

GNSO Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference

25 January 2007

19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO RN Working Group teleconference on 25 January 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/GNSO-WG-RN-20070125.mp3>

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

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Jon Nevett - Registrar constituency

Seth Jacoby - Registrar constituency

Tim Ruiz - Registrar constituency

Mike Palage - Registry constituency/Registrar/IPC/CBUC

Caroline Greer - Registry constituency

Tamara Reznik - IP constituency

Greg Shatan - IP constituency

Dan Dougherty - IP constituency

Marilyn Cade - CBUC council

Neal Blair – CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Avri Doria - Appointee to GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Denise Michel – Vice President policy Development

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Counselor

Patrick Jones – Registry Liaison Manager

Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Chuck Gomes: ...people's benefit including those who are not on is, provided the people are okay with it, I'll send around a contact list that has some of that information. Or I won't send it on the list...

Man: Great.

Man: ...but rather...

((Crosstalk))

Man: But I won't do that until I get the...

Woman: I think that's great. We've normally done that in the, you know, in the other - I think it's really helpful.

(Mike Palage): And, Chuck, I'm here. I was listening to your broken headphone stuff earlier on the call.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you've been here for a while. Sneaking on me, huh, (Mike)?

(Mike Palage): Just ghostin'. Ghostin.'

Chuck Gomes: Welcome.

Okay.

Man: Hello?

Coordinator: Excuse me. Tim Ruiz has joined.

Chuck Gomes: Tim, welcome.

Tim Ruiz: Hey, Chuck. Hey, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I won't wait too long to start because I don't like to waste people's time that are on time.

What I think would be a good idea as - or as Marilyn already suggested is that we each take about 15 seconds just to introduce ourselves, because there will be some on the call that don't know us.

Coordinator: Excuse me. Alistair Dixon joined.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And so, let me ask the operator to go ahead and start the recording. And she will signal us when it's ready to go and then we'll take off from there.

Coordinator: Sir, the recording has begun. You may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

Okay. I want to welcome everybody. I have been very, very impressed by the quick response since this, the decision, was just made less than seven days ago

to kick this thing off. And I think we have, what is it, 13 or so members that are on the group. So I thank you for the quick response. I welcome you to the group.

And before we actually start the agenda other than the welcome, I like everybody to just, like I said, take about 15 seconds and just introduce yourself, what company you're with, what constituency you're with, and hopefully we'll get a chance to know each other a lot better than that over the next few weeks.

So, since - I'm going to follow the order of this list I have in front of me.

Alistair, could you start if off?

Alistair Dixon: Sure.

Alistair Dixon from the Business Constituency, and I'm - my company is Telstra Clear.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

And - oh, for the sake of those who don't know, tell where you're located as well.

Alistair Dixon: Oh, country? I'm located in Wellington, New Zealand.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alistair.

Neal, you go next please.

Neal Brian Blair: Yes. Neal Blair and I'm a member of Business Constituency. And my company is Capital Strategies. And our main office is in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Neal.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm a member of the Business Constituency. I have consulting company that focuses - and I primarily advise and represent AT&T where I was employed for 27 years, continuing actually to do much of what I did for AT&T there -- Internet governance, Internet policy issues.

I also advise Overstock.com on their interactions with ICANN. And I have a couple of other very small, you know, client relationships as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Avri?

Man: Where is Marilyn located?

Chuck Gomes: Oh, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: We're worldwide. I physically am in the United States.

Chuck Gomes: And the - you have a garden in Washington DC, right?

Marilyn Cade: I have a garden and (two cats) in Falls Church, Virginia...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Falls Church. I'm sorry I missed that. Okay.

All right. Avri?

Avri Doria: Hi. I'm Avri Doria. I'm a NomCom to the council. This session I guess I call myself (unintelligible) researcher splitting my time between a university in Sweden and US. I also do consulting for the secretariat of the Internet Governance Forum. And the university is Lulea University of Technology in Northern Sweden.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Avri.

(Dan), are you on?

(Dan Dougherty): I am.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Welcome.

((Dan Dougherty): Thank you.

(Dan Dougherty, the IP Constituency and recently joined. And I am with Yahoo! and I'm located in San Francisco.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Greg?

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan. I am with Reid Smith in New York and member of the Internet Committee of International Trademark Association. And I'm joining this on behalf of the IP Constituency.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg.

And Tamara indicated that she would not be able to join us today. So, Tamara Reznik also from the IPC and with Expedia.

Greg Shatan: And she's in Seattle, Washington.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, she's in Seattle not Bellevue or...

Greg Shatan: Oh, actually I guess she's in Bellevue...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh, she's right there. Just I'm being picky I guess.

Jon Nevitt?

He was there a little bit ago. Maybe he's on mute.

Jon Nevitt: Hey. This is Jon Nevitt from the Registrar's Constituency. I am with - Solutions and I'm located in - we have an office in Virginia DC and live in Maryland. So I guess the (niche) part in Washington area.

Chuck Gomes: And you're with the Registrar's Constituency. In fact, he's the chair of the Registrar's Constituency.

Seth, are you on?

Seth Jacoby: I'm on.

Seth Jacoby, Vandare Netblue, the Registrar's Constituency based in New York City with our headquarters in Mountain View.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Time Ruiz with GoDaddy, the Registrar's Constituency based in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, myself while the GoDaddy is based in Scottsdale, Arizona.

Chuck Gomes: And he wishes that they wouldn't make him be in Scottsdale so often.

Caroline, are you on?

Caroline Greer: Yeah, Caroline (unintelligible).

Hi, I'm Caroline Greer with the Registry Constituency. I work for .mobi based in Dublin, Ireland.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Caroline (unintelligible).

And I am with VeriSign and with the Registry Constituency. And I work most of the time out of a home office in Sacramento, California, although I still have a small office in Virginia as well.

(Mike)?

(Mike Palage): Yeah, I thought you forgot about me, Chuck.

(Mike Palage) based in Palm Beach, Florida. I have my own consulting company. I actively participate in three constituencies -- the Registry, the IP and the Business. However, in connection with this working group, I will be wearing primarily my Registry hat on behalf of (Dock Koap).

Chuck Gomes: And, (Mike), you're inde - you have your own business, right?

(Mike Palage): Correct. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Denise, are you on? Denise Michelle?

Denise Michelle: Yes, I'm on.

Chuck Gomes: Would you introduce yourself, please?

Denise Michelle: Denise Michelle, I'm the Vice President of Policy Development. And I'm in California as we speak, but I'm based in Brussels.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Denise. I appreciate you joining us.

And, Liz?

Liz Williams: Yes, sure.

Liz Williams, based in Brussels for ICANN Senior Policy Counselor. I'm the Lead Policy President on the new TLD's PDP commonly known as PDP-Dec05 and on PDP-Dec06. So - and I must say that I'm delighted with the variety of the people that are signed up for this little piece of work. It's fantastic. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I am too, Liz. Thanks for expressing that. And I do appreciate Liz and Denise's help on this.

So, hopefully everyone got the latest agenda. It wasn't too much difference than what I send out - sent out earlier in the week. But I just had a little bit of detail there.

And the first thing I would like to do is to review and approve the agenda.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, you're missing one more person.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: It's Patrick Jones and...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, hi, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome.

Are you - Patrick, are you going to participate on an ongoing basis on this?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: It's okay if you or don't; I'm just curious whether we should add you to our contact list.

Woman: Right.

Patrick Jones: Liz asked if I can participate in the call and, you know, I said I'd be available.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: So, if you need me further...

Chuck Gomes: Well let me know if you should be added to our contact list. I - that would - I'm perfectly fine with that. And there may be a time later in our work particularly where if there are questions about some things that you are expert in that we would certainly invite you whether you're a regular member or not. So, thanks for joining us, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: Chuck, this is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Tim.

Tim Ruiz: So I - did I get this right then that there's two constituencies not represented, the Internet Service Providers and the Non-Commercial?

Chuck Gomes: That is correct. I did hear from (Tony Harris) from the ISPs. And he was working on it, but - and possibly getting somebody, but apparently he didn't succeed.

And because this is a working group, not a formal policy effort and ultimately the council will take any recommendations we make and act on them or not, of course all constituencies will be represented at that point in time. And also, if somebody is on today doesn't mean they can't show in later.

Woman: And, Chuck, I think that just (unintelligible) but also probably with this reiterating again the - when we go to the supports the kind of documentation that's going to be available for people who joined a little bit later. The transcripts, et cetera.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And I'll get to that in the agenda. Okay.

