Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference
15 February 2007
18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 15 February 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made by the Chair, in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/rn-wg-20070215.mp3

On page

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

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Jon Nevett - Registrars

Dan Dougherty - IPC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Absent excused:

Caroline Greer - Registries

Tim Ruiz – Registrars

Liz Williams - staff

(Chuck): I know you already sent it to me and I just…

Woman: What?

(Chuck): …wasn't prepared. It's all these documents last minute has kept me (offing).

Coordinator: Excuse me. Mr. (Dixon) joins.

(Chuck): Thank you.

But I think - okay, one more report just came in. So, let me open it up

(Mike Palage): Yeah. (Chuck), that's probably my report; the low-hanging geographical fruit.

(Chuck): It is, (Mike).

(Mike Palage): I have five pages and counting and I haven't even got to summarize the 20 documents I found. So…

(Chuck): Oh my. I have to get some of your partners and trying to help you on that. Okay, let's see then, so this and then, still looking for - oh there, okay. So - all right.

Well, rather than waiting Glen any longer for me - I mean, to log on for that, I don't want to delay start anymore, so I'm going to hit star-0.

Man: Hello?

Glen Desaintgery: Hello. Yes.

(Chuck):   Yes, Glen. I'm still watching for that URL and…

Coordinator: This conference is now being recorded. If you do have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

                Thank you, sir. You may begin.

(Chuck):   Okay. Thank you.

                All right. I think all of us have been really busy and I appreciate everybody's effort. So, let me start off by saying that, as you just heard, the meeting is being recorded and transcribed.

                So, please try to identify yourself, except for those who have same and, you know, first name, it's probably okay to just say your first name, but we do have a few duplications of first names, so you need to (contradict) to that.

                It's important for the - especially for the transcript, if any of you looked at the transcript from last week, you'll see that in a lot of cases the transcriber couldn't identify who was speaking understandably so. So, if you could…

Woman: Yeah.

(Chuck): …that would be helpful. Okay.

Okay. I got your saying there, Glen. So - there, so I can get that on there.

Glen), I just typed my user name - oh, what's my user name?

Glen): (Chuck) - use (Chuck). Just your name.

(Chuck): Okay. That's pretty easy, I think.

It's the first time I used this. So - oh, look at that. Wow. Very nice. Now, I can still searching Marilyn for that deleted person button.

Marilyn Cade: I know you are, but I hope you're not going to find it before this call is over.

(Chuck): I probably won't.

Marilyn Cade: I'm safe. I'm safe.

(Chuck): Okay.

Now, I want to welcome at least one new member, it's hard to keep track of which members are new and which ones aren't as we keep getting people added.

I suspect that he may not be able to join us today, but (Mawaki Chango) is the latest one who joined the group from the NCUC. So, we will have someone from that constituency.

Mawaki?

I don't see Mawaki on there. So, anyway, just welcome him in his absence.

Anybody else that's first time on the call?

Okay. All right.

Now, any problems with the agenda, any changes, anybody wants to suggest?

Okay. I'm going to move relatively quickly because we have a lot to cover and we have a short timeframe to get our job done in the next few weeks. But, please stop me if I go a little bit too fast. Don't hesitate to interrupt me. I'm pretty comfortable with that. But at the same time, I will try to keep it moved, so that we can get a lot done.

So, the next thing we want to do then is status of interest statements. Glen, can you give us an update on that. Is anybody missing in the group? Obviously Mawaki is.

Glen Desaintgery: Mawaki and (Edmon Chung).

(Chuck):   Okay. (Edmon) and...

Glen Desaintgery: (Edmon) is off to join and he said that, he would not be able to join this week, but he will be from next week on.

(Chuck):   Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: So, it's just he and (Edmon).

                    (Edmon), I sent out an updated list.

(Chuck):   Yup. I saw that. Hopefully, everybody saw that.

Glen Desaintgery: And so that's the current status.

(Chuck):   Good. And we have regress for today's meeting from (Liz) and
                    (Caroline) and I'm blank. It seemed like I had one other one.

Woman: I'm sorry. (Caroline); I didn't hear the other name.

(Chuck):   (Carolyn Greer) and (Liz) will not be able to make. And (Liz) is working
                    on the new TLD report. So, she sent me an email saying she would not
                    be able to join us today.

Man: But our tech support is on the phone, right?

(Chuck):   Yes.

Man: Oh, okay.

(Chuck):   (Tim) is on.

Man: Oh, great. Okay.

(Chuck):   I should say, (Tim Denton), since we have two (Tims).

Okay. I don't know if (Tim Ruiz) is going to be able to join us or not because of, you know, he was in, like (Carolyn), in Barcelona. And I'm not sure whether he's traveling or what today.

So - okay. Thank you, Glen, for the update on that.

And, again, if anybody has any updates to their statements of interest, please send them to the list or communicate them on the call when we have them. Once in a while that happens and we just want to be upfront about those kinds of things as we go through this work.

Regarding liaisons, most of you should have seen that (Minjung Park) from Korea has joined our group as a liaison from the ccNSO. She will rarely if ever be able to participate in the conference calls, but will try to participate on the list.

And the reason is, that it's in the middle of the night for her in Korea. I'm pleased that (Edmond) is going to join us on the group, but even though he also will be in the middle of the night from Hong Kong.

I still haven't got a final word on an IDN working group liaison, I think that's going to be increasingly important as we move forward because just to make everybody excited that's working on these reports, one of the things that all of us are going to have to do is also address the issue of IDNs with regard to the reserve name requirements that we're dealing with and how will the recommendations that we end up making be impacted with regard to IDN.

And in that regard, one of your experts probably just about everybody - well, probably be (Rom Mohan) or, you know, them, (Rom) being the chair of the IDN working group and (Tina), the ICANN Program Director for the IDN Program.

Also, have not heard from (Susan Sene) regarding a GAC liaison, and so we have no word on that.

Now, the next thing, is just a logistical matter that I want to cover. We've changed the meeting time for next week because the new TLD PDP work will be going during our scheduled time for this and several of us are involved in that and so that's going to be happening in Marina del Rey.

And because several of us are going to be in Marina del Rey, Avri Doria as a chair of the February '06 PDP on existing conditions for registry contracts, the - she agreed to postpone the start of her two-day meeting on - starting on Saturday, the 24th, for two hours.

So, from 8:00 to 10:00 Pacific Time, sorry about the earliness for those on the side of the world, we are going to have a meeting that will be in person for those who are in Marina del Rey at the courtyard muriate there and there will be teleconference capabilities.

So those of you that can dial in, and again, I apologize that it's on a weekend, but it was hard to avoid - if you can't make it, please let us know and if there's - you know, get somebody else in your team to talk about the report and make sure you send the report that we'll talk about later in the meeting.

The - again, for Korea, Hong Kong, New Zealand, it's a lousy time; although if you get up in the middle of the night, then we won't interfere with the other parts of your weekend.

Oh my. Now…

Man: And (Mike)…

(Chuck): …we're going to have two hours - see, the rest of us will be interfering with our regular - the good part of our weekend.

Now, what I'd like to do real quickly is find out who is going to be able to attend in person for that meeting a week from Saturday on the 20 - I will be there.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I'll be there.

(Chuck): All right.

(Neal Blare): This is (Neal Blare). I'll be there.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Dan): This is (Dan). I'll be participating by telephone.

(Chuck): Telephone. Good. Thanks, (Dan). I appreciate that.

(Dan): Sure.

(Chuck):   In fact, let me just go through the list and let's see, Alistair, you've got a lousy time on that one. Are you going to be there?

Alistair Dixon: I won't be there, (Chuck). I'll see - we're on edge in terms of participating remotely given the time.

(Chuck):   I understand completely. Thanks. Okay.

Alistair Dixon: If I'm away, yes, I will.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right.

                 (Avri), are you - I don't think I saw (Avri) on the call. Okay.

                 And (Carolyn Grer) is not on the call.

                 Is (Dan) - (Dan Allen) is not on the call either is he?

                 Okay. But (Dan) is Deputy - General Council for ICANN for those of you but then he is at least participating on our list.

                 (Denise), are you on the call?

                 No. Okay.

                 (Edmon) - I'm not sure. He's not on the call, whether he's going to participate or not.

Glen Desaintgery: He'll be there, (Chuck).

(Chuck):   What's that?

Glen Desaintgery: He will be in there late, (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Okay. So, he will be there. Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

(Chuck):   Thanks, Glen. I appreciate that.

                     And Glen, you will not - because of your…

Glen Desaintgery: I (won't).

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   …at the moment.

Glen Desaintgery: No.

(Chuck):   Sorry, we will miss you.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you.

                     Mawaki will be there too, (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Okay. Mawaki will be there. Excellent.

                     (Greg), he hasn't joined our call yet. Huh. Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Maybe late or not able to join.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right.

                Jon?

Jon: Most likely going to be there.

(Chuck):   Probably. Huh. Okay. Jon, thanks. Hope to see you there.

Jon: You've downgraded me for most likely to probably for the recorded.

(Chuck):   That doesn't sound promising.

                Okay. (Liz) will be there.

                Is (Lucila) on?

                She's not. Okay. I'm just looking at my list here. She is not on.

                Are we still having to - I mean, there's enough dial up number for
                Buenos Aires. So, is that not usable? Is that why we had to call her?
                Glen, do you know?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. She's got great problems coming on the call.

(Chuck):   Okay.

                Marilyn, you said, you would be there.

(Mike Palage)?

(Mike Palage):   I'm going to be there Thursday, Friday. Unfortunately, I'll probably going to have to fly back Friday night. But I'll be able to give at least have some preliminary discussion, maybe with you before heading out Friday night.

(Chuck):   Okay. And do you expect to call in?

(Mike Palage):   Depending upon, if my red eye gets back in time, I should be able to call in.

(Chuck):   I'll put down with a question mark on that.

