chuck Gomes: I was actually going to ask you for your input here.

Cary Karp: Okay. It's my understand that hyphens in the third and fourth position are intended to (unintelligible) the software that they need to do me

something with the characters that follow and the characters that are in the first two position in that string tells the software what it is supposed to do.

And the current application, if you're going (QDM) coding is only one perceivable thing and I'm not sure there are any other things implemented, but the notion of past labels is not dedicated to the internationalization of the name space, it's just sort of here's how we tell software to do something with a label other than simply display it as some - display it literally.

Is that a correct understanding, Ram?

Ram Mohan: Yeah. That is a correct understanding.

And, Cary, just further on that, I think if I were a software developer, an application developer, what I would like to see is a very explicit thing that say (X10) - you know, all dash dashes are excluded, but (X10--).

And then eventually what I would do is build an exception list and I would add to that list of labels that are allowed in the - in either name server or any other application software, you know, browser, software, et cetera.

If I have to go the other way around where everything is okay and only a few things are restricted, I think as an application software developer, my task is also quite a bit more magnified.

Cary Karp: Well, wouldn't it be reasonable in the process of this revision because the entire protocol revision is based on exactly what you just said. At

the outset, it was - everything is permitted except a couple of things that are restricted and now we're turning around, so there's an explicit list of what's okay. And we would be doing that with the tagging mechanism itself.

Then instead of anything that has dash, dash from a certain (forward) position is reserved for some (unintelligible) purpose or not. We have this list of four character sequences that appear in the beginning of a string, that means specific things and nobody needs the program in anticipation of something that may or may not happen because that's (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: It seems to me that the current reservation requirement and maybe we need to reword it so that it's an understanding that it's not just for IDN strings, but it allows for acceptance. And, in fact, acceptance are made for registries if they're offering IDN in making use the (X10--).

(Bruce), you have a puzzled look on your face.

(Bruce): A little puzzled look that I would support what Ram is saying. I think the reservation should remain. I think what you - what we're doing here actually is we're building that encoding within the string itself and we're (unintelligible). And we're building that encoding by using dash, dash, dash to indicate the software that they need to look at the (unintelligible) of that dash, dash.

And then what - and I agree with Avri that, yeah, sure we want to be able to support different things. But I think the key here, we want to support it in a standardized way.

And so, let's say I decide to use (AB--) for some application I have, then Avri decides to use (AB--) for some application she has. And then the software, it's been not - not going to know which way is which.

So, I'd rather say that we have dash, dash, dash with the third and fourth character which is to indicate the look at the third characters to the left. With the assignment of the third characters to the left is assigned as those using (unintelligible) process.

So, you have probably a new application with (unintelligible) (AB--) will represent that application and at somewhat later point, we create another new application, we'd say, you know, (XY--) is going to be - something also in a standardized way.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks.

Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Commenting on that, I definitely agree that a new assignment of a new encoding be subject to the IATF, IANA process that there needs to be an RSD and a definition of how to use it.

But what I'm - what I think you're agreeing with is the fact that you're saying you see the dash, dash in the three, four or the hyphen, hyphen in the three, four, you then look at one and two to figure out what to do.

And if IANA has a list of, these are encoding, then, you know, what to do, but, yeah, I certainly agree that it should be, you know, and, you know, an IATF process, however, get to the point when this becomes standard, yeah.

Man: So, the protocol assignment. I think...

Avri Doria: So, this wording doesn't quite allow that, and that's...

Chuck Gomes: How is that just allowed, I don't understand.

Man: There is something preemptive here. There are - I don't know how many whether combinations - there are like 26 time - whatever it is, 26 times, 25, I guess...

Chuck Gomes: Twenty-five squared.

Man: It's just squared straight, okay. There's that number of reserved (unintelligible) that the two hyphens can signal. We can reduce that number and - but then we'd have to explicitly state which letter combinations are not - are no longer reserved and I'm not quite sure what anybody gains by that. I mean, we're assuming that somebody might legitimately want to have a name - or label, (AB--) something else.

Is that the kind of thing that so clearly needs to be allowed for that is worth the trouble?

Chuck Gomes: Is that a question to Avri?

Man: It's just a general question.

Well, I supposed I'm doing is wondering why this thing is being questioned at all.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah. We maybe going further. I've been - I'm basically looking at it and we've talked about the software engineering perspective, I'm looking at it from that perspective, where once I've put a mechanism that says, "Encoding is allowed here," then the normal procedure in protocol is to leave them as open as possible to future innovation.

So, we certainly have one thing now and - but once you create a mechanism that says, "Go here for encoding," new encoding become a possibility. So, a general rule of protocol, design that, you know, I've lived with for a quarter century now is, you design a protocol as open as possible for the innovations and eventually, at least, you can't see.

So, if this is somehow worthy to say, you've got to have an IANA first and second (CDC) before you have a new TLD at any level of that work, I mean, a new domain label at any level that works for me.

It says, this restriction that sort of says stop no other, this is what I'm problematic.

Man: This is the (unintelligible) that Avri and I (unintelligible) an opportunity (unintelligible), but we're still reserving (unintelligible).

Man: And if we don't reserve all of them, and I can tell you exactly what will happen because it happened before, there were any reservations.

Man: Certainly.

Chuck Gomes: The (BQ) dash, dashes were registered just randomly by people and they would use other letters if they think that a new issue was coming that will involve a different a prefix, I guarantee you, there will be people out there just randomly registering those.

And so, I guess, I also support the conservative approach. And the conservative approach perfectly allows what you're asking for.

Avri Doria: Well, actually what the change would be with the (unintelligible) made for ICANN approved gTLD and IANA defined, you know.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay. That's what...

((Crosstalk))

Man: And I'm comfortable...

Chuck Gomes: ...email right there and I would be more than happy. That makes sense. That makes perfect sense.

Ram Mohan: Yeah. And I'm very comfortable with that also, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Say that again, please, Ram.

Ram Mohan: I said, I'm also comfortable with that friendly modification that Avri stressed just now.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, (unintelligible) that's easy and then if that covers your concern, I probably don't need to ask the next question I was going to ask which was if you do have any disagreement or if there's anybody else wanted to join me and not in the group, you could of course submit a minority opinion.

It sounds like maybe come up with a thing, well, that's even needed so I think I saw - okay, Liz.

