GNSO Working Group.
 22 June 2008.
 Paris, France
http://www.gnso.icann.org/meetings/paris-agenda-22june08.shtml

5. IANA/ICANN names - what is the process for changing Reserved names beyond the new gTLD process (11:30 -12:00)

6. Single Character Second-Level Domain Names (12:00 -12:30)
ICANN Synthesis on Single-Character Domain Names at the Second-Level
http://www.gnso.icann.org/drafts/icann-synthesis-on-sldns-27feb08.pdf

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Moving on on the agenda, I don't know if everyone wants to stay for the next item. Just we went a half hour longer. I want to give, though, the full time to Items 5 and 6, which are both listed as half-hour items before lunch. So if it's okay with you, Jon, we'll start with your paper right after lunch and then move everything else like that into that. Anyone that's leaving because the next two topics weren't the ones they came for other than council members -- Adrian -- (laughing) -- please feel free, but leave quietly.
 Do we have Patrick? Yes, we do have Patrick. Okay. So the next two item open-the next item was the IANA ICANN names, and I guess our issue is trying to understand what the process might be for changing reserved names beyond the new gTLD process to bring them into some sort of agreement so that the new gTLD reserved names and old -- and is there something we need to do, how do we go about it, what's the process that we need to engage in now.
 >>PATRICK JONES: All right. I'm Patrick Jones, ICANN staff, and I'll do my best to try to address this topic.
 So there is a lot of work underway that will be made available once the draft base agreement is published on the schedule of reserved names for the new TLD process.
 I think that that document will address some of the concerns that have been raised about the ICANN IANA names that are in the existing registry agreements, what the process is for addressing reserved names in the existing agreements. I think that depends on, you know, work with a registry that may -- or -- so that's an area that I want to throw it back to the council to see, you know, is this a category -- how does the council envision changing the schedule of reserved names? And right now that's something that is -- it's in the registry agreements and would have to be changed by agreement with the registry.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Jeff?
 >>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I'm not a member of council, but is this really an issue? And the reason I ask is, there's really only five ICANN names -- at least in the biz agreement. I don't know if it was expanded. It's ASO, GNSO, ICANN, InterNIC and ccNSO. Has anyone really asked for that to be taken off the reserved name list?
 >>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Yes.
 >>JEFF NEUMAN: I can't --
 >>AVRI DORIA: I mean, it was brought up as an issue within the council. I don't know if --
 >>JEFF NEUMAN: Well, I mean, has any registry asked? Forget -- no there's a lot of theoretical issues, but I believe -- it would be really -- I'll take ICANN.biz I guess but the point is that we could spend a lot of time talking about the theory but unless any of those --
 >>AVRI DORIA: No. I don't think it was a theoretical question. I think there was community interest in knowing whether those names remain on a reserved list, are available for -- and it wasn't just the IANA -- I mean, and ICANN names. Jones.
 >>JEFF NEUMAN: Maybe I'll be more helpful and I'll ask the registries at the meeting but I'll ask the registries whether there's any interest in the registries for taking off the names on the list because I don't imagine there is, but I could be wrong. Except for single letters, which probably --
 >>AVRI DORIA: That's different.
 >>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah.
 >>PATRICK JONES: Why don't I go, just briefly -- backtrack a little bit and provide some context to how this topic keeps coming up for discussion. The reserved names working group looked at all of the reserved names categories, and came up with the final report, and that report was presented to the council in the San Juan meeting last year. You know, ICANN IANA names was left as, you know, one of the reserved names categories where further work might be needed, and to address how the -- those names would be dealt with in the existing registry agreements, so one of the suggestions from

council was to poll the organizations that have those names on reserve and see if they still want to have them on reserve or if they want to make them available.

That's an area of work that's been much lower on the priority scale than new TLDs, and in some of the other, you know, categories of work.