Mike Rodenbaugh?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I will be there.

(Chuck):   Thanks, (Mike).

I mean,Hong), I don't think will be - have you heard anything from her, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: No. I don't think she will be because she's going back to Korea.

(Chuck):   Yeah. Okay.

Neal, you said, yes.

(Patrick)?

(Patrick):   I'll be there.

(Chuck):   Are you going to bee able to make that long trip?

(Patrick):   Yeah. I think so.

(Chuck):   Okay. Thanks.

                 (Seth) is not on the call. I recall, he's not.

                 (Tamara)?

(Tamara):   Yes.

(Chuck):   Are you going to be in the Marina del Rey?

(Tamara):   No, I won't be.

(Chuck):   Okay. Are you going to try and call in?

(Tamara):   I can try and call in.

(Chuck):   I'm sorry. I didn't understand that.

(Tamara):   I said, I'd have to check my schedule. But I can try.

(Chuck):   Okay. I'll put you down as a question mark.

(Tamara):   Okay.

(Chuck):   And (Tim Ruiz) has not joined us. So - and then…

(Jon):   I think - (Chuck), it's (Jon). I think, he needs to leave on Friday night, as well. I think like (Mike).

(Chuck):   Okay.

(Jon):   But I'm not sure.

Marilyn Cade: That's what I recall as well. It's Marilyn.

(Chuck):   Thanks, Jon. Thanks, Marilyn.

                  (Timothy), you're going to be there.

                  And (Tina), do you know - (Patrick), whether (Tina) is planning on being there?

(Patrick):   I'm not sure yet. She will - I believe be in the area but…

(Chuck):   Okay. All right. So I get a little bit of an overview. So…

Glen Desaintgery: (Chuck), I don't think (Tina) will be there because she sent a note to me saying that she would be there only on Thursday.

(Chuck):   Oh, okay. So, she's a no. Okay.

                  So, at least, we have eight people in person and several calling in. And so, we'll plug away. Again, those of you who can't participate in either

way, if you please, provide any feedback via the list before you come, then make sure we have latest revisions of the reports that we'll talk about later.

All right, moving on. The - I don't know if any of you had a chance to look at the draft GAC principles regarding the introduction of new gTLDs. It is a draft; it's not finished. And I'm - we're not going to go over those right now but I did review them, a few others on the committee reviewed them.

I think it will be very helpful if we form a little subgroup that would develop some questions that we can send to the council which would then in turn be sent to the GAC as soon as possible. And I'd like to have a draft list of questions that we can talk about in the committee - in the meeting next Thursday and Friday regarding the new TLD.

And so what I'm looking for right now is some volunteers and I will start off the volunteering by volunteering myself to work that. In fact, if nobody objects, I'll draft up a quick list of questions, send it to the other volunteers later this week, so that you can just correspond via email on that.

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck), it's Marilyn.

I'd like to volunteer. But I'd like to give a quick update on the status on that from a discussion I had with some of the GAC members this week.

(Chuck):   Please. Go ahead and do that right now, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Then that may help people in understanding where things stand.

I was at the Internet Governance Forum and there's a significant number of GAC members who were here in Geneva. And I had an opportunity to run into the chair and several members of the GAC and just have a very informal, so what's going on conversation.

And the - what I took out of that conversation is that, you know, there will - so I should just say this so people know this. There is scheduled, at this point, a discussion on Saturday in Lisbon between the council and the GAC and observers. It's intended to be an open meeting. This is just a left over update from what was worked out in Sao Paulo. So, I'm merely reporting from previous decisions taken.

And the GAC does hope to have - the GAC small working group does hope to have the - they'll have a final version to work from. It isn't clear whether or not they will fully approve principals and put those forward but they'll meet with the council on Saturday and then they'll meet in plenary during the week and try to complete the principals and put them forward in their GAC (communicate).

So, the more work that can be done and particularly in preparation for the interaction between the council and its expert bodies on Saturday, the better because that will allow the advancement of discussion on Saturday and hopefully the clarification of outstanding questions.

One thing to remember is the GAC members, once they arrive, cannot take decisions on things that are not agreed to before they leave capital.

(Chuck):   Okay. Thank you, Marilyn.

Now, I'm going to…

Mike Palage: (Chuck), this is Mike Palage here.

Just with regard to questions - with regard to the issue or geographic and geopolitical identifiers, you'll see some of the issues that I've already began to touch on my report. I will try to provide a list of questions just on that particular subject matter that…

(Chuck):   Okay. I'll put you down and include you on my email. So - and what I sent out and you can just add those to it or whatever.

Okay, (Mike)?

Mike Palage: All right. Thank you, (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And, (Chuck), just one final point, although (Tim) is not on the call, I don't think on the issue of controversial names, you know, I volunteered to work with (Tim), we'll need to give you questions as well.

(Chuck):   Okay. Good. Well, since you've already volunteered, that works pretty well.

Okay. That's fine. So, we've got three volunteers. I don't want to take too long on this unless somebody else speaks up right now, I'll just…

Mike Rodenbaugh: So, will we have opportunities as a group to comment on the draft questions and supplement?

(Chuck):   We can send them to our list…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Great.

(Chuck):   …because - keep in mind that we're going to want - as long as you provide any feedback before next Thursday, that will be fine.

                  Okay? I mean, you can provide it afterwards, they won't, you know, but whether it needs to be timely, so that…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Understood.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   Okay. Good.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yup.

(Chuck):   And was that (Mike)?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, sorry, Mike Rodenbaugh.

(Chuck):   Okay. Thanks, (Mike).

                  All right, now - all right, so enough on that. Thank you, Marilyn and Mike Palage for volunteering there. And then if we send it to the list, anybody can comment on it.

Now, we're ready for the big part of our meeting and that's the updates of reports from working group member regarding reserve name.

Now, I want to let everybody know a couple of things in this regard. Let me tell you what I'm envisioning with regard to these reports.

Eventually, they will be attached as - the final versions will be attached as part of reports that we give to the council and to the two PDPs that are going on. And so, they are live documents that we're going to continue to improve over the next few weeks.

I know it's a lot of work. I know it first hand because I've been working on one myself and along with (Patrick) and some of the topics are tougher. Please, understand that the reports aren't going to all be exactly the same. I do expect them to end up in the same format so that it's easy to find things and we'll talk about that later.

But in terms of recommendations, some recommendations are probably going to be, you know, "Hey, we recommend that this reserve requirement continues and extended to the first level," you know, other cases, there's going to be probably a recommendations for follow-up working groups to be performed, not necessarily a subset of or team here but to work on it because it's a much more complex issue.

So there's a lot of directions and in some cases, we made us decide that this is an area that can be left handled in the way it has been in the past through negotiations or whatever. So, don't think that everybody's recommendations are going to end up looking a like.

Also, don't hesitate to - if you have questions that I can be helpful on, send me an email or call me. I'm going to be in some real long meetings Monday - see, I guess, traveling on Monday and tied up in all-day meetings, mostly next week, but I have my Treo and I can sometimes use it during my meetings and I will be keeping up an email as I have time. So, if I can be of help, if you're not sure about something don't hesitate to ask me.

Now, let's start going to the reports and let me pause, does anybody have a question or a comment at this point?

Okay.

Now, unless there's objection, I'm going to be real brief…

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck)?

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I do have - I just have a point of order that I'd ask you to come back to at some point. It's Marilyn.

(Chuck):   Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And that is - sorry, that is discussing after we go through the reports, how we might coordinate the scheduling of any expert conversions to expedite those.

(Chuck):   Good. Yeah. We're - and - yeah, let me write myself a note. I think I have that in my own notes here, but let me - okay. I wrote myself a note on that. And that's good, Marilyn. Thank you.

                  One of this - and let me talk about the use of experts a little bit right now. And then, Marilyn, it'll probably still going to be useful for us to come back that way.

                  One of the ways you can use experts, that's probably the easiest, it's for the volunteers on a particular category to communicate with the experts and give them question that you have. (Patrick) and I on the tag names have already done that and received once response that was very helpful.

                  And to the extent that - please feel free to do that. The working group as a whole may still decide that it's useful for the whole group to consult with the expert, but that may not be necessary in all cases.

                  And if it can be handled more expeditiously by the volunteers and we get at the - and you get the information that's needed and that the working group needs, that will probably be a much more expeditious way of involving experts.

                  Now, I'm sure there will be some cases where the whole group who want to control with experts and, of course, that's what Marilyn is

referring to that we're going to need to schedule those times as part of our meeting.

Any questions on that?

Okay, then let's get started.

The first category is ICANN and IANA related names. (Tim), you had submitted a report last week, have there been any changes to that report?

(Timothy Denton):   No. No. I don't know quite what to say here, (Chuck). I have not received any comments and I'm not sure what to say in relation to it.

(Chuck):   So I'll just open it up because it's been on the list. Does anyone in the group have any questions or comments regarding the reports that (Smith) - that (Tim) submitted last week?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn, (Chuck).

I just - I think the one outstanding issue, but (Avri) is not on the phone, is that, at some point, we need to come back and just discuss the question that she raised.

(Chuck):   Right.

(Timothy Denton):   Remind me again what it was, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: God, let me pull my paper out here. I think it had to do with why she was not treating - we had subdivided ICANN names and IANA-related

names and I think it had to do with she wanted to be sure that if there was a separate process which might lead to hypothetically the IAD or the IATF creating names that might go into IANA that we knew what that process was and that it was - I'm just going to use the word harmonize.

So, it kind of I think to do with, how does a name gets identified as an IANA-related name.

(Timothy Denton):   Okay.

(Patrick):   This is (Patrick), maybe I can add something to that.