Liz Williams: Yes, hi, it's Liz here. I have a question for (Bruce) and for Chuck. The (unintelligible) recommendation is looking like you've got majority support for most of the elements like that they're going to go ahead.

Each of those sections have a direct bearing on for example in Number 4, (African) criteria, this being it's upper level community on this report. How do we - how are you proposing to - give me a final version of the recommendation that will find their way into the (unintelligible) report and do have a bearing on various sections for example (unintelligible) will not be a reserved word, the reserved word mean (X, Y, Z).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Williams: How are we going to get from this text to the meeting of this report? It's a (two-chairman) decision making process here, it doesn't - I need to know when you'll finalize in your group and when it could be included in your report?

Chuck Gomes: As we wrote on the agenda, we actually have our work cut out for us with after today's three more meetings, the last one on the 15th of March to the counsel and to the (unintelligible) ccTLD committee by the 16th.

So our plan right now is to give the report, so we have these recommendations but then it could be discussed with and I talked about this (unintelligible). This will be a good topic for discussion on agenda for public forum in Lisbon but I think, you know, hopefully then after a comment period there and counsel action possibly in (unintelligible) then you will have (opinions).

Liz Williams: So, in that case, what I'll do just to keep the type of this very good discussion and great progress is to create what I call (unintelligible) recommendations, you know, in some way that will then comeback (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Excellent.

Liz Williams: Okay, that's fine thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Any - now, is there anybody - any other comments besides Avri in terms of the recommendation?

Man: Just - this (unintelligible) for Avri's point I think it's - if it works just the same somewhere either in the section of this report (unintelligible), we are creating reserved names as of today or affirming account reserved

names list, so not creating prohibitions full time, it's an important consideration that's where - displaying somewhere and just - and to another point it's in Recommendation 3 but all labels of hyphen, that's equivalent to the phrasing you see under research (critics) on consultation with experts character, character, dash, dash in 1296 variations, maybe better to use that phrasing in recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: Which phrasing?

Man: Character, character, dash.

The 1290 - 1296 variations, the character, character, dash, dash, because that's an explicit number rather than a general phrase or label, an editorial (point).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, yeah, we can do that anyway.

Man: Can we hear (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: And just to make sure it's (copied) correctly, (Philip), if you could send me an email in that regard and I'll...

(Philip): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody not comfortable with that?

Woman: I have a further question, clarification.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead now.

Woman: And it's called to my attention because of my support (unintelligible) on the single letter issue character means what? Does it mean letter? Does it mean symbol? Does it mean number? Or does it mean (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: I'll let the technical people respond to that but my - I'll let the technical people respond, I'm not sure.

Man: I can tell you where the current thinking of this little design team is on this question and that's - there is the display version of the label and there's the new label and then the stored version of the label which is going to be longer and the lanes constraints apply to - just the longer form of that.

So if you have - sorry, just the short of all of that, if there is a single display character by the fact that it requires eight or nine characters in his own file let's go a single character and therefore...

Chuck Gomes: Let me clarify the question.

Man: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Does the term character or numbers - they're just - and letters.

Man: Yeah, I mean if you imagine something that is as wide as an M would be on your screen and put something (regular) in its place, that's a character.

Woman: Maybe that but I think maybe a footnote needs to be put in there that says - because we've been talking about alphabetical letters and so those are what's going to be addressed if it's broader than that let's (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Well, a Chinese ideograph is a character too. So I mean in an - if you're talking about alphabets, characters and letters are the same thing, if you're talking about anything other than the alphabet, then characters are the same thing as the graphing, the single (unintelligible) that's in front of you.

Woman: Cary, let me try to clarify. I think that - and when we're talking about at the moment is when you got what is referred to in this document and you haven't seen it as (CCHH) where the Hs and Hs are obviously referring to hyphen to know the (XN--) is one (unintelligible) of the (CCHH); the C are the Cs any (LDH) or are the Cs only L?

Cary Karp Oh, those feeds are going to be protocol elements and I would assume that they are only going to be L.

Woman: Okay, although the first C could probably only be an L but the second C actually...

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: Yeah.

Woman: ...would be an Lucentis, a D, or an H.

Cary Karp: Well, no, yes actually I suppose so. I mean the hyphen restriction if it's a third and fourth position and the first two are I'm assuming subject to the (LDH) rule which means that the first one has to be an L but the second one can be an (LD) or an H.

Woman: Thank you, Cary.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, yes.

Man: Chuck, sorry the (unintelligible) there, the point of my intervention was that we need decision in the Recommendation 3 whatever that position may be and that the experts email you to do that.

Chuck Gomes: I'll work that. I understand that there's something.

Any other comments or questions on this one?

Okay, then I think that we're getting really close on this one. I'll go highlight - Patrick and I will highlight and edit them, send it out for the group and include Avri for suggested language and (Philip's) suggestions. So this is one that is real close to being done and the whole group will have a chance to express any objections and then will probably benefit them.

Okay, and then going on to the next set of low-hanging fruit and it's probably not hanging quite as well as the other with selection and that's the ICANN-IANA related name and from (Sam Denton) and

(Milwaukee Fango) have been working on this one. (Sam), you're the lead on that, so if you want to give us an update on that report.

(Sam Denton): Well so far as I can tell, (unintelligible) significant changes since we last quote. The concern is of course is the ICANN reserved names and you can see in the chart in the front years in which the agreement wads reached and the times with the - set of names that have been reserved.

In the case of IANA, all the TLDs and all the reserved names or all those reserved names are reserved for each of those TLDs.

Keep asking me questions, Chuck, and I will answer them, otherwise, I'll make...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Why don't we completely go over the role of the - these are the requirements for ICANN and IANA.

(Sam Denton): Well, I think it's the rule of the reserved names held by IANA and ICANN has been maintained so those organizations have the exclusive rights to the names of ICANN it bodes or essential related functions as the two organizations.

Chuck Gomes: And can you have this report if you want to look at what that requirement is so we just got two nice tables in there (unintelligible) what those are so feel free to look at the report.

(Sam Denton): So my recommendation was given that these names relate to the essential functions, attributes, and parts of the two organizations and if they're used by other persons could entail unnecessary confusion, possible inappropriate uses, and that ICANN and IANA would be reluctant to tolerate the use by others and that they may have name and - not like - be covered by other potential users. I recommend that these names stay reserved at the first and second level.