So that's something that has not yet been done but is going to be addressed as part of the draft base agreement that's put out for new TLDs.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah. Mike.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I think it was more than just polling those organizations, asking whether they wanted to maintain those registrations, but asking them to justify those registrations. Or justify their need to have those as reserved names.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Yeah. I mean, trademark owners take a little offense that a whole lot of folks don't have the same problems they do because they have the luxury of putting their famous marks on a list. I mean, we think that if everyone had a little skin in the game and were having to deal with all the cybersquatters we were having to deal with, perhaps it would be a very different view when it came to policy if you were down in the trenches slugging it out with the rest of us.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I don't understand this. It looks like it was directed at me but I don't understand the comment. I mean, I understand the comment. I don't understand why it was directed towards me.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: I just wasn't directing it towards you. I just think you're very handsome and I wanted to stair at you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm a Libra.

>>PATRICK JONES: So I think it's very likely in the draft base agreement proposed schedule of reserved names that this will be addressed, and the council can talk about, you know, how the existing registry agreements deal with it, but I think that the question is going to get answered when -- post the draft base agreement schedule.

>>AVRI DORIA: So if I understand -- and then I've got Marilyn and I've got Mike on the list. If I understand, if the reserved names for the new gTLDs are -- somehow end up different, then using a -- possibly using a PDP, we could amend the reserved names list, if that's what the council and GNSO wanted, of course going through the whole issues report and then the -- the legal staff saying yes, in scope, not in scope, but contingent on that's correct those would be the way we would have to address it?

>>PATRICK JONES: So that's one way, or the other way is a registry comes through the funnel process and proposes a release.

>>AVRI DORIA: So if the registries wanted to do it without forcing it through a PDP process, they can go through that way. But that's a single registry at a time, correct?

>>PATRICK JONES: Yes.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Can I clarify one thing? In some of the registry agreements, a PDP cannot force the release of reserved names, any reserved names. That may not be the case in all registry agreements. But certainly with dot biz, even if there was a PDP -- I am not saying we wouldn't voluntarily comply. I am just saying technically, if there was a PDP and wanted a release of certain names, it doesn't mean NeuStar would have to release it.

>>AVRI DORIA: That's why I mentioned the whole legal step telling us where it was in scope and where it wasn't would obviously have to be done.

I had Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade, and I'm speaking as an individual. But I was a member of the highly revered working group that Patrick is referring to, which tackled a number of very diverse issues. I am just going to say that while I do have sympathy for the concerns that famous and well-known brands and our trademark holders have, I think actually these names are in a different category.

And that my view about the treatment of a very short list of names that are used for purposes of administrative clarity and perhaps other purposes such as the word "ICANN," the word "IANA," et cetera, I think should be understood as having a different function and different purpose.

I also, however, am not a fan of there being an ever-growing list of names that either individual registries or ICANN should develop. And so I think that the discussions in the working group, for those of you who would want to just refresh yourselves on the fact there was a significant amount of discussion and there were technical experts. In one case, I retained a technical expert who is pretty highly respected in the technical area. You might just go to the transcript and if you wanted to get up to date quickly, take a look at the debate and discussions that did go on there.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Did I have someone else that wanted -- okay, Mike.

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes, Michael Palage, also participant in the reserved name working group. On this issue of ICANN, the record will reflect that me and Mr. Denton, who was the staff consultant, had many detailed exchanges on this.

My question to Patrick is when we concluded the reserved name working group, I had asked for the legal basis upon which ICANN originally reserved these. And at the time, they said they were investigating and would look into why these were originally put on the list.

So, I guess, I'm going to ask for an update on whether ICANN has found any information from the archives of how these originally came into protection because -- and the reason I'm asking this question is I do agree with J. Scott, I think it sets a very dangerous precedent here to say that ICANN is somehow more special than other mark owners.

It sort of rings of "do as I say, not as I do." If ICANN believes that the processes that they're putting in place in connection with the new gTLDs are good enough for trademark owners to rely upon, ICANN itself, which has an United States trademark registration, should be able to rely upon those same processes and not expect anything different.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Any other comment on this?

Patrick, did you want -- I see your finger on the button there, looks like perhaps there is something you wanted to add.

>>PATRICK JONES: We're going to look into this, but I thought that Mike's question was addressed in the reserved names working group and it was addressed by staff. And if it wasn't, we'll try to get an answer on that again. But I thought we did answer that.