I believe at the last call Marilyn passed me with contacting someone in IANA and…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

(Patrick):   …try to find out if there was a process.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

(Patrick):   And I know it's something that they're looking into. To my knowledge there is not a process for getting on the list, but they may want to create one. In addition with the list was most likely created by (Luchison) back in (declamation) of ICANN or at least around 2001 and there's not a lot of history or information that goes along with how this list was created, except that most of that names were taken from (RFP) and it was an effort to make sure that those entities or (RFCs) were, you know, reserved across all TLD.

(Chuck):   Thank you, (Patrick).

Marilyn Cade: You know, I think, you know, that is consistent with my memory of those days and I was kind of involved in those days as others were, as well. That is kind of consistent that, you know, we were doing the best we could and we put together the names that we thought out to be there. But I think you're, we didn't necessarily say, "Here's the formal process by which IANA will designate a name."

(Chuck):   And what we will do, hopefully, next - a week from Saturday is, go through the reports in more detail because some of them maybe getting close to being final and make sure that we have rough consensus.

And if there are any - you know, if there are some people that disagree on some points, we can add some minority-type opinions to them, as long as we have a strong support within the group for the report and particularly, the recommendations that are there.

Mike Palage: (Chuck), this is Mike Palage. Can I make a comment on…

(Chuck):   Please.

Mike Palage: I guess, my question goes to - is should we even be protecting these names in the first place? And the reason I raised that is, as someone who has spent a lot of time looking at the WIPO-2 report, there was talk about IGOs and there are some issues about providing protection to IGO acronyms.

Now, depending upon what action ICANN takes with the IGO, this I think goes back to, shall we - I'll be allowing ICANN to protect some of its acronym, is it somehow getting more preferential treatment than such as the World Health Organization or the WIPO.

And again, this potentially even cuts across, you know, to the business community where defensive registration is something that a lot of businesses have to undertake.

So, I guess, I would have to - I would like to see articulated a technical for security instability reason for protecting this names as opposed to just - I just like to see some reason not as opposed to with the list that we came up with because otherwise, it just seems rather arbitrary and capricious for how they are protecting this particular subset of names.

(Chuck):   Thanks, (Mike). I have a question for you.

Mike Palage: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And, (Chuck), I'd like to be in the queue.

(Chuck):   Okay, Marilyn.

If you - would you consider user confusion to fit in to the technical category?

Mike Palage: I guess what happens is if you want to start down the user confusion category, I don't see how you stop with either IGOs or how you potentially stop with businesses. If there is potential user confusion, that is what in the fact the UDRP exists for.

(Chuck):   Well, but UDRP is not going to cover that in all cases. Let me give you
                an example.

Mike Palage: Uh-huh.

(Chuck):   And (Patrick) and I have run into this with regard to tag name. As all of
                you are aware, Avri's question whether we should (wait) for all tag
                names or just some subset (unintelligible) wording but that's at the
                essence of what she was questioning in the meeting last week and on
                the email list.

                And the response when we raised that question with (Rom Mohan),
                Chair of the IDN Working Group, his opinion was that if you only
                reserve for example a subset of the X - of the character, character,
                dash, dash, prefix name, then it can be confusing.

                Now, obviously we have another reason for reserving more too and
                that is the case that - it's possible that the prefix will have to be
                changed in the future and you're going to have trouble finding a prefix.

                But, you know, it is confusing and, in fact, (Patrick) sent a message to
                me this week regarding the name fix.com that was on an auction using
                a different character for the "I."

                Wasn't it, (Patrick)?

(Patrick):   Yes, that's correct.

(Chuck):   And, you know, it really had no value from the point of view of a
              domain name but it was being done. And so - and when they
              registered X and dash, dash, whatever, now that doesn't exactly relate
              here because the X and dash, dash prefixes aren't allowed to be used.

Mike Palage: But did…

(Chuck):   But there can be quite a bit of confusion in this regard and I'm curious
              as to what you think about them, (Mike).

Mike Palage: Okay, and I think I was a little confused. If we're just dealing with tag
              names, with the dash, dash in the set - in the third and fourth place, I
              agree that that reservation needs to be in place.

              The issue I was trying to raise was the IANA names and ICANN
              names, such as, IB, IANA, ICANN, RIPE, those types of strings. That's
              - when I was hearing IANA and ICANN reserve names, that's where
              my comment was directed at.

(Chuck):   Let me say, and sorry, Marilyn, I'm going to get to you, okay?

Marilyn Cade: Well, I'm - (Chuck), I think you're probably raising the questions I'm
              going to raise.

(Chuck):   Okay. Another category, (Mike) is the dub-dub-dub, nick and (who is),
              would you look at that as another okay area that would be an issue of
              user confusion?

Mike Palage: Well, I would - hopefully, the Registry Operator for a TLD would put
              that on its reserve list since…

(Chuck):   Well, they don't need to now, it's a reserved category. And I believe that one of the reasons for that is to make sure that users know that they're dealing with the authority for that particular TLD.

                  But it's another - see, what I'm saying is that I think we're going to run into several cases where user confusion may be the justification for reserving the name, making sure that there's - it's clear. But at the same time, I respect what you're saying and I understand your argument.

Mike Palage: And again, (Chuck), just to follow up. I just pulled up on the PTO and there are over -- let's see, one, two, three, four -- there are about - there are over 20 active registrations that involve the trademark string NIC. So there's - there are legitimate people that have a trademark in NIC.

                  And the fact that we - what we're doing here is we're saying, "Well, ICANN" - we're saying that this subset of names are special ICANN and we need to reserve them and protect them in all TLDs.

                  Now, while we're taking this action on behalf of an international organization, we have IGOs that have gone through an international process, the WIPO-2 process, in which every country, except the United States, has advanced protection for IGOs just being at the UDRP, we're not providing them defensive registrations or blocking them out in (mess). They still have to go and, if you will, fight on your own to protect their brand or their mark.

And, again, these are IGOs, we haven't even gotten to the businesses and, you know, this, you know, (Mike Roddenbuck) had talked about how he has to deal with defensive registration.

I don't understand the technical and stability reason for why we're doing this. And basically, what it comes down to is, this was a list that (Louie) came up with back in 2000. And while I appreciate that basis, what I'm saying is given the WIPO-2 process that has taken place since that time, I really think we need to seriously rethink or at least ask the question, "Will this open up ICANN to attack by the GAC in other venues?"

(Chuck):   Okay. That's good. It's a good point.

Marilyn?

(Patrick):   (Chuck), this is (Patrick). Can I add something there?

(Chuck):   Sure. Do you want to add it right now or can Marilyn go first?

(Patrick):   No. Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to caution us against thinking that we can create the art of the perfect as opposed to the art of the pragmatic on some decisions. And in some cases, I think we are going to encounter a need to just be pragmatic about a list of names that are on the reserve list. We can't find an easy way - we can't find a pragmatic way to get agreement to unreserve them.

And I think instead the question I'd like to ask is, "So how do names get added into that special category? Do they need to stay in that special category and is there harm if they are unreserved?"

I frankly do think that we're going to find confusion. I understand the interest of registries to run a business model but I don't think a business model is implicated by having a short list of IANA names or ICANN names. So, I hope we can just sort of focus on thinking about what I think we (wrote) the statement of work to do and that is examine whether names should stay on the reserve list, is it logical to unreserve them, logical to leave them on, how do new names get on to a reserve list?

(Chuck):   Or how to get names get off.

Marilyn Cade: And, yeah, and how do names get off, exactly.

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Mike Palage: (Chuck), this is (Mike), if I could respond to Marilyn.

(Chuck):   Sure.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):Luvox   …because we've got a lot of proof reports to go through.

Mike Palage: Will do.

This has nothing to do with the registry business model, this has to do with the legal precedent that ICANN is saying in connection with reserving a subset of names.

And we talked about - you talked about pragmatic versus practical. You know, the arguments that could be made to protect IANA or ICANN dot whatever TLD could likely also be made on behalf of the World Health Organization, WHO, who may sit there and feel that their mark is being infringed. I, you know, so I just…

(Chuck): Or Yahoo!.

Mike Palage: Well, might they have you and a good team of legal experts and - to beat up on those bad people. But I really think we have to question the legal precedents here.

(Chuck): Yes. (Mike)…

Mike Palage: This is not a business opportunity - this is not a registry, you know, trying to seek to make money but this is really are we starting down a slippery slope and we need to look at that going forward because I do think there may - you know, the Government Advisory Committee who has made their position very clear with regard to IGOs and its board with regard to country names will view this as, "Okay, if you've done this for yourself, why can't you do this for us?"

(Chuck): All right, thanks. (Patrick)?

(Patrick): Just to add that there is an ongoing effort at sort of running behind the scenes with all the other PTPs going on but I believe that's between

the (IPC) and the (BCA) proposal for a special IGO dispute process. And this would take into account the WIPO-2 consideration so just to let everyone know, there is work being done. There's a small group of people and we met in (America) and we met briefly in Sao Paulo and hope at some point it will come up. But it hasn't yet.

(Chuck): Now, just to provide a little bit of guidance, and this is for all of the different reserving categories. Keep in mind that we do have a short timeframe, we do want to make some recommendations that are timely for the new TLD process and (Marilyn's) point with regard to being pragmatic I think is helpful.

And one of the things we can do is we can make recommendations like this and I'm not advocating this in this case, okay? I'm just trying to illustrate what we can do with our recommendation in a way that allow us to complete our work when we're supposed to.

One recommendation for this category or some other categories could be, we recommend that for now, the requirement remain the same and that it be extended to the top level if we think that, but we would suggest that in the next six months or whatever we think that a separate group or maybe we referenced coordination with the group that (Patrick) just talked about to look at this issue and here are the reasons why. I don't want to discuss that now because we don't have now, but you follow me.

We have quite a bit of flexibility in terms of what we can recommend. We don't have to resolve and we won't resolve every reserve name issue in our report but we can make some suggestions as to how they might be resolved in the future and more time can be allotted to it.

Does that make sense?

