

## **Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference**

**3 May 2007**

**18:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 3 May 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://gns0-audio.icann.org/rn-wg-20070503.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#may>

### **Attendance:**

Marilyn Cade - CBUC - acting working group chair

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Greg Shatan - IPC

Ray Fassett - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

### **ICANN Staff:**

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Consultant

Glen de Saint G ery - Secretariat

### **Absent apologies:**

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair - absent

Jon Nevett - Registrar

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council IDN

wg Liaison

**Absent:**

Bilal Beiram - CBUC  
Seth Jacoby - Registrar  
Mawaki Chango - NCUC  
Victoria McEvedy - NCUC  
Tamara Reznik - IPC  
Lucila King - IPC  
Mike Palage - Registries constituency  
Edmon Chung - Registries constituency  
Caroline Greer - Registries constituency  
MinJung Park - ccNSO liaison  
Dr. Kung Chung Liu - Commissioner Taiwan

Coordinator: Thank you. The recording is ready.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Glen, may I ask you to do the roll call.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly, Marilyn.

We have on the line yourself, acting chair; Neil Blair, Commission Business, BC, Ray Fassett, Registry Constituency, Alistair Dixon, BC; Liz Williams, staff; Tim Ruiz, Registrar; Patrick Jones, staff; Avri Doria, Nominating Committee; and Mike Rodenbaugh, BC.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. And then would you go on please to just cover quickly who's not on the call besides our chair who sends his regret.

Glen Desaintgery: We have not on the call - the people who are absent are Chuck Gomes, chair, Jon Nevelt Registrar Constituency; Sophia Bekele who

asked me some time ago to make her apologies because she could not be on because she's in Ethiopia at the moment.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Dan Daugherty, IPC; Greg Shanton who can't be on the call either, he sends his apologies; Lucila King; Tamara Reznick; Mawaki Chango; Victoria McEvedy; Jonathan Nevitt who is Registrar; Seth Jacoby, Registrar; Tim Ruiz, Registrar; Edmon Chung, Registry; Caroline Greer, Registry. We've got Ray Fassett on the line. Chuck is absent. Michael Palage, Registry, (Min Jung Park) who is the ccNSO liaison; Dr. Kung-Chung Liu who is from Taiwan who is a member of the GAC. And that is it for the participants.

Marilyn Cade: Great, thank you.

We are going to start with a quick review of the agenda. You know the meeting is being recorded and transcribed. Please identify yourself when you speak so the transcribers can attribute comments. And try to use the handset when you - I will start doing that myself. I just want to open this for suggested changes to the agenda.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Marilyn, sorry, I don't have the agenda in front of me. It's Mike Rodenbaugh. And I'd forgotten that you were chairing. I sent Chuck a note asking that the IANA names be upfront if they're not already. They usually aren't, it should be very short, but I only have about 20 minutes today.

Marilyn Cade: Sure, they are. You're first. But thank you for mentioning it. Okay?

If you have questions or comments about the use of the revised template, if you are experiencing problems about, I'm going to ask you to post to Liz, Patrick, and Chuck on that, and we won't spend time on trying to resolve those who troubleshoot those on this call.

If anyone has an update to their (Intra) statement, they should also post that to the full reserved name working group list.

Are there any other changes to the agenda? Hearing none, we're going to start with the report. I did ask people to please use -- and I'll just remind everyone that the final subgroup reports are due the 8th of May. So, time is quickly passing here, and I know we're all urgently working. I've seen a huge flurry of reports coming in. So we'll hear from the chairs and their members on how the subgroup work is doing.

I'm going to ask you to try to answer the questions (and fix) in your report from your group and, you know, if you forget a few of those things, we'll conduct and just ask clarifying questions.

So, the order we're going to follow, just so people are prepared, we're going to have Mike's report on ICANN IANA names first. Then Patrick is going to report for the single and two-character reserved names in Greg's absence. Greg may be able to dial in later, but would only be able to listen due to being at an airport.

If Mike Palage doesn't join us for geographic and geopolitical, we'll address getting a substitute or dealing with that when we get to it. We'll deal with - then we'll have, either third or fourth, Ray, your report on just gTLD names at the second level. Then we'll hear from Avri on

controversial names. Then we'll move to the tag names report, the (next) who is www. And then go in to discussing the rest of the agenda.

So I'm going to turn, if I may, Mike, to you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure, very brief reports.

We just need to essentially send the questions out to IANA and ICANN and the various organizations. I had a basically miscommunication with Chuck and Liz on that a couple of weeks ago and overlooked an email back asking me for - to do a bit more. So I've done that this morning.

And if anybody has comments, please forward them along shortly. Otherwise, we're just going to send out these very basic questions.

Marilyn Cade: And would you just quickly, for those of us who are struggling with keeping up, can you just briefly touch on the kinds of questions you're asking them?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure. In fact there's actually only one.

So I'll just lay out the background and say that the working group so far stated that the role of reserved names held by IANA and ICANN has been to maintain for those organizations the exclusive rights to the names of ICANN, its bodies, or essential functions of the two organizations.

Do you believe the names in the attached table which correspond or relate to organization should continue to be reserved at all levels in all current and future gTLDs?

If yes, please state the reason why you believe such rights should be reserved in all gTLDs, and describe you have used or may intend to use these domains in the gTLDs and in any other TLDs today.

If no, please state which name reservations may not continue or if you believe the reservations be modified, and please state this.

Finally, please provide the name of the person for your questionnaire, and any additional comments or questions that you may have for the working group.

Marilyn Cade: Excuse me. I have a question and some of these just (spot) on this. I thought there was a reference to IANA in an RSC. Is that - am I mistaken about that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't think so. I assume Tim Denton would have mentioned it in the earlier reports.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. Okay.

So you're sending me out - can I just ask the turnaround? That's one of the questions I think you may have put that in there and I missed it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, no. We have not set a date. I guess that obviously makes sense to ask for as soon as possible, but, you know, we're not planning in putting a deadline on this. We weren't really expecting it. We would get complete answers from all those organizations within the time of this working group.

Ray Fassett: Hey Marilyn, this is Ray. Can I ask a question?

Marilyn Cade: You sure can. Let me just Mike to clarify, all those organizations, I'm sorry, I am confused -- who's this going to?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, we, at least Liz, Chuck, and I...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...at one point decided that we were going to send it to each of the organizations, to the ASO, to the GNSO, et cetera.

Marilyn Cade: I see. Thank you for that clarification. So to each of the organizations, meaning the supporting organization.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. The ones that have corresponding domains on the reserve list -- (Black Nick), IETF, (DAB), et cetera...

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thanks.

All right, Ray?

Ray Fassett: Yes. Mike, can you just read the first sentence that you - in your letter?

Mike Rodenbaugh: About what the working group has stated thus far? I actually skipped the background part.

Ray Fassett: No, I mean in the questionnaire that you're sending out, the very first sentence you read.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think I said that the working group has stated thus far that the role of the reserved names held by IANA and ICANN has been to maintain for those orgs the exclusive rights to the names of those orgs or their essential related functions, for example (unintelligible).

Ray Fassett: Okay. That's the sentence.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And that's directly from the earlier working group report.

Ray Fassett: Okay. It just seemed a little leading, but that's okay.

Marilyn Cade: It's actually a factual statement, isn't it?

Ray Fassett: Okay, all right. That's what I was asking.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, yeah. So you have a draft ready to go. Your plan is based on - so we're having a discussion about it and then your plan is to send it to these organizations. I would just say I do think you ought to set a target date?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, certainly makes sense. I appreciate that. What would you think would be reasonable?

Marilyn Cade: Well, you might also to tell them that we're going to conclude our report - that we...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, that's a good approach, I agree. Okay. And what was the deadline for us completing this again?

Marilyn Cade: The 8th.



Mike Rodenbaugh: The 8th. Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. And...

Mike Rodenbaugh: But - and obviously, this was always intended to go on further. You know, we're eventually just going to continue to work during these 30 days, and this just may be something that the council deals with on its own later.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Can I ask you - so setting the letter aside, could you go to the report then and just briefly update us on - these deals with the justifications? Can you walk us through the - what your view is of the recommendation that go with them - in your new report, right...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sorry, I don't have the current draft report in front of me. I do have the recommendations from earlier report that we did.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think yes, I have the earlier working group report in front of me. So here's the recommendations.