Now, in terms of consultation with experts, we found, well, basically consulted ICANN and we got this back from (Dan) and (Chris). It says, "Regarding the recent information in names reservation on these 17 names, present staff with ICANN were not involved in the decision (unintelligible) the documentation so it's regarding these reservations and we make contact with those involved."

We'd had discussions regarding this issue but we'll not be able to generate the final report in new term. In the meantime, it is ICANN's decision that these names continue to be reserved.

Chuck Gomes: Now, Tim, were you - did you see Mike Palage and (unintelligible) last night here so he's going to try and join, I don't know if he had delays or what but he hasn't joined us yet.

If you see his - some of his concerns expressed with regard to this reservation requirement.

(Sam Denton): Yes, they did.

Chuck Gomes: Can you maybe give a brief stint of what this concern is?

(Sam Denton): Yeah, this (unintelligible) is going to get his reaction here.

Here we go. (Unintelligible) is right. While I appreciate the difference that we should provide ICANN staff as they juggle responsibilities, I must respectfully disagree with the statement of ICANN staff regarding their position that these names should continue to be reserved. The basis for my concerns is presented below.

First, you know the current ICANN staff does not have access to this documentation. I question the prudence of the working group to affirmatively continue their reservation which we know have a full set of fact before us.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, and that's a particularly (unintelligible) I don't have it but I know people can do - in fact, myself, I'm sure we could very easily contact (Lily Tucson) to put these things in and ask him for input and that he is kind of an expert.

So let me make that suggestion and (unintelligible) Mike for (Lily's) email. I'm sure there are lots of other people who can give it but I know that Mike has been in-touch with (Lily) so I would suggest that in that regard.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I would like to have a better understanding...

Chuck Gomes: Say a little bit louder.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I'd like to have a better understanding about the weight we're going to give to questions and objections as we go through this because I do think looking for additional information about why the names that were reserved make sense.

And I also think that taking into account the fact that there needs to be some amount of predictability for uses not just for ICANN but for users needs to also kind come into play here.

And looking at the names that are reserved and comparing that to the list of names reserved by any other registries, with long list that's a lot longer than others but just find the...

Chuck Gomes: Not for all registries, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I was looking at you with - yes, affirmation and not gazing in other directions. But my point is there's not a lot of names reserved here. I have someone who advises a large tier one IT communication provider who, you know, I'm looking at this and going, "These names make sense to (unintelligible) but not see them being introduced and therefore introducing confusion at other levels of folks who have to move a lot of process."

So, you know, I should probably put my concerns about unreserving them and might even send them to the group.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And of course as a member of the whole working group, keep in mind (Sam's) recommendations and (Milwaukee) will come to all of us

and we're going to talk about the various things that you're talking about and hopefully read some rough consensus at least with regard to what we want to put forward and then the whole counsel get the chance to review those as well.

Man: Mr. Chairman, I agree - I don't think this objection really have merit. If you think about...

Chuck Gomes: Hold on a second. We don't want to just readily discount anybody's objections. We want to understand them fully.

Man: No, I'm...

Chuck Gomes: Now, we're not going to do that today.

Man: I'm objecting to his. I don't think they're valid. I think people can look at him and see that essentially these are reasonable and related to circumstances. The put...

Chuck Gomes: Why don't you go ahead and...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...some other reason, don't read it all but what's - there's another reason he gives...

Man: The other reason given by Mike was that the (WIPO) (unintelligible) report and the current stand is for the reservation of trademark. He didn't think - let me try to get the right sentence here.

By reserving the string (ISPF) from registration negatively impairs the rights of trademark on it, to register that trademark as the second level domain. Although trademark on us do not have an absolute right to register the trademark as a domain name where ICANN is going to affirmative reserve and deny a trademark on this right, it must do so and it's fairly documented evidence only based on some substantiated recollection.

Chuck Gomes: And that's okay for now actually. We're not going to have time today to talk about that very much because there's so much we have to cover. But I do think, Jon, looks like you want to say something, I would welcome that.

Jon Nevett: I'm questioning the value of this discussion to some extent because it's really like we're spending a lot of time on a few names which I think we could all agree there should not be registrations in which subject end users to confusion. And I think more than that the thing we probably don't want to get into it is having to use the EDRP which we oversee as a mechanism to challenge our registrations.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And Mike?

Mike Palage: You know, I just note that, you know, some of these domains may don't need to be reserving, more obviously, DNSO, PSO are absolute so perhaps there should be change in the reserved GNSO and PSO and those TLDs if they become available.

Chuck Gomes: Those in part will be changed when the agreements are renegotiated so that's a minor point.

Man: Okay.

And also the, you know, reserved names come with the - the IANA reserved names, for example, IAD, to Palage's point, you know, that to me is the Internet advertising board not the Internet art session board so, you know, it's a lot of people.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: And right, you know, is a common word.

Chuck Gomes: I'll accept some brief comments right now but we're not going to debate this one now.

Man: I hear you. The only other comment I would make is that it's a little bit - I think we should try - in your justification, you say the justification is equally obvious, you know, maybe it is, maybe it isn't and you need to track your language from your other report but says that likely reserve because of user confusion issues.

Chuck Gomes: And, Jon, to your comment, just one comment from me.

Jon Nevett: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: The work - (unintelligible) to be really thorough. When we get down to the final decisions with the right recommendation, I'm sure we'll sort through and apply those rationale, what you're suggesting and in fact

I'm very confident of that. We're trying not to leave anything uncovered, okay?

Jon Nevett: And I didn't intend to be critical of your...

Chuck Gomes: I didn't take it that way.

Jon Nevett: I just want to make sure that we're putting in perspective when I read the report and when I hear the discussion.

Chuck Gomes: It's certainly my goal that we have a good broad perspective when we make the recommendation.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Just a question - a question for clarification with the (ISACS) related name when I think of Internet architecture board, but anyhow, when we talk about those as being reserved at the top level, what if (ISACS) wanted to do something with them? In other words, they're reserved because of (ISACS) or may not but - and I'm not quite sure how that would work even at the second level should (ISACS) who in the sense owns those names if ownership can be said holds them actually the - that the trust holds them at this point.

I'm not quite sure. I'm really more asking for clarification because I don't understand.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, sure.