Okay. First of all just to confirm, make some logistical information of the group, an RM-WG email list was established by Glen and (Kent) at ICANN and I appreciate the quick work they did on that.

Has anyone on this call not received the welcome message for the list?

So everybody is on that. Excellent.

And in the agenda that I sent you, you can see that the email address for the list is there and also the URL for the archive. Please be aware as Glen so kindly reminded me that the list is public archived. So anybody can see that.

So, if there's something like a phone number or something that you don't want to be public, which I already violated in my own case, then you probably shouldn't put it on the list. Okay? But hopefully, the majority of these things we discuss will be open and transparent and we won't have any problem with that. But I just wanted to make sure people are aware of that.

Did somebody want to say something there? Did I hear somebody?

Okay. The meetings will be transcribed and recorded. And a day or so after the meeting, Glen will let us know on the list when those are available. If you want to rehear things or if you missed the meeting and need to catch up.

ICANN staff support is the next thing on the agenda. And I'd like Denise to talk about that if she would.

Denise Michelle: Hi. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Denise Michelle: Okay.

So we'll be providing a data case staffing report for this working group to ensure that's fully supported and that the work in particular, the work that the working does that relates to the PDPs in progress are done in the way that's coordinated and in the appropriate timeframe so they can be set into that process at the council level.

And I'll take the decisions made on today's call if you have closure on your workgroup, your statement of outline and the timeline for your work and get back to you in two days on how this will be set.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now I - did I - did we allow time for (Dan Dorothy) to introduce himself?

Man: No.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Did I skip (Dan)?

(Dan Dorothy): No. I introduced myself.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. All right, thanks.

The...

Marilyn Cade: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. What's up, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I think this goes without saying and maybe it's already been said, but - so we would - the working group would have the dedicated policy support needs and we will turn to Glen for secretary's support. Is that the idea?

Denise Michelle: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And those who aren't aware of it, Glen has already done a bang-up job in providing support. So I have myself sincerely appreciated that.

So, okay, going on - thank you very much, Denise.

The next question I have, I have created a little table that's got everybody's name, title, company, location - geographical location, the constituency associated with your email address and telephone numbers, if I have them, and that can include an office number or a mobile number or both. Does anybody have a problem if I share that with members of the group only? In other words, I've created a little distribution list that's separate from the ICANN list. And I could send it to that so that everybody has a listing of the people on the group and would update that as the group changes overtime.

Does anybody not want that any of that information shared?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

I support sharing it, but I might just note that in the DC, we actually have a disclaimer on our membership list. It might be good to put that on this document as well because if accidentally, you know, the document gets shared with someone, so probably we ought to have the footnote that says this is a private list and should not be distributed for everyone.

Chuck Gomes: Would you just...

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...email me your disclaimer and I'll back it on there. Good suggestion.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Yeah, we'll just get it from the secretary and have it sent to you.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, excellent. Okay.

Very good. All right. So nobody has a problem with that, then that'll be an action item for me.

And the next item on the agenda is just I wanted to talk a little bit and allow others if you would like to talk a little bit about the difference between a working group and a policy development process, a PDP.

As you can tell by the title, this is a working group, not a PDP. We're not tasked with developing policy. That doesn't mean that we won't talk about some possible policies. Okay? But we're not formally tasked with developing policy itself like a PDP would under the ICANN bylaws.

The concept of working groups actually goes back to the original DNSO, the Domain Name Supporting Organization, before it was changed to the GNSO. And it's being used currently, not only in this group but with IDN to provide some supplemental inputs to ongoing PDPs.

And in my opinion, that's a little more flexible mechanism. It's not intended to replace a PDP if a PDP is necessary, but in the case - in particular in regards to reserve name, in the Dec-05 PDP which is for the introduction of new TLDs, the issue of reserve names came up especially at the top level and with controversial strings, et cetera. And so we got to the point where we are where the GNSO Council decided that it would be helpful to provide a working group that could provide some input to not only that PDP but the February '06 PDP which has to do with contractual conditions for existing registries, and also of course to the GNSO Council.

And that could mean that, you know, we could end up recommending that maybe some PDPs need to be started on some of these issues or there's a - I

think the door is open as to what kind of recommendations you might come up with out of this group.

Any questions or does anyone else want to add to that?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

I think, Chuck, to add that, we do have the - because we are tasked with developing recommendations, we could actually draft a policy recommendation, but it would have to go to the council for consideration and elaboration.

So one of our recommendations could narrowly be the time permitted a particular recommended policy or something else, is my understanding from (Bruce).

Does that sound consistent with you? Or it could just be additional processes?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think that's consistent with what I understand.

In some cases, you know, it was - if it was actually a policy that was recommended, we might then have to, you know, check with General Counsel of ICANN to make sure that it doesn't have to go through all the steps in a PDP. But I think that's something we could face when we get there.

I don't want to imply that policy won't come out of this group, okay? So let's make sure we understand that. But we don't just have to recommend policy either.

Okay? Thanks, Marilyn.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is interest statement. Now, for those that have been around the GNSO for a while, you know that on different task forces and on the council (federate), participants are asked to submit an interest statement so that all of us are aware of each other's particular interest.

Now those interests may or may not create conflicts, but we at least want them to be on the table.

And in this particular case, obviously, if anyone has particular interest with regard to reserve names of any category, then it would be very important just to put that on the table so everybody in the group knows that you're doing that.

And so, for example, if you're representing somebody or if your company is very interested in a particular reserve name category, if that was ever unreserved, then that will be a good thing to put forward. The - and what you'll see under action items is that the - that each of us by our next meeting, hopefully, can submit an interest statement. And it can be fairly simple. I submitted one for example when I became a member of a GNSO Council.

Now, I can send that around. I don't mind sharing it. I'll probably add to it a little bit for this group just to address the issue of reserve names and - but if everybody is comfortable doing it without seeing an example, that's okay, too. I'm curious as to what you might think.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck...

(Neal): This is (Neal). Either way would be fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

But I do think that for those who haven't done this before, some people sometimes just say, I work for X company and they don't realize that the rest of the members of a group don't understand what their interests are. So, it would be - I think it's important to stress that you do need to identify what your interests are. We don't treat that as a conflict, per se. We treat that as the need is there.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And, in fact, what, Marilyn, is really important, it's okay to have interest about some of the issues we're going to be talking about. In fact, you probably wouldn't be on this group or be any worth to this group if you didn't have some interest. So, that's perfectly okay. It's just if we're upfront about them then we all know where you're coming from.

So, for example, if I'm really hot on getting v.com for VeriSign -- and by the way, I don't think VeriSign really wants that, I'm just using this as an example -- then I should, you know, state that that, you know, that if we get to the topic of single-letter reservations at the second level, I want you guys to know that my company has its interest, so that you know where I'm coming from.

Any questions on that?

Man: That's great.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So, that'll be an action item for each of us before the next meeting. And is it okay to just have this sent to the list?

Avri Doria: That's perfect, I think.

Chuck Gomes: No objections to that? I mean, we all need to see each other's anyway, so that seems to make sense.

Avri Doria: Yeah. This is Avri. Can I add something?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Avri Doria: Yeah. You would mention, you know, the idea of sending an example beforehand. I personally - you know, I would think that wouldn't be necessary assuming that we are sending them to the list people that haven't written one yet. You can just wait until the first...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Avri. Thank you.

Okay. I am sixth on the agenda. This one may take a little bit longer.

We need to have regular agendas. Hopefully, you've all looked at the Statement of Work and the timelines there. It's a pretty aggressive timeline. There's quite a lot to do. I personally think and I - keep in mind, though, it's not me to decide; it's the whole group to decide. I personally think if we're going to need weekly meetings as much as we can do it and think that we need to consider scheduling them weekly.

Man: Absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: So I guess my first question for the group, does anybody disagree with that? I think we don't need or can't practically do weekly meeting?

Okay? So, I assume then that the weekly meeting is the direction we'll go.

The next and tougher question is, when? Okay? For example, is this a good time for people on an ongoing basis? Now please, we understand we all know that all of us -- myself included -- are probably going to have conflicts once in a while. It's one of the reasons why we have transcribing of the meetings and recordings, so that you can catch up and so forth, and of course, we have the list where we can do that as well.