So our recommendations in the first part were more work is recommended. And I think that's probably going to be changed to something along the lines that the organizations to which these name reservations correspond have been requested to provide the basis for that information and their recommendation whether or not the reservations should continue. And those responses are still forthcoming.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. And then would you say based on those responses, a recommendation needs to be developed?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that's right.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. And then you've got IDN at the top level and you have a recommendation for that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes. We weren't going to look at IDNs again...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...this (moment) I believe. I think it will just kind of roll into the general rules between IDNs and (unintelligible). And I'm not real up to speed on. I know Patrick was going to send around information on that and I just haven't read it yet.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

And then second level ASCII, recently it was more work.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's exactly the same.

Marilyn Cade: And - okay. And then you described - are you guys providing description of what the more work is going to be or you...

Mike Rodenbaugh: The more work will be to collect the responses from the organizations.

Marilyn Cade: Oh I see. The same as the recommendation under top level ASCII.  
Mike, is that what you meant?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thank you.

And then - so we discussed IDNs. And can I ask others if you have other questions for Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Mike, I don't see a reference to the GAC principles. Are you planning on adding that or did your group consider that...

Mike Rodenbaugh: We have not - I don't believe there are any GAC principles relevant to this.

Okay. You might want to just include that you reviewed the principles and did not find relevant principles. And then on the IDN working group recommendations, have they been referenced and addressed as applicable? And I think what you were suggesting is this that Patrick has done some work which you haven't have a chance to review it yet.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

And then going back to our suggestion outlined from the chair. What's your view on - do you have - well, tell us when you think - how far

along you're going to be or whether you think the report is relatively close to being done given that you don't know whether or not you're going to get a response from any of these folks by next...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Clearly we won't have responses by next week.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Frankly we weren't intending to have them within this timeframe. We just knew it was not going to happen. It was not realistic.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So.

Marilyn Cade: So your recommendation to the council is going to be more work is needed?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: And I think we're looking for the subgroups to provide as much recommendations as possible on how to guide that work if they feel they're able to do that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, I think we discussed that. Collect the responses, come up with a recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: Right, but how do you - how about your recommendation for how the recommendation will be developed -- do it at the council or, because the subgroups are...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Or through reconvening the subgroups.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Would you guys give some thought to, you know, what your recommendation is going to be on that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure. Is Edmund on the call?

Marilyn Cade: I haven't seen him up here.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No problem.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

And do you see - do you expect minority statement?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I welcome them. I'm not sure that there's really much debatable about many of this, but...

Marilyn Cade: There's a subgroup minority statement, there's also the opportunity for others on the full working group to submit minority statements. Anyone on the call thinks that they might submit a minority statement?

Tim Ruiz: Marilyn, this is Tim with (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. Hi, Tim.

Tim Ruiz: A question about that. I mean if let's say for example, and I don't think this will be the case in regards to IANA names, I don't believe them, and I'm not referring to that specifically, but just in general, if a working

group of three or four or five people, you know, make a recommendation, even if they agree why - if there's a large number of the other participants in the working group who don't, why would their opinions be considered minority?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I comment on that?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: I actually thought that when we did majority, minority, if such words can be used or supported, less important, additional comment that it was more related to the whole working group and not so much the subgroup. So, of course, the subgroup people being in the larger group, they could fall on to either category.

But I tended to think that those statements, when they made the full report, were, you know, not that they just basically start in the subgroup. Hopefully, the subgroup could come to consensus. But if they don't, then there's, you know, other opinions.

But I think that the group - for example, if there was a minority and a majority in a subgroup, but in the overall group, it was reverse, I think the report would have to reflect the reverse.

Marilyn Cade: I think that's for the final report. But as Chuck...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: ...had architected this, and we have up to now had - for instance, Avri, I noticed on this, you did have a statement. And, you know, maybe it's

better to - it's called the minority statement, I think. You did have a statement, and so did Mike.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: The question on the final report I think is going to be - when we go to reviewing everything, what's the broader group recommendation. And so, I think we could find that a subgroup has the recommendation and the broader group is not in support of it. That's just the nature of working in subgroups.

Man: Okay. This is (unintelligible). I just want to make sure that - to clarify that.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And the date for the minority statements from working group members who are not in the subgroup is the 9th of May, which is just the day before, and everyone is responsible for providing their own statement. It's not going to be, all right?

Avri Doria: Yeah. And, yeah, I just wanted to mention that in terms of the statement that I had last time...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: ...I think the fact that you're going out and asking each of these groups, you know, what they want to do about it kind of, probably handles most of my question, because my question had to do with, well, what if I (unintelligible) wants to use the name, why should (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: So that wouldn't handle my question at all.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Okay. Let me just make sure that I've covered the list of questions.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Hey, Avri, would you say that your question is covered in my question or not?

Avri Doria: I...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Because I did ask at all levels. We could break it out for clarity and have two separate questions top and second level. Maybe that makes sense.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I mean it is assumed in at all levels, but if you broke it up and made it clear, that wouldn't hurt. But I wasn't objecting.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Any other comments for Mike?

Hearing none, I think we're going to move to the next report. And I Greg rejoined us, and welcome. And you're just...

Greg Shanton: I have - I'm now standing in the Lost Baggage line (unintelligible).

Woman: Oh no.



Marilyn Cade: You're just in time - we're sorry to hear that. We hope you find your clothing and your...

Woman: I think...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: And we're going to move to Patrick and ask him to do the report for that (unintelligible).

Patrick Jones: Okay. Well, what I should probably start with is the recommendation table that was sent to the four working group lists yesterday. And it's titled, "Single and Two Character - it says, "One and Two Characters SG Rec Chart Version 2." If everybody has that.

Let's start with - our first recommendation is on symbols. And this really didn't change from the original working group report that was published before Lisbon. We recommend that the current practice be maintained, so that no symbols other than the hyphen be considered for use at any level, unless technology at some time permits the use of symbols.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: Okay?

The next one, the single- and two-character IDNs. This is for IDN balance strings at all levels. So, top level, second level, it's applicable at third level. Previously, our recommendation was further worked. And I think we've - a lot of work has been done in this extension period. So

the recommendation right now with single- and two-character use labels on the top level and second level of the domain name should not be restricted in general.

At the top level, requested string should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis depending on the script and the language used in order to determine whether the string should be granted for application in the BNF, and there's an asterisk, and that refers back to the complete subgroup report section on this. Chuck asked the question about that earlier today, so I just want to let everyone know that's what the asterisk is there for.

Next recommendation is single letters at the top level. This is a draft recommendation the subgroup is still considering. I think there may be some edits in the language.

But right now, what is in this version is, we recommend to continue reservation of single letters at the top level until completion of the technical test based on the outcome of the technical test discussion of methods of allocation can be considered. And examples included .a, .v.

The next one is single letters and digits at the second level. This recommendation is released contingent upon the development of a suitable allocation framework. Examples include a.com, i.info. This recommendation is unchanged from the version in the March 19 report.

The next recommendation is single and two digits at the top level. We - the subgroup had a call with two technical experts early last week, I think.

Marilyn Cade: It was on the 23rd.

Patrick Jones: The 23rd - 27th I think.

Marilyn Cade: Anyway.

Patrick Jones: Yeah, anyway. So, we had some detailed discussion with technical experts. And as a result of that, our recommendation is, we recommend continuation of the reserved status for digits at the top level. And examples include .3 and .99.

The recommendation is single letter-single digit combinations at the top level. This recommendation is unchanged from the March 19 report. It says, applications may be considered for single letter - oh wait, this is a new category. Applications may be considered for single letter-single digit combinations at the top level in accordance with the term set forth in the new gTLD process. Examples include .3f, .a1, .u7.

And we have recommendation on two letters at the top level. This recommendation is unchanged. We recommend the current practice of allowing two letter names at the top level only for ccTLDs remained at this time. Examples include .au, .de, .uk.

Finally, it's - this category is, any combination of two letters, two digits at the second level. Registries may propose release provided that measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes are implemented. Examples include ba.aero, ub.cat, 53.com, 3m.com, ea.org. This recommendation is also unchanged from the March 19 report.

Man: Patrick, what are those asterisks, same as above?

Patrick Jones: The asterisk refers to the full subgroup report...

Man: Oh.

Patrick Jones: ...and that's a carryover from the original report that was released before Lisbon. It just - there's - it means that there is more to the recommendation and it's completely inserted into the full subgroup report.

Man: Got you. Okay, thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, quick questions for Patrick - before we go into my review of the - for Greg and for Patrick on the...

Patrick Jones: But that's just the recommendations, that's on the report itself. I know we discussed the report on the last call. And in the last call, we had not at the time added in anything on definition of character on single and two-character IDNs that are now in there now. We've done a lot of work on digits at the top level as well as digit-letter combinations and single letters at the top end at the second level. So, we've actually done a lot of work in the last couple of weeks.