Man: So two things, one is I'll take a shot at Avri's question and that's kind of a second level inquiry when we were talking yesterday and we got to reserved names scrutiny as part of the application evaluation so it's the question on the table does reserved names means the application is out or is there a message for determining whether a reserve name could be registered.

But I think that's where we might address that issue as part of the application process. And then the really short thing is, you know, ICANN staff facilitates and contact with (Lily) so we'll do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Man: Just from - my point of view from some of this is that I think that this group is entitled to make up its on mind and that it's not really a documents question fundamentally but in other words rational minds may agree or disagree that these names be reserved without abusing a vast pile of documentary evidence which may not in fact...

Chuck Gomes: We don't have; no, we don't have.

Man: One other comment about the top level I heard it mentioned that these are reserved at the top level. I don't see that provision in the background section. I just want to understand it a little bit better.

Chuck Gomes: If you look at the requirements and the agreements, those are reserved at all level.

Man: Well, in the background you say it's reserved at all other levels within the TLD at which the operator make registrations and that's - well, so clear that's not covered at the top level.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That registry thing.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And that's what the language is intended to state there but if you have a suggestion in terms of (unintelligible), why don't you email us.

Man: Well it looks like that's a quote from the registry agreement I'm just looking for a quote and basis with substantiation for how they're reserved at the top level. I think it's (unintelligible) the background also.

Woman: Maybe - let met talk to Mike off-line and I'll talk to Tim. I think maybe a couple of sentences but...

Man: You know, there maybe some - very special notion I have to cover or something. I'm saying is that it should be documented.

Man: Yeah, I don't know if there's an (RSP) that's specifically - covered the reserved - reservations of those names there but (unintelligible) of the IANA and ICANN, I don't think...

Man: At the top level.

Man: Now, the top level honestly is more covering things for example it's one of the...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Exactly.

Man: Okay, let's hold on.

Man: Okay, I mean it's either reserved at the top level because...

Chuck Gomes: We don't have much documentation in there, but feel free to email Tim and more of the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Can I just ask a clarify question? So - but example is covered by an (RSP)?

Man: I believe so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: So we need to just add that into the background document.

Chuck Gomes: Is that it, Tim?

(Sam Denton): That the top level is what?

Chuck Gomes: No, the example.

Man: Yeah, I think just from the (RSP), that's on (unintelligible). Because there an (RSP) that points out some of the ...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. It's a fact that's referenced in our document and other cases in our working group so - okay, (Sam), I thank you. (Sam) and (Milwaukee), you have any questions for anybody in terms of next step for you?

Man: No, I think the instruction was pretty clear.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

All right now then we go - let's get too far down here. The next category, small Roman Numeral 4, name - this is the third level, Greg and Dan, they're both on the phone. We're not going to talk about your subject because you are unable to submit a report for this but I would like you to give us the status update in terms of where you're at and when we will see that report.

Greg Shatan: Okay, listen, I actually just sent everybody reports a couple - about an hour ago.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: Finished up. Not to many changes from the first direct report which was articulated.

Chuck Gomes: Not having had to cancel look at that and is that Greg talking?

Greg Shatan: Yes, it is.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

The - not having a chance to look at that, what do you think - how close you are to having something that - with the (straw) recommendation?

Greg Shatan: Our (straw) recommendation is that it is fall hanging free and that they really are no changes to current policy other than one of the subcategories of names reserved at the third level is ICANN and IANA name and there we should follow the second level recommendations whatever those are of this committee.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. We'll all get a chance to look at that and we will talk about that in our meeting on Thursday.

Greg Shatan: Good.

Chuck Gomes: Dan, did you have anything to add?

I don't hear anything from Dan, he may have been on mute if he's still with us.

Let's go into the - some good higher up to three and reversely order of this from our agenda last week because we really gave short drift, the controversial names and other names as there to the second level because they were not assigned.

So (unintelligible) given to controversial names and as Tim apparently has not been able to join us, Tim Ruiz, Marilyn and Avri were also involved there, who's going to give us the report on (transfer) domain?

Marilyn Cade: I think I probably be better, Avri?

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, I think you have that one in your folder so, you know, you may want to pull that out.

Marilyn Cade: Let me just start by saying that the report today is really the combined work of Tim and myself and Avri has it but hasn't yet been able to provide edits or additions to it. So consider it very much work in progress.

Controversial names before addresses two aspects of controversial names. The whole concept of a category called controversial names -- and please think of it s in quotes and in italics -- came up in our discussion in Amsterdam possibly as a way to deal with nominated strings that may turn out to have handicap that would slow them up as they go through the approval process or unresolved questions or might be because the name is actually in a reserved category right now.

But in exploring the concept of controversial name category, what Tim and I uncovered and primarily Tim did much of the work on this exploration was that - well, there is no separate category of controversial names at top level.

One of the five categories of reserved names at Appendix 6 could be viewed as being unreserved because it is controversial to government and that is the concept of geopolitical and geographic name.

The other four categories are likely unreserved due to technical or policy issues. There are ccTLDs who have an actual category at the second level of controversial names.

We've given you three examples here, (dot US), (dot IM), and (dot CN). We are - we also provided the names from additional (CPs) that was going to reach out to to see what treatment they provide at the second level on controversial names, or disputed names.

If you have a particular ccTLD that you have a contact with and you recommend if you look at (1.4) you'll see the proposed list there and we would certainly welcome any other additions.

Sorry, Jon.

Jon Nevett: I don't have the documents.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: That was emailed yesterday and I thought...

Chuck Gomes: I didn't do a check on the ones that were printed, sorry about that.

Marilyn Cade: I know it was emailed because Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: It was emailed to the list.

Marilyn Cade: Because Chuck got it four times.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, it was email to the list.

Marilyn Cade: And you got it too, I sent it.

Man: I have (unintelligible) to somebody, who will distribute it or just give it to me.

Man: So, well, I'll mail them (unintelligible).

Woman: We'll go down to it.

Marilyn Cade: I had a listing maybe it's the wrong address but Glen advised me and then I did resent it, Jon. I know...

Chuck Gomes: I did get it four times.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: That's probably...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: It indicates - so we're exploring what the situation is in (CC) mostly to educate ourselves not because of course we have any oversights of what happens in (CC) but mostly for educational purposes.