One problem that we need to be aware of with this particular time is that next week at this time, there's a special GNSO Council meeting and the regular GNSO Council meeting should reoccur at this time as well. So, we would have to work around a few instances.

Now, I think and those that have been on the council for quite a while can chime in and help me out here. But at this particular time is picked to accommodate both sides of the world or all sides of the world, maybe I should say. So, for example, in this group, we have people from Europe, we have people from the East and West Coast of the United States and in between and South America, we have people from - we have one member from New Zealand, so he's a day ahead of us, and we hope that his thinking is also a day ahead of us so he'll be a lot of help.

Alistair Dixon: Very (marvelous), Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: So, what's you're thinking about that? Is this time generally good ignoring for right now -- we'll talk about in a minute -- the adjustments we're going to have to make when there are GNSO council meetings?

Avri Doria: Until we get people from China, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, you're coming through really low.

Avri Doria: Sorry. I said, until we get people participants from China, it's a good time.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody object to - have a serious problem with this time and the day as well, Thursdays?

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. I might suggest that it's a good time, and on the days we have council conflicts, for those of you in the council, maybe you could just move it to Friday on just those days.

Chuck Gomes: Is Friday a better day to move it to rather than Wednesday?

Marilyn Cade: Oh, you mean...

Alistair Dixon: That would be Thursday my time and...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's - I think that's bad for Alistair.

Marilyn Cade: I see. Right. So, you - maybe the alternate proposal is to move it to Wednesday, Chuck, on the days of this...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Would that work?

Marilyn Cade: On the days of this council?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And the first one would be next week.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: I guess I (have) to look at my calendar.

John Nevitt: Chuck, this is John. Next Wednesday, the registry-registrar meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's right. And so, that would be 11 o'clock in that meeting. Good point, John. And I will be there, as a matter of fact. So, the - that doesn't work very well for that.

How many people are involved in the registry-registrar meetings that are on this call that's taking place next week Wednesday?

Man: I am.

Caroline Greer: Caroline...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Caroline and John.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: One thing we could do is...

Tim Ruiz: Tim as well, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So, we have four. So, we're getting a pretty good group, so we don't want to - if there's just a couple of us, I thought we might be able work around it, but that probably doesn't work.

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, would it help us if the meeting was an hour earlier?

Chuck Gomes: A little bit louder, Alistair. I'm barely hearing you.

Alistair Dixon: Sorry. Would it help us if the meeting was an hour earlier?

Chuck Gomes: That would give us one hour and that's probably better than not meeting at all. Would an hour earlier work - not work for anybody?

Avri Doria: On what day, Chuck? Thursday?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Now, you're talking about Thursday then, Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Thursday, your time. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So, that'll Thursday. So, what I think Alistair is suggesting is that on days when there's council meeting and the council meetings start the same time we started this meeting, okay? So, if we are to move our meeting up an hour on those days then we could - we would be okay.

Now, are you suggesting that maybe we move it up an hour all the time?

Alistair Dixon: We could. I mean, that would work for me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: So, the - that'll be my preference to have a consistent time every week.

Chuck Gomes: Tim, did you say, it'd be your preference then to move it an hour earlier on a regular basis?

Tim Ruiz: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: And then, on the days of council, we'd have to restrict ourselves to an hour. Other times, we could go further and I'm sure we will.

Any objections to that?

That works for me. So, we'll get that word out to Glen and to the whole list for that.

Were there someone - did somebody else have a comment?

John Nevitt: Just a question, Chuck. On the weeks that there's - this is John Nevitt. On the weeks that there are no council meetings, how long do you want to us to set aside for the call?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't want the meeting to ever go beyond two hours if we can at all help it.

John Nevitt: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Whether if I'm leading the meetings -- and I may not be, okay, because I'm interim chair -- I'll certainly try to keep things moving quickly, and I think it's important that we try to do that, taking more than two hours. Now, it'd be nice probably if we could keep them to an hour and a half. I think an hour is going to be too short for us on a regular basis.

Does that help, John?

John Nevitt: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So, if you can block out two hours except when there are council meetings, it's helpful. Hopefully, we can try to be as efficient as possible and do a lot of work, not just on the calls but in between time so that we don't have to have such long calls.

All right. Well that was easier than I had anticipated. Thank you.

Woman: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: The next topic is election of a permanent chair. If you read the Statement of Work, you know that it just calls for the council to elect an interim chair. And

they elected me and with the understanding that the group itself would elect its own chair.

Man: Chuck, I'd like to propose that you become permanent chair of the working group.

Avri Doria: I'd like to second that proposal. This is Avri.

Marilyn Cade: I think it's time for us to hold the question and held the vote.

Chuck Gomes: Hold on, Marilyn. I'm chair.

I think we ought to give opportunity for other people if there are other nominations.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, but, Chuck, I actually have different question for you. Do you want to - did you need to turn that process over to somebody else?

Chuck Gomes: Do I need to?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. I just asked.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Yeah. Well, it takes a lot of time and I have a busy schedule. One other thing...

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no. Sorry. You misunderstood me. I meant to ask, did you want to turn the process of...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I got you. Yeah. Yeah. That's a very good point. Marilyn, since you brought it up, would you like to take over?

Marilyn Cade: All right, I will but very temporarily.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: So, this is just for those of you who are new kind of a tradition, whenever the person in the chair is - who were discussing and holding the nomination election process is typically is someone else for a temporary period. So, can I just ask if there are other nominations?

I see a none. Can I ask for a vote of - by voice vote, can I ask for a vote of acclamation for the person who has been nominated, Chuck Gomes.

All in favor, please say, aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Marilyn Cade: I think this has been confirmed. I'll ask the secretary to record that. And then it was the nomination process, a second call for additional nominations and voted acclamation by voice vote. And I'll turn this back to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't know if I should say thank you or not. But I will try to do my best. I really appreciate the fact that there's going to be staff support. And I would also just encourage everyone that's on the group to contribute in as many ways as you can and be responsive. It makes it a lot easier for the person trying to keep the thing moving if that's the case, and it takes much less of the chair's time. So, thank you very much for your confidence to me. In that regard, I hope I can live up to that. But again, that'll be depending on all of us because it is a team effort.

So, okay. So, I guess it's back to me, huh, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: No kidding.

Chuck Gomes: Alrighty.

The Item Number 8. And this is an important one to make sure we have good understanding of the Statement of Work. Now, we shouldn't look at the Statement of Work too rigidly. Certainly, we should with regard to particular deliverables or dates that are in there, but it's not meant to be - to tie our hands and keep us from doing a good job if we think we need to make some adjustments there. And at the same time, it's important we understand the Statement of Work and the purpose of it - purpose of our existence and what we're supposed to accomplish.

So, the first thing I thought I would do would be to just open it up for general questions and comments. And then, if it's okay with everybody, go over the little outline that I sent around little while before the meeting that incorporates quite a bit of the Statement of Work in that outline in a little different order and so forth.

Any problems with approaching it that way?

Okay. Then, let's start off with just open it up for anybody on the call who has a question about the Statement of Work or any comments you would like to make.

Liz Williams: Chuck, it's Liz here. But I'll go after everyone else has made their comments.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. Who - was that Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, this is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So, I've got Tim and Liz...

(Michael Coolidge): (Michael Coolidge), Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anyone else?

Marilyn Cade: And, Chuck, and Marilyn.

Chuck Gomes: Marilyn. Okay.

All right. Tim, why don't you start it off?

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Mine was just to point out on your summary on 2B and C, both mentioned Feb `06 and no mentioned above Dec-05 PDP.

Chuck Gomes: Good. There are several mentions though, the introduction of new TLDs, I think. It's a very good point you're bringing up, Tim.

There's absolutely a connection to the Dec-05 PDP. That's how this thing came into existence. Don't assume the fact that I didn't mention it by name that it's not there. You'll - I think you'll find several places where we talk about the introduction of new TLDs. And if it's not there, we should understand that that's a very - in fact, that really drives our priorities in our work.

Good question. Did that answer your question, Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yes. Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. (Mike)?

(Michael Coolidge): Hi. Yes. I guess one of the questions I have about the Statement of Work is just the broad reference of the term "reserve names." And to give you an example, .coop in their contract has a list of reserve names that are outside of the traditional one and two character names that most people generally refer to. And again, some of these are bank insurance, health.coop.

And I guess my question here is most of the discussion that I think most have seen within the community has focused on the one and two letter names. And would it not be - would it be possible in this Statement of Work to possibly, if you will narrow this focus, to just the ICANN reserve names, those that have been traditionally withheld from reservation as opposed to broadening this - broadening the scope of this potential mandate to include other names that have been reserved by registry operators for other purposes?