Marilyn Cade: And, Patrick, I'm just going to quickly go through these and - because I know that there've been some changes. The group has one more working session next Monday. Is that right?

Patrick Jones: That's correct.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

So, let me see if we can try to clarify - expert consultation was initiated and we should just update on the fact that we have sent the four categories that we discussed were two technical experts, so they have the draft recommendation related to what was discussed with them had been sent to the two technical experts with the request that they confirm their views of the recommendation and provide them the other comments that they wish to, and that we ask for them to give us the turnaround.

I will just note that we need to go back to them and include now the changes that have been made to a couple of the recommendation. We'll have their responses back in time to meet the deadline on the 8th.

We have referenced the GAC principles in some cases but not all. So, I'm wondering what views are - view for Greg and others who've been drafting on this, whether there are other places in this set of recommendations where the GAC principles need to be referenced.

Patrick Jones: Well, I think I've gone through and referenced the GAC principles in - let's see, we didn't do it for symbols, but I'm not sure if it really applies there. We've done it for IDN.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: We've done it for - I'm just scrolling as we talk. I believe that we've done it for single letters. No, I don't see it there on single letters at the top level.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: You know, I think what we've done is probably reference it across the board. And maybe what we'll do is, we could break it down by recommendation. It's really maybe (unintelligible) for working group to see what people think.

Marilyn Cade: I think it's probably good to - for each of the subgroup to review the GAC principles and make sure that they reference them as applicable and then get back to you. I think it's a broad question.

On IDN Working Group recommendation, we have (unintelligible) those, right?

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And then, we've included examples as much as possible. I heard several examples.

Patrick Jones: I think we've included examples for every category.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And then, can we just talk a little bit about - Greg, are you still with us?

Greg Shanton: I am.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Maybe we just talk a little bit about the areas where we are close to getting less consensus and any areas where we think we have still areas of disagreement we need to address.

Patrick, do you want to try that since Greg is standing in a public line?

Patrick Jones: Well, we would send around updates to Recommendation 6 and 7.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: Recommendation 6 is single letter-single digit combinations at the top level.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: And I think Mike provided some edits. Alistair may have provided some edits. And I think we're pretty close on that one.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: The next one is Recommendation 7, two letters at the top level. I think we already - that one is done.

And Recommendation 8, combination of two letters and digits at the second level is done.

Marilyn Cade: Let me just say that I saw a suggested change on - from - I'm not sure who that suggested that ordering of confusing 1 and l and 0 and capital O that ordering doesn't matter in user confusion. I'm not sure that's - of

actual characterization but maybe we can take that up within the group and try to get a better understanding on that.

Then, we had single letters at the top level that I think Alistair or - no, Greg provided some edits too.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And we had not had a chance to discuss that in the subgroup. So, I'm assuming we're pretty close to...

Alistair Dixon: And, Marilyn, I've also provided edits to single letters at the second level, which the group has yet to discuss.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Can you...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I didn't see those, Alistair. Can you quickly tell us what those are? Are they - are they major, or...

Alistair Dixon: There is actually some overlap between what Greg has sent in relation to single letters at the top level and what I've sent in relation to single letters at the second level. Basically the experts pointed out that there were some problems and some resolvers that would mean that single letters at the second level and single letter at top level domain should continue to be reserved, and so that's the full recommendation at the moment.



So, it would mean that the - basically, if you are going to have .a at the top level, you can have .a or .b in the domain at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: You can have .a, .a or .a, .b, et cetera.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Alistair, that's something that would be resolved for the technical test.

Alistair Dixon: I think, Mike, it is something that could be tested in the (TSG).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Great.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, it sounds like the group is finalizing - oh, there has been - there seem to be many areas of rough consensus. There may be a few minority statements, but it's not sounding like they're going to be a major number.

Can I just ask if anyone from the group wants to comment? I'm going to ask the larger group about minority statement.

Does anyone on the larger group expect to have minority statements on the two-character report?

I don't hear anything. Have you guys had - the rest of you, had you had a chance to read the report? It's pretty detailed and quite educational. And I know you may not - many people may be thinking, okay, now,

I'm going to read it, now that I'm final. But can I just ask from - have the rest of you had a chance to read it?

Sounds like not. Then, I'm going to suggest, if you can, to - when you read it, can you post back to the full list if you do think you're going to have a minority statement, so the group will be aware of that? And if you know what the category is going to be, that'd be good to let the subgroup know as well.

Does anyone oppose to the recommendations you've heard so far?

Doesn't sound like it. So I'm going to take one last round of questions and then quickly move to the third report. Give me other questions or comments.

Hearing none, Glen, can you just announce the time of this call on Monday? It's at 4:30, Eastern Standard Time, is that right?

Glen Desaintgery: That's right, Marilyn. Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So let's...

Glen Desaintgery: It's at 10:30 in Europe. That's 4:30 here.

Marilyn Cade: Great.

I'm going to move to - I don't see Mike Palage on the call or Caroline. Tim - oh, we have you and Alistair. Should I assume that either one of you are prepared to report on geographic and geopolitical name, or do you want me to hold back and come back to that later?

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, my preference would be to hold it and come back, because Mike may have something more to report than we do.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Let's just do that, Tim, and let me move, Ray, to gTLD names at the second level or third level as applicable.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Marilyn, it's Mike Rodenbaugh. I just want to let you know I need to drop off the call now. Thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, bye.

Ray Fassett: Thank you, Marilyn. This is Ray Fassett.

At first, I'll go ahead and read the recommendation, the gTLD reserved names category and sub gTLD strings that, historically, have been restricted from registration at the second and third level as a contractual conditions. It's not a policy.

The recommendation coming forward as of now, which is not a completed recommendation is to modify the contractual condition for new gTLDs in a manner that requires notification to ICANN rather than approval by ICANN for the release of gTLD strings for registration.

The simple example would be that if the .travel registry wanted to release jobs.travel, it would require .jobs registry operator to notify ICANN of its permission for .travel to do this. In other way, there's a notification process, whereas today, it is in approval process. ICANN, contractually, is required to approve that.

Going to the questions, what expert consultation has been initiated? Primarily, these have been the ICANN GNSO constituencies that have been contacted. Technical advice was not required for this reserved names category due to a technical document release by ICANN's RSTEP that basically opinion that TLD.TLD is not a material, technical stability, and issue security concern. So, we did, however, go these constituencies. And based on last week's call, reach out to other constituencies beside the registry constituency for feedback.

Response deadlines were provided, which were basically yesterday. GAC principles are referenced in a manner that can allow the release of these numbers of change the contractual condition but in a manner that avoids user confusion or taking into account the potential for user confusion.

For IDN, the recommendation would hold the same. This is a string. One-to-one characters string issue, not so much a translation or transliteration issue. So if a new IDN top-level domain should go into the (root), it would apply - this recommendation could apply to it exactly as it does for ASCII TLDs.

I write to you the summary of the recommendation. How close is the subgroup membership in reaching consensus? I'd say we're 75% plus to getting there where the subgroup will have another call between now and the time of our next call to discuss the - some of the issues that have arisen. Much of what's been communicated up to now is more immediate than the two subgroup members.

And I think that's the basis of my report up to now.

Marilyn Cade: May I have a couple of questions? And I'm going to turn to others.

Ray Fassett: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: You said that you undertook outreach to the other constituencies...

Ray Fassett: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: ...the deadlines. How did you do that?

Ray Fassett: I sent a note to Liz Williams, requesting her to send the question out to each of the constituency representatives. And I believe that went out as I was cc'd on it. And besides that, constituency members did respond.

There was not a response from the business constituency, the ISP constituency, nor the non-commercial users constituency.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just going to put my BC hat on for a minute and say...

Ray Fassett: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: ...I may have missed it being posted to the BC list. I didn't see it, but I can follow up with Philip or - and Alistair. You may be familiar with how it was handled at the BC.

Ray Fassett: Sure. And additional feedback is certainly welcome.

Marilyn Cade: So, maybe we can just drag that because - and, you know, Alistair and I can talk about that. On the ISPs, you know, maybe Mark McFadden

secretariat might be reminded, because the thing I just noticed, Ray, is the three of the user-oriented constituencies didn't respond, and it just might be helpful to give them one more round, you know.

Ray Fassett: Yes, I agree with that. And I think the subgroup is probably -- and this is something we will discuss -- should additional feedback not come back that the issue is not a material concern to them should there be not a response.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I have some other questions for you, Bill, but I want to - I don't quite understand. This kind of looks to me like the registry - for instance, the category says, gTLD reserved names.

Ray Fassett: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: What that sounds like to me is, names that gTLD registries have decided to reserve as opposed to the actual similar string at a different level to the string that is being used as the top-level domain.