Okay. (Tim Denton), obviously you got some good feedback for that report. Mike Palage, I assumed that he could pick your brain a little more on this as he refines his report on this area.

Man: Just a - excuse me, (Chuck), tell me what you would like me to do in relation to do this because the - since I get it to the - enter into a large (unintelligible) unknown minefield in relation to these other international issues?

(Chuck): I'm not expecting you to do a deep detailed research on that, but I think it would be good in your report…

Man: Yes.

(Chuck): …if you capture under information sources and see you'll see that on my email that I'll send out after this meeting.

Man: Yes.

(Chuck): I'm going to - instead of - I'm not going call it document, I'm going to call it information sources.

Man: Yes.

(Chuck): But you could capture it there as an issue.

Man: Good.

(Chuck):   Okay?

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   Does that make sense?

Man: Perfect. Thank you.

(Chuck):   Okay.

Man: So I'll talk to (Mike).

(Chuck):   Yeah. Mike Palage, are you okay with that?

Man: I have no problem. Sure, I will.

(Chuck):   You can just email him some of what you just said. It will be captured in the MP3 and in the…

Man: Transcripts.

(Chuck):   Transcripts, so you maybe able just get it by that, but that would be great.

                  Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

(Chuck):   (Tim Denton), do have anymore questions on yours?

(Timothy Denton): No, I don't.

(Chuck): Okay. Now, we go to single and two-character label, Mike Rodenbaugh was the lead, (Neil Blaire) and Alistair Dixon are participating in that and a report was sent just before the meeting, I believe. It's not that one. Let's see, I'm looking…

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Here we go found it. Okay.

I did not have time to review that one.

(Mike), are you going to give us a quick summary of that?

Mike Palage: Absolutely. It won't take long, (Chuck).

We basically gone through the initial document we collect to staff. Probably, (Dan), (Patrick), and (Tim) were pulling together a lot of useful of information, well, bunch of which I certainly had never seen before.

So myself, Alistair, and Neal will now go through the process of analyzing all those documents and creating summaries of them. I'll endeavor hopefully with their assistants to have that done by next Saturday.

For today's call, I did just kind of want to gage (ones) opinion on whether people thought there would be need for use of experts on this

topic. And, you know, I come out that it's not likely particularly given the information that has been circulated to the list already by (Patrick) and (Tim) especially, you know, showing that there are so many of these already out there.

You know, I just don't really see what experts can add if the proposition is that expert will tell us there's - anyway, I'll just leave it at that and open the floor for anybody else's comments on that issue.

Alistair Dixon: Can I get in the queue, (Chuck), it's Alistair.

(Chuck):   Sure, Alistair. Go ahead.

Alistair Dixon: I'm not sure whether that's the case. You maybe right, (Mike), at the (thick) and label. I just think that the top level maybe necessary to make because the top level - we'll be dealing with both sort of (unintelligible) characters as well as, you know, (unintelligible), et cetera. And some - there maybe technical reasons for some of those characters plus the numbers not to be available at top level. So I just wonder whether it maybe valuable to have (unintelligible).

So I understood that there technical reasons why at least some of those characters were considered - was considered inappropriate and have those characters available at the top level. So I just think we may need to seek emphasis at least on the top level.

(Chuck):   And you might also need experts with regard to the IDN implications of single character and double character.

Alistair Dixon: Right.

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck), it's Marilyn.

(Chuck):   Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: So, we need to start it out and maybe give you guys…

(Chuck):   Marilyn, we can barely hear you.

Marilyn Cade: Pardon me.

(Chuck):   Yeah. Your voice was very low, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: That means everyone will play close attention.

(Chuck):   That's better.

Marilyn Cade: That means everyone will play close attention, right?

(Chuck):   Yeah, but I have - I use a hearing aide, and can't…

Man: (I've always).

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Maybe you guys are going to do this. But one of the things that would be helpful for the non-day-to-day - want to jump into the deep end of the ocean on this would be maybe a footnote or something else that you add for you acknowledge that the use of the term character here

actually includes three categories that is the symbols, the numbers, and the letters.

So the use of the term single character actually has three subcategories and dual character has three subcategories. Because I believe you will find to Alistair's point different levels of sophistication required to analyze and different treatment possible based on those.

The (RFCs) say and practice says that you can use a dash for instance, and the second level, which can't use an underscore due to the issue of being confusingly similar.

There also are these limitations to the use of some symbols due to their use in programming language as higher levels above the DNS. Those, but there are of course, as (Patrick's) survey showed - the stock survey showed single letters and dual letter used and at the second level and a variety of setting not just gTLDs, but ccTLDs and many ccTLDs already use numbers and single characters.

So I think that parts are going to come out. But if you add that characterization upfront in your background statement and then maybe explain where you - because I do think we will need expert conversation on some of those, but not all of them.

Mike Palage: And I appreciate that, Marilyn. I've actually amended the report in real time to say characters, cleared letters, numbers and symbols. And I would just say that based on Alistair and (Marilyn's) comment, you know, we probably don't need experts read second level letters and numbers given the ample of just this use, but we maybe need expert consultation regarding top level, regarding IDN and regarding symbol.

(Chuck): I'd say, they might even be useful in those other categories, (Mike), and let me to tell you what I'm thinking is.

For example, we know that there some single letters at the second level being used not only in gTLDs, but ccTLDs and I think (Patrick) has put out some information on that.

And it could be that it's worth just sending an email to some people in that regard to see if there have been any problems with that, you know, that's kind of a very minimal use of an expert, but probably would strengthen your report to show, "Hey, this has been on used and there is impact or there's no impact or whatever the result maybe."

Does that help (Mike)?

Mike Palage: It does. I do understand that. I'm just - no problem.

(Chuck): Yeah. And I'm not - we don't want to make it too complicated because we got a short timeframe.

And by the way, you don't have to have all the expert things finished by next week, but to the extent that we can - getting closer, that would be helpful.

Mike Palage: Right.

(Chuck): (Mike), also in your report that you sent, apparently, it was not clear what is intended with regard to the role of name reservation requirement, is that correct?

Mike Palage: Correct.

(Chuck):   Let me talk about that a little bit.

First of all, you know, take a look at the statement of work for the working group and you'll see that it defines that a little bit in terms of, you know, why it was reserved, what's the value, and it may not be exactly the same; in fact, I don't think it is the same for a single character versus dual character.

But for example, one of the roles of reserving all two character names I believe is because so there wouldn't interfere with ccTLDs, okay, in their use.

So there are - you know, we just want to make sure because one of our key task as a working group is to define the role. And then based on what the role is, then we can determine whether or not it's still valid, whether to change like it may have with single character second level.

One more comment on this one to try and be helpful, maybe again, because we're venturing in the new territory and this could be a category where additional work needs to happen beyond our group, that's probably quite likely.

But - and that can be recommended, but it maybe helpful if changes are recommended at the second level for example in single character to not in the same - at the same timeframe recommended at the top level allow a little testing the at the second level and go. So you can do things like that too.

I'm not advocating that, I'm just trying to facilitate thinking so that we think through these things.

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck), it's Marilyn. Can I just elaborate on that?

My conversation with technical experts on the issue of single letters has at least indicated that there will be technical questions that need to be asked and answered.

Some technical experts seem to be sympathetic to the use at the second level and not at the first level. I'm not commenting on the validity of that, I'm merely reporting on conversations.

(Chuck): Uh-huh. Good. Thank you. Okay…

Marilyn Cade: The one other thing that I wanted to mention in the second level names, there's a very sensitive category that exists when a two-letter string has been allocated to an economy, has not been used and has now being retired, but the name is expected to continue to stay on reservation while that economy is completely - it's agreed to that economy actually no longer exists, and ICANN as gone through a couple of recent experiences with that.

So we may want to just also address and get more feedback from the ICANN staff on the rationale for two-letter strings, (Mike).

Thank you.

Mike Palage: Okay.

(Chuck):   Hopefully, that was helpful for (Mike) and Neal and Alistair.

Mike Palage: It was.

                One other point then, (Chuck), is just if anybody is aware of any other
                relevant information sources that aren't listed here, that would be
                wonderful to know as well either now or by email later.

(Chuck):   Thanks. That's a good suggestion. And please feel free to do that; any
                member of the group, just feel free if you think of something that can
                help another group, please let them know because we're all in this
                together. And ultimately, we're going to all, you know, deliberate on the
                report so - and it's going to come from all of us not just the volunteers.
                So that's a very good suggestion.

(Patrick):   (Chuck), this is (Patrick). I have something to add.

(Chuck):   Please.

(Patrick):   I'm going to forward to (Mike) some of my edits or comments on his
                draft report and you can use them if you want. I think I've got a lot of
                information on single and dual character names, so hopefully they'll
                help.

(Chuck):   Yes. Send it to (Mike), Neal, and Alistair please.

(Patrick):   Okay.

Mike Palage: Thanks, (Patrick).

(Chuck): Anybody else?

(Timothy Denton): It's (Tim).

(Patrick), can you send that to me too? I just got to read in more on the subject so I understand better, so anything you can send would be helpful.

(Patrick): Sure.

(Timothy Denton): Thank you.

(Chuck): Thanks, (Tim), and thanks, (Patrick).

Let's go to tag names and unless there's objection, I'm going to allow for any comments and any additional new comments that people have on that, but I'm not going to spend much on that time one because quite a bit of time was spent last week.

I will tell you that (Patrick) and I have done some revisions to our report, but rather than confuse things and so forth, I'm not going to send out the revised - the latest revision of the report until after this call.

What we've done is we've - as I already indicated, send out some questions to two experts and we have response from one that's included in the report and we've re-ordered the report - I have re-ordered the report to inform to a slightly reversed outline that I again will be sending out just after this meeting.

Still contains all the same elements, I'm just looking ahead to when it becomes final report and try to instruct order in such a way that it maybe easiest to use.

