Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference
15 March 2007
16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 15 March 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.

The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/RN-wg-20070315.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Bilal S. Beirm - CBUC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Dan Dougherty - IPC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Jon Nevett - Registrars constituency

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Edmon Chung - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council IDN

wg Liaison

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, Marilyn, I thought you said you weren't going to be able to make this call.

Marilyn Cade: I'm on the call to give my apologies. I'll be here in 10 minutes.

Chuck Gomes: The whole 10 minutes, wow.

Marilyn Cade: Well, maybe 15.

Avri Doria: And hi, this is Avri. I will be on and off the call. I'm having a crisis, with slides to get me to (prog for the IETF).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: So I'll be here but then I won't, but then I'll be back.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sure, neither of you probably had much time to look at the final document.

Avri Doria: I haven't even been able to open it due to a computer problem.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, all right. Well, I just thought I'd ask you since you're going to might be off and - off most of the call. But anyway, again, it was sent last night. Unfortunately it didn't go.

Avri Doria: But the reason I'm on is I'm trying to print while I'm at time hanging around here. But I will just keep doing that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, 128 pages.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Did people get two copies of it now?

Avri Doria: I just got one.

Chuck Gomes: You just one? Because I sent it to both my private distribution list for the group and to the…

Woman: Okay…

Chuck Gomes: …GNSO list on it, so, okay.

Glen Desaintgery: That's me Glen.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I know it's - how really is it for you, Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm often up that time anyway, so…

Alistair Dixon: So, my only concern, Chuck, is I have a - IDA working group call at midnight.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, wow.

Alistair Dixon: It's going to be a long day.

Chuck Gomes: That just a long day. Well it's kind of like what my day was yesterday, although I didn't go to midnight in my time. I went to - I think I'd sent the document finally about 10:00 and I started before 6:00 yesterday morning. So, you got about three hours more on me today.

Alistair Dixon: Are you? Well, it's going to be a (unintelligible) putting those reports (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes. If we - I was - yeah, it will. It sounds that it looks like we have some, Alistair, already. But at least with controversial name so, that sounds like I may have used the wrong one in a few edits I made.

Well, I've got Marilyn and Alistair and Patrick on though. And the - one of the things - oh, I did one in the report that I changed which is apparently the wrong document to be working from is I moved the personal comments to the recommendation section because I thought that they fit better there then up in the background.

And then and I did - I put him right below the table. And the other thing I did is I reconstructed the table and put it back together, so that all of the recommendations on the one row that was - that had four or five actually if you say - if you include 2A and 2B…

Woman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …into one cell and just use numbering format in that.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, because I know you're probably doing it because of my open office.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri Doria: …editing. But I thought that it had already been fixed.

Chuck Gomes: Well, again…

Avri Doria: By someone else, by Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, maybe I was working on the wrong version which appears to be the case now. Anyway…

Avri Doria: Yeah, because Tim had fixed it and then the final edits have gone in. And Tim had actually put in the final edits that have been agreed to.

Chuck Gomes: Well, ones you guys agree to the correct version, send it and I think we've agreed as a group on the recommendation so, it…

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think Tim will have to be the one that does because Marilyn are online.

Man: Tim has joined the call. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Okay, good. So, yeah. So he had the final copy…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And if you will send me the final copy we'll get all that straightened out once I know. Let me tell you, it was quite confusing yesterday making sure I was working with the right documents and obviously I missed on this one.

Tim Ruiz: Sure. Yeah, it - I attached it to that email with my question this morning.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Ruiz: And I forgot to…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And I - yeah. Well that is definitely - you guys are in agreement that is definitely the one? I just want to make sure.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, that was the one that I had sent that had some red line in it. This one is - just got all the…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And now, (Patrick), you had send an e-mail later than suggesting that maybe there was a something - that there were a couple of things that we're different.

(Patrick):   Yeah, I sent to you that what should be the correct recommendation for single letters, single - ASCII letters at the top level and single IDNs at the top.

Marilyn Cade: But that's not the controversial names reported right?

(Patrick):   No.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm mixing up reports. My mistake.

Man: The one for our internal information, that one I was working off that I was (unintelligible) to see final was working - draft report March 13, Version III Redline 1.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And the actual ones, the last one that was…

Man: This is not - Tim, this is not the controversial. This is one and two-character name.

((Crosstalk))

Man: In ray, one and two-character names, the one I worked off was March 13 Version III Redline 1 for (Patrick).

Man: And what I'm saying is the one that I sent to you, which was that version.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Man: So, the recommendations don't match with what I sent. And so, you're going to have an e-mail that has the proper text.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well that's - again, is that the only problem?

Man: So far that's the only thing we have.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Man: That have been - yeah, grateful (unintelligible)…

Chuck Gomes: That's certainly easy to fix. So the - all right.

                   Now, the - I think it's probably time to start. And let's then get the - what is that (document)? Okay. Where's my agenda and how come it's not up?

Tim Ruiz: Hey Chuck, this is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Ruiz: I apologize that I'm only going to be able to be on this call for about half hour.

Chuck Gomes: And since you're going to have to get off, do you have - have you had any chance - I guess, you did have a chance to look at some of the document because you found the problem.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: I have, you know, I have no - other than what I mentioned, I have no issues with anything else…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, well that's good to know. And Marilyn hasn't had the chance, she's going to have go get off too and she has hadn't a chance to look. So, anyway so, okay, Marilyn, are you going to have any chances to look at that today? Probably not, huh?

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to do my best. I'm - the meeting I'm in I'm going to - that's why I'm trying to take it back into the meeting that I'm sitting in.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm online on my blackberry but not on my PC.

Chuck Gomes: Right after the council meeting, I'm going to try and fix all the fixes that need to be done and get that to Tim for final editing.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So, just let me know the timeframe and so - and then there are maybe some personal statements that need to be added that I'm asking for those by I think 5:00 of my time today, so that we can - then I can make sure that I have all those incorporated as well.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: So we'll know after the meeting and whether there are any of those, hopefully.

So, okay, let's see. Let me pull up my agenda here and we'll get going

I'm going to go print that out so that I got it. All right, let me hit start-0.

Using a speakerphone, use the handset when you're talking.

And any questions or suggestions on the agenda?

Okay, I want to extend the special welcome and apologies to our newest member, (Unintelligible) from the Internet Affairs Manager at a (Unintelligible) organization in Amman, Jordan. You are in Aman, right, (unintelligible)?

Man: Yes, yes, that is correct.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I assumed you were as you could tell by my e-mail. But he's an observer and also a member of the business constituency. And the

apologies are because we should have added him about a month ago and it got through the cracks, so we're sorry about that. But we certainly welcome you now and feel free to participate in today's call and the rest of the work's activities this week and if we're extended 30 days by the council during that period.

Man: Thank you very much. Thanks for the welcome.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, the first thing we're going to do is just a quick status of the subgroup reports.

Now, if you have the final draft report in front of you - if, and you know, it might be helpful that you look at the reserved names table in Section 4 for the particular topic we're on. And when we're talking about - and of course, take a look at the roles in Section 3 or no - yeah, Section 3 of the report. And then you'll be able to - you can find what we're talking a bout.

Now, you can also go back to the - make sure that each of you look at the report that is included in the appendices, okay. The - because that is - and make sure we have the right one. It already looks like we in one or two cases, we may have a - the wrong one there, so make sure that you check that out.

And the appendices if you don't know where yours is, just look at the table that towards the back part of the report in Section 6. Table 6.1 actually shows exactly where every table is for the report. Okay? Excuse me, whatever report is in the appendices. Okay? And of course, I'll have that ready if you just want to ask me on the call as well.

All right, then any questions on that? Then let's - now keep in mind, we're assuming - so I'm assuming that the recommendations that are given for each category are already correct. Now, I understand that that's not the case with single and two letters, and it may not be the case with controversial, although, I think - I don't think there are any changes in my content on the controversial one of the recommendations. There was just a matter of some other things on the report. Is that correct, Tim Ruiz?

Tim Ruiz: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. So, we're okay on that.

Now, again, I'm making that assumption but if you know it differently, you need to call it to our attention today, like Tim Ruiz has done in the case of the controversial report and like (Patrick) did with the single and two letters.

Now, tag names I think is done. It's already been edited by Tim Denton, and it should done. The one question I need to ask is, does - are there - is there anyone that wants to submit a minority statement one?

Tim Ruiz: Oh, I'm sorry on which one, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: On the tag names report.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And if - so I'm going to assume that there are none on that. And so I won't be looking for any today.

In the case of all minority statements, I need them by 5:00 pm Pacific Daylight Time which is midnight GMT, UTC, okay. So that that - then I can get them incorporated if there are any.