Do you see what I mean?

I think you're talking about the specific registration of the top-level string at a different level, are you not? Are you not talking about just a number of names that a registry may have on reserved?

Ray Fassett: Yeah, I'm deciphering what you're saying as you're talking. And I - yes, I believe that is correct. The point being that, you know, cross - across zones, gTLD string that exist, for example, at a list is online. If it's on that list, it is not across into another zone.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I'm just going to point out that the name of the category isn't clear...

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...and recommendation isn't clear. I'm not disagreeing with what you - at this point, I'm not challenging what you recommended...

Ray Fassett: Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...but, for instance, to modify the contractual condition for new gTLDs in a manner that requires modification to ICANN for the release of an existing gTLD string for registration at a diff - in a different zone or at a different level.

Ray Fassett: You're right at in there.

Marilyn Cade: And then, secondly, the category gTLD reserved names makes it sound like it could be 500 names or 100 names or 5000. It sounds like it's one name.

Patrick Jones: Marilyn, this is Patrick. Let me try to explain.

I think in the definition, we can clean it up...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: ...so that it's clear that this category is only for gTLD string names appearing at other levels...

Marilyn Cade: Good. And that...

Patrick Jones: ...something like that.

Marilyn Cade: That's all I'm suggesting.

Patrick Jones: And if we make it the definition, then we don't have to spend any time and throughout the rest of the report on other names that maybe owned by a registry.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: As this report really is only about TLD.TLD.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. And I think that's important. I'll just note, Patrick, for purposes of the record that actually no names are owned by registry, that I think you probably meant reserved by registries, right?

Patrick Jones: Well, we can argue about whether that's accurate or not, but I understand.

Ray Fassett: But for Marilyn, just so I'm clear, you're focusing on a definition. The definition was ambiguous to you. And I think that's a good point.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I'm just saying, reading it. I know what you mean.

Ray Fassett: Right.

Marilyn Cade: But I'm not sure if someone not close to this (unintelligible).



Ray Fassett: Great. I see that's excellent input. Thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Does anyone else have comments that I - is this - Tim, did you have comments to make on this?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, actually, I made a number of them on the list. I have - you know, right now, what I have more is the question that kinds of seems to have come up, you know, as a result of this recommendation in the discussion, but I think might apply in other cases.

And just what, you know, what the end result here that we're working towards.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Tim Ruiz: You know what I mean, this particular reserved name group is a good example, because there are existing contractual conditions that apply to the existing registries but, you know, is the PDP '05 - December '05 committee looking to make recommendation - policy recommendations regarding how these reserved name groups are handled going forward that would result in potential contractual conditions in new gTLDs?

If that's the case, if we got these two different scenarios, then it seems that we're only making the recommendation in regards to one and not the other, and that the recommendation could potentially be different.

And, you know, so I guess the question, are we recommending contractual changes? Is that our purpose or are we - what we're doing is working to provide support for the PDP '05 - December '05 committee to make policy recommendations?

Marilyn Cade: You know, I'm sorry, we don't have Dan on the phone, but I'm going to speculate that a policy recommendation could be there should be a contractual condition. Right?

But I take your point that, if it's Consensus Policy - let me see if I can try this. If it's Consensus Policy -- big C, big P -- that applies to new gTLDs while the contractual provision would continue in the legacy TLDs or would the consensus policies be extended to all gTLDs.

Tim Ruiz: Well, I mean, the question is, you know, if the - should we either be making recommendations that affect contractual conditions in listing TLDs. I mean, we really make policy recommendations for this new process and for new gTLDs going forward. And perhaps based on that, some of these existing conditions might be re-looked at, might be reconsidered, but, you know, this particular recommendation is - says, you know, is mentioning contractual conditions specifically.

And if that's really what we should be doing or if we should be looking at, you know, here's the existing - this reserved name we just handled, and we're recommending that perhaps policy, you know, the policy work be done going forward.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Tim Ruiz: You know, looking at it perhaps a little bit differently.

Now, and I think it could be true of any consensus policy that's worked on within the community is that, you know, it's going to change something that already exist in, you know, some other agreement.

They'll have to be looked at and considered, but do we leave that - but should that affect the recommendations that we'll make going forward, that all would (unintelligible) existing agreement so we can't make different recommendations going forward.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. This is Ray. Let me respond to that just a little bit -- in that this is a working group and not a - you know, what we're doing here is not a consensus policy process while it is branched off of PDP in theory.

It is important to appreciate that the registry constituency, while we didn't go down this road, and I didn't want to go down this road, but if there was a vote taken, you would find that the preservation of these reserved names categories is likely far more in favor than not.

So, it's difficult I think to make a recommendation as a policy that if it ever was in a real - its on positive element process likely may not succeed, or we don't know we have to go through that process.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: ...what you're doing here, Ray - I mean, this is a working group supporting any policy development process in progress.

Ray Fassett: Right.

Tim Ruiz: So they asked us to look at this and make - you know, gather information and make recommendations back to them that they intend to use to recommend policy, and that's my understanding.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Yeah. And I think that's important to clarify, Ray. This is - the working groups are a formal (unintelligible) part of the work of a formal PDP process. So...

Greg Shanton: This is Greg. I'd like to get in the queue.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So, you know, I'm - I just want to better understand what your - whether you were - I think we all ought to be clear on that. But then, go back to the discussion of, you know, what we - what we're recommending and what the questions are - let me take Greg and then go back then open the discussion back to Greg.

Greg Shanton: I just wanted to briefly say that it's no surprise that the registry community would support the policy to serve the needs of the registry community and certainly be - if there was a similar policy in favor of brand owners, I'm sure there would be similar strong support from the IPC. So, it's - I think - I don't think that it holds the weight by itself as a point.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I'm just going to make one actual statement and then open this back up. In the ccTLD, very often, the name of the country code is registered at the second level as is and many of the cc's have adapted as a means of structuring their gTLD at the second level. The strings that are used at the top level at the gTLD space.

They've done that to try to be helpful to the community of registrants in their ccTLD. I'm not appointing one way or the other. I'm just sort of noting that.

Ray Fassett: Yup. And, Marilyn, to your point, this is Ray. Greg, that's a really bit of an unfair characterization that it's just a completely self-servicing view and et cetera. There, you know, there are some sTLDs, for example, in the marketplace that do feel that their user community could become - are confused and some instances such as Marilyn is inferring.

There is no really - I don't think there can be a debate that opinions from the registry constituency must be taken by the subgroup as an expert opinion. So I want to make the point that, it's not a surface-level as it may seem that it's just a self-serving view.

Marilyn Cade: Ray, I'm sorry. I have a question.

Greg Shanton: I just - I didn't mean to say it was nearly self-serving, because there are definitely good reasons pro and con in terms of, you know, scams and fishing and other sort of fun and difficult things, which do impact negatively the registry community. So, I think it's probably an issue that's need to be unpacked, and I didn't mean to say that was solely a self-serving...

Ray Fassett: Oh, actually, Greg...

Greg Shanton: ...point of view.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, that's a very good point, Greg. That's exactly correct. There is a conflicting opinion back and forth on the issue. So, you know, what we need to be able to do as a subgroup is provide a recommendation that reflects the fact that there is conflicting view on where the recommendation should be.

Marilyn Cade: And...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: And this is Tim. I think too though that there needs to be - if we're going to make a recommendation then there should be more - I mean there really isn't any expert that had been queried about this except for the RSTEP report that basically said they didn't see - that there was no security stability issue.

I don't think the registries, you know, they are appealing to be taken to account but I don't think we should consider that expert opinion, and, you know, if we're going to make - if we're going to recommend that a policy - make a recommendation that could potentially result in a policy that says these names must be reserved, then I think there needs to be much more to back that up. You know, some sort of empirical evidence or documented evidence or expert advice that says, here's why this should be done, not just opinion or, you know...

Man: Well...

Tim Ruiz: ...here's some...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: ...this happens when there's no evidence that it ever had.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: But...

Marilyn Cade: Just a minute. I want to ask a question of clarification for everyone.  
And then I want to come back to you.

I don't think I personally - and I'm speaking both as the sit-in chair but more broadly, I don't think that the only thing to base a recommendation on is technical confusion. So, the RSTEP report may address technical issues. The registry's views should be heard, but I do think more broadly what we're trying to understand today is the subgroup close to reaching consensus, and then we need to hear, are there going to be minority statements from other working group members, and is the recommendation going to be supportable by the full working group or does it need to be modified to say, for the work as needed.

User confusion is a valid point to put forward and explained. And I'm looking at a recommendation, but I'm not looking at a written report. Is there a more detailed written report behind this that I just missed?