>>AVRI DORIA: Anything else on this at the moment? So my view on this at the moment -- and somebody please correct me if I am getting it wrong -- is that we wait and see what comes out in relation to reserved names in the new gTLD process and then we have to decide -- I guess, then we have two decisions to make. One is do we want to comment on that as the council on what's being done with the new gTLDs, whether we agree or disagree with what's presented there and do we want to propose an issues report/PDP on bringing the current reserved names insofar as legal counsel says it is within scope and do that. That's really the next steps for us, wait and see; and then two-track actions, one in regard to the new gTLDs and one in regard to existing.

Do I have that right? I see no one raising their hand to tell me I have it wrong, so I will assume I'm close.

Okay. Then I guess that covers that issue for now. And we've caught up a little bit of time. And that brings us to the single character single-level domain names.

>>PATRICK JONES: I provided the council an update on the last council call. On May 29th, I mentioned that a paper from staff on a proposed allocation framework would be posted for community consultation. That allocation framework document was posted on June 13 and it is open for comment between June 13 and July 13. So far three comments have come in and the comments on the framework document are certainly welcome from anyone in the community that's interested in this.

I'm hoping that those who participated in the reserved names working group or anyone else that's interested in single-character names would want to provide a comment or provide some feedback on that proposed allocation method.

On the same day as the council call -- in fact, an hour before the council call was conducted -- there was also a briefing of the ICANN board on work that has been underway on single-character names, including very brief discussion of two proposed registry services requests from two registries. Those registry services request have been posted, and both of those requests have been referred to the ICANN board for consideration. Those requests are from dot coop and dot mobi, and they're both proposing a -- with variations, an RFP process for single-character names within their respective sponsored top-level domains.

Just to go back to the allocation framework document, in that same announcement, ICANN also announced it had selected Power Auctions, L.L.C., as ICANN's auction design consultant. And that was to cover a number of auction design needs, not just for single-character names but also for the development of models for resolution of contention among competing gTLD applications, disposition of data from failed registrars or registries and, also, allocation model for single-character names.

To clarify from the record from what Kurt had said, Power Auctions is based in the Washington, D.C. area but they have an international team of well-noted auction design experts. Some of them are here at the ICANN meeting this week and available to answer questions that anyone might have about their work in a wide variety of auction areas.

So I'll stop there.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. So far I've got Jeff and Chuck on the list. I've got Tim now. Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I have two questions. The first question is actually -- the second question actually depends how the first question comes out.

First question is -- and there has been disagreement -- does this allocation framework apply both to existing and to new gTLDs? Or is it only existing?

>>PATRICK JONES: The framework is a proposal for community discussion and it does -- it is aimed at existing registries. It's not -- because the future registries are covered in the recommendation of the reserved names working group to not reserve single-character names.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So that being the case, I think -- by the way, you probably should say that in the draft because it is very unclear.

So there is a couple different sides disputing that. So nowhere does it say it only applies to existing.

The second thing is if it's meant to apply to existing, yet you can't force a registry to release its names, what value does this paper have? Let me follow it up with a comment. It is very interesting that you guys think an auction is the most efficient, and that's great for your own knowledge.

But -- and this is not a secret, I have told you many times before, dot biz, for example, wants -- would rather do a RFP process to see which parties can add more -- I'll use -- more value to the DNS for dot biz than auction it off. Because, frankly, dot biz is not going to generate that much money from an auction. We're pretty realistic.

To tell me I have to now -- I'm not sure what you're telling me with this paper because you're saying the registry has to agree, but the only way I can agree is to actually do an auction. So why would I agree?

>>PATRICK JONES: So let me answer both those questions. The first sentence of the executive summary makes it clear this is for existing gTLDs. And the document also states that it recognizes that there are different registry models and that there's -- this is not intended to be a one size-fits-all approach that ICANN does with their registries that want to propose different allocation meth modding.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: But registries have proposed it. You have held it up because of this paper. In other words, are those for approval for the board this week or have you -- because what I've seen a bunch of comments, in fact, one of the board members at the last meeting, it is reflected in the minutes, said, wait a minute, I don't think we should decide these two motions because there is a policy pending before the GNSO.

So which is it?