The second category was the intent to - and so let me just say that in the role of controversial name, again, there's no defined role for something called controversial names in the existing categories of the - at the second level in the existing in the existing gTLD.

So far and we are going to email the shares, the registry constituency and ask them to - send the question to each of the existing registries and ask them if they have any practices related to controversial names simply shared those with us.

But we - I'm really on then to also explore (straw) recommendation the idea of creating the category call and so right now I'm - we're calling it controversial/disputed strain that could be used at the top level as it sort of a holding place so that as names come in that may have - and you remember the flow chart we worked through yesterday that as names come in that some kind of dispute emerges that can't be easily resolved, the names could go into that category while the process is explored to have - to how to unreserve them or address the problem.

That hopefully would mean that other names that are less controversial or non-controversial would be able to proceed through the application process. We would assume there will be a time limitation to this process; we're not looking to create new categories of reserved names although I think we have to recognize it is possible that a new list of highly controversial names might emerge over time I'm not going to speculate I know those are but I might suggest that.

We've talked about some yesterday that might have very high sensitivity, somewhat religious or other ethnic or experience of the world in the past such as (dot Nazi).

So the idea of the controversial holding (can), perceived name holding (can) is that that it needs to be addressed if at all possible and then the application would go back in to...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Similarly if the name is presently on the reserved list, a procedure could be proposed to unreserve and allocate the name. Primarily we thought that would be focused on dealing with the geographic and geopolitical names and new character codes where right now there already is a process in place or a recommended process to allow the unreserving of these names.

We plan to talk to experts of the ccTLD, send the email to the care of the registry working groups for computation with the registry and continue to build the list of relevant documents.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And we're not going to spend a lot of time on this but they don't have much time but they made some really good progress and I'll compliment them on that in a top category.

Now, there is something I'd like to talk for a little bit because I think there's a real connection between what we've talked about yesterday afternoon and then in TLD (TTD) process in terms of some of the language that was adopted there with regard to this particular category.

I don't know, (Bruce) if you want to comment on that or someone out - even Marilyn or me might be able to in terms of what was agreed or

anybody that was in that meeting yesterday but it's - it does like maybe for people who weren't on that meeting any - in particular those - on this working group.

No, it's not a controversial name with some languages - sorry I don't have it in front of me.

Marilyn Cade: Right. So this was written before we have that discussion and the right path today it talks about more (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: The approach, (Bruce), that we're talking about is suing some existing - some language and we showed specific words yesterday. I'm sorry I don't have that in front of me.

Woman: (Morality category).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: (Philip), say that again.

(Philip): Morality and public order.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

Any brief discussions or comments for Marilyn or Avri with regard to this one again this one we're not ready to talk about the

recommendations here because they're still working on and still gathering information but while (Bruce) is looking at up anybody have a comment or question.

Man: Chuck, just a clarification. The idea here is to look at certain existing registry practices and to see whether or not a simple solution to the controversial name thing might be the creation of reserved list is that the...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Woman: Careful about that at the top level (unintelligible) between second level and top level, right? And our point was we can identify that some ccTLD have rules that they apply individually. We haven't yet heard back from the registry and I didn't mean to put any of the ones who are in the room on spot but, you know, we do want to go the registry - detail the gTLD registry to say, "Do you have a role about controversial names? And if so what is it and if it's documented?"

So that's one - that's a good second level. At the top level it's the broader issue of should there be a kind of a category, you know, let's say the staff can't make an immediate decision.

Man: Yes, that is all the learnings of existing registry policy at the second level or we could apply the top level is the objective, yeah, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

Man: That we would talk today.

Chuck Gomes: For those who weren't involved in that meeting it's just (unintelligible) quite a while we're just here but I thought it was really productive time and that, you know, it isn't concrete yet but that's the direction that group is going and relates very closely to what's the group is working on and with controversial name.

Okay, I didn't see any comments or questions. Let's move on then to other names reserved at the second level and Caroline, are you still with us?

Caroline Greer: Yes, I'm still here.

Chuck Gomes: It's your turn.

Caroline Greer: All right.

Chuck Gomes: And, by the way, this one is in your packet, or at least it is in mine.

Caroline Greer: My apologies for the delay. I came through it quite late last night. We were simply waiting to get a few more registry statements included and so that's why it's so late.

Okay, so we have three different categories, the first one being gTLD strings which I believe to my coverage on the call last week and it's fairly obvious and simple I don't know whether you need to cover that off again. Basically our proposal was at this profession be retained and it's in there and although there's no documentary evidence.

Chuck Gomes: Caroline, just a little bit louder please.

Caroline Greer: Okay, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: That's much better.

Caroline Greer: Okay, I don't know whether you need me to cover this particular category again because I know Tamara covered it last week. What - essentially what we are saying is that we've retained this particular provision it appears it's being put in there by ICANN to avoid market confusion and where you've had a double TLD name if you like so (org.net) or (moby.com) and that's the sort of thing we're talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Let me interrupt you a second so everybody understands and again, I suggest you pull this out because the report is organized. They actually kind of send us three subcategories within the overall category and you're talking about the first one right now, correct, Caroline?

Caroline Greer: That's right, Chuck, gTLD strings.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Go ahead.

Caroline Greer: So as I say, an example would be (org.net) or (net.com) or essentially you would have two double TLD names within the string and really the difference is at the there's a static list for older TLD agreement getting back to the 251 and 252 and there is now a hyperlink to IANA list that is being added in 2005 for the new TLD agreement reflect back.

And so the idea is that this IANA list is a more dynamic list than it's constantly being updated as new TLD for common stream and registries (unintelligible) to consult that's on an on-going basis.

And so we're saying that we should retain this provision and since fairly clear that it's in there to avoid market confusion and we don't believe that many experts need to be called - a discussion with Patrick from ICANN and but it doesn't appear to be a lot of documentary evidence on the background of this but, you know, we feel that it's hardly obvious and provisions.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, before you go on to the next category, any discussion or comments on that category?

And has your little subgroups, Caroline, pretty much (unintelligible) recommendations?

Caroline Greer: Yes, yeah but we're pretty much in agreement that this provision should be retained and we don't need to take a look any further.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: I'll just think one qualifying that as an - thinking about it a little further here. The question really, this really scales the new TLD and it's real simple while we've got the existing ones again, the 15, but when we have a world of a thousands and we're adding over hundred years, how does that really work and how does this dynamic list. I think we will speak to this a little bit more.