Ray Fassett: There are comments that, you know, the comments that have been received are included in the written report, including from individual registrar members such as Tim that have provided input to this question.

Marilyn Cade: So, your answer is, yes, I ought to be able to find a few more pages to go with this table if I go back on the list.

Ray Fassett: Yes, pretty much that is correct. Now, but to Tim's point is that we have to understand that there's an existing practice in place.

When we talk about evidence to statewide - you know, that there is user confusion, I, you know, I've taken the approach as the chairman of this subgroup is that the evidence needs to go the other way. If we're going to change what is an existing practice, then the others need show that there is not user confusion. I don't know of a study that goes either way, to be honest with you.

Tim Ruiz: I don't know, Ray. I mean, well, there's a number of ways of looking at this. One is that, as you were trying - the point you were trying to make was that there is no policy for contractual conditions. So if we're going to create a policy, then I think it's the other way around.

Ray Fassett: Well, I don't think we're creating...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: ...create a policy, then there needs - we're going to make a recommendation that could result in policy work, that could resolve in a policy - if policy is going to get created, then there needs to be, you know, evidence to back up the need for the policy.

But regardless of that, I mean, it sort of like, you know, trying to prove it negative but prove there's no harm. That, you know, it doesn't seem to me - to me (unintelligible) the approach is, here's the harm that has been taking place and why we need this policy.

And the fact that it's just been included in previous contracts for whatever reason I don't think in itself holds a lot of water...

Marilyn Cade: Let me just note...



Tim Ruiz: ...especially when we're talking - what we have to look at is what potential for this is going forward. We look at today, we got 13 gTLDs. So, in that perspective, it's not a huge issue. So, we've got 200 gTLDs and maybe more.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Tim Ruiz: All using, you know, some generic terms, you know, .shop, dot whatever. And each of those are restricted from being used and each of the others were creating, you know, a very restrictive name space for prospective registrants who might have very legitimate use for those gTLDs. So we have to look at it long term and what the effect of this is going to be going forward and the imbalance that's going to get created amongst registries depending on where they come online and where they're coming to the process.

So, I think the use of the other thing is, here's the harm that can be done and that we need to be able to show that and document it and not just, you know, opinions and fears of what might happen.

Marilyn Cade: So, it's Marilyn. And I'm going to exercise the chair's just prerogative and summarize what I've heard.

Actually the subgroup doesn't seem to be close to rough consensus, right?

Man: As of this call, I will likely pretty much disagree with that.

Marilyn Cade: How many members do you have in your subgroup?

Man: Three.

Marilyn Cade: And they represent the registry and registrar constituency?

Man: We have Edmon Chung, Patrick Jones and myself.

Marilyn Cade: So - and Patrick is staff, and Edmon is with which constituency?

Man: He's with DotAsia, a registered constituency.

Marilyn Cade: So - then let me note that this may be an example where your subgroup may (unintelligible) rough consensus, but I'm hearing questions about it from other members of the full working group, and based on that, I think I would just suggest that it's been a helpful discussion for you two have had. I have a few other questions from the outline I want to ask you, and then I'm going to move on.

Patrick Jones: Marilyn, can I jump in and add something?

Marilyn Cade: You can, Patrick. Can I just finish?

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Then turn to you, if you don't mind.

I unfortunately have not had a chance to look at your draft recommendation. So I have to turn it to you, Ray, and ask you to reference (unintelligible) IDN if you think that is - because I see second

level, third level where applicable IDN were applicable in the domain name level.

Ray Fassett: When applicable.

Marilyn Cade: When applicable. But what I don't see in the recommendation draft is any reference to IDN. And I don't know if there should be one or not. I'm just pointing that out. So I want to ask you about that.

And then my other question to you is - and actually, that's my primary question. Let me turn to Patrick and then I'm going to ask the rest of the group if they want to comment on (seven) such as if anyone else has suggestions for improvement, if anyone else wants to express a concern about the recommendation and then wrap this up and move to the next report.

Patrick, can I go to you?

Patrick Jones: Sure.

This is more of an observation that in the original term of the working group, this category had different members, and they couldn't come to an agreement either. And it's likely that where we're headed is that this category just needs further work.

I understand, and I guess we discussed this within the subgroup that there are potential problems with scaleability as you add new gTLDs. And that's one thing that I'm concern about, but I know we're still discussing it. It's, you know, the original working group subgroup couldn't agree and we're - I'm not sure where we are right now.

Marilyn Cade: I think that's helpful. You actually provided the summary I was going to provide, which is it does sound like the - at the full working group level, it is likely to come out with needs more work and more discussion.

Tim, I don't need to put you on this spot, so I'll go first. Listening to this, I have concerns, as a member of the full group, about the scalability. And I don't think there's been - and I take to heart the fact the business constituency has not responded. And Alistair and I can figure out how to help this to happen in a timely manner.

But does anyone else want to comment or any suggestions for improvement or questions before we move...

Greg Shanton: This is Greg. I just have one comment, which is I think that if we can identify, and they may not be within the scope or at least the time for scope of this group, if we can identify the nature of the problem, we may be able to identify a solution.

For instance, that occurs to me that an RSP process for kind of cross - for these types of (unintelligible) may be approached to consider or more broadly "appropriate allocation process" other than first come first serve which could you know, eliminate the kind of the fishing and fraud level issues that would - that, you know, I believe one of the concerns, but I don't know them all. So, that's just a thought.

Ray Fassett: Right. This is Ray.

And let me add this comment, Marilyn, is that, you know, scope is an issue here, you know, for example, how names are allocated is a scope question.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Ray Fassett: Primarily, though, to Patrick's point, you know, there was a reason why this work on this particular category was extended rather than a recommendation coming out, and it's really pretty apparent that we could, as a subgroup, go to the level where we have to have more time. That's an option.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Ray Fassett: If that is what ends up as the result, then what will likely happen as part of the new TLD process is the default condition will remain, unless it's able to complete its working time for all the PDP '05. But again, that becomes a suspect now. Or there's a recommendation that could arise, as Tim is suggesting, if you just completely remove it. That's an option.

And then, there's the option of being able to remove it on condition, which is what it is right now.

So, there aren't that many options here to pick from if the working group, as a whole, reserved name working group as a whole, wants to feel that there needs to be more work on this, then that's okay. It's just that we're not going to be of much - after all this time to spend on it and not that we should drive doing to an answer to get to an answer, but

we're questioning what kind of input - substantive input we're going to be able to provide to the PDP '05.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to offer you a more heartening vision on that, Ray.

Ray Fassett: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And that is - I think you ought to think about this in terms of, you know, do you and your group think that your recommendation would be more work and within another 30-day period the following things need to happen, so that a recommendation could be put forward. That's a more hopeful vision, I hope.

You know, Greg mentioned the issue of identifying the concerns about consumer confusion or abuse of such as consumer fraud or blah, blah, blah. I think those are all things that are useful to note that you need to take into account, and I would just reference you back to the GAC principle where I think you might actually find the principle that is more relevant to the concern. It may not be directly related, but I think it's more relevant to the concern that I thought you were raising as the sTLD to feel that, as you noted, that users could be confused, in particular between who is the authoritative top level domain.

Ray Fassett: Yes, that's exactly correct. Those are the opinions coming out of the registry constituency.

Marilyn Cade: That's very helpful.

I'm going to move to the next report. Are you guys having another - is your group going to - you've heard a lot today. Some of us owe you

feedback or noting that we're not going to get you feedback in terms of constituency, there isn't anyone from the ISP AMD reserved name working group that I'm aware of but maybe going back to the - or actually, to Tony Holmes, as the chair, maybe one more time.

Okay. He's going to just follow up on - offline.

Can I turn to Avri and ask for an update from your group, the (Contro Group)?

Avri Doria: Yes, the controversial group. It's fun being controversial because we (unintelligible) more projects for controversy.

But anyway, we've had two meetings and a bunch of online discussions. We've gotten to a point where we have several consensus points, though it should be noted that only three out of the five subgroup participants participated in the last discussion.

And while in general, this is less consensus and there still could be wording differences, but I will read through the points where I believe that we are approaching consensus.

One is there should not be a new reserved name category for controversial names. And I don't know whether we want discuss this point by point or after or just stop me whenever.

Two, there should be a list of disputed names created as a result of a dispute process to be created by the new gTLD process.

Third point, the new gTLD controversial names resolution panel could be established as a standing mechanism, and I'm editing some of these as I'm writing, as a standing mechanism that is convened at the time a dispute is initiated.