>>PATRICK JONES: Those proposals are not on the board agenda for this meeting. They would be available for the board to consider at the July meeting which is, I believe, July 31.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So those statements from the board members -- it is pretty much irrelevant. They're just statements? I'm not trying to trap you here. I'm just trying to make a point that people believe -- the people that read this believe that this model is going to apply. That's the problem with you putting out this document and then relying on your synthesis document which was your document, too, is that it creates an expectation in the community that that's what's going to happen.

And if a registry wants to do an auction, let's say that they do, you're now dictating that all the money has to go towards whoever ICANN deems it appropriate throughout this methodology. I'm just very confusing by this whole paper and what its purpose is. If I am the only one, I'll stop asking questions.

>>AVRI DORIA: I have Chuck, Tim and then Marilyn.

>>CHUCK GOMES: In the interest of transparency and disclosing my interests, I would like to inform you that VeriSign has submitted a registry service proposal for the allocation of single and two-character domain names. There aren't very many two-character domain names available, by the way, one.

So, unfortunately, until it's posted it is not appropriate for me to discuss the details. I can tell you that I believe that we incorporated a lot of the issues that were recommended in the comments with regard to ICANN's paper and that we think it has excellent benefit for the community.

And in fairness to ICANN staff so that we submitted it late leading up to these meeting and at a very difficult time for them to respond -- although we have had some interaction, so I don't want this to come across as a criticism to ICANN staff that it hasn't been posted.

If per chance -- and I don't know whether this will happen or not -- it is posted this week, we will be happy to talk about it and receive comments from people.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

Tim?

>>TIM RUIZ: Are the applications for registry services to allocate the single-character names, are those moving forward on the same schedule and contracted time frame as any other registry service would be?

>>PATRICK JONES: So the answer is yes and we're following the procedure as it's intended. There hasn't been a delay that wasn't expected by the two applicants. Both registries had submitted in their proposal contract changes, and those have to follow the process which is for public comment and board consideration. So the public comment process is underway, at least on the allocation

framework document. And that is separate from the contracts amendments that were proposed by coop and mobi. And those amendments, once their negotiation is finalized between the registries and ICANN staff will be posted for public comment and available for the community and the board to review.

>>AVRI DORIA: I have Marilyn now and then I have Mike and then Jeff and then Bruce.

>>MARILYN CADE: I want to thank -- my name is Marilyn Cade, and I want to thank the only other person that so far I've heard declare their interest, and that was Chuck Gomes. And I'm just going to say, for the record, that I really urge all of us to be careful to state our interest. I think that's really something that we owe ourselves and the community.

I have stated my interests before but because I am speaking on this topic, I will state it again. I advise Overstock.com. Overstock.com is interested, as they have stated in writing before many times in registering and using O.com. They also submitted a proposal.

I, like many other people in the room did participate in the work of the reserved name working group that Patrick has mentioned.

There was extensive public comment taken on a number of things. I really welcome the fact that staff has put together the work that has been done and is proposing an allocation process.

Overstock will, they advised me, be filing comments about it and will be raising a couple of concerns about the approaches that are being proposed that do not seem to be consistent with the public comment -- the feedback and from the public comments.

But among the areas of concern that I think I have are making sure that proceeds from the allocation of reserved names, which are unique names and the fact that they had been on reserve, and many of them do have unique value, can be used for the good of the stakeholders in a unique way.

And the proposal that Overstock presented and many of the public comments supported the idea that the funds would go to unique uses that would have oversight but could also be used to develop the reserved fund of ICANN, thus contributing to the stability of the organization and potentially do capacity building to ensure that parties from developing countries are better able to fully participate in an informed way of the various processes of ICANN.

Overstock will be filing more detailed comments on this process, but I wanted to thank staff for moving forward with putting into play and seeking our comments from the community how to address this issue.

>>AVRI DORIA: Mike.

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: Hi, Mike Palage. I'm going to switch my hats here. And as a consultant to dot coop, I authored their single and double-letter requests that now appear in the funnel.

What I will say Marilyn to follow-up, dot coop much like what Jeff had articulated on behalf of NeuStar, their commitment is not to raise any money. They've put forward a RFP. Their job is to make sure that those domains get into the hands of the people within the cooperative community that will do the best job in promoting the community and the TLD. There is no interest in raising money in an auction. They are going to do a straight RFP, and the person that wins will pay the standard registry fee. There will be no surcharge, nothing extra.