Let's go on to the next who is… for registry operations. The report done by Tim. He's already gone through and look for additional - any additional edits that are needed.

Have we included - I don't have it in front of me because I'm looking at the agenda. Tim, do we have any minority statements in there now?

Tim Ruiz: No, nothing - no, no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and does anyone want to submit a minority statement on that report? Okay. I'm going to put none down on that. So I'm assuming that one's done and ready to go.

Now, again, because the glitch last night and the report getting out with such short advanced notice because of the size of the file, if anybody changes their mind of anything, let me know in the next couple hours or after the meeting, so that I won't just finish it off okay. Via e-mail would be fine and include it. But I'll assume none on that.

Okay, let's go to ICANN. ICANN and IANA related names, Tim's already regone through that one. Let's see. Do we have any minority statements in that one? I think we do, don't we? Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yes, there are two.

Chuck Gomes: There are two. And they're already in, right?

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That's from Avri and Mike…

Man: Mike Palage.

Chuck Gomes: and Mike Palage, right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And I've just sent along another one.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And so, who was that? That was Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I got it after I thought of that.

                 Okay. All right, so I'll look for yours then. And what I'm doing on my
                 note is identifying who's sending one. So for some reason, I don't
                 receive it I'll raise a flag. So I'm - thank you, Mike.

                 Anybody else wants to send one on that one?

                 Okay. And notice what we're doing with the minority statements.
                 They're going right underneath the - after any general comments, after
                 the table of recommendation. So they are now.

Tim Denton, make sure we get those in the report that's in the appendix as well. Okay, so…

Tim Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …they should - they need to go two places.

Tim Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And if you'll help me on that one…

Tim Denton: No, I'm keeping track.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, anything else on ICANN and IANA related name? All right. Going then to other names reserved at the second level, now this one I have a concern about because I ended up having to make some changes. And we don't have anybody from that group on the call. So that's not going to be very good.

Let me tell this to the group what I did on this one. That was - if you can look at the recommendations for - in fact, we probably better take a few minutes and look at the recommendations. So if you'll go to Section 4 of the report, I'll give you a page number in just a minute.

In the recommendations regarding other reserved names starting on Page 17 of the report, okay, because they weren't on the call for the full call on Monday, and nobody took the lead this week in making adjustments after our discussion on Monday, I went ahead and did it and sent it around and received no comments on it from - not from anybody in the subgroup of anybody else.

But, one other thing they had in their recommendation that apparently the three of them had agreed for this category, they referred several times as sponsored TLD. In the new TLD process, there's really not going to be an emphasis on sponsors and unsponsored.

So I took out the references to sponsored. Now, I did talked to (Caroline) on what I did because she called me up yesterday from being on vacation, and she was okay with the changes. And I said, nobody was on the call. But, Mike Rodenbaugh, you're on the call, so you can…

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Right).

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry about that. I was thinking of different people. And so maybe you can - have you read through the recommendations as I changed them, Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm looking at them now, Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Please let me know because I've been wanting. Now (Caroline) said she okay, but she hadn't talked to either you or Tamara.

Mike Rodenbaugh: As you know I was on vacation until the last evening as well trying to catch back up here.

And, you know, the reason that we did that was because we saw a distinction between at least the current fTLDs and gTLDs along this

line that, you know, fTLDs could have unique business models and such.

And I hear what you're saying that maybe there won't be an emphasis on sponsored and unsponsored as such…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No I think that's - I think that's pretty much a done fact with the…

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, no, I don't understand. But we are looking at things like community support, right, in order to differentiate.

Chuck Gomes: Well, in the new TLD you're process you're talking about.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. In cases where for example, a geographical, that's definitely the case. In the case where they might, you know, like (unintelligible) is an example of one where - and I think there's even something in the language that addresses those kinds of things.

So, yeah, that's correct in the evaluation on new TLDs, the selection process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Great.

Chuck Gomes: But…

Tamara: And yeah, and this is Tamara. I'm on here as well.

Chuck Gomes: Oh good, okay.

Tamara Reznik: And I'm looking at it right now along with you since I was on vacation for a bit as well. And I'm looking at Gregory's comment right now. Did this make it in, his recommendation?

Chuck Gomes: No. I sent Greg - In fact I didn't see his comments. What I saw was some issues he was raising. I didn't see a statement or…

Tamara Reznik: Well he had asked that language be placed at the beginning of Section C1.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Tamara Reznik: Was that added in?

Chuck Gomes: C1 in the background section. No, I don't think so. When did he ask that?

Tamara Reznik: March 13. And I see that you responded back to him but he still on it…

Chuck Gomes: And he has never responded back to my questions. I was trying to understand…

((Crosstalk))

Tamara Reznik: …your questions are really just challenging everything he's saying right?

Chuck Gomes: That's correct.

Tamara Reznik   Okay. But I don't know that that's…

Chuck Gomes: And I was trying to understand what was being done. He said he was uncomfortable.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I think I was…

Chuck Gomes: Oh good. Greg, you're on. Excellent.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I'm still not understanding what it is we're trying to accomplish with what you said, Greg. Can you help me out?

Greg Shatan: Sure. Well I think - you know, the issue here is what - I guess the root issue is whether or not these are reserved names. And the issue is whether these are functioning as reserved names because…

Chuck Gomes: But, let's put that aside for a second. Whether we call them reserved names or not, I still would like to understand what the goal is that you're trying to accomplish. I still, you know, I still haven't got a specific answer. And I saw you said that you weren't comfortable. But I - that's all I got.

Greg Shatan: Well, no. Well the goal here is if these are reserved names or if they are functioning as reserved names, then they should receive the same kind of oversights as the other reserved names that we have been dealing with them as working group.

Chuck Gomes: So which one of those categories should it be like because they're all different?

Greg Shatan: Well, I'm talking to oversight in a broad sense. I don't necessarily see them as being, you know, like any one category. I haven't, you know, frankly given the thought as to which category they would go in. You know, we've been dealing with them in the other category precisely because, you know, they don't quite necessarily fit simply into any one category. And but - so, you know, maybe they should be dealt with like controversial names, maybe like geographic and geopolitical names. That's - the question is…

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, this is Marilyn. Can I just - the question I understood - and let me just try this, Greg. You were just trying to have a stand - a stated and understood framework when names are put into a reserve category.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So that if they're going to be released and allocated, there would be process by which that happened and they wouldn't just either languished or somehow be subverted from reserve status into allocated status and there would be no awareness of it.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Or really, it's more vice versa which is…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: …that they wouldn't be subverted into reserve status without the sort of due consideration that other reserved names have got.

Chuck Gomes: No. Isn't…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Tamara Reznik: I mean, as Greg raised - I'm sorry. I'm just looking at things here. The Olympic, I mean the fact that they reserve Olympics, you don't think that that deserves the same consideration and as other reserved names. I mean, as all of you know, you know, several of you know, you know, I was approached by the registry by a premium and they pointed out with the registered trademark of another competitor. I mean, I think that name should have been given the same consideration as any other reserved names.

(Patrick):   Tamara, this is (Patrick). And I've already the issue with .travel on Olympic, and I think they're addressing that.

Tamara Reznik: Okay. Did you raise - did anybody raise, (Patrick), to raise to .travel the competitor's trademark that they asked me to buy?

(Patrick):   I don't know about that one specifically. So maybe if you want to send me something that off list.

Tamara Reznik: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Now, with regard to what Marilyn suggested and Greg, I think the middle section of the recommendation there where it has A, B, C, D…

Man: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: .I thought that that was I kind of accomplished what you were looking for with regard to, you know, just that they include some things that include even allocation plan like that. Did that not address that particular suggestion?

(Patrick): Let me look at that. I think…

Chuck Gomes: Now, maybe what would be helpful is if the three of you could - and the problem of it is this is our last meeting - we've got to get support from the full group on whatever we have here.

Tamara Reznik: Right. I guess I was just surprised (Greg's) statement didn't make it in.

And I would like to comment further, (Patrick), you know, it's wonderful that we're all in this committee and could raise the Olympic issue. And you personally could talk to the .travel people and work that out. And, you know, the fact that I, you know, realized that they approached me and specifically said "Hey, we have this reserve premium name that is a trademark of, you know, one of your competitors. They don't want it. We thought you might want to buy it." That's great, (Patrick), that I know you and you can raise that to them and, you know, I know them very well as well. But it doesn't fix the problem that those names never should have been placed on the premium list in the first place. How do make sure this doesn't happen…

((Crosstalk))

(Patrick):   Well, the problem is that these premium lists become reserve through it without any oversight of what's going on the list in particular. You know, .mobi - the concept of premium names was put forth by .mobi during the approval process but not the names on the list. And same thing with .travel…

Tamara Reznik: Right. I mean and for example…

((Crosstalk))

Tamara Reznik: …what was on their premium.