Chuck Gomes: Now, (Mike), if we were to go that route, how would we - what about the new categories that may come up? Again, in the Amsterdam meeting for the new TLD PDP, one of the things that came up was this whole category of controversial names at the top level. So, that's not in there right now. And so, how would you - are you suggesting that we not look at those sorts of things or...

(Michael Coolidge): Well, I guess my suggestion, Chuck, is I think - you know, ICANN I think has done a pretty good job on this to date. And in part, I based that wearing my other hat I - for disclosure purposes, in connection with the consulting work that I do with Affilius, which is the registry operator for that .info. I have worked with them in connection with the Board Resolution 01-92 that was the allocation of the original country names. So, I think ICANN has generally done a good job of being responsive to allow the allocation of these names.

There are actually I think it's - is it A - let me just see something real quick. .coop has actually worked with ICANN in getting a two-letter domain name release. I think it was A2 or it was - I could take a look at the exact - yeah, it's a2.coop. So, ICANN has been responsive in working with the registry operators to get these names reserved as evidence by the recent GNR proposal.

So, I think what I'm trying to say is the process is working I think today and we just want to try to be a little less restrictive. And again, for those members of the cross constituency call, we heard today how one of the - how the proposed registry operator for Triple X was talking about a much more broader reserve list. So, I think that's some of the things that we need to be careful of. We need to allow registry operators to have some discretion in

reserving certain names. That so I guess - that's what I'm just trying to bring to the table here.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Let me respond first of all by saying I don't think there's anything - we should not assume that we need to necessarily recommend changes and anything that's being done right now. Okay? The fact that this working group exists - we shouldn't presuppose that that means that things that are handled one way now and need to change. In my mind -- and people may have different opinions on -- we could come back with the recommendation as long as we can reach for our consensus that the way certain categories are - reserve names or for that matter the way all reserve names are being handled right now should be handle the way they are today.

So my first response, (Mike), is that the outcome you're looking at could happen through the work of the group. But I think what you're suggesting is that the Statement of Work narrow it right up front. Is that correct?

(Mike Coolidge): That would be my proposal.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. No, that's good. No, that's perfectly okay. I just wanted to clarify and make sure we were all in the same page.

And one other thing I think would be helpful in that regard, (Mike) is I'm not sure saying ICANN related covers it. So we might have to narrow, you know, define that a little bit better because what's ICANN related? Did that just mean IANA and the ones that are referred to ICANN in there is a two-character reservation ICANN related? I'm not sure.

(Mike Coolidge): And if you like, Chuck, perhaps I could when we - I think later in the call, we do have a session where we'll go through some of the comparative list and perhaps...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. We will if we have time, yeah.

(Mike Coolidge): ...at that time we could - and if you want maybe I could even try to take a crack at drafting some language that may encompass that, so.

Chuck Gomes: That's perfectly okay with me.

Before we move on to Marilyn, did anybody want to respond to that at all?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan.

Just kind of from a point of view of trademark owners and just my own general point of view, I think I'm more comfortable with the broader mandate. Indeed that some of the newer and reserve name such as geographic names, controversial names, premium names and the like that are really of equal if not greater concern or at least, you know, are I think working through, so I would not want to limit our mandate upfront.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I add something to this?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Was that Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, please.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah. I actually tend to agree that it's probably good that we discuss what role if any, you know, adding extra names have. I mean, I can't just - I hope that we haven't made a decision that yes, there is a role and we'll create list. And I'm open to the argument that there is no role if any for more reserve more. But I think discussing that particular issue, if there is a role for a larger list is the discussion we should have.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. I'd like to get in the queue on this conference.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Tim Ruiz: Tim, I would too.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I think it's well known to everybody on the list but if not it should be that Chuck and I are the primary authors of the original Statement of Work. And I think we - I'll speak only for myself. I think we tried so hard to create the openness that addresses the - what role if any that Avri just mentioned.

But I will just note that as the previous councilor, the working group actually doesn't have the ability to modify the Statement of Work itself. It's like a task force modifying the terms of reference that the council gets it.

If the working group were to go through the Statement of Work and spend time deciding it can't do a Statement of Work, it would actually have to go back to the council to get a vote on the modification of the Statement of Work.

Just as happens with task forces, you can at some point decide that this - a particular area is not addressable or there's no resources for it or whatever and report back on that. But it's not our job - I don't want to be legalistic about this, but it's not a working group's job; a task force's job to modify its assignment of work from the council.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marilyn.

Tim?

Tim Ruiz: You know what, I think Marilyn just probably made my point better now that if we - well first, are we able to even change the Statement of Work given (unintelligible), you know, a council resolution?

You know, if we get into that now, I can see us spending weeks, you know, engaged in that discussion, we probably actually just started on the Statement of Work. So I guess I would prefer that we leave the Statement of Work as we get our work started.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Any other responses to (Mike's) suggestion?

Okay. Marilyn, you are in queue.

Marilyn Cade: I was.

My question, Chuck, is - and it probably does come from the fact that I'm extremely familiar with the Statement of Work. You did an excellent job reorganizing this and the statement of having and giving us work outline and identifying back to the Statement of Work.

Off the top of your head, did you match all of the elements to our work outline or is that something that we should try to do offline in case we missed anything?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I would encourage everyone to make sure that I did. I tried to. Okay. But please make sure that I did.

Now, I didn't include everything that's in the Statement of Work. For example, I didn't deal with the voting and some things like that, okay. But I certainly tried to deal with purpose, with tasks, with approach, and with issues. I tried to include everyone that was mentioned there. In a couple of cases, I think I even broke it down a little bit. But absolutely check to make sure that we - that was well covered. Okay?

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

And then my follow-up question is when - if after we do that, so we could possibly, if someone observes something that needs to be added in, we would then be able to update the Statement of Work outline in any way that's necessary.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely. In fact. I'm sure we will.

Liz Williams: Chuck, it's Liz here. When you're ready, I'll just add my (unintelligible) in.

Chuck Gomes: You're next.

Liz Williams: Thank you very much.

Chuck, I was conscious that we have quite a few people on the group that might not be familiar with the broader context of the work. And I just thought I should quickly run through the other timeframe, especially with respect to the deliverable dates that you got listed which is Statement of Work 1.3.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Liz. Go ahead.

Liz Williams: Just - and I'm happy to take any questions from anyone of the group offline if you need extra information.

The new TLDs committee is preparing a final report which is a formal piece of the policy development process with TLDs in preparation for the Los Angeles meetings which have referred to in the progress report for the deliverable dates there on the 22nd of February. And we'd be expecting that we will be completing the final report in time for the Lisbon meeting. And it's critical that this piece of work on reserve names gets finished by that point because it's very important to be including that work in there.

And I'm happy to take further questions on or provide anybody with the copy of the existing draft report on the new top level demand, so people can see the broader context of the recommendation.

The second piece of that is the policy development process on policies and contractual conditions for existing registries. And you'll see that that's referred to a couple of times in the Statement of Work there.

The PDP Feb-06 and Avri who is on the call is the Chair of that particular task force. And the draft final task force report is under preparation as we speak. Well not actually at this very moment because I'm doing this, but it's actively in preparation for final discussion at the Los Angeles meetings which again happen in the third week of February.

Again, I'm more than happy to provide this working group with that cross-reference material.

The final piece of the puzzle is that there is quite a lot of background materials available for anyone who's on this reserve name working group. And that includes stuff that I was handed today which is actually a delightful piece of ICANN archive that goes back to correspondent John Costello in 1994.

So if anyone who's a history (unintelligible) and who wants to have a look at what the treatment of reserve names was in 1994, then I'm more than happy to send you the material.

But more (currently) than that, there is a lot of information that's available on the existing RFCs the researcher's name on the appropriate appendices that relate to these specific existing contracts for reserve names, particularly an existing registry agreement. And there's quite a lot of information - technical information that's available, and I'm happy to provide that for any - all of the individual working group of course. But if anyone wants to have that right away, then I'm happy to give it to you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

The - and my suggestion, Liz would be that any of those that deal with reserve names in a general nature I think it would be good to send to the list right away.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: My own personal preference is if someone of them that get - start dealing with specific reserve name categories, I would prefer that those be brought up and refer to people when we get to those categories, so that people aren't so inundated with huge amount of data that they just get totally bogged down.