So, again, I think it is important -- and I've articulated this in the past -- that we need to be careful that the dot com tail does not wag the rest of the gTLD dog. And it is just -- yes, I think -- if, in fact, when VeriSign's proposal is put forward, I think it is reasonable. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to look at the names that are, if you will, occur on the secondary market. Dot com is always a -- the financial values associated with dot com names are a significant multiplier or a factor higher than the other gTLDs.

And, again, their concern is growing their brand and serving their community, particularly in a dot cooperative community. And that, I think, what was articulated in the funnel request.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Jeff? And then Bruce.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. My question is back to Patrick on -- you said the timing is no different than the normal standard process or it's in the standard process, but I'm confused because the coop 2 letter was approved by the board. The coop 1 letter was not.

So why? And then -- yeah. Just why?

>>PATRICK JONES: So the coop request was split into two. They proposed release of single-character names and two-character name. The two-character name elements did not require a contract change and they were approved by staff. The single-character names required a contract change and have been provided to the board.

>>AVRI DORIA: Bruce?

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, Avri. It's Bruce Tonkin, from Melbourne I.T. and also a member of the ICANN board.

I'm just trying to, I guess, frame the -- this particular document from the ICANN staff in terms of decision-making processes, and let me just sort of state what I think it is, and Patrick, if you can confirm whether I'm right.

The way I'm interpreting this is it's essentially a bit like a white paper, where you basically -- ICANN staff is saying, "Here's what we think would be best practice or a good way of doing things," but is the decision-making process basically through the registry services approval process? In other words, each registry can put up their own request and the board -- and that goes through that process, and then the board signs off on that on a case-by-case basis and those registries can take this report and the feedback that the community gives to this white paper into account?

Have I correctly characterized that?

>>PATRICK JONES: Yes. Yes, I believe that's a correct characterization of this.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Or they could not take it into consideration, right? I mean, you --

>>BRUCE TONKIN:
[Speaker is off microphone]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right. I mean, because it's -- because however they reach this conclusion, it says their white paper is based on the premise that an auction is the most efficient way to allocate these names, but that may be efficiency looked at in the abstract, but not --

You know, and not to pick on the IP owners here, but, you know, if overstock wants o.biz only to put it in its warehouse, I don't care, frankly. If someone else wants o.biz and they're going to actually use it and it's not -- it doesn't create a likelihood of confusion with overstock and all the other legal aspects, then I'm going to go with that one over overstock, because that's going to help my brand and dot biz, whereas someone who puts it in their warehouse to never use it, or to just forward it to another site, is pretty much useless to me.

>>BRUCE TONKIN:
[Speaker is off microphone]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: But that's what I'm trying to get on the record. I still have a choice even after this paper comes out that --

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay.

>>BRUCE TONKIN:
[Speaker is off microphone]

>>AVRI DORIA: Right. Patrick?

>>PATRICK JONES: Yeah. So I just want to clarify once again that the paper states, "ICANN recognizes that a one-size-fits-all approach may not work for all registries and that there may be variations proposed by certain gTLDs."

>>JEFF NEUMAN: It's a little bit buried. I'm not trying to be difficult, but it is there. You're absolutely right. But it should be more up front. Because most people don't have time to read these entire papers. It's well done. I got to say it's -- I'm not criticizing that, but I'm just worried that things are lost on the community that doesn't have the time to actually pay attention to these documents, and so it creates a perception that a decision has been made when -- and you're telling me in this meeting it hasn't been made, but I'm not sure that that's what the community gets from it.

>>AVRI DORIA: Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: This is a simple question. Can you just review one more time the proposed time line? I saw that you had mentioned that the comment period ends on, I believe, July the 13th. Do you have a rough estimate of what would happen next, and -- that would be great if you could do that.

>>PATRICK JONES: So when the comment period is closed, there will be a staff summary and synthesis of the comments, and those comments will be provided to the board in conjunction with this paper and along with its consideration of the two pending funnel requests or, you know, once staff's -- pending completeness review of the VeriSign request is done and their request is posted, you know, there will be time for the board to consider that on their next -- we would hope on the July 31st board call, and then it's a -- I don't want to, you know, take it any further than that. At least for the next month, that's what the timing is.