((Crosstalk))

(Patrick):   It becomes the matter of registry whim.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, you know, I'm not going to be able to spend a lot of time on this. But I do think that we - this issue of premium names and whether it creates a special category deserves more work. If only to gain some understanding and understand where the community broadly supports the registry having a lot of discretion and where the community thinks there need to be some clarity or transparency.

John Nevitt: Sorry to interrupt, Chuck. This is John Nevitt. I just joined.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Thanks, John.

Michael Palage: And this is Palage here as well, Chuck. I was - I had to take another call, so if you could maybe on the last 20 minutes…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me tell you we're looking accommodations regarding other reserved names. It's on Page 18 or 17 and it starts on the bottom of Page 17 and goes into Page 18 in the draft final report that was distributed.

Michael Palage: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: And because nobody from this particular subgroup was involved this particular week, I had actually do a rewrite of the thing. And one of the things I did is I took out references to sponsored since there's really not going to be focus on sponsored or unsponsored.

What we're talking about right now is Greg Shatan's recommendations that there should be some process or by which the names could be reserved in this category, you know, certain things like there should be allocation plan, other time limit, et cetera.

It can be really helpful if everybody on the call can look at the text that's in there now. Now, Marilyn just made a suggestion that there would be further work on this one rather than making this specific recommendation.

One of the simple things we can do was just say this category needs more work and then just show some of the discussion that have happened as a guide for that additional work. Now, what I'm asking right now is, you know, several people have - or just asking how many people would support that recommendation on this particular item.

Man: Or the alternative is to go with the recommendation as you drafted it, right, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: That's one…

((Crosstalk))

Man: Or we could make some minor changes to it in the…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Right. Yeah. Any of those except we can't spend too much because of…

Man: Right.

Chuck Gomes: … - we got t get it done in this meeting and we have lots more to cover.

Michael Palage: What - you said 17 through 18, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Pages 17 and 18.

Man: Recommendations regarding other reserved names, Mike.

Man: So I mean, Chuck, you know, I'm on this group as you know. Tim is on this subgroup.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Man: Actually personally, I'm fine with the recommendation as you drafted them. I believe you've heard from (Caroline) yesterday that she's fine with them. But I think if anything, you may want to add another statement from Tim or Greg or someone as a different position.

Chuck Gomes: Now, that's an option but we need to get the - you know, if there's fairly strong support in the group to leave it as is, and I'm not questioning that, okay. I have to write this without any input from the group, okay. If there's fairly strong feeling in the group to leave it as is and then have minority statements, that's fine. And that's what I'm trying to get a feel for right now.

So I - there's a couple of people are okay with it the (way) it is. There's some couple that aren't. I'd like to hear from the rest of you.

Tamara Reznik: Yeah. I have to give it a more careful read really before being able to say that I would be okay with this.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, we're actually out of point where you need to do that, like careful read.

Greg Shatan: You know, this is Greg. I mean I think that I would support a more work recommendation and…

Tamara Reznik: That's what I'm intending…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No, no, I kind of a - I assumed that from both of you. And that's fine. I just need to see do we have a leaning one way or another. S o I'd like to hear from other people as to where you're at on this one, because keep in mind, the recommendations going forward are going to be from the working group, not the subgroup.

Michael Palage: Okay, Chuck. I guess my question and this is - if you recall, this is the issue I raised on our very first call. This type of name classification, I never thought qualified as a reserved name in the first place. You know, to me, a reserved name is something that ICANN says that you can't allocate. It appears in the ICANN contract.

Chuck Gomes: Now, rather than going back and rehashing the…

((Crosstalk))

Michael Palage: Well, the point here - okay. My statement being is if we are going to do more work, right, I'm not opposed to someone doing more work, but I don't want this to be considered more work under the reserved names because I don't think it ever deserved to be here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Michael Palage: So if we want to sit there and look at this as Marilyn has suggested, I don't mind doing that, but I don't want it to continue in the 30-day work that we're going to do with reserved names if our work gets extended.

Chuck Gomes: So, Mike, I think you're suggesting a third…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …that could be considered, and that is more work is needed but it shouldn't come under that statement of work for this group. Is that correct?

Michael Palage: Yeah. You know, I think what Tamara and I think Greg are talking about is there needs to be work regarding, you know, the, you know, what scope a registry has in, you know, allocating these things.

And personally where I have agreed with both Tamara and Greg is I think this really does come more under - along the lines of what the protecting the rights of other does, because that to me I think is their primary focus. You know, if in fact one finds their trademark on a list of a company that's trying allocate it, that's where you need to sit there and look at, you know, what mechanisms are going to be in play to get it off. And if you can't get if off, how ling do you have to wait until the registry decides to allocate, not allocate.

You know, I really do think this class is really, you know, more of protecting the rights of others and not, you know, it's not in this scope of work.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I think it kind of falls across both. And I think if you look the background section for this Section C begins with at least before I edited it or try to edit it, therefore, the names fall outside the remit of this particular group, I would say arguably fall outside the result of this particular working group.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, would you send those - for some reasons, those got missed the part in the background section and…

Greg Shatan: That was at the beginning of our email trail if you look at them.

Chuck Gomes: That was specifically in Section 1 of the background.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, yeah, yeah. There was a specific edit that was proposed there.

Chuck Gomes: I missed that.

Greg Shatan: And then we went off on our rather more high-flown abstract discussion. But it was all grounded in a concrete proposal to put particular language in a particular place in the document.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I'll have to go back and look at that because I…

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …missed that obviously.

Greg Shatan: So there's really two pieces to this such as how are these names reserved and how, if at all, are they allocated. And in a sense, Mike, what I'm - I'm trying to get this to agree with you more in a sense that if they are truly allocated and allocated, you know, and both the intent and effective that they're allocated and maybe they're not reserved names.

But if they're never allocated and there's no methodology by which they're allocated, they become reserved names but without any of the

contractual process really touching them which is - so I would like them to be more one or the other or maybe even just more both in a sense that they need to be more transparency at the contractual stage regarding what these names are what names will become - will be taken out of circulation and also how they will be out back into circulation and therefore not act like reserved names.

Michael Palage: And then, I put it this way. I agree with you that a registry should not use a reservation, you know, they should be clear on what they're going to, either we're going to allocate this and this is what we're going to do, you know, or - is tough because as I said, I just - it's the tag of reservation that just has caused me so much concern because it's…

Chuck Gomes: I'd like to hear from other people that haven't spoke on this one and then I'll probably make a command decision here shortly.

Victoria McEvedy: This is Victoria.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Look, I'm not sure that I'm entirely following the proposal here, but am I - do I take it correctly that this is really a suggestion that any registry can unilaterally that's on discretion without sort of (the said) criteria decide to restrict reserved names? Is that really what the suggestion is in this part of the report?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think that's in the recommendation, no. I think though the concern is that there should be some information that's provided if a registry does decide to reserve some names for its own business model or for whatever reason that there should be some, you know,

process to that, some communication like Mike was just saying about what they're going to do and some details about that.

Tamara Reznik: But that - actually, Chuck, that's not what your recommendation in here says. What your recommendation in here says is the presented approach could include. It doesn't say the presented approach should include.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I would object to things should include. I don't - I mean, if we're going to go with this recommendation and we shouldn't be putting should and must into it. And if we're going to do that then I would support Mike and that was just, you know, suggest what further work needs to be done outside of the reserved names.

Tamara Reznik: Okay. But let's just be clear that if doesn't say "should include," then Victoria is correct. We are just saying they should be able to propose whatever they want as reserve premium name, you know, know…

Tim Ruiz: I don't think that way at all. I think it more like we're saying this just needs to be looked at and here are some things that could be included as the GNSO community on new gTLD…

Tamara Reznik: But we are saying should. We are not saying should. So I mean, essentially we're saying they can do whatever they want.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean I…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: …can look at it and make decision. Right.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean I certainly would just add that I think maybe I need to submit a minority statement on that because I would have thought really someone would need to look quite carefully at the kind of procedures, the challenge to make sure that, you know, there are sort of, you know, arbitrary decisions and freedom of expression concerns here and so forth. And there weren't be any obligation vis-à-vis registries to, you know, consumers. So they may have a difficulty challenging decisions if we don't make it - if we don't sort of include a strong focus on that. And perhaps it should be a requirement.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes. It's Mike Rodenbaugh. And I want to clarify my comment earlier. I actually agree with Tamara that word should say "should" or "must" rather than "could" in order for me to accept it. I think that that is the majority view of our subgroup as the three of us, Tamara and I feel that way.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody else new wants to speak up on this one?

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, it's Alistair. I think I would certainly support further work on this topic.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And further work and maybe a group outside of this group.