Caroline Greer: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Well, and I understand that any time you have requirement that haven't existed forever that there is going to be legacy issues. So when new

TLDs are added, you're going to have situations where they are probably used in some other - especially when you're talking about a three character and name as you - probably every one of you.

And so the - it's - if you're going to have (unintelligible) but it that doesn't necessarily mean that you wouldn't want the requirement going forward but that's going to be at a certain way as a group we're going to have to look at and try to understand some rationale to what we want to recommend.

Man: I agree and perhaps (unintelligible) is perhaps this gives an (unparalleled) advantage to existing registries over new registries who want to have similar protection (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Caroline?

Caroline Greer: Yeah. Thank you and your team for this work. I wanted to just call everyone's attention to a distinction which I do think is very important and it's under (two), the role of the name reservation requirement.

In the description that (dot moby) provided about the distinction between reserved name in the main list which was - those are the part of the (dot moby) application and it is a part of the business plan.

I think it's important not to actually - we are saying here that (dot moby) reserve the constantly 5,000 such names and I don't think we want to confuse the concept of a reserved name category with the constant premium with approach which actually is a business strategy and those names will be released then and disposed of or registered according to the business plan introduce five registries kind of the - awarded the

agreement. I think that's very different the situations there (dot info) or (dot travel) or some (unintelligible) has reserved names.

And those reserved names aren't (unintelligible) registry to go, "Oh, okay, I got this and that and now I'm going to unreserve them..."

((Crosstalk))

Caroline Greer: ...a whole new process, those are actually reserved names.

Woman: Marilyn, that's actually (unintelligible) of our reports so I was simply covering Category A there was such a gTLD strings I don't know if you want to - we can move that discussion on.

Marilyn Cade: Right, I just explained (unintelligible) and I think it's really important for us, the rest of us not to think that the premium names category is similar to the reserving category where the registry doesn't have discretion to release the name.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Let me make a comment here too and this is similar the way that we sense that (John Jeffrey) earlier does not. There are certain people that approached me and said, "You know, should this even be discussed in this working group (unintelligible)?"

And what - we're really trying to be extremely thorough quite likely (unintelligible) it's likely a possibility it'll come back and say, "This one is fine; the way it's been handled out is fine. It's a very different category than that." But - okay.

Caroline, go ahead.

Caroline Greer: Okay. What category are we? Category C was registry specific names and as a subgroup we kind of struggled to understand the difference between that and other names. But we eventually decided that registry specific names and for those such as (dot base) and (dot info) has in Appendix 6 of their agreement. So we have statements from (dot info) and we are still waiting one from (dot base).

Essentially in their agreement, there appears to be two different like Category A and Category B if you like. And Category A which (dot info) clarifies is a list of names of ICANN wishes to see transferred to any successor registry operator that category would have more sort of generic if you want to use that word and type of words such as (register.info) or (search.info) or (registrars.info). (Dot base) would have (dns.base), (registry.base).

Then the Category B would be more names associated with the actual name of the registry, so (affiliates.info) and (newlevel.base). And those are names which would be retained by other affiliates or new level in the event that a successor of registry operator is named.

So as the (straw) recommendations from our groups and it kind of occurs to me reading at night that if we only really tackled it, the Category B if you like it (unintelligible) a new level (dot base) names.

And we sort of thought that registry should not perhaps be granted any preferential treatments in the protection of their names and that we might look to the PRO working group refer to them to see if we can capture that and within their statement of work. I'm not involved in that group of Mike and I thought that this might be a (unintelligible).

We may as a subgroup have to go by to address to the Category A and Mike (unintelligible) we didn't really answer and part of this. So as the consultation experts and as I've mentioned before, we should defer to the PRO working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Now I mean, you have one more category, is that right?

Caroline Greer: One more category was other names. And so those are really are names of the sponsored TLDs with reserves and such as (dot name) has (dot movies). Premiums names to be in that category (unintelligible), (dot travel) and (dot job).

So we have statements from each of those registries bar that (unintelligible). I know Michael Palage is being (unintelligible) he wasn't able to complete the statement this week and I hope he captures that next week.

I don't know if you want me to go through each of those statements and...

Chuck Gomes: We want you to go through them because we think you can read them.

Caroline Greer: Yes. Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Again, if you can talk a little bit about the role and the (unintelligible) recommendation.

Caroline Greer: Okay. So, the role of these main (unintelligible) registries are stating that this particularly reserved names and someday benefit their

particular sponsored community and/or they are an (unintelligible) parts of the registry business model.

And I've draft strong recommendation, we were saying that sponsored TLDs their particular business models are very unique make across the board and no one tried that sort of approach coming to identify the (unintelligible) as we can see.

We have suggested about each sponsored TLDs should be allowed to present that particular model or that was (unintelligible) in contract negotiations. And I (prenormal) those there are some opportunity for the public to comment.

And I mean, I need to correct myself in the second base that it was point guard to me that I've said generic TLDs should not be afford of this opportunity for (unintelligible) with unsponsored TLDs and should not be afforded this opportunity.

Tamara Reznik: And this is Tamara. Oh I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Caroline Greer: I'm just going to go on and say we've mandate the experts (unintelligible) registry and we're suggesting that the experts submits registry present themselves in the call and perhaps illustrate (unintelligible) of that names and best serve that particular community (unintelligible) was part of their business model.

Man: Now (unintelligible) that started so long. My suggestion would be that the three of you in that subgroup get that information with registry and I don't think we need a full group consultation with registries in that regard.

((Crosstalk))

Caroline Greer: Okay.

Man: Okay. Is that all right? I mean, if it's mobile points that we'll do it but I don't think it's necessary and obviously, we're going to have to manage our time extremely carefully to meet our goals.

Caroline Greer: Yeah.

(Kim Rice): Yes. This is (Kim Rice) and we can (unintelligible) you think it's important for us to gather any information and explain to the group what (unintelligible) to high (jacking) the premium names and also to fully understand how they will be allocated if they will be allocated.

For example, in the expert information we already got, we see that (dot travel) may not only have not been allocated the premium name but they have no process or plans for allocating that and I said that can turn in three group names.