>>JEFF NEUMAN:
[Speaker is off microphone]

>>PATRICK JONES: So the next board call after this meeting is July 31st, is that correct?

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. I've got Jeff, Bruce, and Chuck. So Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I just -- maybe I can help Marilyn. Isn't the short answer to Marilyn's question that there is no time line. That, in essence, that the only time line that's in place is really for the registry services that have been proposed, but as far as this paper, there are no actions. After this paper is posted and comments are posted and maybe ICANN does a synthesis of that and it's presented to the board, that's it. It's over. But separately, registries have proposed services and

those are going to be commented on, depending on how the registries propose it, but there is no action contemplated as a result of this paper?

>>PATRICK JONES: Unless as a result of the comments and the board's discussion of the paper, the board decides to provide some direction.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm sorry, I'm confused. What kind of direction could they provide? If there's no registry services request, what else is there? In other words, there's two different processes. There's the registries that have proposed the service and this paper may guide them in deciding how, with respect to registries that have proposed a service, how that's handled. But if a registry hasn't proposed a service, what other direction could there be?

>>PATRICK JONES: So we have two registry services that are being reviewed right now, and a third that's being reviewed by staff, so the board will have registry services requests to review.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. I have Bruce, Chuck, and then Marilyn.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: I guess I just want to clarify -- and again, you know, from a process point of view, just to reiterate, when the board's considering a registry service request, it's considering that on the basis of the criteria for that. This document isn't actually part of that request. So, in other words, for a registry service to be approved, it needs to not have an impact on security and stability and not have an impact on competition, and the evaluation of that registry service request is included -- you know, a paper to the board and the board makes a decision on that. So I just want to be clear.

So they're not tied together, Patrick, in other words. I'm not considering this document along with the RSTEP process. The RSTEP process is a self-contained process.

>>AVRI DORIA: Chuck?

>>CHUCK GOMES: A question for you, Patrick, of a little different nature.

There's a comment period going on right now for dot coop and dot mobi and I'm looking at the dot mobi agreement and the new registry services provision in there, the RSTEP process or funnel that we commonly call it.

I understand if there's a contract change that you put it out for public comment. It appears now that there's going to be two public comment periods for the same thing, because the proposed -- the proposed amendments to the contract are in the proposal, okay? Obviously then those have to be negotiated. And again, I'm trying to fit that into the RSTEP process and struggling with that.

>>PATRICK JONES: Okay. So there's a comment period for the allocation framework document. That's running right now. That's separate.

>>CHUCK GOMES: No.

>>PATRICK JONES: But the comment periods for the proposed contract changes of dot coop and dot mobi have not started yet. We're going to be trying to finalize any language and posting that as a separate comment period, but that hasn't yet commenced.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Oh, okay. That was my misunderstanding. I thought the comment periods had already started on those. They were just posted? Is that correct?

>>PATRICK JONES: Right.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Okay.

>>PATRICK JONES: So they were posted as part of the normal ICANN 15-day review period. We completed the security/stability competition review, provided letters to coop and mobi and said these would be referred to the board for consideration along with any contract change. We need to post the contract change.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE:

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>AVRI DORIA: Mike, and then Bruce again. Oh, Mike's deferring to Bruce? Bruce?

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Oh, I just had a question for Patrick, because Chuck's just disclosed that he submitted something. I was just wondering if Patrick can disclose when he thinks it might be posted? In other words, will it be this week or some later time?

>>PATRICK JONES: We are conducting our completeness review to make sure that the questions that staff has about the request are answered, and once that completeness review is done, we'll post the proposal for a 15-day ICANN preliminary determination period. I can't give you any other answer than that, other than I'm continuing to push to get it posted as soon as we can.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Mike?

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: Patrick, just my recommendation, if you can take back to your supervisors. This evaluation period was really never contemplated. It basically talks about if you -- if you read the original funnel request, it starts the 15-day clock, one would assume after submission.