Alistair Dixon: That would be fine.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay.

Anybody else new want to jump in?

Okay. Then I think what we ought to do on this one is - is anybody opposed to recommending further work but by a group separate than this group?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I would support this being worked on by, you know, further work being done by this group in conjunction with another group. But I don't necessary see is it as one that we should just wash our hands off.

Man: I agree with Greg. We've already done (further) a work on this.

Woman: I will support that as well.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I don't see why we'd not continue to finish it out.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. It would seem bad to start over. Why couldn't you propose to conclude the recommendation using this group?

Chuck Gomes: Well, If can do it in 30 days.

Marilyn Cade: It sounds to me like it could be done in 30 days.

Tamara Reznik: I mean, I don't think another group starting over could more easily do it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Keep it - and the reason I asked that question -- could have done 30 days -- if this is the only thing we're working on, that would probably be the case. I suspect there's going to be (unintelligible) that that they may obviously work on, and that makes a different ball game.

But I'm - so I'm hearing - anybody else wants to comment before I wrap this one up?

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, can I just clarify my comment? I'm certainly happy for it to be done by this group if we give another 30 days.

Chuck Gomes: All right. So I won't specify by - I'll just say additional work and then - what I would like to request is because we obviously have quite a few opinions, some are in sync with one another, some are in different opinion. Could I ask each of you that spoke on this with an opinion to submit a minority statement that we can include with this that would just kind of support why we didn't come to a decision and what the issues are so that it's clear to the council and others that look as to what work needs to be done? Is that okay?

Now, in other words, I'm looking for statements from Greg and from Tamara and from Mike Rodenbaugh and Mike Palage and from (Tim Ruiz and Victoria.

What's that?

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: …again, Chuck, I think we, you know, again, we have a majority view from our subgroups I believe, although it might not be perfectly refined. I do believe Tamara and I are in sync. So…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. But we don't have - I don't think we have a majority from the whole group, Mike.

Marilyn Cade Chuck, I have to drop off. Do you want me to - I hook up to you…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Sure, Marilyn. You can do that. Keep in mind I need those before 5:00 pm, Pacific Time.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to write it on my Blackberry. Thank you so much. Got to go. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thanks, Marilyn. Have a good day.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Chuck, this is Greg. I guess your point is that there is no clear majority within the working group as a whole.

Chuck Gomes: Right. That's right.

Greg Shatan: Even though, the subgroup has a majority view and therefore, there is an essence no majority statement but only a collection of kind of minority or pluralities statement.

Chuck Gomes: Now, one thing I would certainly welcome if the three of you can do it and are willing to do it, is to take the recommendations that I did on my own just because nobody else was working on it and redraft them. And we'll put that in the thing as this is what the three members of the subgroup recommended. And then we can just there was not - there was mixed support from the full group, and so we recommend work.

Does that make sense?

Tamara Reznik: I'm confused with that.

Man: Let me take a stab, Chuck, and see if we got it right. And Tamara and I could certainly work on it later this afternoon after the council call.

Basically take your draft, make it how we would like as our majority…

Chuck Gomes: You can ignore my draft. I basically reworded some things that you wrote. You can start from scratch for all I care. And I don't mean that cynically. I'm saying you write what you three agree to and we'll put it in the report. It won't be a recommendation from the working group…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …but it would be guidelines for any further work that might happen.

Man: Understood. Well unfortunately (Caroline) is out, so it won't be all three of us.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That's right. Yeah. Well, I'm okay if it's from others. The point is that I'm more than happy to have that in there. In fact, I think it's good to have it in there. And I'm glad you guys are on the call. It was an awkward situation this week on this one.

Avri Doria: Chuck, this is Avri. I missed part of this, but can I make one comment?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Avri Doria: Okay. The one comment I'd make is - and I don't you to rehash what I didn't hear and didn't understand. But since so there's so many views, if we continue working on it, I think that the different views need to get represented in the subgroup I think on anything, not just this one and as I say I don't know the issues. On any of these that we do more work on, we need to rethink our subgroups so that they have the differing opinions so that they can hash it out.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well said, Avri. In fact, I've been thinking about. If we are extending for 30 days, I think it's very important for - on the topics that we do continue working to reformulate the groups, so that there's broader representation in them.

                I think that's a point well taken. And that will make the whole thing even more effective.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I assume we'll have fewer groups because some of these…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: …are not going to need the 30 days.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Third level may not.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. You're right. And in fact, it may be just, you know, so yeah, I think you're absolutely right, Greg.

So any other comments or questions in this? If you guys will send me the statement then that you agree on as far as recommendations, I will just, you know, we'll just change the wording. Tim and I will change the wordings so that it says that it's, you know, more work is recommended, and see that guide - see the discussion notes below for guidelines in that regard and then we'll have minority statement.

If in the recommendation - and by the way, several of you - let's see. Tamara and Mike Rodenbaugh it's in your recommendation that kind of covers your concerns. You don't necessarily have to submit a separate minority statement, but you're welcome to do that too.

Tamara Reznik: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? All right, well let's move on.

And the next category is controversial names. And we have a little mix-up there, probably my fault. I apparently used the wrong document.

Tim, you've already sent me the correct document. I think we had agreed on the recommendation ,so it's just the matter of getting the right document in there. Do you agree with that?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, exactly. My only - my main concern was just that we were - I thought we have intended to quote verbatim from the new gTLD draft report. And but then the verbatim quote was edited.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: No, I don't recall that happened, you know.

Chuck Gomes: Who edited that? Did I edit that? I didn't edit that.

Tim Ruiz: I don't know. I don't recall seeing it before.

Avri Doria: Yeah - no, I think - this is Avri. I think the only time it was edited Marilyn did make some edits to it that I didn't carry through. But I don't know, Tim, whether you picked up and combining Marilyn's and at my latest one. You may have picked up her edits to that.

I noticed when I noticed her edits that they were (unintelligible) direct quote. I didn't put them in.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. Because the one I looked at this morning that I thought sent.

Avri Doria: Right, yeah. And so but if somebody picked up Marilyn's version, she went through and corrected the - I mean the question she made, made sense, but they made it no longer a quote.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yeah, I'll let you guys - if you guys can send Tim and what you - in fact, he was going send it to the whole list, send us what needs to go in there.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm just going to look.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: You don't have any problem was me moving the three personal statements down to the recommendation section, did you?

Avri Doria: I don't have any issue with it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I thought they fit better down there than they did up on the background. And they kind of go really close in-hand with your recommendation which I thought was very supportive of the solution you came up with.

Avri Doria: No, (unintelligible) to you in the beginning. But if you're going else, (unintelligible) it doesn't matter.

Chuck Gomes: And why is that?

Avri Doria: Just because I thought that they would clarify some of the examples and also that, you know, we didn't go through very detailed material later which is by way of example. And (unintelligible) - they hardly just got lost and where they're quite important to the relevance of the material that follows.

Chuck Gomes: But personal statements really aren't - didn't seem to me like they're part of the backgrounds. And I thought the personal statements really tied in nicely with the recommendation.

And plus the recommendation section is where we have statements from other people -- personal minority statements, et cetera, so…

Avri Doria: As long as they were in it, it's the main thing obviously I think so. I mean, fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Now again if the subgroup wants them atop, I have no problem with that, okay? You just let me know. But again I've got to finish that today so.

Avri Doria: And, Tim, I just heard you completely on it since I won't have the ability to edit, so.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. And I don't…

Avri Doria: Whatever you think is right is right.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. I think they're fine where they are.

And, Chuck…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: They are meaning the recommendation section or the - in the top, in the background.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: The comments, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. What did you say?

Tim Ruiz: We were talking about the comments, right, where they…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, the personal comment.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think they're fine where they're at.

Chuck Gomes: Where they're at is where? I'm just trying - in the background or in the recommendation?

Tim Ruiz: On your draft report.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay, all right. That's all. I what to make sure that I wasn't misunderstanding.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Now, is there any body that would like - now we pretty much talked through the recommendations on Monday, but is there anybody that wants to have a minority statement? And I'm looking at the three statements in there as minority statements. Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: I've already submitted the minority statements; that hasn't gone on yet.

Chuck Gomes: And so - all right. Would you send that to me again please, Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Sure. I think you gave me comments on it, so I know you've got it. But I can…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh I did get that, but I never heard back from you on my last question, I thought.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh, okay. No - okay.

Chuck Gomes: So go ahead, send me whatever you want and I'm not going to change it, okay? I had just asked some questions to think through, and you're welcome to say exactly what you want to say there, okay?

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: So I'm looking for one then from Victoria on that one. Okay? Very good. And it is probably just whatever last version you want and I'll accept that, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else?

Okay, geographic and geopolitical.