Liz Williams: Sure. Chuck, it was my intention to deal with the whole six of reserve names rather than dealing with subsets...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Great.

Liz Williams: ...of a particular category.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right. Good.

And anything you have that fits that category, I certainly suggest that you send them to the list.

Liz Williams: Yeah, sure. I won't do at this moment because I can't be on the phone and online at the same time (unintelligible). But it will be tomorrow morning.

Chuck Gomes: No, that's fine. That's very good. Thank you.

Any other general comments or questions regarding the Statement of Work before we look at the outline?

Okay.

Avri Doria: Before you start, this is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: I'm going to have to drop off the call in 5 minutes, so I'll just do it silently when I have to.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Avri. I appreciate you joining.

All right. Did anyone did not receive the outline that I sent out today? If you have that in front of you, it probably makes it easier to go through it right now which is what I requested in the message to Liz. And I won't read it verbatim, but I'll try and go through the key points. Please stop me at any point that you have a question whether I pause for questions or not. And I'll try to do that periodically.

Again, the purpose of this document is not to replicate the Statement of Work but rather to get some of the key action items on purpose and so forth and approach captured in a way that may help us in our next really big step in this group, and that is to map out our work plan.

First of all, as far as general approach, it's a rough consensus approach. We really want to try to reach positions that most if not all us can support. And my own personal biases that I really like to minimize the use of voting except

for simply pulling to see how close we are to get in pretty good agreement in terms of what we've done and if we haven't got agreement, then let's try and see if we can accommodate some of the other of using come up with position that most of us can support. And I think that's a healthy way to go.

I think for the most part, that's what happened in the new TLD PDP. And I think that works pretty effectively. It happens in other organizations in terms of a rough consensus approach well.

Now, there is the fact that if - and I'd like to hope maybe we never get to that point but that maybe overly idealistic. If form of voting is necessary, each constituency gets three votes regardless of how many people you have on the working group or who are present in the working group. And each - and I suppose that could mean that different members from constituency could vote differently. That's probably between them and their constituency.

Each individual nominating committee counselor has one vote. And liaisons are nonvoting. And we probably will have some liaisons. I think we probably will have one from the GAC. I heard and directly that there are some interests there, and I certainly - and I sent a note to (Susan Sen) who is the GNSO Counsel GAC liaison welcoming someone from the GAC. And of course, as you can see in the Statement of Work, the ALAC, any of the other advisory committee could put member on this group as well.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I just wanted to ask. I heard this morning from a member of ccNSO that that ccNSO member was interested, and I wondered if you had yet - I did understand. Have you yet been able to send communicative press to the chair?

Chuck Gomes: No, I did not. And I guess maybe I'll throw that out to the group.

There is one particular category of reserve names that is particularly relevant to ccTLDs. And I was kind of thinking that would be the appropriate point to do that but maybe I'm wrong on that. The two-letter second level domain names obviously are an issue for ccTLDs.

Do you think that I - I'm throwing this out to the whole group. Do you think that I should send something to all of the - maybe all of the other supporting organizations and as well as the advisory committees?

Marilyn Cade: The Statement of Work - to quote on that -- it's Marilyn speaking -- says advisory committees, for example, ALAC-GAC. What I would just say about the - and then at the (ccNSO) could be invited, blah-blah-blah. This recently, though it occurs to me because of my participation in the IDN working group, Chuck, that actually a particular issue of names that maybe controversial could be a country name in lieu of country code, right?

Chuck Gomes: That's right.

Marilyn Cade: And so I actually wanted to propose that you might want to yourself reach out to Ron Mohan, the chair of the IDN working group, and to Chris and ask them based on the Statement of Work, you know, ask Chris to tell the working group what being interested the ccNSO might be to you have an observer.

It probably because PDP 05 includes the treatment of IDNs. And we specifically have in our task and working group responsibility to review the applicability for IDN gTLDs. We probably would want to ask the chair of the IDN working group, Ron Mohan...

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: ...for his views.

Chuck Gomes: Right. So you made two specific suggestions, right? Reach out to Chris Disspain, Chair of the ccNSO, and reach out to Ron, Chair of the IDN working group.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. If there are no objections I would do that.

Okay. Good.

Now, one of the things I'd like each of you to keep your eyes and ears open on, I think it's really important that this team of people represents as many divergent points of view on this as possible, so that we can then work towards reaching rough consensus and in a way that most or all of us can support going forward.

If we don't do that, when we pass our recommendations forward to the council, it's likely that they will go nowhere or will all of a sudden run into that divergence and it will create problem. So the extent that any of you are aware that particular view points are not well represented on the group, I would encourage you to try and get someone who represents those view points

to join us if not on a regular basis, maybe even to come in share their viewpoint on a short term basis.

Liz Williams: Chuck, it's Liz. I just want to make a little point, if you don't mind, when you put a break.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Liz Williams: Chuck, I had a conversation yesterday with (Susan Sen) who's the GAC GNSO Liaison and just to let her know that this work was taking place because the GAC will advance in the preparation of the public policy principles for new TLD. And of course, the reserve names list relates to many of the things that the GAC might be interested in.

So in addition, I'm sorry to create work for you but - and I'm happy to do this for you, but perhaps you might just like to send (Susan) a formal note to just tell what's going on and send to the Statement of Work. It should require...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I prefer - last night I sent (Susan) an email.

Liz Williams: Oh, good. Okay. Cool.

Chuck Gomes: And let her know that this was happening today. Told her if she didn't get the Statement of Work from the council list that I'd be more than happy to send it to her.

Liz Williams: Lovely.

Chuck Gomes: And welcome the GAC liaison on the group.

Liz Williams: Super. Thanks, Chuck. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome.

Liz Williams: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. The - okay. Next, deliverable dates. Now, Tim, I think I know the source of your question now that I'm looking at my outline (TLC) that February - I see as we look at deliverable dates, the February `06 PDP shows up really clearly there. And the reason for that is because I went to the GNSO calendar because in the Statement of Work we're required to keep the two PDP groups, both `06 and `05, inform the progress. I picked out dates when they were meeting so that we know that we should, you know, give them an update. And that'll probably be done by somebody on this group that is a part of the PDP. And in this particular case, there were no dates listed other than the joint meeting for the December `06 - December `05 PDP.

So anyway, enough on that. You can see - we have two - I bolded the two really critical dates that Liz already alluded to. By 22 February or actually probably the day before, or in the meetings, at least I'm going to be there for the new gTLD part of the meetings, so I could actually do this. But we do need to have a progress report ready for those meetings, you know, before they start so that they have those at the time they need them.

And the other big deliverable and could be the end of our working group is 16th of March which is the week before the start of ICANN meeting in Lisbon. That's when our final report is due. Everybody understands that the council could then decide, hey, we need you to do some - we would likely you

to do some additional work, and the motion that was passed said that that would, you know, would need to be completed within 30 days after that timeframe.

So the other things I put in their, status report of the council. We're not going to have much, but I can deliver that, you know, verbally next Wednesday - excuse me - next Thursday in our special council meeting if we can get this. It's not on the agenda, but I can do it under other businesses. That won't be a very lengthy thing, but at least let them know we got started and give them maybe couple of minutes worth of status.

The - Avri had to leave us but she's the Chair of the February 06 PDP task force. And they have a couple of meetings there that I put in there for giving a status report. And I suspect that Avri will be able to do that for us in that regard.

And the next meeting of the council would be on the 1st of March. And we would need a status report there. That's probably one I can deliver. So those are just deliverable dates. There may be others added to that as other meetings are set up by the PDP groups and so forth.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

On Item 2S.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh?

Marilyn Cade: You and I and those who are in the council are very familiar with this particular issue. But it would be helpful for other folks I think for you to just explain the one modification made by the council on the issue of our work is concluded unless the council specifically asks you to do something else and then it has a deadline?

Chuck Gomes: Right. And that's what I was referring to when I was mentioning the 30 days.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: There is the option that the council could ask the working group to do a few more tasks, but there's a limit on that. It should not go beyond an additional 30 days.

Now, did I not answer that what you just asked, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I just - I it's, particularly for people who are going to be going back to their constituency and reporting on, you know, how long their - how long you have tightened to the grindstone.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Yeah, exactly.

And it's probably good to add here as well. And I'm sharing my own personal opinion right now. I think it would be very naïve to think that come the end of this working group, we're going to have all the reserve name issues resolved. There are several that are highly controversial and fairly complex.