Preliminary elements of that process are provided in the report but further work is needed in this area. And Marilyn provides a very good beginning to that process. And then we did have discussion of it point by point.

Within the dispute process, dispute should be initiated by the ICANN Advisory Committees, for example ALAC or GAC; or supporting organizations, for example, GNSO or ccNSO, as these organizations do not (unintelligible).

As these organizations do not currently have processes for receiving and deciding on such activities, these processes would need to be defined. And it says, not prerogative of the GNSO or subcommittees to determine the internal processes of other ICANN bodies. This remains as work- work that needs to be done if and when the proposal is accepted.

Further work is needed -- the next point. Further work is needed to develop predictable and transparent criteria that can be used by the controversial reso - the controversial name dispute resolution panel.

These criteria must take into account the need to: A, protect freedom of expression; B, affirm the fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of human person and equal rights of men and women; and C, take into account sensitivities regarding terms with cultural and



religious significance. Those last two were lifted almost verbatim from the GAC principles.

And then there's a fourth one that I believe we'd have consensus on but we didn't specifically talk about this morning because it was in the wrong place in the document. In any dispute resolution process the controversial name category should be the last category considered.

And that sort of follows from the definition, but it's just basically covering basis where it may be uncertain whether it's a controversial or a trademark issue or is it a geographical or a controversial. And since the definition of controversial says "it does not meet the definition criteria of any other - any other name category."

So this is just sort of a catch-all at the end that sort of, in cases of doubt, deal with the prior categories first. Deal with it within prior category first.

And those are - and then there's a lot of discussion. We had a set of issues that were talked about. But at the moment, I think that we're approaching consensus on that.

And then there was a lot of discussion which I think that I've captured in the - there's a report though they'll need a bunch of cleaning up and clarification and such. And I forget what the specific questions I'm supposed to answer are.

We didn't consult with any experts at this point. We didn't ask for extra consultations with the GAC. But we did take a lot from the regular open

GAC consultation that we've had, and certainly welcome, you know, follow-up discussions, however that would happen.

I guess I'll stop.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Oh, and the assumption was -- sorry -- that these concerns would apply equally to LDA and IDN.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Avri.

I'm just going to - and at this point it sounds like you're not expecting minority statements from your group.

Avri Doria: Well, I don't know. As I said, we have three out of five. So if the other two come and look at it and say - from the three people that we have talked, you know, you were one of them, I think we're reaching consensus, but since this was written up after the last meeting and the people haven't had a chance to read and review, and also noticing that I did it quickly in half hour, I will probably get another revision just to clean up out, you know, this evening.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Can I just turn to the rest of the group and ask if any of you have questions for Avri or comments or if from what you've heard you anticipate having a minority statement?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Go ahead.

Ray Fassett: This is Ray.

How can there not be any questions on the controversial names category and all the question point on with the gTLD names category?

Marilyn Cade: Yes. So we think we're going to switch the names of the group.

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: But as soon as we call this one non-controversial there'll be controversy.

Ray Fassett: Well, I'm going to ask a question.

Avri Doria: Sure, please.

Ray Fassett: Okay. A label that it's applied for would be considered controversial, the public comments say that the new gTLD application process, the label becomes disputed by formal notice of a consensus position coming from an ICANN advisor committee or ICANN supporting organization.

Isn't that giving a sort of a veto power to an ICANN supporting organization?

Avri Doria: I guess that's one way - it's looking in, this is one of the things that's discussed in report, it's looking at it, and certainly have been a lot of discussion on how things get in and how things get in scalable.

One can presume that on any of a broad range of words, that someone will find it controversial somewhere in the world.

Ray Fassett: That's right.

Avri Doria: And so therefore - I'm trying to also look at this from the perspective of how do we come up with a scalable process and that basically sort of that there's need to be some sort of front-end filtering for it.

Now, it was basically said advisory committee and/or supporting organization, basically come up with a process where they act as the legitimization or the filter. So you have one can sort of say that if I am filtered out I am vetoed.

But I mean - and I don't want to get into sort of the gaming that one can get into with shopping a name that, gee, if I have a name and I think that it's controversial, but I don't think that the supporting organization would think so, but I think I could talk to GAC into thinking so, then basically I bring my dispute to them.

And so there's a lot to be thought about in terms of how one structures these first-level disputes.

But basically, the effort is to basically, first of all, that was the decision that was sort of made by, you know, RN working group instantiation one, and we didn't change that, and basically trying to use that as a

scalability factor, trying to have someone who is responsible within the ICANN context that basically take responsibility for carrying the dispute on.

Now we had some other suggestions that have come through. For example, you know, a notion of any organization or individual in the world can dispute something, but it got to pay big bucks to do so, or, you know, they've got to pay half of the fee.

So there have been other discussion, none of which have been actually sort of brought in to in any sort of consensus way, that how do we make it possible for anyone to dispute but also not saddle the process with immense scalability issue.

Ray Fassett: This is Ray again.

I kind of (drive) to the definition. It seems like a really broad definition of controversial name.

Avri Doria: Yup.

Ray Fassett: Any name that doesn't fall into any other category.

I think can - did the group discuss at all how to sharpen that definition?

Avri Doria: We did. But that's a problem too. In other words - and it comes down to what I've been calling very loosely sort of the Heisenberg Principle of Controversy, that as soon as we start to say, well, for example you might consider a certain kind a certain category or here's an example

of a name. And as soon as we start to sharpen it and look at it too closely, we start to actually (feed) the disputed name list.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. I'm thinking that maybe the stuff, you know, the burden of what is controversial needs to be on the party that feels they potentially will be harmed. So...

Avri Doria: So in other words, explaining why this would harm you.

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: I don't think a - this is Tim.

I don't think the definition (unintelligible) but I don't think that the definition was meant to define what a controversial name is, but only, you know, only names that could - that could be disputed as controversial. So in other words, it's already a part of another reserved name group, something else covers it. So that was the intent.

So, you know, if some process or some other, you know, reserved name groups covers it, then, you know, it can't fall - it can't become controversial to a dispute.

But if it's not covered any other way then...

Avri Doria: Right.

Tim Ruiz: ...a controversial dispute could be filed against those.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) point is...

Man: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...and I don't know whether that for example only a name that can cause you harm.

Although even something at that higher level can almost - I mean, a clever writer (unintelligible) anything to look, I mean, to make that kind of statement, and then it's up to the adjudicating, the filtering, or the dispute resolution people to see whether that is indeed the case. But - I don't know.

Marilyn Cade: Guys (unintelligible) anyone else on the group who wants to join this conversation because we need to note that we've had discussions from Ray and...

Avri Doria: We're looking to see if I can wordsmith something. And if Ray, if you can think of any way to sort of provide a sort of focusing definition that doesn't create controversial names bias by a (unintelligible) existence, I'd be really appreciative.

Ray Fassett: It almost seems that a controversial name will not be going to the new controversial names reserved list until it is found by some party to be controversial.

Avri Doria: Yes. And that's within - that you get into the disputed list by the Dispute Resolution Board saying, "Yup, this one is controversial and we recommend" or you know, not giving it.

Ray Fassett: Okay. So technically then, it's not controversial.

Avri Doria: Until they say it is.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. So even at the dispute point in time, it's not yet controversial.

Avri Doria: Right. It's only called controversial, but it still needs to be adjudicated by the dispute panel.

And actually at first we need to find somebody within the ICANN AC or SO structure who's willing to take up the banner and say "Yup, our folks in GAC or to our folks in, you know, ALAC or you know, the business community within in SO or within GNSO, we say yes this is controversial in our opinion" and explains why.

Ray Fassett: Okay. There has to be some - there have to be consensus demonstrated to that fact. It's not an individual within one of those groups...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...and this is one place where we sort of backed off a little bit. We had said originally that it has to be a consensus decision of that organization. Now that is actually presupposing a little bit too much on how those other groups make their decision.



So we're basically focusing also say, has to be a formal process within those groups, that is, you know, and they have to come up with that, you know, a transparent and just, etcetera process and not us saying, "Hey GAC, you must do this consensus based." They may decide that, you know, some other basis is an appropriate way to do a formal decision on this.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. And I do kind of subscribe that there needs to be some barrier to - for this dispute process because in theory any word can be controversial to somebody for whatever reason, not necessarily, you know, offensive if you will, but just controversial for some entirely different reason that might have to do with their own business or something like that.

So it just seems there's not enough of a threshold, and just thinking out loud and et cetera, but there's not enough of a threshold to make the dispute, to put the dispute forward.

And when does the ICANN staff or whoever, when do they decide we got to kick this out of the queue and hold it?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: When somebody - when somebody initiates dispute.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. That to me, there is an - that to me is a problem. That takes away now certainty for the applicant.