Tim Ruiz: Hey, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tim Ruiz: So this is Time. I'm going to have to drop off now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Tim. Thanks.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, you bet.

Chuck Gomes: Now geographic and geopolitical, Mike Palage, are you still on?

Michael Palage: I'm here, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Now you had said you were going to send a paragraph or two on that one…

Michael Palage: Didn't just - none enough of time in a day.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's all right. I don't think it really…

Michael Palage: Yeah, I was just trying to be more of a perfectionist since I read about…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Michael Palage: …three inches of those documents.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Michael Palage: I wanted to put maybe a sentence or two.

Chuck Gomes: Now, and so Tim's edited that one. I think it's in pretty clean shape. We didn't get to talk through - we didn't see that a written version of this, so maybe we ought to just quickly look at those recommendations and just as quickly as we can here. And I'm scrolling up to where that is.

Geographic. It'd be nice we have our table of contents then, huh. So I'm just trying to find - okay, there's…

Anybody finds the page number…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …I do, let me know.

Alistair Dixon: Fourteen.

Chuck Gomes: Page 14?

Alistair Dixon: Oh no, sorry. Fifteen.

Chuck Gomes: Fifteen. Okay, I'm down too far.

So, (format). Okay, I'm coming.

Okay, yeah I tried after - and so yeah, okay. So it starts on Page 15 here.

Now, the recommendations are on a different format. There's a few cases where the table format really didn't help much and so we didn't even try to fit it, squeeze it in that because it didn't add any value.

If you have that, please take a look at that. Mike, why don't you kind of give a synopsis of what your subgroup decided, how they decided to approach this?

Michael Palage: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: In terms of your recommendations.

Michael Palage: What we did is we basically looked at all the work that has been done in other international (fora) regarding this topic. It has been rather extensive to say the least.

And what the group tried to do in our recommendations here is basically set forth the recommendation that registries should comply with the local - with not only their local laws, but in the case of those countries that have supported the WIPO recommendations on the protection of country names, they should undertake those extra steps as well.

So that was the approach that we were trying to do. And f that is exactly what sort of is embodied in these final recommendations here.

So instead of trying to come up whit the universal policy that will apply to all ICANN accredited registries, it might potentially crate conflicts, what we have done is we have just said those countries that have

adopted these guidelines they should modify their ICANN contracts to incorporate those protections.

That's our - that's base of our recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: And did you see that comment from Dr. (Lou) who's a member of our group but because he's in - I did not - in the Fareast, he's unable to join our meeting.

Take a look at that. I also sent a response on the list.

Michael Palage: Where is that? That's on the…

Chuck Gomes: He basically -it's on our list.

Michael Palage: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: …our mailing list. And he probably - he's basically saying that he supports the language that's in the current TLD contracts that have this that basically says the names will be reserved geographical identifies in both ASCII and IDN versions.

And I responded to him and pointed out to him that's the recommendation that it appears to be going forward and but that, you know, I encouraged him to continue to participate on the process through the common period, et cetera.

Michael Palage: And one of the things we've done as well is if you look at be the current GAC draft principles that we're not supposed to articulate, but one of the things that they call for is, if you will, an absolute right to have it

blocked or to have it block for free or allow, if you will, the registrations to the country.

And if you look at the recommendations that the standing committee that WIPO has done, if you will, they're inconsistent. It's actually they're proposing the potential broader expense.

And one of the things that we've asked and our group has asked the supplemental question is, you know, there's about 7 inches worth of documentations by 178 member nations that had undergone a very extensive consultation process regarding the protection of country names. And that is whey we're using that as our basis as opposed to recommendations.

Again, if there's something else that we have not known, you know, we're asking the GAC to provide that information. And as Marilyn has noted, since these are only draft documents that, you know, that particular recommendation may in fact drop out.

So that's, you know, that's what we've tried to do is to go with the most documented recommendations by member states by the - probably the most authoritative body on this subject.

Chuck Gomes: And then following up of what you said, Mike, something you referred to this a couple of minutes ago, if you look - if everybody looks at the last paragraph which it says if any of the above recommendations are not supported of the community is recommended that further consultation with WIPO, the ccNSO and the GAC be conducted as described in the following section consultation with experts. And they

actually inserted some good questions for those groups in their section on the - on consultation with experts.

So I probably - that needs to be - Tim Denton, let's - I need to fix that, I need to tweak that a little bit. It was just cut and paste it obviously and there's the next section isn't consultation with experts in this particular…

Man: Chuck, give me the…

Chuck Gomes: At the bottom of Page 15. The very last paragraph there. Well I just marked in yellow on mine. Let's remember to fix that because the wording works fine and the subgroup report.

Man: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Then next section in the main report isn't that in this part of the report. So I just need the tweak the language a little bit.

Man: Got it. Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, any questions or comments on this one?

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, can I be in the queue please. It's Alistair.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Alistair. And then who else was there?

Mike Palage: That was just Mike.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Mike, you wan back in.

Michael Palage: Let Alistair go. I just…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, Alistair go ahead.

Alistair Dixon: I had sort of a question/comment. It seemed to me that at least as far as the country (names) and perhaps some geographic identifiers that the PDP05 recommendation that where they was contingent either a string, preference would be given to a string where there was a community support.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Alistair Dixon: It seems to me a country or perhaps a region might be a community support. So for example if you had say you had say .dot New Zealand and you had the New Zealand government versus the registry base in Wichita, probably preference would be given to the New Zealand government for that string.

So I'm just wondering how that is incorporated into this recommendation?

Chuck Gomes: Well, it wouldn't necessary to be incorporated in these recommendations, but I think it's the issue has been dealt with in the new TLD report in that regard. And even the new TLD isn't recommending that the names be reserved, but if there is a specific community associated with the particular name that the recommendation I think that's pretty strong in the group right, the new PDP group is that, you know, they should be able to show some support and certainly not opposition from our community.

Alistair Dixon: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But I don't think that that necessarily fits in directly with what we're doing.

Michael Palage: Hey, Chuck, this is Mike. I mean I fully agree with the scenario that you had outlined there,. Alistair. I fully agree with it. But I think what Chuck was saying we took a very narrow focus on what our recommendations were. And, you know, perhaps as part of the new TLD process, they will be able to use our recommendations here as one building block in, if you will, the overall scheme of what you were just referring to.

So we view - what we've done here is one building block to achieve that goal, but we wanted to stay very narrowly focused on what we were doing in this group.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense, Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, I think. Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And - so okay, good.

Does anybody want to submit a minority statement on this one?

Okay, I won't look for any on that one. Let's go to names reserve with the third level.

Michael Palage: If you can, Chuck, the one thing that I just sent to the list is just the new registry for new gTLDs, just striking that language and just - because that was the one thing we wanted just to be for…

Chuck Gomes: Oh, yeah. Thanks for sending that, Mike. You sent it to me - okay, let me write myself a note on this one.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Last paragraph and the fix the new TLD remark. Yeah and what he's talking about there is I had restricted the new TLDs. Mike thought that was too restrictive. And let me just highlight. That's just…

Michael Palage: I think it was only - I think that was only in the second. And again…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …part third too, Mike.

Michael Palage: Oh, it is in the third? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I jus thought there. I'm just going to highlight in yellow on mine so that I get that, yeah.

Michael Palage: And again for the group, for the whole group, one of the things that Avri, John and I were talking about here was just trying to if you will recognize the sovereign rights of governments to regulate businesses, incorporate it under their law. So we didn't want to - we wanted to try to create a scenario where ICANN was trying to use its PDPs to (trump) national authority.

So that is why these proposals are written in a fashion that we think, you know, is a mutual win-win. So, thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks for the work.

All right, recommendations at the third level. Now, Greg, that's - you're the lead on that. But I think that yours is pretty much stayed intact, did it not?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …with the group?

Greg Shatan: Yes, I submit as a draft on the 12th. I just cleaned up - in Section B1, I just cleaned up a little bit how the prohibited third level label were described to make - to show more clearly which…

Chuck Gomes: Now, is that a change you did since that's different than what's in the final report? Or is that before we did the final report?

Greg Shatan: That was before we did the final report.

Chuck Gomes: So the final report is okay?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good, good.

Greg Shatan: I'm happy with the final report.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I just want to make sure because it was a credit challenge getting it all together. And I'm sure there's plenty of places…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I'll just double check that.

Chuck Gomes: …I don't want to make - yes, please do and let me know…

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …if there's any problem there.

Is - does anybody want to send - submit a minority statement on this one?

Okay, let's go to single and two-character labels. And, Mike Rodenbaugh, you're on here. This is another one I think where there are some mix-up in terms of whether we got the lightest version or not.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Certainly, we did not.

Chuck Gomes: We did not.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let's make sure we do get the latest version.