So I think it's naïve of us to think that we're going to solve them all in this working group. I don't believe we will. But hopefully, for those that are more

complex and controversial, we can at least recommend a roadmap forward that can be used either in other PDPs, other working groups, some may even - maybe even parallel working at the same time on different subsets of the reserve names topics.

So does that make sense?

Okay. Going on then, Section 3 of the outline are some examples of reserve names. Now those - this again, this list is not intended to be complete, so please note that. There's a parenthetical at the bottom of the list. But it certainly gives us some key issues to start with and we can add to it and modify them or whatever.

But certainly, what are the possible roles and purposes for reserve names at the top level? How should reserve names be addressed for IDN? What role if any should reserve names play with regard to controversial categories, trademark names, country geopolitical names, et cetera?

Now, I should point out that with regard to trademark names, I personally don't see this group doing a lot with that because another working group will probably be formed on February 1 or be initiated on February 1 that is going to deal with that category. So there's no need for us to duplicate that particular thing, except as specifically relates to reserve names.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And so we may need some feedbacks from other working groups.

Tim Ruiz: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Ruiz: So is that working group in regard to actually Sunrise processes within the TLDs or...

Chuck Gomes: It's been renamed, Tim. Actually, if I can get the names correct...

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...and it may change again but it's a Domain Rights Protection Working Group or something like that.

So the council in its meeting last week decided that, you know, the was calling at the Sunrise working group is to kind of imply that there has to be Sunrise period. And so, that working group and the statement of work for that s being reworked right now and will be considered by the council, the revision on the meeting next Thursday. And that's in fact why that special meeting was called.

Liz Williams: Chuck, I can provide you some updated information there if you wish -0 if it was helpful for the group.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Go ahead, Liz.

Liz Williams: Just for the purposes of the good because the Statement of Work is not complete for the, what I've now called the Protecting Rights of Others Working Groups, so one of a better term, Ute Decker and I had - Ute Decker

is one of the representatives from the IPC constituency and Kristina Rosette who's the other person who's on the council, (unintelligible) council members, they've revised the Statement of Work. And I had a conference call with Ute today which is to substantially revise the Statement of Work. And I would expect that would be turned over to the council list for the further discussion tomorrow.

So, Tim, to answer your direct question, it doesn't just deal with Sunrise period. It deals more broadly with the protection of rights and then (unintelligible), lack - and over-protection from the (BC) registration. So that's going to be coming out probably tomorrow afternoon.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Liz.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck? Chuck, it's Marilyn.

But I think it's important to clarify, that group is dealing with second level only. As the terms of reference guidance that were originally given to that group, they are dealing with second levels only.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: So - and I'm just noting that because...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: ...if this group were to decided that, you know, I personally would put the use of trademarks at the top level under the category of probably very controversial that - you know, I just note that...

Chuck Gomes: Good point. Very good point. Thank you.

Yeah. And so that's really going to fall into our court.

(Mike Coolidge): But Chuck, this is (Mike).

And perhaps - I guess what I'm confused is we've sat there and we've had a process -- it's going on for over a year -- with regards to you introduction of new TLDs. And we've talked about if you will if there are potential oppositions, there's a potential conflict, if someone believes that their trademark appears as a top level domain.

And if we're talking about trying to, you know, not broaden the work of our scope or whatever, I just don't see how that gets into how - that's within our scope. I mean that clearly has been addressed by the other working group, and I just see a disconnect here, because that's...

Chuck Gomes: Well, it has, (Mike), except for one aspect that comes to mind for me. And that is at the top level - and by the way, the new TLD PDP committee has talked about this and has addressed it at least at a high level so far in the recommendation.

You know, I don't think you want a new TLD introduced that may violate some trademark rights, have them set up all their infrastructure, go to all the expense there and then go through a UDRP process after the fact and lose and do that.

So the committee itself in the recommendations -- and, Liz, you're welcome to help me out here -- has as I recall, recommended that some UDRP-like

process happen early on in the evaluation process so that we don't get in a situation like that.

Did I characterize that accurately, Liz? Or someone else that's on the new TLD.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Yeah. Chuck this is Lizzie. Sorry, I was struggling with my mute button again. It's late at night and (unintelligible) my mute button.

The - just so that the broader group - and I'm sorry I'm cross referring to other works that's happening, but it's important for this group to know what's going on. The discussion of the use of UDRP-like dispute resolution process is the string contention, is actually quite important. And that work is being taking place behind the scenes to ensure that I reserve names list, meaning small r, small N that provides guidance to applicants. We need TLD strings, not just provides guidance for potential registrants and registry operators. So there would be a reserve names list in a successful registry that might be a new that takes place. So that is definitely going on.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

But - and isn't there something there, Liz, in the draft report that has to do with looking for intellectual property violations or other sorts of violations early in the evaluation process?

Liz Williams: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay, good. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: (Mike), did that - I don't know if that helped or not but...

(Mike Coolidge): Well, yeah. I mean I totally agree with what Liz has said. There will be a mechanism. As a matter of fact, I stood up during the public forum, during the council, I believe (Liz is) doing the one public forum and specifically recommend that WaPo based upon their expertise in this area.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right.

(Mike Coolidge): So, you know, to me I would like - I think this is what WaPo - if we're worrying about resolving, you know, trademark disputes at the top level, you know, WaPo is the appropriate forum. Or hopefully their guidance in coming up with an administrative process is what we're looking for.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

(Mike Coolidge): As opposed to talent, you know, coming out with the reserve list of names that somehow trademarks are going to be founding themselves on this reserve list and then no one will ever be (unintelligible) forward.

That was the potential slippery slope I was worried about going down there.

Chuck Gomes: Got you. Yeah, I know. Very well said.

And again, let me make sure we all understand. We shouldn't presume that what we need to do is come up with some expanded reserve name list on all these issues. Some of them may be handled very differently and may not be

same for all TLDs or whatever -- another question that comes up here shortly on the list.

So let's not be so fixated that the only recommendations that come back with are reserve name lists. We may decide that reserve name lists aren't necessary, but rather some process should be developed like (Mike) was just talking about to deal with certain issues.

Okay?

Caroline Greer: Chuck, can I ask a question?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Caroline Greer: It's Caroline here.

I'm just curious. Is it there general understanding at this stage as to what we name (unintelligible) controversial categories as name? Just from my own understanding. You mentioned that come up in the Amsterdam meeting that time as our - I mean, are we just throwing that back there or do you mean conclude?

Chuck Gomes: No, I mean...

Caroline Greer: And in the secular categories that with singular or double letter. Is that what we're talking about?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Of course you get into - and if you look at the new TLDs recommendations, you'll see some mention of (unintelligible) names, of

religious names, of - there's a whole bunch of things there. It's a really tough category. And GAC is also...

Caroline Greer: Okay. So like an umbrella...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. The GAC is also taking a look at that.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

Caroline, I might just say I've had that extensive conversations with - I spent three weeks with 120 governments in Turkey at the end of the year last year. I had to have something to talk to them about, right?

A lot of the governments I would say are, they kind of still think that they - they seek - they recognize controversial when they see it. But others are clearer as probably any of us would be that a religious name that is globally recognized prophet or deity would be controversial?

Caroline Greer: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: On the other hand, some names are controversial in individually in certain countries. Some countries have laws about whether or not their country name can be used without permission of the government. Others do not. So a name might - and it's worth just saying a name might be controversial initially, but it may be possible to make it non-controversial and then release it.

And that brings me to something, Chuck, that I forgot to mention that I think we're going to get to this when we talk about (H). So when we talk about that

there may be a reserve name category, I think it's really important to understand there may need to be a process by which a name becomes unreserved because the controversy is resolved.

And I'll give an example of that. A country might initially have a long list of names that they want to go on a reserve list, but then be willing to have that name or geographic phrase released to a group that they support. .Asia might be existing example that was non-reserved list, but an effort with me to gain the concurrence of a number of governments to not object to the use of that name.

Do you see what I mean? So originally, original phrase might be considered controversial, but it may be possible to release it.

Chuck Gomes: So did your question get answered, Caroline?

Caroline Greer: It did, yes. Thanks, both.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, you're welcome.

All right, D under Item 3 is should names reserved at the second level automatically be reserved at top level?

E, should any reserve name requirements be the same for all TLDs?

F, should there be a procedure for publishing new categories of reserve names before adding them to registry agreements?