So I do think that the process (unintelligible) understood whether it's our (tee) or there's no process or at our (tee) or an (unintelligible) comes along with that (unintelligible) that I have discussed as that (unintelligible) does contractual obligations which one of the (unintelligible) because essentially included in the (unintelligible) have to include will be a revenue fair between the domain name owners and the registry as, you know, that will be outlined in (RP).

And I do think that (unintelligible) understood us, you know, the reasoning as for the process.

Woman: You know, I'm certainly happy to go through (unintelligible) in particular. But I do see (unintelligible) really gone very deeply and to particular allocation models of different registry.

Man: And we're not going to do that right now.

Woman: Exactly. Yes. That's right.

Chuck Gomes: But I want to comment. First of all, thank you Tamara for your (unintelligible) comment. But I do want to communicate one (unintelligible).

Understanding what's in our statement of work, okay?

Woman: But how can we - how can we decide what should be a premium name if we don't know what being a premium name means? And how the premium will be (opted) in the end? So can you ask what a premium name means? What it means and for what base and how it will be allocated in the end?

Woman: These registries are strong recommendation I understand within our subgroups was that each registry will have a chance to present that back IDN models during the contract negotiations. And so that would be (unintelligible)...

Woman: Well, I can tell you I (unintelligible) go back, gather and we didn't fully decide on that recommendation.

Man: Okay. We'll let's take that up in our meeting next week. There has been a lot to cover and (unintelligible)...

Woman: I totally understand that.

Man: I truly want all of those things brought; don't get me wrong. My concern was to regard the safety of (unintelligible) start talking about revenue share into that. I thought it doesn't sound like it's a safe and we're working I would like to response and to jump into that regard.

Man: I just want to make it clear that this group is looking at nine (unintelligible) reserves in the sense that they can't be registered. It's not looking at how to allocate certain types of names (unintelligible) on which what it say is better than others.

Woman: But...

Man: But certain allocation is (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Woman: Okay. And I guess that they -- if premium can't be registered as they can't be (unintelligible) travel under that (unintelligible) names then we should consider them as such.

Man: Okay. And we will talk more about that next week.

Woman: Okay.

Man: You see we're going to skip the geographic and deal political names because, you know, by the way just to let people know Mike Palage and I don't know if he's involved at all what Avri had to, but we haven't been able to get in and report (unintelligible) report. They do have a report that's done and have some tremendous work in terms of background information. But I would like to get Avri to (unintelligible) if you've got anything to add at this point.

Avri Doria: Only that Mike is still doing much of the work and expected to have another one since we got off the plane. But of course who knows? So there isn't anything though and then we will have more and we are still sending their devil.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And Jon, did you have anything to add there? Okay. The end. And we did give this group quite a bit a of direction last week and, you know, it roughly goes (unintelligible) Thursday in our call.

Okay. Very quickly then, and this time the (unintelligible) we're going to short trip so that we can wrap up our agenda in time.

But Mike Rodenbugh, (Hugh Blair), (Alfred Hexamine) and Marilyn also helped on this one.

Mike, do you want to give a very brief summary of where you guys (unintelligible)? They've done a lot of good work. I kind of tend to look at some stuff here.

My apologies that this one did not get printed. I actually now (unintelligible) that I don't have my connections here anymore, (Bruce) can put up the (RSP 2606) which is an (RSP) that we look at the beginning of the working group but great that you think give you your specs (unintelligible) back. I will put the -- we're not going to through the details. But I do have the single and dual captured names reports up on screen on my laptop now because there was an error and (Victoria) was not able to print this one.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Go ahead. Go ahead, (unintelligible).

Man: Okay. So what we've done as well as Patrick has done since we've been through (unintelligible) inquiries for filling a lot of value background information. And we've been able to break this down between single characters and two characters obviously at the top level and the second level and registered tag names reports. I think we probably need to just think about the third levels too. So we'll do that.

Essentially, showing that a lot of second - one - and two-letter number names have been released already in the past, so there is certainly distinction between at least on the one hand letters and numbers and on the other hand symbols, we've heard suggestions that may actually be differences between letters and numbers. So we're going to approve that a little bit more as well.

Essentially, where we're at right now is trying to show the consultation with experts that there have not been any problems with the existing

(unintelligible) domains in these categories - oh I'm sorry, I should also breakout IDNs of course.

We also realized that there's going to be lead further expert consultation for IDNs in both single and dual characters (unintelligible) that will be defined and (100 to 200) different scripts but (unintelligible) and come up with the list of experts, so we want to ask a few basic questions too.

So that's potentially the status. That's where we start recommendation only to say that the working group is not - is not in (unintelligible) on the (star) recommendation at this point.

Just late yesterday I got quite lengthy comments from Marilyn and Neil from (overstocks) that we need to incorporate. We will have a meeting on Monday.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Sure.

Avri?

Avri Doria: A quick question. (Jeff), I don't quite understand what a one-character IDN is since the (ace) is always going to be at least five.

Man: Great; precisely a great point. Yet there are a bunch of them that are on sale as (stato).

Man: And what (elements out there and there) because this is going to be an area where the expert consultation was seen and wrong. Next Thursday will be very helpful I believe. So we'll talk more about that then.

And by the way, that's a good read in for something for all of the groups, again except for the tag names not because I'm not doing that one (unintelligible), it just doesn't have the same implications. But that expert consultation is going to be very helpful there.

And each of the group is going to have to add to the report out what's the recommendation of the group; any background information with regards to IDN version of the main reserve name categories that we're talking about. Okay. So please understand that that will be an important thing.

Now what I want to do with regard to - I want to get some guidelines with regards too for all of the reports, okay? Make sure you follow the outlines. The single and dual character names are - they recognize that they're not exactly (in the same foot) with the outlines that we had.

We really want to report to all; follow the same exact outlines in the case of the second level registration that Caroline just talked about what they've done because they kind of have three subcategories. They follow the outline within each of the three categories. So, it (synchs) very well.

I will make it very easy for new people to come in and follow these things and look at them and find the information and especially for Liz

who is going to get to incorporate a lot of these things into another big report.

Liz Williams: (Geez, right). Good (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: All right. So remember just some guidelines for all of you with the role. There are a couple of versions of the report where the role was is very lengthy. I think it's useful for the role to be a fairly concise statement some of you have included background information for experts testimony in the role. I just suggest that you move those things into those areas so that we have a fairly succinct definition of role that the full committee will be able to do - make a decision on and it'll be real clear and easy to use.