Any new comments since last week on tag names? And we will - we have already talked about some (straw) recommendations between the two of us and those will be included in that. Keep in mind that (straw) recommendations are what the volunteers on a particular topic want to put forward for consideration by the whole working group. Okay?

All right, going on then to - and I'm going to rename this next category because I think it was misleading although I understand why it was used.

I'm going to simply call the category (nicwhoisdubdubdub) -- (nic/whois/dubdubdub) because the reservation requirement is to reserve those three strings.

And (Tim Denton), you want to give a brief summary, you submitted a report on that today. Do you want to give a brief summary of your report?

(Timothy Denton):   Well, just to be very briefly, I'm unable to come up with any huge rationale for their preservation or against their preservation. It just seems to me that they're in degree related to some business judgments of the registry as to whether to keep them reserved. But there maybe a public interest in keeping them reserved for the avoidance of consumer confusion. And I haven't got a feeling for which

way to fall on this. And I'm quite open to discussion as to, you know, how it might go.

So that - sorry to be so indefinite, but that sort of where I'm out in question. There are just three simple little names and I will benefit from the views of others as to how these things should be categorized.

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck)?

(Chuck):   Yes, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I guess when I read this, I saw a - I do think there needs to be some understanding that there are some names that you're just…

(Chuck):   Can you speak a little louder, Marilyn?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: …(unintelligible) example that most people on this will recognize, but it's (ARPA).

                 (Dot ARPA) is - that maybe better (dot ARPA) is a phrase…

(Chuck):   That's better.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, sorry. (Dot ARPA) is a phrase that whether you like it or not, it needs to be on reserve and it needs to be on reserve because of the fact that certain considerations were taken around the use of that name not only internally about it uses an infrastructure TLD. It's not a visible TLD.

But externally, at the ITU, which is the International Telecommunication Union, there is an agreement that (dot ARPA) will be the underlying TLD for use in INAM.

So it has - you know, if you were to just logically ask the man on the street, should we reserve (ARPA)? They would probably feel, "Huh?" But if you have thought through the fact that a name of - sorry, word string has taken on use and has certain implications in the technical functioning of the Internet, it - you know, I think some of these names just have a halo around them, I going to of say.

I kind of think these three fit in to that category and I like us to at least consider just keeping them reserved because we don't have a logical reason to unreserve them.

Mike Palage: (Chuck), this is Mike Palage, if I can comment.

(Chuck):   Go ahead, (Mike).

Mike Palage: While I agree with the reservation of (ARPA), I think Marilyn is a little off base because (ARPA) is already reserved as a TLD. So the protection of that infrastructure string is already provided for under other contractual requirements in the registry contract with regard to these particular strings, (nic), (who is), and dub, dub, dub, any registry operator if given the choice, would reserve this as part of their, if you will, existing operational infrastructure.

So as far as making these be available for general reservation, I don't see the logic in it. To me, I think reserve should reside with the registry

as part of it, if you will, that infrastructure argument that Marilyn has just made. And thus, I really don't see why we need to have them reserved under this existing context.

And again, this goes back to my comments about when you begin to reserve names, when you take an action of why you reserve something, does that legal analysis scale for other potential strings and causes.

So I agree that it should not be available for general use, my question though is there should be other contractual mechanisms by which we can address this reservation or exclusion.

(Chuck): (Mike), I have a question for you in that regard.

Do you think - let's say we've followed your advice and we decided to remove this as across the board reservation requirement, do you think it would then be useful to have a recommendation in RFPs for new gTLDs that suggest that new registry consider, you know, preserving these names on their own and the implications of that.

And what I'm getting at, you know, as we get a lot more new TLDs which is a possibility, if you don't have the requirement, you know, some registry - some new registry is probably not going to do it. The names are going to get registered and then it's hard to reverse after you get to that point. What's your thinking of that?

Mike Palage: I think that is a practical pragmatic solution for addressing it.

(Chuck): Okay. But you understand my point. Once you, you know, we run into this with the (bq dash, dash) names with IDN and the, you know, before there was any reservation requirement of the tag names, you know, and people found out that the (ACE) prefix was (bq dash, dash), people started registering (bq dash, dash) name all over the place.

And so, once - and we have the same thing really with single character name, you know, before there was, for some that's slipped through for (Dot.com) and I think (Dot.net) and…

Mike Palage: (Chuck), I totally agree in providing a unified structure I think is important. The only reason I will - the basis of my original question was the appropriateness of how it was reserved and by who is reserved, you know, to me, I think it would be intuitive for registry providing access to their (who is) information to have (who is dot string) and provided that is, if you will, a common template for providing (who is) information.

I think that would actually help the community, if you will, and the intuitive - in intuitive fashion.

So I have no problem with what you're talking about to preserve that communality. Again, my question just goes to the appropriateness of the contractual reservation that is in the current contract.

(Timothy Denton): (Mike), it's (Tim Denton).

Mike Palage: Yes, (Tim)?

(Timothy Denton):   So do I take it then that your reservation - sorry, your rationale is that that they should not be reserved by ICANN in contract, but it might make sense for each registry to hold them in reserve without the obligation to hold them in reserve by an ICANN contract.

Mike Palage: I think that what (Chuck) was alluding to is it could be part of an RFP process where these names shall be - you know, ICANN could say these names shall be withheld from general registration although the registry reserves the right to use them for internal operation.

(Timothy Denton):   You said (threshold phrase). Is that another distinction or is that different?

(Chuck):   Well, let me ask another question to yours, (Tim). (Mike), isn't that essentially what the reservation requirement does now? It is a title that you…

Mike Palage: Yes, but what have to do, it says it's initially reserved which means under the current (construct), a registry operator would have to go back and if he wanted to use that, put in a phone request.

Marilyn Cade: That's not the case right now, (Mike). They don't have to phone a request to use these names for operational procedures of their own.

Mike Palage: The way they're appear…

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Maybe we take that up offline, but my understanding is that they're reserved to be used for the purpose that is, you know - so a registry couldn't use (www), but they certainly use (who is) right now.

(Chuck): Yes, it looks like that's the way it's worded, (Mike) because it says, "The following names are reserved for use in connection with the operation of the registry."

Marilyn Cade: Right.

(Chuck): "For the registry TLD." So…

Mike Palage: Yes, and - okay.

(Chuck): Does that makes sense?

Mike Palage: Yes.

(Chuck): Yes. Okay. By the way..

Alistair Dixon: Can I just ask a question?

(Chuck): Go ahead, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Does this rationale apply to all three? I think I can understand this is relation to (nic) and (who is) in the case of (www). Is that also needed for registry operations or are there confusability reasons that as (Mike) was alluding earlier?

(Chuck): Good question, what do people think?

Marilyn Cade: As far as I know - it's Marilyn. I don't - gosh, we have a registry on here? We have an actual operational registry on here…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Who's on here that runs the registry?

Man: We have (Chuck). That little registry known as (COM) was 60 some
                  million names in it.

Marilyn Cade: Well, I was thinking, (Mike), about an operational person, but (Chuck),
                  are you the…

(Chuck):   No, I'm not an operational person you know that.

Marilyn Cade: Do you know the answer to that about (www)?

(Chuck):   No, I don't.

Marilyn Cade: (Patrick) might take that as assignment, do you mind? But that would
                  be good.

(Patrick):   Actually, I'm suite swamped right now so if there's a way that I -
                  somebody else can - I'm doing the best I can so far but…

(Chuck):   I think (Tim Denton) could.

                  (Tim), why don't you and we can take care of this offline. We can start
                  with (com) and (net) and I can give you a point of contact right there.
                  Why don't you send an email to (Pat Cane) which is…

(Timothy Denton): KANE?

(Chuck):   Pkane@verifying.com. And…

Marilyn Cade: And how about (Rom)?

(Chuck):   Sure. For affiliate; that'd be a good idea.

Mike Palage: (Chuck), this is (Mike). To provide some information on this, let's just look at (dot coop), (dot coop) currently uses (nic.coop) which resolved to a default directory page for the registry.

                They also use (www.coop).

(Chuck):   And what is that used for, (Mike)?

Mike Palage: The (www) - let me - hold me. The (www) I believe just refers to this - yeah, it goes to the same page that (nic.coop) does.

                So what that is basically using as a default and what I can tell you is when I need to look up information for a ccTLD, if I don't feel like going to the IANA database, one of the things I intuitively generally type in is (nic dot) the ccTLD string.

(Chuck):   Right.

Mike Palage: So, you know, to me I think that is part of the, if you will, you know, if you will, high article structure of why those strings, you know, (www), (nic), and (who is) are probably there. These are things that we intuitively we typed in.

Now it's interesting from a branding perspective to look at some of the pages that registry uses as default pages. Travel for example uses travel.travel as their default page. As you may be aware. (dot jobs) actually uses (goto.jobs) as their default page. As I was just explaining, you know, coop, if you want one of their default pages is (dubdubdub.coop) or (nic.coop).

So I think what it - what these names are reserved for is allowing people that would intuitively type these second levels in and then put a top level as the extension to hopefully find what they're looking for. They are, if you will, designed to increase end user functionality.

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck), it's Marilyn.

It occurs to me now that we've had this conversation that (Tim) might want to email (Emily Taylor) at (Nominac) and somebody at (dot de) and maybe (Jacob) at (dot ca) and just ask three large cc registries whether they adhere to the respect of the reservation of these names as well just as a quick sample.

(Chuck):   Marilyn, do you have email addresses for all three of those?

Marilyn Cade: I'll send them and I'll also send (unintelligible) and (dot au) so, you know, there's five or six that can be quickly just sampled.

(Timothy Denton):   It's (Timothy) again.

(Chuck), just to - say, the niche of the questions to be asked to Mr. (Kane) and (Rom) is what?

(Chuck): It has to do with (dub dub dub), right?

(Timothy Denton): Okay.