Marilyn Cade: Ray, it's Marilyn. I'm going to end the debate because I mentioned to you guys that don't want to have long debates on the call because there's so much work to do.

Ray, you've identified the problem that it's a very valuable one. It's actually noted and in the works that the sub group did including the need to have transparent criteria blah, blah, blah.

But I think maybe...

Avri Doria: I'd be happy to carry on the conversation with you in email.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: And see that if we can come to some...

Ray Fassett: Right.

Avri Doria: ...some wording or some something that helps make you more comfortable with...

Ray Fassett: And actually I'm not debating inasmuch I'm just trying to understand it.

Avri Doria: Yup.

Ray Fassett: I'm not debating at all.

I think in my view I hit on what my issue is which is, when does the application get kicked out?

Avri Doria: Right.

Ray Fassett: That to me (drives) to the issue.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...slow pass when one of the ACs or SOs (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: And let me just note that we didn't - we are calling for more work on this. I want to reinforce that message...

Avri Doria: Yeah. These are hard questions (unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

Man: And it's not completely kicked out, right, Avri...

Avri Doria: It's not kicked out, it goes...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...it's found not to be controversial but it just - it's like - it doesn't have to be reapplied (unintelligible) right?

Avri Doria: Right. Once the AC or the SO initiates the dispute that goes into slow pass.

Marilyn Cade: And you know, I would just say to people. Read the work that's been done (unintelligible) but read it. And Avri, I'm sure you'd welcome post from other members of...

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, please. And I'm willing to carry on, you know, one to one conversations or, you know, we can get on the phone or whatever. I'll be gone all weekend but, you know, other than that...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Normally I work on weekends, just this weekend I'm not.

Marilyn Cade: We're now going to turn to Chuck's two report tag names reports and (Nick) who is www. I'm going to report on those quickly.

Chuck has asked that we try to be sure that we close any questions out about B so that we can get them approved. And I haven't seen any comments, so I'll just remind people of where we are.

On the tag names report, that - the reserved name working group on the 25th of April, Chuck asked for comments prior to this meeting. We have the draft document that was mailed out to the list on Tuesday, the 1st of May. It was changed to the second recommendation.

And so I'm just going to review that change which is the only change that was made and see if anyone has any comment. Otherwise, I'm going to ask that we consider this report approved. And if anyone has a concern about approving it, especially I have a bit of concern about approving it, on the call today because we have so many members not here. But at least we can verify that the members here don't have any other questions about it.

So, Recommendation 2 is the one that deals with top level IDN and is described on Page 4 of Chuck's report and goes into some examples of -- hmm, goes into some examples that really basically asked that the applicant provide a good amount of information including that ASCII comparable coding to A level, the Unicode display form, the new label, the Unicode code point and the English translation or transliteration when they actually make their application.

That's the only change that I'm aware of in this report.

Patrick Jones: Hello, Marilyn. Marilyn, this is Patrick. Can I ask to meet you on this?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: There's been quite a bit of email discussion between Chuck and Tina and myself and Ram and Cary on this updated recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: And I think Chuck is probably going to be sending in another version to the full list taking out the suggestion for the Unicode code point.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: So I'd say that that's probably going to be coming soon. But you know, he would have mentioned it if he is on the call today.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Then I'm going to take agreement to this report off the agenda.

Woman: Right.

Marilyn Cade: And we'll wait for Chuck's update.

Man: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

On next WHOIS and WWW, what about that one, Patrick? Do you have any further insights on that one?

Patrick Jones: No.

Marilyn Cade: That report is also to remind everyone the recommendations were approved by the full working R and working group already. So this is just making sure that everyone has reviewed the report and agreed to the report.

If there aren't any questions about this -- and I'm not hearing any, then I think we can assume that this report is agreed by the members who are on that subgroup. Okay?

I'm going to take the next 27 minutes and see where we are on the agenda.

There is a document that describes the categories of names that are deemed to be out of scope that was sent to the full working groups for review on the 1st of May. It covers third level reserved names, registry specific names at the second level and other names reserved at the

second level. And it's intended to be part of the final working group report.

I don't know if others have had a chance to fully review it. I have not. It's due to lack of time. Chuck is asking that we approve it, but I personally am going to have to at least read it before I approve it.

I don't know if anyone else has the same problem I have of not having fully read it? That means everyone else has fully read it?

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think silence equals dissent.

Woman: ...on mute, I haven't fully read it.

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick again. I haven't had a chance to read it.

Woman: I see that...

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. And I haven't had either.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shanton: This is Greg. Me neither.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thank you guys.

My feedback to Chuck is going to be "We haven't read it yet." We clearly have to read it. So this is my reminder. And the comments I'm going to report back to him is we haven't read it yet, so we can't approve it.

The status report on the Chuck and Liz action items.

We've done one which is to add symbols back into the single two-character name subgroups. We're expecting a revised version of tag name for Patrick from Chuck so we won't be able to approve that at this point.

We've got to read this report we just referenced. I am (knowing) that we can't approve until we read it.

On the general task to Chuck and Liz, we were also seeing that we needed a definition of reserved names and that was approved on the 25th of April.

And then, Liz, you will be organizing the working group report. Any other comments that you wanted to make in relation to this task that you and Chuck are working...

Liz Williams: Yes, Marilyn, I will.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Can I turn to you?

Liz Williams: Yup, I'm here.

Marilyn Cade: Any other comments that you wanted to make?



Liz Williams: Yes, just some timeliness comments.

I've just actually been working on the new TLDs report in great detail today. It's really critical that the working group is doing is completed as soon as possible because much of it is very, very important in terms of string criteria and reserved names recommendations and contractor conditions. So I just urge you to get - finish as quickly as possible.

Let me know if you need additional help.

Marilyn Cade: Actually that's going to bring me too, Liz -- thank you for mentioning this -- I'm going to go to that very point and ask the group.

Does anyone on the group - are there any special needs that you have for you group you need additional technical assistance, you need another review or insights from the IDN first? Is there anything pending of what we've talked about so far that any of you would see as a special need other than a 40 hour a day - a 40-hour day which you're not going to get?

So other than more time, which you're not going to get, any other special needs?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim.

I think I'm the only one here from the geographic geopolitical, whatever, the name - right?

Marilyn Cade: Actually Alistair (unintelligible) come to...

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...I was going to turn to you next, Tim.

Exactly. Geographic and geopolitical names, could you Alistair share with us kind of where you think things are and because maybe you'd need additional bodies or I don't know. But could the two of you bring us up to date on where you think this is?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. Maybe Alistair will have more. I'm just wondering if I missed anything.

I think last I knew, the set of questions had been agreed upon to submit to the GAC. And as far as I know, that was submitted but I haven't heard or gotten any response and no further work I'm aware this had been done.

Alistair, do you see it differently or...

Alistair Dixon: You know, I wouldn't have anything to add that, Tim. I certainly haven't heard whether there has been a response from the GAC. And I - I'm certainly, the report itself hasn't been updated at least or at least an updated version hasn't been shared or discussed by the group.

Marilyn Cade: And Alistair, when was - when were the - there was a questionnaire, so it's on the - it's on the archive. Is that right?

Alistair Dixon: I'm not sure if it's actually been sent to the wider working group. I can't recall...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Maybe I can help - I can help Alistair out if he needs it.

Alistair Dixon: Please, Liz.

Liz Williams: Hey there, Alistair, how are you?

Alistair Dixon: Hood. How are you?

Liz Williams: I'm fine. Thank you.

There has been a broad discussion going on about the interactions with the GAC. And Donna Austin who has now taken over the GAC liaison role and I had a meeting late last week when she was here in Brussels about the best way to send the materials to the GAC and then to get responses from them.

We are putting together a program of activities that wouldn't take place on the Saturday of the Puerto Rico meeting -- just checking the dates of that. Sorry. Bear with me.

Because one of the issues that we've got is the way in which the GAC work is not the same as us. And we do need additional time for them to be able to respond to us.

So we will hand the best way of dealing with a more formalized way of working. As many questions as possible have been sent to the GAC

were included in the GNSO GAC call on the 16th of April that took place.

But we're limit - we're constrained in what we can send them because of yet not a mechanism for them to get back (unintelligible). But I'll let you know how Donna and I go with developing a better way of doing it.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So I still have a question about, was a list of question sent to the GAC and when and where is the list of the questions as far as the archive is concerned?

Liz Williams: Marilyn, I don't know where that -- sorry, that presumably was directed at me, if it is.

Marilyn Cade: No, I'm asking whoever sent it.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: ...Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm sorry.