G, should there be a process for reserving names?

H, should there be a process for unreserving names?

I, should it be assumed that all new strings allocated as TLDs are reserved at the second level when they are awarded?

And, you know, again that list isn't intended to be complete. I'm sure we'll come up with lots of other questions. We may even break some of those down in the sub-questions.

Any questions or comments on that? Again, I don't want to have discussion on these questions right now, but is it clear what the - are the examples are clear?

Okay, tasks.

In A and B under Task, I actually quoted from the Statement of Work. The first thing we have to deal is perform an initial examination of the role and treatment of reserve domain names at the first and second level. And then - and you can see the reference there to where that's found in the Statement of Work.

And then I tried to take some things from other parts of the Statement of Work and fit them in to that. And the first one under there was to summarize the existing reserve name contractual condition found in the TLD registry agreements. Now that's one I took on myself and at least made what I hope is a good start on that and have distributed that already.

And I show you there in the outline which attachments or appendices apply to the different TLDs. And there are 16 TLD agreements that are on ICANN's

Web site. There are not 16 that are live right now but there 16 that are on the Web site with their agreement, okay, on ICANN's Web site.

And then, next underneath that initial examination of role and treatment is to find the role of reserve names. And that's where a lot of documentation that Liz was referring to will come into play -- community discussions, ICANN staff reports, relevant technical documents, existing staff work and relevant experiences that are recorded, two-letter ccTLD names, et cetera.

So that whole idea of finding - of determining the role of reserve names is going to be a really important early task for us in my opinion.

The second part - the second task listed there at the high level is provide recommendations for further consideration by the taskforce or councils. So ultimately out of our work, we're tasked with making some recommendations. And some suggestions are made in the Statement of Work as to how that might happen.

First thing being to organize sub-elements of this huge broad topic of reserve names, which I think (Mike) referred to there, into -so that if we can organize it so that first of all, to guide our work, but secondly possibly to guide future work that might not even be done by us but by other working groups or PDPs, et cetera.

And the first thing there is to estimate the complexity of the various issues associated with each sub-element and then - and describe that complexity.

And the purpose of that would lead into Number 2 which would be to help us then to prioritize the sub-elements according to the estimated level of

complexity, the importance or relevance to complete the work prior to introduction of new TLDs.

Let me pause and comment a little on that one.

The new TLD process is moving forward. So it'd be very helpful if we can get some things done that are realistic and practical to get done, some recommendations that could happen with the introduction of new TLDs when that occurs.

And so, if there's some things that aren't so overly complex and can be done in a short period of time, identifying those and moving those forward would be very helpful to that process. And then of course we can come up with some other criteria. We won't take time to talk about that right now, but when we're prioritizing, we could, you know, apply some other criteria that we thought it was helpful.

Number 3 under there is to identify any sub-elements involving names at the first and second level for which additional work may need to be done. Or excuse me, work that may be able to be completed in the near term -- I got ahead of myself -- and again in time for introduction of new TLDs. And I categorized that as short term work to help in the next few bulleted items there.

So then I think we would need to come up with a plan for completing the short term work. We may then depending on the details need to get council approval to proceed with that work either ourselves or that it'd be assigned to another group, whatever, our recommendation may be. And then those elements of short-term work need to be implemented if applicable. Now, that

could involve us, it could involve some totally different group. We don't need to focus who does that right now.

And then, Number 5 then, there going to be some things that are not short term. Now hopefully we can make some contributions even with some more complex and lengthy processes that may need to happen for some of the reserve names of elements. But hopefully at a minimum, we can at least make some recommendations as to how we would suggest those other issues be dealt with going forward.

Okay. Now I went through that pretty quickly because of time. Are there any questions or comments?

What I'd like you to do between now and next Thursday when we meet is think about, you know, how we should organize our work. And hopefully, this outline can help us some. And if people can come up with constructive ideas of how to proceed, and you can use this, you can go a total different route, but next week we really need to map out at least what we're going to be doing in the next few weeks, so that we can jump right in and proceed.

All right, that takes care of Item 8 on the agenda.

Item 9 is relatively brief. There's some documents and Liz already committed tomorrow she's going to send us some other ones that fit into the kind of general category of reserve names. But I listed some here.

Obviously, the appendices and attachments in the registry agreements are a key source.

Now, because there are 16 different agreements and you have to go to each URL separately to review them and so forth, I have tried to take some of the pain out of that, and I'll take talk about that in a minute.

There's also three RFCs that are - that, you know, related to reserve name. And they're referenced in the agenda there, in the latest version of the agenda.

Man: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, go ahead.

Man: I'm just having - when I was looking at RFC 2141, I was having a hard time trying to figure out how that fit into the reserve names, exactly how it applied. So that's - and I don't know if we need to address that right now, but it may be something to...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, good question.

Liz, can help there at all? I'm picking on Liz because she's the one that gave me the RFCs.

Marilyn Cade: Can I ask who was speaking?

Liz Williams: Sorry, Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: That was Tim Ruiz.

Marilyn Cade: Oh hi. Thanks.

Liz Williams: Yeah. Hi, Tim.

Oh, sorry. Marilyn, were you speaking?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Those were the few (RM syntax) for that one.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Liz.

Liz Williams: Sorry. I just got caught in the crosstalk there.

Yeah, Tim, just to answer your question, the 2141 was the part of the more historical background to the use of reserve name and how it came about. But tomorrow - I won't go into it now because I know that time is short for the group, but I'll set out an explanation for those three things and why they're included.

Tim Ruiz: That would be excellent. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Tim.

You're ahead of me because I haven't gone back...

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So, all right. And again, we can add other documents to that. As Liz already committed, she's going to send out some others that kind of have a general background information with regards to reserve names in general. Okay?

Now, I sent you earlier today all a document entitled, “Comparison of GTLD Registry Reserve Name.” Now I’ve already got one addition to it and I’ll talk about that just briefly. But because Caroline Greer who’s on the call with us pointed it out to me when I did the comparison, I only looked at the attachments and the appendices and it was actually something in the body of that .mobi contract, maybe and others as well, but I did not have time to look in the body of every agreement and do that. So I will give you that information.

Now, we’ve been going for almost an hour and a half. We can do a high-level overview of that comparison document. I can run through it very quickly and then you can examine it in more detail yourself. Or, because we’ve been going an hour and a half, depending on the wishes of the group, everybody could review that on their own and then we could talk about it next week. We’ll probably going to talk about it next week whether we do it today or not.

What are the wishes of the group?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim.

I’m going to have to drop off. So I apologize but I will follow up on the action items to the next call.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Tim.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it’s Marilyn.

I have a couple of questions about it that would be helpful. I generally am familiar...

Chuck Gomes: About the comparison document?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I generally am familiar with reserve names because I have tried to familiarize myself with them as much possible in order to help my statement of work. But there was something in here that I was surprised about. I think it's worth noting that - but I can't do page numbers. But I think it's worth noting offline over here in a minute.

I was not aware that names are reserved in any of the registry that's third level until I saw your addition here.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And that it is presently one registry only and that's .pro.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: I think that was helpful to note. And I would assume - I'm just assuming that that is because of the unique character of .Pro.

Chuck Gomes: Right, I think it is.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Because of the fact that they were using the second level for something else.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And the - yeah. Okay, thanks.

So I just - that was really a surprise to me and a learning experience.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. Well, in fact it was a learning experience for me to put this thing together just because of, you know, to see the - I had never gone to the detail of seeing what the various...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I also...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I also thought that the - it's not in appendix. It might be thought of it that way as the explanation about .name is. And that too is a unique situation. It's probably, you know, worth the group becoming more familiar with. Because what I generally knew about it, I thought that was a good addition. And then, the fact that I am familiar with .name's other reserve list, but the fact that they have a unique approach to dealing with African names, Arabic names...

Chuck Gomes: Yup.

Marilyn Cade: ...et cetera, and the postfix reservation.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And one of the things that's interesting as you look at the variety, the fact that it's - things are done differently with different gTLDs, it probably is very healthy. But that's something we can talk about as we go through and there are variations in terms of business model with the TLDs.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Now, let me call your attention to the fact that one of things I left out - and, Caroline, you're welcome to jump in on this. And she pointed out to me what - by the way, to test the accuracy - I didn't have the chance to test that document you got with anybody else. I got it out so late. But I did send it to the registry's list and I asked the registries if they had time to please take a look at it...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...and make sure I represented their agreement correctly. And I got a couple of responses back. And Caroline in particular pointed out that in the main body of their agreement for that .mobi, they do have clause that makes reference to an analyst of TLDs that are reserved as well.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: In the next version, which I will send out right after this meeting, of this document, I'll send out a Version 2 and the orange highlighted things will be the change in it, including that particular issue.