(Marilyn Cade: It has to do with - do you want me to - I'll - I think I understand that I can address something and send it to (Tim) and (Chuck) to take a look at.

(Chuck): That's fine.

(Timothy Denton): Thank you. I mean, I'm happy to do it. This is (unintelligible) the niche of the question.

(Dan): And this is (Dan) and just to add that if you do a quick check of, you know, (dot de), (nic.de), (dubdubdub.de), (cu.uk), you know, they do seem to adhere to it. It's not an exhaustive search but it seems to indicate that they do it here.

(Chuck): thanks, (Dan). That's helpful.

Any other comments or questions on the (nic), (who is), (dub dub dub) category?

(Tim Denton), are you okay with the feedback you received so far?

(Timothy Denton): I am.

(Chuck): Don't you love it when you keep getting more work when you thought you were close to being done?

(Timothy Denton):   No, no, no, this is all fine. But I'm just saying - I'm just trying to get the sense that - I don't get the sense that there is a (unintelligible) notwithstanding that there's a strong desire to move these into an unreserved place yet.

(Chuck):   Yeah. But it would be helpful to gather that additional information. And let me come and I'm going to segue away off of Marilyn's comment, a comment about being pragmatic.

By the way, I think all of these discussion is essential to us doing a good job, okay. And so I welcome it and I'm glad it's going on. But keep in mind because of our short timeframe and a need to get this work done, at some point we're going to probably have to be pragmatic and, you know, make a decision in terms of out-the-door type recommendation in terms of introduction of new TLD, what's the possibility maybe that some of these things can be explored a little bit further under a different form.

Okay. Let's go on then to geographical and geopolitical names and, (Mike), you sent a report. Just for a second. There it is; is that it? Yes, okay. You sent a report. It was the - I think you set a record for the link. My compliments on the work you did there.

Now, let's see. On that particular group, Avri volunteered to participate and (John Navete).

Now, (Mike), did you and Jon have an chance to collaborate?

Mike Palage: No, because I just got it done today and what happens is we're just going over the voice mail. I was on the call - I was not on the call last week when Marilyn gave me some help on the particular things.

(Chuck):   Okay, fine. Okay.

Mike Palage: So what I've done is I just exchanged emails with Avri at the beginning of this call about trying to go back and forth with her and trying to, if you will, see what she wants to dig into.

(Chuck):   And you'll do the same with Jon.

Mike Palage: Sure.

(Chuck):   (Mike), would you give us a quick summary of this, please?

Mike Palage: I guess the best way to start off is this is a very complex and - it's a complex issue. It is definitely not considered low-hanging fruit. I do think there will be the potential to use experts, but as I note in the report, I don't think the experts will be useful in reaching consensus, but will be in fact useful for documenting the consistent deeply-held views and, if you will, opposing views by the different parties in this particular subject matter.

I went through - I spent a lot of time with the history of this particular thing. Unlike the lack of history regarding some of the names we're just talking about, previously, here there's a much more cleaner history regarding the GAC communication in 2001, ICANN board resolutions, former DNSO resolutions, GAC communication, response to those.

So there is a rather extensive history trail regarding this particular subject matter. Regarding experts, I think the three bodies that I have reached out to potentially identify experts would be the WIPO. Potentially, someone within the US Patent and Trademark Office and someone from INTA.

I already engaged in those outreach and when I find out who they would like the recommendation to go to within that organization, this group can then undertake in, if you will, sending out the some type of formal notification to those individuals.

(Chuck): (Mike), in that regard, what about GAC?

Mike Palage: With the GAC, well, I did talk to (Susan San) to tell her about this is an issue that is very passionate for some GAC members. So she is aware of, if you will, what I'm doing.

In the report, I actually break down how the countries are positioned. There are about 175 of the WIPO member states that support protection of country names within the DNS.

There are three countries however that have disassociated with that particular viewpoint. Those being the United States, Canada, and Australia, and Japan has also has some reservation regarding the legal framework for that.

What's going to be very problematic in this particular issue is if in fact we're go to go forward with providing (unintelligible) protection to individual member state that potentially puts ICANN in the position of

providing rights which when you go back to the original WIPO, one document ICANN was not supposed to be creating any rights.

So these are some of the, if you will, substantive legal issues that we'll be dealing with a I guess, hopefully, that is that as brief as I can be.

(Chuck): Thanks, (Mike). I appreciate the thorough work. It looks like - Avri, have you joined the call?

Avri Doria: Yes. I've been here a while.

(Chuck): Yes. I see you…

Avri Doria: And I'm quiet.

(Chuck): …on my little list here and Jon, you're on. Do either of you - I know you haven't had a chance to look at this, but I…

Avri Doria: I read through and was quite impressed and, you know I don't see why I can contribute here, but I don't have anything to add.

(Chuck): Thank you, Avri. Jon, any comments or questions?

Jon: No, I have nothing to add either.

(Chuck): Okay, good. How about the entire group?

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck), it's Marilyn.

I have a question that relates to probably how this report relates to the IDN issues and also the issue of the ability to - so let me just give a concrete example. There are a number of countries who will strongly object and some countries actually have laws about the use of their name and the requirement to get permission to the use of the name and one of the ones that emerged much, much earlier was South Africa as just an example, but some countries don't have those laws. A few do have laws. China has requirements as well whether municipality name can be used and under what conditions a country names can be used.

So in taking that into account, I'm not sure that I quite understood how we were going to document or take note of those other limitations because while WIPO is one state, there's also - and there's also a principle in the (dash principles) that sort of refers to the national sovereignty issue.

What section in the report might we put information - additional information about those issues into?

(Chuck):   That would be the summary of the information sources.

Mike Palage: Yes, (Chuck). This is (Mike). If I could address Marilyn's concern.

(Chuck):   Please.

Mike Palage: The specific legal contracts that you're talking about are outline in great detail in the second WIPO report and what I think is worth noting here is actually the following sentence from the Chapter 6. While

misuse of geographical attributions may offend many feelings, only certain types of such misuse are sanctioned by law.

The WIPO-2 report goes into the (unintelligible) specifically addresses some of the arguments - legal arguments raised by certain member states. Again, it's not the position I think of this group to say what's right or wrong. We have had experts analyze these legal issues in great detail.

And, you know, I think what we're trying to do is just document and articulate what those positions are and to look whether the policies that ICANN has taken in connection with these reservations are consistent.

Moreover, as (Patrick) alluded to, there is potentially some work going on in connection with IGOs which was also an important subject matter of the second WIPO consultation.

So I think all those issues that you talked about regarding the national sovereignty and the laws, this is all covered. That's what I spent about 20 to 30 hours reading over the past couple of weeks.

So if you want to get up on fixed term and all that other good stuff, I would encourage you to jump in and read the final report.

(Chuck):   Now, (Mike), and I apologize doing this to you after all the work you put in and I hope that you won't do it by yourself, but that Avri and Jon can help as well and anybody else who might join this area, but it would be helpful in the report if - I noticed that you referenced the second WIPO Internet domain name process and I assume that has a link to the report you're talking about.

It would be helpful if there was like a one paragraph summary of what's going there and I'm not talking about summary…

Mike Palage: Just to give you a forewarning that the summary of the WIPO-2 is probably going to be about three or four pages. I'm just…

(Chuck): I don't think that works for our thing. All I - even (Mike), if it just told what wrap the report - you know, what's the intent of the report. I'm really talking about something fairly brief, but for, not only for our own use in this working group, but for people who will look at our report later on that don't know the first thing about WIPO-2.

Mike Palage: Uh-huh.

(Chuck): It would be helpful if there was one paragraph that describes what they would find in that report. Not every detail, but what does it generally cover.

Mike Palage: I'll put it this way. I think I will, again, if you look at the - what my document says it's (unintelligible) 0.5. So I will try to articulate upon the summary and I do have the WIPO-2 report as, if you will, the principle document.

So I will try to keep that to, if you will, a one-pager that the man on the street or woman on the street will be able to digest.

(Chuck): Yes and even keep it even shorter than one-page, that's great. The idea is just give a little bit- I mean when I read second WIPO Internet domain name process I have some background and know what that

was all about but some people who look at this report when we submit a final report down the road, won't.

So just enough, enough information to just say what is this all about, and what, you know?

Mike Palage: Not a problem.

(Chuck):   You understand?

Mike Palage: Understand.

(Chuck):   And please try to get Avri and Jon to help you on because you've listed very nicely a whole bunch of information sources there and I would hate to see you have to be able to do that and all of those.

Mike Palage: Right. As I said, I have them all highlighted and marked up so, you know again.

(Chuck):   Well, I'll let the three of you decide how you best want to handle that but…

Mike Palage: Not a problem.

(Chuck):   Any other comments or questions on geographic and geopolitical name?

Marilyn Cade: (Chuck), I just said to well, another one, its Marilyn.

Is it helpful in the background to just include and maybe its here and I just missed that; this is how - that how geographic and geopolitical names have been treated to date because they are treated in (dot info), (dot travel), (dot jobs) but they do have somewhat different treatment and some of the (Gs).

(Chuck): Yeah, that would be a good thing to have in the background section.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, just a short quick…

Mike Palage: Well, I actually, I think I that - I mean if you…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Mike Palage: …if you look at it, Marilyn, I talked about - one of the things I though was rather interesting here is when you look at the original GAC (communicate) that was issued…

Marilyn Cade: Oh, can you just tell me clear and because…

Mike Palage: It's on Page 2. On Page 2 of the report…

(Chuck): But not on the background section is what you're saying.

Mike Palage: No, it's literally in the next section where I talk about how the role came up. I always thought the background I wanted to keep, if you will, introductory but the roll of the reservation is actually into where the

GAC communicated how they did the GAC (communicate), how the board took action.

And what I think is very interesting for this group to sort of take or keep in mind are two things. The board resolution recognizing this protection was 11 to seven it was not anonymous but any stretch of imagination.