Man: Chuck, I did send right before the call to you and to Tim the correct version that would be in for single ASCII letters and single IDN characters. And, Mike, if there's another version that's something that we've missed you can let me know. But I think that what they received was the version of March 13 to late…

Chuck Gomes: March 13, these three?

Man: I believe so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Man: Just a little…

Man: Okay, that's fine what's in the draft final that Chuck sent around is - did not correspond to the recommendations that you sent. And I believe they're also were some, yeah so you have minority positions.

Man: You're minority position was picked up.

Man: One of them was, yes. I thought actually suggested three that evening and I'm not sure that all of those were incorporated…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So do we now have what we need at the correct version?

Man: I'm not certain in that, Chuck. So I've just sent to (Patrick) again the version that or some things, and I think (Patrick) and I are going to need to talk about that and obviously…

Chuck Gomes: Would you please get back to me hopefully a lot before 5:00 because I can't leave everything until after five5:00?

Man: This is a really difficult day for me so, you know, maybe I'll try while I'm on the call to resolve this. But this is sort of the worst of all possible days.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, well, Mike - is it possible that Mike can resolve it and…

Mike Palage: I think can, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …maybe working with Alistair. And if Alistair and Mike can make = again we just want to make sure we have what's correct.

Man: Just clarify that you guys…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …there was nothing administer about getting the wrong one.

Man: Oh, we understand that.

Man: I know. But we've already - I've already sent the correct recommendations for the two that I mention. So if there's other changes that these may not be changes that the whole subgroup agreed earlier this week.

Alistair Dixon: My recollection was that it was I think a different recommendation for - this is related to the top level and for two letters at the top level that I alluded to the areas that I can recall.

Man: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I recall that in Mike's minority position on the two letters at the top level.

Man: And Mike's minority position has been added.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Man: And the corrected text for single ASCII and single IDN characters has been sent to Tim and to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now does anyone want to submit any additional minority statements? And, Mike, if there's some that aren't in there that need to be in there, please send them to us, okay?

Michael Palage: Yes. We have also some additional background information to go into the single letter TLD section that was not included, so I'll make sure…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We'll just - get that stuff to us as soon as possible.

Any minority statements on this on any of these they've actually broken it down into several subcategories and…

Michael Palage: Unfortunately nobody seen the current recommendation, so we need to get those out.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, we talked about them on Monday.

Man: No, we've actually changed them since then, so.

Chuck Gomes: Well, that was…

Man: Mike…

Chuck Gomes: …a problem in the approach because that's one of my concerns when we get down to this late and after the group has already talked about it and then changes are made. Then I guess what you need to do is send the recommendation, just the recommendation.

Mike Palage: All right.

Man: Mike, just to clarify, the recommendations that are currently in the table that Chuck sent, the only one that are appeared to be incorrect to me are single ASCII letters and single IDN character. And I've already sent the corrected text that should be there.

Chuck Gomes: And what are the changes?

Man: May I read them? I have them in front of me.

We -in relation to March 13 Redline Document 1 that he sent, we recommend that further work be done to confirm that single ASCII letter be allowed at the top level.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, I tweak that wording a little bit because I didn't think it was worded effectively. I think the gist is still the same. The - and I don't think I changed any of the intent of the content.

Man: What did you suggest?

Chuck Gomes: Let me go down to go - what is that, down or up? Let's see. It's a huge document. Let me find out...

Man: Are you talking Page 11, Chuck?

Man: Yeah, I'm heading back there. Let's see. (Unintelligible) the reserve, I think going up. We were on…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: … - okay, symbol was okay. The single character names, what I like for example the top level, I think I changed that we recommend that further work be done before single ASCII letter TLDs are considered.

Man: Again, well we…

Chuck Gomes: Confirming, you know, I'm not - it didn't seem to - and then for numbers, we recommend that further work be done on single numbers at the top level. There may be technical issues and that some programs may - I think that didn't change.

And then at IDN we recommend that further work be done before considering single character IDN-TLDs.

Man: So I mean in my view you're saying that as in your draft Table 4.3 single letters is really use to just it should be. We recommend that further work be done before single letters are considered. That is the material difference than a recommendation that our group unanimously agreed on.

Chuck Gomes: Just give me your wording again.

Man: Basically…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I wasn't trying to change your intent but…

Man: I understand that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: They just meant we recommend that further work be done to confirm that single ASCII letters to be allowed at the top level.

Chuck Gomes: See it doesn't make sense to me, Mike, to say that confirm that they be allowed. They're not allowed now so, what are we confirming?

Mike Palage: Well, actually, Chuck, there's no provision on them now.

Chuck Gomes: There are - oh, and…

Mike Palage: There is not any provision on them right now.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Okay. So what…

Mike Palage: There may be a practice. There was once - it was once applied for (.I) and it was rejected. But there is no (RC) or any other rule...

Chuck Gomes: But what is being confirmed? That wasn't what is clear to me in your statement.

Mike Palage: Well, and that's exactly been my point. And the focus of intents to date in our subgroup that, you know, since they're confirming as they can be allowed because there's no reason to disallow them.

Man: I think, Chuck, the point is the group basically I think considered that there is probably should be a presumption for allowing the TLDs to be released.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay. I understand that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: …the work is required to actually confirm that there are no issues. Because one (unintelligible) the subgroup has raised the issues that there may be technical issues that has yet to be identified by anybody.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay.

Mike Palage: And, Chuck, this Mike. I think Alistair I think…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I got it.

Mike Palage: …very well articulated in my view that there should be a - there is nothing - there should be a presumption unless the technical community can come forward and document their concern. Because there right now is no provision I think is Mike is…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay. And by the way, I'm okay with all that. I just - my suggestion is then and what you send out, say what's being confirmed because that didn't - what are we confirming. If you're confirming that they are okay that there are no technical problems, say confirm that there no technical problem.

Man: Perfect. I like that.

Chuck Gomes: That what's you're trying to say. That's what drew me when I read and that's I why it tried to tweak it. And if you'll send out what you want I think you understand where I coming from anyway.

Man: Can I - I'd like to add one sort of grammatical point here which actually turns on meaning. When you guys say, we - the actual letters, the actual word I see before me is "we recommend that further word be done to confirm that single ASCII," and here comes "letter be allowed at the top level."

Man: It's a typo. It's just letters.

Man: Letters.

Chuck Gomes: And I think that was another tweak I made to your recommendation. I actually said before single ASCII letter TLDs. Okay.

Man: Which is better.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Man: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So some of the tweak were just to make it really clear there that are considered - I understand your concern there better now and what I did was didn't really fit. So, I think we've got this, is that right? So, that you guys would send me what you've got. And send it to the whole list. And let me encourage everybody unfortunately, we're going to have to do it via email so, if you decide after you see that you want to submit them an minority position, let me know and get it to me before 5:00 Pacific midnight UTC. Okay?

Man: So, this is probably one that's going to generate a minority position from Marilyn since she dropped off the call. Because I know that the language that we submitted referred about a hard (unintelligible) compromise. And if we're going to change it, she'll I want to send in minority position.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Why don't you and maybe, Mike Rodenbaugh, if you could send out - why don't you get this sent out? You might want to send this (unintelligible) to Marilyn and say, "Hey, Marilyn look at this if you want to send a minority, please do so," so that she knows.

                I really can't be looking at additional things added to the document tomorrow morning.

Man: And likewise, then with the IDN if, it with the same (thrust) I take it. I
                think we recommended further work be done. This is - I'm n reading
                what (Patrick Jones) sent me to confirm that single character IDN-
                TLDs be allowed at the top level.

                This is also an area that can be address by the IDN working group.
                This is consistent with what the group is talking. Is it consistent with
                your decisions?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And my wording again I had trouble with the word "confirm"
                because they didn't say what was being confirmed.

Man: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Fix out on the same way as up above.

Man: Excellent. Good. I feel relieved, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: Can I just make a comment on that? We actually did discuss this issue
                in the IDN working group. And the IDN working group or at least Ram
                did, that's an issue for those names with (Kurt).

                And but basically yeah, I mean I did actually ask the question. So, I
                think we can actually do it and I can - I mean if necessary, I can just
                consult with Ram and (Carrie) and people like that.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Sure. Okay.

All right, anything else on this one? And again, because we haven't got the final language in front of us, or at least not all of us, if somebody decides later to do a minority position, just do it in the time constraints that we have.

So, Mike Rodenbaugh and Alistair, the sooner you can get that stuff our so that they can meet my deadline with minority statement, that would be much appreciated.

Are there any - at this stage and what you understand, is there anybody that thinks they may want to spend a minority position?

Alistair Dixon: Are we just looking single character at the moment, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Any of the subcategories…

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon My understanding is that as Mike had a minority which I can't see there on list is only at the top level.