Caroline, do you want to add anything top that?

Caroline Greer: No, I think you've covered it there.

Chuck Gomes: Do you know, Caroline, right off the bat, are you the only registry that has that clause in your main agreement?

Caroline Greer: I don't know off the bat. I'm not sure.

Chuck Gomes: I know that Com and Net doesn't have it. But I haven't gone back and done that work...

Caroline Greer: I'm not sure if .info has it. Michael, I'm not sure if you know that.

(Mike Coolidge): What was that, Caroline?

Caroline Greer: Does .info have the requirement?

Chuck Gomes: (Mike), the clause - let me read you the clause. It's really brief, okay.

(Mike Coolidge): Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: It's - this is in the main part of their agreement.

Registry operators shall reserve and not register any TLD strings first appearing on the list of reserved TLD strings attached as Appendix 6 hereto. That we've been - we're familiar with, okay?

Number 2, located -- and it gives the URL there for the IANA site -- for initial i.e. other than the renewal registration at the second level within the TLD. Okay now, and the list there, (Mike), that's referred to is basically I think - and correct me if I'm wrong on this, Caroline, because I haven't analyzed it thoroughly, but it looks like a list of all TLDs.

Caroline Greer: Right, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ccTLDs, gTLDs and any that you might now consider neither of those, depending on what - whether you consider .arpa or some of those like that. But all TLDs that are in the Root-zone then are listed there. Is that correct?

Caroline Greer: That's right, yeah.

Something tells me I've seen it in .info agreement. I don't know. (Michael), if you could be able to verify that but...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Somebody can - if somebody can...

(Mike Coolidge): Yeah. If you want, Chuck, I could sit there and that's something I could easily verify.

Caroline Greer: I'm just not online at the moment, so I can't say.

Chuck Gomes: And just send that to the list, (Mike)...

(Mike Coolidge): Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...and then that would be great.

Caroline Greer: Right.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this Patrick.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: That provision shows up in the new Biz agreement. And I'm sure that also Info and Org. agreement as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

Item I - I think it's 3I. I got a - it was in our initial statement, Statement of Work. It was put as a question.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're talking about the outline?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: I was aware when we wrote this that there was this question that in some cases the - I knew that the existing TLDs had been reserved.

So the question reads -- and I want to be sure that this question relates to the points you're making -- should it be assumed - or we could - you know, should it be - this is what it says now, should it be assumed that all new strings allocated as gTLDs are reserved second level when they, it should say after they are awarded.

That would be - that's the - right now, that's what it looks to me like, .mobi and to Patrick's point, the new .biz, et cetera.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: As gTLDs are reserved, Patrick, am I right about that? As gTLDs are allocated, they end up on this new IANA list, and any further TLDs would then need to reserve those.

Patrick Jones: That's the language as it appears now.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I just - I want to verify that.

Patrick Jones: If there's a problem with that so, you know, we can talk about it as we go forward.

Chuck Gomes: Patrick, do you know just offhand which registry agreements that requirement is in?

Patrick Jones: I don't. But I just did a quick look and it is in the new .biz, .info and .org agreement. The problem is as you add new TLDs going forward, what if a new TLD that's added that string has already been taken in the existing TLDs?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think those kinds of things are grandfathered. At least that's been the historical way to handle this.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Obviously in Com, we've had quite a few of those things and....

(Mike Coolidge): Yeah. Although, Chuck, let me ask you a question. They were grandfathered, but if a person decided to let that registration laps, that grandfather provision

would then end and would then go in to a reserved list. Am I - I think that is how...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think that's a correct conclusion, (Mike). In fact, what we had to do for Com and Net and previously for Org. was to actually set up a procedure and customer service that if those names were ever deleted to make sure that they weren't re-registered. That was somewhat of a challenge because of all the automated processes, but that yeah.

Now, that doesn't prevent things like transfer some things like that though.

(Mike Coolidge): Yeah, correct. Yeah, as long as you have a valid registration...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Mike Coolidge): It can be renewed transfer and then stuff like that, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, there are cases like in the IDN world where we - they're having cases where we actually had to go back and take the registration away. But not with reserve names as such like we're talking about on this group. Okay?

So it looks like it's Mobi, Info, Org., and Biz all have that clause, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any - do you whether any other agreements do?

Patrick Jones: I'd have to look.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Me too. I've looked at so many things so far.

So, okay, I'll - so before I'll send this out, I don't - won't necessarily try and look at all the agreements because I think it's more important that I get you a revision that at least has the clause. I will certainly have the fact that Info Org. and Biz have it as well. And so I'm guessing probably it's all of the new ones. That would my guess.

Patrick Jones: The language is slightly different in .tel and .travel agreement.

Chuck Gomes: Is it? Okay.

All right, so that's going to - so this will get a little bit more complicated but at least you'll know the general thrust here. I suspect, you know, other than the general question that Marilyn just referred to again, you know, the detailed contract language maybe less of a concern, but the general approach of reserve in this kind of names will be one that we'll take about.

Well, we've gone an hour and almost 40 minutes. I think rather than going through this list now because of the time and because of some of the changes that we're talking about that the best approach would be to have as an agenda item next time to go through just comparison.

And I think what I'll do - Patrick, could I get you to let me know which agreements this latest thing is in? And if you can just point me to the ones where it varies a little bit like you just did Tel and Travel, then I won't send this version to out until I update the correct information there.

And could you also, because it's not posted yet, could you also get me the correct language or the changes that were approved by the board and the - for .name for two-character second level names?

I don't know if that's possible. It's not posted yet. I comment on that in my summary if you look at it. It'll be good to have that in here too so that people have everything right in front of them.

Patrick Jones: Why don't I follow up with you offline about that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, that will be fine. Not a problem.

Any other questions or comments?

Okay, then action items for the next call. Please submit an interest statement. Each of us have that responsibility.

If you need to review the registry agreements directly, feel free to do that. The URL was provided where you can find all of those. And the agenda here shows you the - where they're located. The outline does - excuse me. The outline shows you where there - which attachment or appendix that is for each TLD.

And of course, review and I'll try and get some lead time before next Thursday with regard to the second revision of the comparison document.

Don't wait to review the one I sent today though. Feel free to go through because what I am doing on the second version, everything that changes will be in a new color. It will be orange, depending I guess on how you have your color set. But - so you'll be easily able to pick up the second version and see what the changes were.

And the review relevant RFCs, and I think Liz is going to get us a little more information on the basis of those three RFCs. For those of you that haven't read an RFC, it's quite likely you may not end up reading them word per word. But hopefully Liz can give us some guidelines so that you can at least scan them and read in more detailed portions that are particularly relevant.

And then be thinking about our work plan going forward, so that next week we can actually hopefully develop one. And feel free to send suggestions in that regard to the list for discussion. We will be using the list for back and forth between meetings and hopefully we can get quite a bit accomplish there.

I have some action items. I'm supposed to send the contact list out. Not on the list but - and then I will reach out to Chris Disspain of ccNSO, reach out to Ron Mohan, and I will send Version 2 of the comparison once I update a little more information there.

Any other action items anybody is aware of?

Our next call will be next Thursday, an hour earlier. And that one will not go more than an hour because there will be a council meeting following it. So you'll all need to block up an hour next week. And we will continue the pattern of that same time every Thursday.

And then on - the next council meeting will be March 1. So barring no other meetings interfere, we'll be able to have more than an hour meeting in those other times.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, I'm not sure if Glen is still on but, are we going to try to arrange to you use the same bridge?

Chuck Gomes: I don't - that's I think a Glen decision. I don't know...

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Liz Williams: Chuck, it's Liz here. It's usually what happens here.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Liz Williams: The numbers usually stay the same, but the pass codes change.

Chuck Gomes: Is it? So the bridge stays the same; the pass code changes.

Liz Williams: Uh-huh. Sometimes. Depending on how Glen usually does it, but she sends out remarks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And Glen will communicate to each of us individually not on the list so that we have the new pass codes. So that's helpful information. Thanks.

Anything else?

Okay, thanks.

Liz Williams: Thanks Chuck. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Talk to you next week. Bye.

END