The other thing that I think is very important is the GAC (communicate) was issued it specifically only addressed (dot info) and this resolution came out before any of the other six original proof of concept TLDs had launched.

So, when you look at, if you will, the administrative history to how these has evolved and how it has grown I think that is very important as well.

(Chuck): Okay. Let me make a suggestion here and I'm going to make a suggestion as a chair but I'm certainly open to consideration of other ways to approach by the full working group.

But in being consistent with the other reports that have been written up so far, most of them contain the information from the rainbow document, you know, that has the contractor requirement in the background sections and the for the sake of consistency across our report I think that's the good place to work so, my recommendation would be to move that kind of information from two (unintelligible).

And I have a secondary reason for that besides consistency is this - that I'm envisioning that Section 2 on the role of name reservation requirement to everybody a fairly concise section, that fulfills our obligation for the roll not a description of how it's use now but why was

- why are these names reserved, when they are reserved and so forth and like that. And I think it will be - our report will be more usable for those two reason for consistency if we're all doing - putting within the background section and secondly so, that roll is - it may - it will prior be the shortest section of all of our report.

Mike Palage: It's already done, (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Yeah. Thanks. That was an easier way, right?

Okay. We've got to keep moving here anything else on that before we move on?

All right I'm not given much time so, you have to be quick. Names reserve as the third level. (Greg) is not on the call unless he was joined since I left.

(Dan), can you talk a little bit about that what's going on and then (Greg) did send a report. Let me see if I can find it here; I think I just did. Can you provide us a quick summary of that?

(Dan):   Sure, through our research into it, the only two TLDs that we found that have reserves, third level domains were in the (dot name) and (dot pro) space and it's pretty well detailed in the memo but essentially to provide some background for people who may not be (unintelligible) with (dot pro).

You know, there are some reserve at the second level, you know, (dot no) - (ENG) for engineers, (MED) for doctors, that sort of thing and

then was contemplated there can be registration at the third level not terribly relevant to our approach today I guess but…

(Greg Shaton): Hi, this is (Greg Shaton). I've joined in hearing registrations at the third level.

(Dan): Hi, (Greg).

The, you know, if you qualified the third level you also can qualify first and second level registration but with respect to the third level reservations, you can see that we've identified in the memo precisely what has been reserved, you know, designation such as, you know, DIR directory email, HTTP mail, (MX), et cetera.

We really didn't find any documents that detailed why those specific things were reserves although it seems fairly apparent that it was a matter of, you know, to some extent perhaps user confusion more likely to avoid sort of a duplication or any sort of technical difficulty. We haven't engage…

(Chuck): Let me interrupt you a second there, (Dan).

(Dan): Sure.

(Chuck): In that particular area, that's a good area to use experts and probably just between you and (Greg) you can do that if - but one of you will send me an email just so that I remember, I will send you contacts for registry pro and for GNR if you don't already have them and you could get - maybe get some clarification in that regard.

(Dan):   Sure. I'm happy to do that. You know, the approach that we took in the memo was essentially that, you know, because what is reserved seems pretty reasonable, you know, we do note that technical expertise would be required to make any sort of final determination on that.

But given what's been reserved and the apparent reasonableness of it, we're just really reluctant to bringing experts at that time.

(Chuck):   Yeah. The only thing I'm suggesting in the section Roman Numeral Three where you said no documentation, they could probably you a little bit in terms of the rationale for those reserved names if you think you need it.

(Dan):   Okay. And I think you - with prior discussions sort of addressed the need to button down those things even if it was apparent and I think you're right, it probably makes sense at least give some opinions on that.

(Chuck):   And this is the kind of thing and this is just me speaking okay, so that working group when we get to the point and then looking at these recommendations may discuss it a lot further and go with different direction. But this maybe the kind of thing that, you know, is fine as long as it's upfront in the proposal by the registry where if it's a new services data as long as it goes through the process for that and the community have the opportunity for comment, it maybe just fine if they handled on that way in the future but that's just me thinking so.

Anything else - (Greg), did you have anything to have there?

(Greg Shaton):   No. I caught most of that and have nothing further to add.

(Chuck):   Thanks, guys, for that, (Dan).

                  How about the whole group, any questions for comment on this
                  category?

                  The easy one for the day.

                  Okay. Well, let's go to other names reserved with the second and
                  (Carolyn) could not join us but (Tamara) is on and (Mike) wants to -
                  would like to work on that; (Mike Roddenbuck) would like to work on
                  that group as well. And so, (Tamara) can you - you sent a document to
                  the group?

(Tamara):   Right.

(Chuck):   And would you please provide a summary of that please.

(Tamara):   Sure. Yeah, (Carolyn) and I sort of worked on this together and then
                  she did the first few sections and I did the last few sections but due to
                  the late timing of me joining the (unintelligible) wasn't able to look at;
                  that may changes - is that clear?

                  So, Section 1 deals with the TLDs string and, you know, reserving the
                  TLD strings such as, you know, (dot buss), (dot com), (dot coop), (dot
                  edu). And I mean that, you know, (unintelligible) put in place to avoid
                  consumer confusion in relation to double TLD addresses which I think
                  makes sense.

The next section deals with what she calls registry specific reservation and that includes some things that I laid out separately below but - for example (dot buss) and (dot info) reserved a number of registry specific names such as common names, community reservations, registry common names and post fixed reservation.

To be honest, I'm not clear on what post fixed reservations are. Is there somebody else on the group - is somebody else on the clear on that?

(Chuck): Which category?

(Tamara): Post fixed reservation.

(Chuck): Post fixed registration?

(Tamara): Yeah. Post fixed reservation.

(Chuck): Let me see if I can…

(Tamara): Since I didn't write that section, I just…

(Chuck): That's not something - I don't think that's in the constructor requirement, is it?

Mike Palage: No. (Tamara), this is Mike Palage. (Carolyn) had reached out to me earlier in the week but I was swamped doing my geographic sections. She had asked for information regarding the history of the both (dot info) and (dot coop) reserved names.

Which regard to coop, they have the community reserved names as well as the country reserved names and then the list of the affiliates is provided. So, now that I am almost on my report, I will try to if you will touch base with you in her maybe off list to try to give you that information.

(Tamara): Okay. Thank you.

(Chuck): Post fixed reservations are a dot names issue, okay?

(Tamara): Uh-huh.

(Chuck): It says the registry is reserving on the second level - if you look on the rainbow report is there - anybody not know what I mean but rainbow report, that was Marilyn's term I think.

(Dan): Can you just clarify that, (Chuck).

(Tamara): Oh, yeah.

(Chuck): Rainbow report is the document that I prepared that showed - it summarizes all of the contractual requirement for registries regarding reserved name and its called Comparison of gTLD Registry Reserved Name and the latest version is - and it's 29 January '07. (Patrick) provided some good input into this report.

Its almost towards the end, there is a category under the GNR that (dot name) reservations it's the - (dot three) post fixed reservations and it says the registry is reserving all second level names ending in a particular set of strings, such names are reserved on the second level

by default and only third level registrations are allowed on such second level.

The following post fixed strings are reserved. And a post fixed I think GNR as I recall and if you want to get clarification on this again, send me an email I'll be glad to give the email information. I think I already - I may have already mentioned that (Gary Rasmus) and (Olken Agnes) from GNR, they would be glad to answer your questions on this with regard to that. And I won't go through the - there's a table of them in that which you can find out.

Now, has anybody not looked at that particular document that I referred too as a rainbow document or doesn't know where it's at?

Everybody knows what I'm talking about and has access to it? Because if not, we can (unintelligible) if not, send me an email I'll be glad to attach a copy and send it right back to you again if you can't find it. Because that is a very important one for us to use in our work because all of the centers around existing contractor requirement (unintelligible).

I hope that helps a little bit and sorry, but - to interrupt there but hopefully…

(Tamara):   Oh, no that's helpful…

(Chuck):   …that it helps a little bit with that.

Go ahead.

(Tamara): Okay. So, I mean I guess regarding registry common names, you know, I know I do understand the reasoning behind that community reservations probably deserves a little more discussion and common name as well.

Regarding experts sorry I'm just sort of reading through her piece; I see so that just that each of the five registries that she named including (dot buss), (dot name), (dot movie), and (dot coop) could nominate representative to help explain how reservation of those names served their particular registry or community.

(Chuck): And you saw my suggestion there. I wouldn't wait for nominations…

(Tamara): Yeah.

(Chuck): I think (Carolyn) is going to come up with some - she knows the contacts on the registries and I think I saw an email from her that she will provide those contacts and I would just go ahead and spend been questions directly to those content - contacts rather than…

(Tamara): Yeah.

(Chuck): … waiting for nominations.

(Tamara): Okay. I added common terms I felt that that was an issue that sort of needed its own discussion. So I just clarified again that she indicated that name reserved common names and community reservation. (Dot movie) reserved common names as premium names and (dot travel) reserved industry works which included common names. I didn't have time to do further research but I will.

Personally, I'm…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, can I - it's Marilyn.

I just wanted to ask you to add a definition and maybe by footnote of what a common name is because while it has meaning to people who speaks the English language, a common name - I think you need a common family name, et cetera. But if I just…

(Tamara): I don't mean a family name.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Tamara): I mean just like a common word on the English language. For example, I'll look at the one (dot movie) reserve I can link to this.

Marilyn Cade: So, is a common word as opposed to…

(Tamara): Common word.

(Dan): Commonly…

(Tamara): Like they reserved abstracts art…

Marilyn Cade: I would just ask if you would - I'm not making the comment I might at the later time on whether I agree with the approach. I'm suggesting that common name didn't - I didn't - I generally know what you meant because I'm embedded in that but I think the average reader might not so, maybe…

(Tamara):   Okay. So, just define that it mean…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

(Tamara):   …common terms of the English language…

(Dan):   Right.