Man: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Two letters? Yeah, that's in there, isn't it?

Man: Yeah.

Man: Yeah. It's in there.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Make sure it stays there. Okay. So, I think we already got that one.

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You know, sorry, I didn't (unintelligible) down. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. If you don't, let me know. Yeah, it's underneath that table.

Man: It's on Page 12. Bottom of Page 12.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay.

Anything else on single letter and two-character?

Okay, let's move on, on the agenda. I know were taking a lot of time in those but it was needed time, and so I won't complain about that.

The next item on the agenda, I did send it out via email of a couple of days ago, (Cristina Rosette) sent a message to me from - saying that she was aware that there some issues that may overlap with the pro-working. And so what I just like to do is to suggest that those of you that are in those subgroup categories, if you could communicate with (Cristina) any information, maybe summarize what issues there that may overlap in that group, that would be good information for that

working group. And I think there's two or three groups where that might come into play.

Certainly, the other reservations at the second, and what was the other one that comes to mind, blank - oh, yeah other - I guess mainly other reservations to the second level. Was there another one?

Did yours, Greg - I don't think he's got into that at on the pro-working group.

Greg Shatan: No. For better or worse it did not.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: And I did confirm that the report in the final group. And the final is what I expected…

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. That's nice to hear.

Okay, now let's go to the final - the full report. And we don't have a lot of time but I'd like to kind - well first of all let me suggest like I did in my email that unfortunately you didn't get until this morning - later this morning, that you certainly look at the role section which is down in Section 3. There's a table there that summarizes the roles.

Now, it's not pure cut and paste in all cases because in some cases some of the text that's in the actual report wasn't necessary to define the role on little more concise way here. But please check that make sure that what's done is consistent with what you're group did for the

ones that you were involved in. You're certainly welcome if you have time to look at all of them and make sure.

But in most cases there were just cut and paste in a couple cases, the role was described in quite a bit more detail and some of it didn't seem necessary in this little summary table. So, please look at that. And also as we've been doing it's very important that at the recommendations not only in your report in the appropriate appendix but in the recommendations tables or text that define them in Section 4 of the report, make sure that we - that it's all captured correctly.

Now obviously there's a couple of them that open right now that are going to need to be fixed a single and two character and the controversial. So, well get that and we'll get the table synched up with the reports on the back.

The - I also suggested - now some - if any of look at the previous draft I sent, lot of the basic language hasn't changed other than minor edits in the draft report. But obviously we've added all the details that weren't in there before.

The - one of the things I would like to call attention to is Table 4-3 regarding single character that we kind of already talked about. But at the third level, I put question marks for more work. I don't - I couldn't come to a conclusion and myself whether we really want more work or not on that at the third level.

Do any of you on that group have any thoughts there?

You think more work is needed single letters at the third level or is that some thing we even need to worry about?

Man: I don't think so because (unintelligible) to the others.

Chuck Gomes: I'm kind of okay with that, but I thought, you know, I was grappling a little bit. Do you think maybe a no is okay there?

Anybody oppose to that?

Okay, we'll just - I'll just, you know, I write myself a note and do that okay.

All right, that's fine. Going down the report, I did the same thing in the next table as well. But I assume is a no there to --- the two character that's third level.

Going on down past to reports then, the - or the recommendations - excuse me. If you get to Section 5, I don't think anything changed in that one. That's some suggested as possible, topics for the working group in a statement of work. We didn't get to those. And that short section is just communicating and suggesting at the end, you know, that the council could consider whether separate working groups that cover, any of those could be done. But we basically didn't have time to cover them.

And stop me at any point on this.

Section 6, reports for reserved name categories, this just explains a little bit about what was done. And then of course has the table that

shows which appendix each of the subgroup reports are located. So be aware your report is located. And please take a look at those reports. We've already found two where there obviously I was not working with the latest version. And so, we want to make sure that's right in that. So I appreciate on your checking on that.

One have change I did make which regard the consultation of experts I had previously had a table in there that was going to show which experts were consulted by each of the separate working groups. And maybe because it was late last night and I didn't see how it was going to done.

And it was pretty detailed job to go back and see where what experts people consulted. Then I also realize on some cases they didn't and that may look, you know, undesirable or something. So, I just left that out and suggested that they look in the individual reports to see what the experts were consulted

But I did want to call out your attention because that is the change I made in the version I sent a week or so ago in that kind of a template.

Now, Tim added Section 7. And I called out your attention in my email. Any comments on that, Tim Denton, do you want to just take a minute and tell what your intent was there?

Tim Denton: Yeah. My intention was perfectly clear I think. It's just that the…

Chuck Gomes: Some people may have not read that's why I'm asking.

Tim Denton: Oh, I see. Okay, basically, it says the following that we should as some names are reserved for technological reason, which are perfectly valid which may not be valid in the future that we keep an eye out for them. And that we - ICANN had an orderly process of thinking about how these justifications might be diminished overtime.

So, I said, "It is recommended that for names which continue to be reserve for technological reasons, ICANN should continue to monitor the rationales or keeping them reserved. We just put in place a process whereby names thus reserve would be released in an orderly manner as technological evolution permits."

Further work need to be done to consider whether (an orderly) process was consist. Just so that there's - it's not just about any particular name but about the process we should consider for technological change undermining this rationale.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, any questions or comments to Tim.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Quick comment.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. I think it's great.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Tim Denton: I fell out of my chair here.

Avri Doria: No, (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay.

Now, I didn't comment at the beginning of the report but Tim is going to add a table of contents to this thing which will make finding things easier. And, Tim, I think I had suggest so that maybe we should just have the major headings. But I think it would be good to have any tables listed in there if that's not too much.

Tim Denton: Headings and tables, (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Major headings and tables. Not subheading so much but major headings and tables would be very, very helpful I think.

And not only tables like in the recommendation section, probably every section whether it's a table or not should be in the table of contents to make those easy to find. And of course the appendices and forth. Does that makes sense?

Tim Denton: Say, again the last sentence?

Chuck Gomes: In the recommendation section, Section 4…

Tim Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …every section should be listed in the table of contents, whether it's a table or not.

In the recommendation sections of the report, most of them are tables.

Tim Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: But some are not.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Those should be included - the ones that aren't tabled should be included as well so that they're easy to find from a table of contents.

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's a critical section, right?

Tim Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, but tables everywhere too and elsewhere.

So, okay the - those are the kind of things like when the council is looking for that we can refer to them, you know, very quickly show them in the table of content for something else and take a look at this so they can see the page number and so forth. So that would be very helpful.

Tim will be drafting an executive summary. We're going to have to rely on people to watch the email list and get back to us. Tim, do you have a target when you can have a first draft of that available?

Tim Denton: I think the shorter the executive summary, the better. And…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it's going to be hard to provide any detail on the executive summary.

Tim Denton: Because basically, the - it may be in some sense that the table of contents pretty well substitutes for one. So, I'll do the table of contents first.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Denton: If it needs an executive summary at the end of that, I'll produce a brief as possible thing that can to - basically, I wanted to alert people to the major decisions and major categories.

Chuck Gomes: If I may suggest different approach and we can talk about it.

Tim Denton: Fine.

Chuck Gomes: I'd really like people to see the executive summary fairly early. And I think it's going to be fairly brief. So it might be better (unintelligible) shorter.

The second reason for that and maybe I'm wrong, that's why I'm throwing out for discussion. Table of contents, if you do it before we have some of the fixes in, that may complicate a little bit. What do you think about that?

You know, if we do cut and paste…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Denton: Since tables of content tend to be automated productions, they can be adjusted very quickly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, as long as you're comfortable with that I don't have any trouble with that…

Tim Denton: No, no, they're much easier because you just…

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Tim Denton: …automate them - you just automate their productions they are - ones they get the (formula) rate.

Chuck Gomes: Go for it. Go for it that way. But if you do do a brief executive summary…

Tim Denton: I've got to get that done before 4 o'clock anyway my time. And it's now half past 1.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good, thanks.

Okay. Now let me throw it open, and if nothing else at least scroll through the report and if anybody have any suggestions, comments, questions about the report?

Okay, it's been an incredible (bribe) guys. We will set some new records of getting this done and it's because of all of the hard work that all members of the group have done. And so, I you know, can't thank you enough for all of that.

John Nevitt: Hey, Chuck this is John I just want - and I'm not usually one who - I won't say what I was going to say. But I will say, you know, I will say the preface but I will say that I've been incredibly impressed with your leadership in this working group, and I wanted to thank you personally for all the time and effort you put into this.

Chuck Gomes: Well, thank you, John. I'm sure sometimes I push a little too hard. But we had a short deadline and again, it's really the accomplishments we had are really a credit to people cooperating with my leadership. It wouldn't have worked if you guys hadn't cooperated, so, thanks.