Liz Williams: ...that was sent.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck sent a list of questions to the GAC?

Liz Williams: Yes. We put them together. But I have not seen that.

And frankly what we need to do is formalize the correspondence much more tightly than rather - rather than just an email being sent from (unintelligible) working group.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Liz Williams: So that is critical that we need to observe with sending of the questions. And I prepared a draft for Chuck. And frankly I haven't followed that up with him. I will do that tomorrow if that's the wish of the group.

Marilyn Cade: Here's my - I'm in total support of the need for more conversation of exchanges with any advisory group or supported - other supporting organization, lessons learned and other bodies that have been around longer than this one knows that having effective documented exchanges and protocols are very important, Liz. I really applaud that.

I think we need to, when you follow up with Chuck, I think we need to get a handle and maybe he can follow up on this with Mike and the subgroups on where things are because it's sounding like this may be - if there are some special needs of this subgroup. And it sounds like this group in particular is also going to be a further work is needed because of time, and the point that you raised about working methods that I could interact with.

So I can just note that and then ask for anyone else, are there other special needs of the subgroups that we should find?

I don't hear any. I'm going to go over to the last page of the agenda.

And just to remind people again, you've got really between now and - we've got between now and Tuesday to get the finals of this report. You've got the outline, you know all the questions.

And on the 10th, Chuck is going to use the outline that's presented here to walk through each of the subgroups' written reports. And he's asking that you be prepared to indicate support, non-support -- he calls it approval or disapproval. But I think it's support, non-support, consistent with the approach we've been taking before.

And I'll leave it to him to follow up and was emailed and trying to make sure we have as broad attendance as possible. And if you can't participate then he's asking for written communication of your position on the list prior to the meeting.

Ray Fassett: Hey Marilyn, this is Ray. I have a question for Liz.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Ray Fassett: I wanted to ask if given whatever the subgroup is or whatever the final determination is by the working group as a whole for particular category, what is the impact on Liz's work if the recommendation is - need additional time?

Marilyn Cade: Can I just ask you a clarifying question before Liz responds?

There are several of the groups that say more work is needed and for instance the controversial names group is suggesting more work is needed. But they're defining what that is.

Is your question more time?

Ray Fassett: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Do you mean so that you can do more work on a recommendation?

Ray Fassett: No, the impact on Liz's timeline with what she's doing.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Got it.

Liz?

Liz Williams: Thanks, Ray.

It's really critical. I have a very - I'll share with the group what my timeframe is, Marilyn, if you don't mind, the indulgence of the chair for one second.

I need to get to Bruce as the chair of the group and I'll (send) a draft of the report tonight. So that's - it's now quarter to 10 where I am, so I'm continuing on that.

He needs to return that draft to me over the weekend. Unfortunately it's public holiday here in Brussels on the 8th of May. I need to distribute to the committee an updated new TLDs report on the 10th of May to

prepare for a final committee conference call on the 15th of May which is not confirmed yet.

So you'll get a sense that the timing is extremely tight.

The timing is extremely tight because we've got also a deadline of posting the report on the first of June to enable three weeks of real-time for board members and other members of the community to review what is the final draft of the final report.

And of course there's much work that has to go on in the background with the internal operational legal mixes that I work with for our internal staffing issues. So asking for more time is not a good idea unless you wish to buy me vast quantities of gin or something to keep me going to incorporate those changes or recommendations into the main report.

What I suggest to do, and this is what Bruce and I have discussed last week, is that each of the working group reports will be posted to the GNSO Web site as standalone documents and where it's possible for me to reference the recommendations from each of the working groups. For example, I can say that the integration of the IDN working group today, where it's possible for me to incorporate any of the recommendations from the working to support the existing recommendations of the committee, then I'll do that. Beyond that it becomes rather more difficult.

Ray Fassett: That's exactly what I was looking to hear.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.



Ray Fassett: What you just said.

Liz Williams: I'm sorry about that. But - there's very little capacity for slippage. I'm sorry.

Marilyn Cade: Liz, it's Marilyn. I have - if I might ask you to give us a bit more detail on the particular topic. Can you just clarify for all of us, is there another comment of process required for PDP '05, the new gTLD, or have we concluded all the public comment process?

Liz Williams: Marilyn, what will happen as far as I can tell with what Bruce would like to do with the work of the group is that we will not do a public comment period until we have the board reports.

So for example we're now at Stage 9, of the PDP process which is the production of the final report of the group.

When we have what is called the Stage 10, which is the Board report, then I would just think that we will put a public comment period in place which will be asked at the Puerto Rico meeting.

Marilyn Cade: And that means that - that means that these recommendations that we're putting forward will have their first public comment...

Liz Williams: On post Puerto Rico.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: So is that what you wanted to hear?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...don't get public comment -- this is Avri.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: Our recommendations don't get public comment until the board seen them.

Liz Williams: No, no, no, no, no. Sorry.

Avri, what I meant, the board report is a formal piece of documentation which is presented to the board. So the board saves them after public comment people period.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Marilyn Cade: So it's a final - it's the final report, it goes up for public comments...

Liz Williams: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ...you summarize the public comment...

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: ...and then take that together and then give it to the...

Liz Williams: Exactly. With the draft contract with the base contract with the base implementation plan with the base - and with everything in it in a whole big beautiful package.

Marilyn Cade: So one more question for you, sorry.

That would mean -- and I'm being hypothetical here -- that would mean hypothetically that during Puerto Rico, the GNSO could decide to hear public comments during this public forum on these recommendations?

Liz Williams: Yes, Marilyn. Theoretically that could indeed take place and you and I know that's what Bruce and I are doing in terms of preparing the public forum materials that we take all of that stuff into great account.

And as many of you now you will see me working furiously during the public forum when people are at the microphone, it's a very, very important piece of the puzzle so that I can represent that into the report.

Marilyn Cade: Does anyone have any other questions for Liz?

Ray Fassett: Yes. This is Ray.

So if you're not able to reference a recommendation in your report, then it can't be part of that document. Is that correct?

Liz Williams: Sorry. Just say that again, would you mind?

Ray Fassett: Well, if additional time is needed by a particular subcategory group to complete their work and that's going to play or pass, you know, the

deadlines that you're working on, then the recommendation can't be in that initial report.

Liz Williams: There is one caveat to that, Ray. You're correct.

Bruce and I discussed this the other day, again, [part of what we're dealing with is a set of relatively stable recommendations. So all of you are familiar with the principles of the new TLDs report and then the series of recommendations, and there are 20 or so of them.

And then things have had gone into the implementation guidelines are things that - which - things which don't have necessarily majority support. So for example, and I don't wish to pick on the (unintelligible) that's all there, but they've made some suggestions about things like reduced fees and languages in other than English and five languages (unintelligible) other nations.

And so for example, if things or group comes up with recommendations that don't get majority support from the committee, then that's where they will end up.

But this is still a fairly fluid process. So I wouldn't get hang up on the process they might just actually spending the time on doing the work. And I send this note to the group today to say how delighted I was that there was so much discussion going on and I would be recommending that we take the time to do as much consultation as it's necessary to get a quality result rather than die a death on a deadline.

Ray Fassett: That's great. Thanks, Liz.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

I have a few minutes left for any comments. I'm going to around and through and just make sure that we have heard them everybody who's on the call.

So, Neil, do you have any comments that you want to add or other questions you want to add?

Neil Blair: Nothing that I can think of.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Ray?

Ray Fassett: No. Thank you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Alistair? Alistair?

Liz Williams: He's on mute I think.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. We'll come back to Alistair.

Tim?

Tim Ruiz: No. Thanks, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick?

Patrick Jones: No.

Marilyn Cade: Avri?

Avri Doria: Nope.

Marilyn Cade: And Gregg?

Greg Shanton: Nothing from me. Thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Let me go back to Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: No, Marilyn. Sorry about that. My line was on hold.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

I'm just going to close with two comments. We all owe our chair, Chuck, a word of appreciation for his preparation of very detailed and easy to follow working outline for our work. And to Patrick for his continued heavy lifting and support of the work of the group. And Liz, thank you for joining us. I know you've got a lot on your plate that we really appreciate the fact that you joined us for this call in addition to everything else that you are doing.

Liz Williams: Just have to make a bigger plate. Thank you very much, Marilyn. It's very sweet of you to say though.

Marilyn Cade: And let me say thanks to everyone for the hard work and urge that you do even more between now and next Tuesday just so that we meet all of our deadlines.

Liz Williams: Thanks guys.

Woman: (Unintelligible) with?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks guys.

Liz Williams: Bye-Bye.

Man: Thanks, Marilyn.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END