(Tamara):   …I can give examples of some that have been reserved.

Mike Palage: (Tamara), this is (Mike). If you look that list, it actually includes non-English words so, instead just limiting it to English if…

(Chuck):   I think the point (clear) that it would be helpful to define that.

(Tamara):   Yeah.

(Chuck):   Go ahead, do you have anything else, (Tamara)?

(Tamara):   That's a good point. I do.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

(Tamara):   I'm just making a note to myself.

                 I guess I would, you know, as far as the role of reserving and what we're now talking about this common words, I am not sure how to best find out what people think the role is, so, I would be looking for suggestions.

(Chuck): Well, because these are reservations specifically proposed and then negotiated by registry operators and my opinion, the best way to approach that is to contact those registry operators and I then ask them what they're intent was and what they see the role is.

Keep in mind when we're defining role, we can talk about historical role, we can talk about in this case the role that the specific registry operators intended and - but we can also talk about what we think the role might be going forward.

(Tamara): Uh-huh.

(Chuck): But is that helpful?

(Tamara): Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay, good.

(Tamara): Yeah. And I guess the only - I guess that sort of goes to what I recommended regarding experts which is, you know, asking some of the registries that reserved common names how to explain how reservation of the names serves back to consumer.

So, you know, we have no strong recommendations for that just yet. I also added and - a section on premium name since in my experience goes those often end up being reserved for years and in effect our reserves name that registry could easily, you know, say, "Great, thank you for your recommendations and reserved names." Anything that I wanted to reserve instead of placing in the reserved names, I'll just put

in my premium name thing and then we just won't release them for, you know, quite a long time.

So, I did feel that it was important to address that category to so that it does not become a loophole for the registry to use.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Tamara): So, you know, something that we would also want to discuss I think is the end allocation of those names. I mean, should there be a timeline on the allocation and what should be the allocation.

So, again, I didn't have time to fully research it though I can and will but that's what I've seen in the past or, you know, use of RFP and option. And I think that there should be a recommendation for the best.

You know, what we think is the best for most of the process so, as far as the RFP, it could have a subjective component although, you know, or an objective component and we should consider that.

Subjective components could include well, does somebody have a trademark registration for the term or a business name and then assuming there are multiple trademark in business name owners we'd have to some up with some way to resolve, you know, who ends up owning it in the end. Whether it's the first to register, you know, the person who owns the most marks on the most countries, whether it's (word) mark versus design mark, type hit so that, you know, the type that's the most popular gets the name to avoid consumer confusion or…

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   Let me interrupt you in a second, (Tamara).

(Tamara):   Sure.

(Chuck):   Let's not get in much about the possible recommendations right now
             mainly because we don't have time.

(Tamara):   Okay. No problem.

(Chuck):   And then, we still have one report to go plus action items for the next
             talk.

(Tamara):   No problem. Okay, so then as far as the RFP - you know, just items
             that how can you use in the past are subjective qualifications such as
             who has the best proposal for content and I lay out there some of the
             negative of that, you know type of approach.

             Auction is another way that has been resolved which is more objective
             but obviously just comes down to who has the most money. And I also
             that auction seem to create an incentive for the registry to reserve as
             many domains as possible because that gives them the most financial
             gain and I'm not sure that we want that to be your end of goal here.

(Chuck):   Yeah. We'll talk about that one when we get to recommendation.

(Tamara):   Okay. So, the role of the name reservation requirement again is
             unclear but we can ask the registries to explain how doing that serves
             the end consumer.

The last section is just additional issues to consider in deciding in our final star recommendation such as, one, should - I can be involved in deciding what qualifies as reserves name at the second level. The idea being that some type of process - you know, we want some type of process to ensure consistency and how we'll reach that goal.

And second, it seems that, you know, there should be a recommendation to have an independent dispute resolution process for disagreements regarding names that each registry reserved. And again considering should ICANN be the final decision maker, you know, and what the rights of trademark holders would be and that's it.

(Chuck): Okay. Thank you very much.

(Tamara): Sure.

(Chuck): I appreciate the work that you and (Carolyn) did.

(Tamara): Are there any comments on that?

(Chuck): Well, I'm going to handle comments a little bit differently because unless everybody can extend the call a little bit, we're coming up very close to the end of our call.

Is there anybody that cannot go beyond our two-hour limit? I wouldn't go more than ten minutes but…

Marilyn Cade: Doesn't Avri's call at - beginning at three?

(Chuck):   All right. Is it…

Woman: Yeah.

(Chuck):   It is never mind; we not extend past.

                So, let me ask you for those of you who have comments to (Carolyn)
                and (Tamara), please send then via email and send them soon.

(Tamara):   Thank you. That would be very helpful.

(Chuck):   The day would be very helpful and, Marilyn, I hate to do this to you but
                you're going to have the least amount of time to talk about - of course
                you have a very easy topic, the controversial names.

                Can you give us a two or three-minute summary of your report - of
                what you're - you and (Tim) have done.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, very quickly, (Tim) has posted a document that initially just
                summarizes how controversial names are dealt with in primarily the
                country code environment. He and I have recently been in touch and
                I've proposed to add in a discussion which isn't there yet. A discussion
                about the potential of a category of name - of sort of I'm going to call it
                a holding for names that maybe initially viewed as controversial and -
                but potentially could be released.

                So, you know, because our statement of work suggests that we look at
                do we continue to reserve names? Do we have a way to unrelease
                reserved names, et cetera.

So, we will be doing some - I think additional enhancement to how controversy or names are identified and treated now with the experience we have primarily being in the cc space and then examining whether it's feasible to have a category, kind of a holding pen, I'm going to call it, that's been a parking space of a names that come in at the first level, they're be at the first level.

They have some problem with them, it could be because they did it to a reserve category right now or there's something else wrong with them, there's something else, sorry, controversy all about them and that they could then be unreserved on that space, that works still has to be done.

(Chuck):   Thank you very much.

And again if you have - if anybody has input to (Tim) and Marilyn please send that via email, you know, like today if possibly certainly not later than tomorrow so that they have it with time to work on it and (unintelligible).

My apologies for having to rush but I want to make sure that our action items for our next meeting are there. With regards the scheduling experts, Marilyn - let me say that please, you know, identify any experts that you think the whole group might want to consider, it doesn't have to any okay, for the whole group but and so - and so that - and our meeting on next week from Saturday we can start working and scheduling on that.

Item 9 on the agenda, I'm going to, you know, I think all of you have seen the definitions that (Tim) - of the terms and he has them in the - in his document on the typology of difficulty level that he send around.

I want to let you know that, the next version of that that (Tim) sends around is going to have percents in the column that's labeled up - level of completion. I will send after this meeting a little table that I gave him and it was strictly of my discretion so I want to be right upfront of that in terms of how we're going to measure completeness so, that you'll how we do that when you see the percents that he did.

It's just an estimate and just design the kind of - the measure there that we can see where we're at. And it's the document that I'm going use in my report to the new TLD, PDP committee next Friday, a week from this Friday in addition to sharing some other things with regard to us progress but I just want to be upfront about that.

Certainly, if you have any questions on any of that let me know. When you see the percents if you think we're way off pace, let us know. We'll be glad to respond to that we might even change them and the - but anyway that's just a tool to help us move forward.

Now, actions items for the next call, I will send a revised outline for the reports, it' going to be just a five item thing just to show you the basic structure. And, by the way, one comment with regard to for (Carolyn) and (Tamara) and (Mike) or other names (unintelligible) second level.

If it's easier, you can break that into different reports. It might be easier to follow up for each of the separate subcategories and I'll let you guys

- you're welcome to do which ever way you like, okay? But that's an option.

The - (Tim) (needs) - you're going to send out the revise typology table with percent completes and if you need to talk to me about that today or tomorrow let me know. Hopefully, we can send that out not later than tomorrow so, that people have a chance to provide feedback before I use that in my report next week in the meeting in Marine del Ray.

Members who have not volunteered for a category, there are several of you, some not on this call, please choose a category and communicated to (Liz).

Any other category - I don't think we need anybody on the tag domain names but if somebody feels really strongly on that, please do so. There are several of them that are quite a bit tougher work there so, you might want to consider one of those.

For each of the categories, finalize a brief statement of the role of domain names as needed. Purpose, ongoing value, et cetera, in your report. Review and summarize any additional information sources and a big section on the report. Expand the list of questions for experts as needed, okay? And you can send those directly to experts you don't have to wait for the full group. Expand - and you don't even need the contact experts as I suspect all of us are probably going to do with at least in some minor way.

Start looking at (straw) recommendations and try and have some (straw) recommendations that you're little subgroup agrees on or even

if you don't agree on them you can just state that we don't agree on that. But something then that the working group and our Saturday meeting can start considering.

Revise your report and follow the outline that I'm going to submit after this meeting. It still has the - primarily the same section so, it won't be hard to that way, just ordered a little differently.

The - try and get a revised report to the list not later than close of business on Wednesday. The reason I'm shooting for that is that, some of us will be involved in all-day meetings on Thursday and Friday and won't have much chance to look at them and were going to have a meeting first thing Saturday morning.

Now, if you can't get I end, try and get it in certainly before our Saturday meeting but preferably not, you know, a few minutes before the Saturday meeting.

And then be prepared on the 24th on Saturday to provide a brief oral overview; if you can't be there - you're the lead and can't be there, please arrange for somebody else to do it or if none of you are going to be there, make some arrangement with somebody on the committee to help you in that regard and then we will have two hours in - on that Saturday meeting.

We don't have time for any business we're about a minute over already. Remember our next meeting that will not be next Thursday but it will be Saturday, the 24th, at 8 am Pacific that's 5 pm UTC. Some of us will be there in person in Marina del Rey and Glen will provide teleconference details.

Anything else? And my apologies for ending in such a rush.

All right, everybody have a good day.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Okay. Bye.

Man: Bye.

END