Let's talk about action item. I've got several. I'm going to incorporate the changes in the final draft report this afternoon. Okay? And this evening, I will make sure that I get all of the minority reports in, because I'm giving until 5 o'clock my time to do that.

And then what I will do is I'll send Redline versions of the revised final draft report to Tim Denton, so that he can start the final editing. And I will cc the full working group with the Redline version so you can quickly see what we did. And please if you find something that stands out that wasn't changed correctly or we missed the change, call it to Tim and my attention and do it on the list or directly, whatever you like, as soon as possible. But again that will be redlined so, that you'll see where we made or change pretty readily to make it easier on you that way.

Now tomorrow then, my task is to send - to review the redline edited version from Tim. And then I'm going to send it - then I'll accept the changes and I'll send them to the GNSO Council, to Glen for distribution to the December `05 PDP observers because there are

people that have participated pretty consistently on the new TLD-PDP that weren't council members, so they can see it as well.

So as that group considers these things, they will have copies as well. I'll send it to (Ram Mohan) with the request for review and comment by the IDN working group, and to the RN working group email list again. So I'll send the final version to the list so that everybody can have a copy at the final version. And Tim has I think increased the final size, so that you should although receive it that way.

The - I thought I had on here and I don't see it here. But I will request that (Sophia) also, you know, feel free to distribute it on the IDN working work mailing list as out liaison.

(Sophia), did you ever join the call? I haven't looked that my little meeting manager.

Woman: No, she hasn't, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. Yeah, I see I'm back there now, so I can see that. Okay.

The - then Tim Denton, you have to accept all the changes in the draft working report. The one I send you today, once I get it done and maybe tonight, okay, go ahead and accept the changes, so you're working with the clean slate. And so that your edit - then you can use the tracking function, so that just your edit will show up when you send it back to me.

Tim Denton: (Unintelligible) make whole thing…

Chuck Gomes: The whole thing at the end of the day today. And you'll probably get it early tomorrow morning, right?

Tim Denton: I have no idea.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm going to send that probably evening my time tonight. I don't know what time.

Tim Denton: I cannot guarantee that I'm still functional past 10:00 in the evening.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not expecting you to be.

Tim Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: You're going to have until noon your time tomorrow…

Tim Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …to go through and do a full edit of the report that you have. What I'm saying is in that, accept the changes so it's clean when you start.

Tim Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And then use the tracking function so that all of your edits are clear in that. And then send the redline edited version to me…

Tim Denton: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …including the whole working group list not later than noon Eastern daylight time tomorrow, and then I will accept the changes and send it out.

I was going to ask (Sophia) if she's on the call to as soon as possible thereafter send the final report to the IDN working group, but I'll do that via email.

Tim Denton: Chuck, you just said something that maybe contradicting. Send the report to you tomorrow when it's all done, cleaned up. And then you will send it to the working group or I think, you have the last say, don't you?

Chuck Gomes: Well you're going to send a redline of your edits…

Tim Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …to me and to the four working group.

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right? And that's by noon your time tomorrow. I am going to accept all of your edits…

Tim Denton: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: …unless I disagree or something, and I'm sure that, you know, I'm just being (suspicious) there. But I'm going to accept those and create a clean document

Tim Denton: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: That is I will send out.

Tim Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Clean document.

Tim Ruiz: Alrighty then.

Chuck Gomes: Then now, the next - just couple of brief items, and we actually make it done less than two hours. That's amazing. I'm not complaining.

The - if the RN working group is extended by the GNSO Council for additional 30 days, is there anybody that is - that would not be able to continue to participate?

Now, if you can't tell me that now, that's fine. If you can, good. But I would like to know, you know, soon so that I have a feel for whether we just continue the same group and everybody is going to still participate.

Anybody know that you might not be able to do that?

Mike Palage: Chuck, this Mike Palage. I will be able to participate. My question is since we did have some constituencies that were under-represented, might we take - if in fact the group is extended, might we want to try seek some additional input or will we be saying…

((Crosstalk))

Mike Palage: … - will we be locking the group and will just allow it to send not…

Chuck Gomes: Well our statement of work doesn't allow us to lock the group. Okay, that's why we've accepted measures…

Mike Palage: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: …all the way along. So I think just because the way the statement that works worded that we - if additional people want to participate, we will invite them. And I think that's okay. We may get some new blood in some f these things and in fact I'm okay with it being individuals. We've accepted individuals into our group as well.

And we haven't resorted to voting on anything. We have diligently try to reach rough consensus. And in cases where we couldn't we have suggested more work. And I don't see that changing. So the fact that observers and so for the can't vote really has been a non-issue and we allow them to participate however they can.

The - so, I think that kind of answers the question, Mike that, you know, I don't know that we'll - I'll go out seeking new members. But if people want to join and if they ask the question whether they I can, I think I have to say yes. And I think that's okay too.

Any discussion on that?

Okay. And again, if somebody finds out you can't, please let me know so we know.

Now, I don't know whether there's going to be a reserved name working group in Lisbon or not. How many of you on this call now - I see several of you look like you've dropped off. But how many on this call now could - are going to be in Lisbon? Let me just go through the list. That's probably the best.

Chuck Gomes: Glen, are you going to be able to make it to Lisbon?

Glen Desaintgery: I've got the list up for you.

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm looking it there's the people on the call right now, but I'm asking you personally, are you going to be able to make it to Lisbon or are you…

Glen Desaintgery: Oh, yes, yes, yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay.

Good, good, good, good. Okay.

Tim Denton: Is your cast off yet, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: Pardon?

Tim Denton: Is your cast off yet?

Glen Desaintgery: No, no, (unintelligible) on Tuesday.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Well, Glen, let's go out for a run, okay?

(Patrick), you're not going to be there. Is that right?

(Patrick): No, I'll be there.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you are. Okay. Where do I see something that maybe you weren't - I'm glad. I'm wondering why you weren't going to be there. That's good.

(Patrick): No, I'll get in Friday.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. I do as well. And Tim Denton is not going to be there. But if we do have a meeting, we'll hook them up via conference call and other people who can dial in.

Mike Rodenbaugh, you're going to be there right?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: And (Ylan), you're not - I don't think he still on, our newest member.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I will be there.

Alistair jumped off, but I suspect he will be there because he's on the council and so forth.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh you're on. Okay.

Alistair Dixon   I'm not - I won't be there. I am, Chuck. I won't be there. I would probably - I'll try and participate remotely to this…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: …(unintelligible) allows me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

And, Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: I haven't decided.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Marilyn is only going to be there before the meeting. I don't think she's going to be there the week of the meeting.

Mike Palage?

Mike Palage: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And Tim Ruiz had to jump off, but I know that Tim is planning on being there.

Tamara?

Tamara Reznik: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Good. And (Dan Dorothy)?

Tamara Reznik: Oh I'm sorry. I'm not going to be there but I…

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're not, Tamara.

Tamara Reznik: No.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Okay.

And (Dan), are you on?

Okay, how about Greg?

Mike Palage: (Dan) will not be going to the meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks, Mike.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I will not be in Lisbon.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And we already talked about Alistair. John Nevitt, you're going to be there?

John Nevitt Yup.

Chuck Gomes: And I already talked to Avri.

So I think - anybody I missed on the call? So we're going to have a pretty good representation there if we do find that…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Neil Blair.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, Blaire. Is Blair on? Blair?

                I didn't see his name on mine, but I guess he's not on.

Woman: I mean he's on line.

Chuck Gomes: But I think didn't he say somewhere else that he - so, you get a different one than I do, huh, Glen?

Man: I think you have to hit the reload button.

Glen Desaintgery: You must refresh your…

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's right, I remember you saying that. So, okay, refresh. Oh, there we go.

                Okay, I forget to do that.

                Now, anything else?

                I think we've hit the limit here. And we'll probably have another 30 days, but we've accomplished a lot.

Again, my thanks and I'll keep everybody informed in terms of what the council decides. We do have a council meeting this afternoon in about an hour. And if anything comes out of that I'll pass the word onto everybody.

Thanks again.

Man: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I look forward to some minority statements and clarifications on the two reports that got (held) up.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, can I…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: Just get how many hours do we have for those?

Chuck Gomes: For what?

Alistair Dixon: From the minority report. You see that what was it…

Chuck Gomes: Oh you have, let's see. It's just about 11 o'clock - that's six hours.

Alistair Dixon: Six hours, right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's a god question. That kind of helps people keep it on perspective.

Thank you very much for asking that one.

Okay? Alrighty.

Man: Thanks, Chuck.

Man: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Woman: Thanks. Bye.

Man: Thanks, Chuck.

Man: Bye.

END