ICANN has, if you will, now imparted this evaluation period. I guess the concern -- and this is from a metrics and an accountability standpoint -- it would really help, perhaps, if you could show date of

submission and then how long it took for ICANN to do the initial evaluation. If it's just merely a day or two, that would be a positive sign, but if the evaluation began to run into a period of time longer than the 15-day window itself, I think that may cause concern for some of the registries that have relied upon this mechanism.

So I guess my recommendation is, if you could just show date of submission and how long it took for that initial review, that would be good.

>>AVRI DORIA: Patrick?

>>PATRICK JONES: So on your second point, ICANN does have metrics on how long it takes to conduct a 15-day review that -- that data is being provided to the board and I'm very sure that soon it will be made public for everyone else to see on how ICANN has conducted the 15-day review period for all its funnel requests.

I mean, I can say, right, right now that the 15-day review period has been handled -- in the 15 requests that have been reviewed, it's been -- the average is 13.2 days.

But to get to your first point, there is a difference in the time that it takes for a request to come in and staff does an initial check if -- whether it's complete or not to when it gets posted and the 15 days starts. And in many cases, that 15 -- that initial pending completeness period is used to Claire FY any areas of the proposal that need to be -- you know, it's useful for the registry as much as it is for ICANN to make sure that the request is as complete as it can be before it gets posted.

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: And just to be clear, I'm not saying that that period is not useful. I -- having done several funnel requests with ICANN, I have found that period to be useful.

To date, that period has generally been a couple of days. My concern, though, however, would be where the evaluation potentially gets strung out for longer than a couple of days, so I think in that interest, it's good just to have benchmarks from a metrics standpoint of submission, when it was originally submitted and how long that initial evaluation took place. I think that would be a good metric to add.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Jeff, but before Jeff, I just wanted to comment on one thing. Is, I couldn't find, skimming through the document anywhere, where it did say one size does not fit all but I probably was looking for the wrong words so if you want to point it out at some point, so it can be shown, but -- Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you for helping me prove my point.

[Laughter]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: In the spirit of openness and transparency, you're right, it's been 15 days or 13 days, but there have been some technical glitches in preventing things from getting posted, so that's also the kind of metrics the community should see. There's -- registries have tried to post things and, you know, the program you guys use to post doesn't always work the greatest.

So I'm interested is it 13 days from the date its posted or 13 days from the date that it was actually submitted? Because I think you might get a little bit different result. And I do feel your pain on it. Not everything can be perfect.

The other thing is, you say you have questions, and maybe this is when there is a review of the RSTEP process, but sometimes the questions are valuable to the registry who is submitting it. Sometimes the registry just wants to see it posted, but ICANN staff asks some questions, so it's not always the fact that it helps the registry. Sometimes we want to get it up there and we want to get it fast, and then questions can be worked out after its posted.

>>AVRI DORIA: Anyone else? No? Yes, Bruce.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Found the quote. So it's under annex background, about the seventh paragraph down, so if you keep going down -- are you in annex background?

>>AVRI DORIA: Oh, maybe I was just in --

>>BRUCE TONKIN: It's in the annex.

>>AVRI DORIA: Oh, it's in the annex. Oh, I'm sorry.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Keep going down the screen. Keep going, keep going, keep going. But, yeah, it's in the annex, under about the seventh paragraph down.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. So sorry. Dan?

>>DAN HALLORAN: So on the comment being in the annex, I want to apologize to Patrick. I think that was my fault. I think in an earlier draft, you had all this kind of background up at the beginning, and I said, "Nobody could possibly be interested in all that arcane" -- just stick that at the bottom in the annex, so I guess that's not true. So my apologies.

[Applause]

>>AVRI DORIA: And I apologize for bringing it up. I was actually trying to be supportive and I was going to highlight on the screen exactly where it was and when I couldn't find it, I got frustrated. Okay. So if that's -- if no one else -- okay. I just want to show that weekly break for lunch now, we come

back at 1:00. This gives us an extra 15 minutes, over an hour. We'll start with discussion of Jon's paper on the relationship between ccNSO and GNSO. Then we'll go into a discussion of the IDNC and then we'll talk about preparations for our two -- our meetings, joint meeting with the ccNSO and our meeting with the GAC.

 And it's okay for people to leave their things in the room because there will be somebody watching. Okay. Thank you. Have a good lunch.

 [Break]