With regards to recommendations, remember you need to cover first and second level and if applicable to third level. Consultation with experts, that category, and again some of you are going to need to move some things around.

List of possible experts; certainly require expert's consultation that you've done on your own without the full group being involved and they certainly going make recommendations that you think that consultation with experts for full working group is needed.

Now, we want to use that when we need it, but let's not overuse it because of the time constraints that we have.

Resource summary, each of the resources should have a brief that can be as brief as a sentence, a little statement of what the resource is about, it can be a little bit more than that if you want, that's entirely up

to you, and then links to communications or if it is an email communication we can show that email.

Any questions, concerns of what is expected with regard to the reports going forward?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn speaking. But realizing that we didn't include this particular...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Right. It's Marilyn speaking.

We didn't include - when we did the outline for the report. I don't think that we actually had a category in it for. We have recommendations, but I don't think we actually had a recommendation for next - the two - as far as recommendation is, we reach a certain - yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay. Marilyn is bringing up this thing.

And again, if you look at the statement of work - by the way the statement of work is on this folder too, and they're approved by the counsel. It specifically anticipates recommendations from some of the more complicated categories that would say something like this. "We recommend - you know, we recommend that sector working group or a (CDP) (unintelligible) - we're going to recommend so many of those, something be established and follow up to this to work this further." I think there are several categories or that maybe the case.

Thank you for bringing that up that's very helpful.

I want and I've got to bring this to a close very quickly because Avri is on - right next to me here and it's her meeting that we would interfere with.

Avri Doria: Oh, gee, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

A new issue worth to think about that came up in yesterday's g new TLD meeting is trainings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top level domain or a reserved name. So I just put that out. We're not going to talk about that now. If you have questions on that you can ask some of us that were in the meeting yesterday.

Time-wise, we only have three remaining meetings. They're on Thursday, the 1st of March, 8th of March, and the 15th of March. Our deadline for our report to the GNSO council and - really as well as the new TLD committee is the 16th of March. So that means we have to approve our final report on that last meeting.

We got a lot of work to do between now and then. And I do recall that I emphasized everybody that we, you know, we're going to hard and fast and I sincerely appreciate all the work that's being put into this because it's been great.

Now, do we need more volunteers in any of the group? I am going to leave it to the group to communicate. We have quite a few people,

some new, that haven't been involved in a subgroup. They don't have to be it at this point, because if you think it's going to be counterproductive to bring them up to speed and so forth, then what we'll have to do is just accept that.

But if any of you would like anymore volunteers, I want you to communicate that with me (do you have a list), and then we'll go out and ask any other people that aren't volunteering on anything whether they would be willing to assist you on this. So that's an action item for all of you if you would like additional help.

We're still adding - working group members we did yesterday. We're getting at a point though where it's very difficult to come up to speed in everything we've done. We will add them because our statement of the work did say that people could join anytime.

It's going to be harder and harder to integrate people into that, and it's going to their responsibility to come up to speed very quickly. We're not going to be able to backtrack in our meetings because we're going to have to be very efficient in that regards.

Regarding scheduling of that expert consultation, I've already planned a schedule to one and I've alerted (Tina) and Ram. And Cary, if you would like to be involved in that, just let - send me an email on that regard or tell me right now.

Cary Karp: Right now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you, Cary. So we'll involve Cary too and we will do that during our meeting at three.

Now with regards to that meeting, we're bumping up against the council meeting after one hour. And as you can tell, one hour is really tough for us. And I hate to say this for Alistair, who's not able to join us; it's a terrible time for him in New Zealand and others. But is it a big problem if we move our meeting up an hour next week?

We have to start 1:00 Eastern time. We'll start at noon Eastern Time and I'll let all of you do your own time zone calculations.

Is there anybody that's opposed that it's really difficult to move the meeting up an hour next Thursday?

On the call anybody?

In the room?

Woman: (Unintelligible) change to 17?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. That is correct. And that will get two hours and I as you can tell, we need it.

Woman: So the real question is if Glen is on the phone?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if Glen is still here. But Glen was going to take survey anyway. I'm kind of helping around a little bit. So she's welcome to speak.

And then again, help me decide other news for experts. We're going to have to schedule - we can schedule them outside of our regular meeting although we're going to start running in to the conflict.

Moving very quickly, action item for the next call. I will revise the topology table with new complete - let me show the rest of the people that are here what that is. If I can find it real quickly to something that (Sam Denton) did. These (unintelligible) are all locked now to tremendous amount of work.

Man: It was Chairman Chuck who assigned the mark, so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Don't blame (Sam) for this for the percents to completion. I did that and I did it based on some specific criteria. But don't read too much into that of a very limited valuable, but they do kind of give us a guide where we're at, okay?

And then (Sam) - I don't - the working item I had on the agenda for you is really going to apply yet because we don't have any of the reports that are far enough up along for you to go back and start...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, exactly. And we're close on the tag names but we still have some added fair and we get those approved first.

And then for each categories in - that we've talked about, you know, I think everybody has their marketing orders there in terms of what needs to be done. We really need by next week to have the reports

coming along quite well because it's going to start knocking us off or we're not going to - it's not going to switch (this).

And then repeat what Marilyn brought up and what I said earlier, in some cases, your recommendation is going to be that further work needs to be done and here are some areas that we suggested for improvement, okay?

We've got to be - we've got to balance idealism on this with pragmatism and make sure we achieve our objective.

Now there is a possibility this council when you submit this will come back and say we want - that they can only do that for 32 - actually do that 30 days. Anyway, I don't know whether that would happen or not but our we're going to achieve everything we've said.

All right. Next meeting will be next Thursday. We're going to move that up an hour and Glen will provide the teleconference details for that.

Thanks again for all the work. I want to thank - is (Victoria) - (Victoria) is not in here right now, for all of her help in printing the document and putting them in the folders for us, and of course Glen behind the scene just constantly doing stuff work and I just can't compliment them enough.

I also want to extend appreciation to Avri and the February '06 PDP task force for allowing us to have these two hours today and delaying the start of their meeting.

So thanks to all of you including the people who were observers today and for the comments that you've submitted.

Have a good day.

Man: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Thanks for doing it so quickly.

So we're going to take a 15-minute break and then through GNSO style start promptly at 10:30.

((Crosstalk))

END