

**New gTLD Committee teleconference
November 27, 2006 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD committee teleconference on 27 November 2006. 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/gTLD-20061127.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

Attendees: Marilyn Cade, Alistair Dixon, (CBUC) Tony Harris, (ISPCP), Ute Decker, Kristina Rosette (IPC) Tom Keller,(Registrars C.) Ken Stubbs (gTLD Registries C.) Bret Fausett (ALAC)

Observers: Dirk Krischenowski, Chuck Gomes, Ray Fassett, Werner Staub,

Staff: Denise Michel, Liz Williams, Dan Halloran, Craig Schwartz, Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies: Tony Holmes, Robin Gross, Mawaki Chango, Philip Sheppard, Bruce Tonkin, Ross Rader, Cary Karp.

Coordinator: Dirk Krischenowski has joined.

Glen de Saint Géry: Hi then, hi Dirk

Dirk Krischenowski Hi. Sorry, sorry.

Glen de Saint Géry: How are you?

Dirk Krischenowski: Well, I'm fine.

Glen de Saint Géry: And Chuck, welcome.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I didn't even have to announce myself, you knew.

Glen de Saint Géry: And (Ray), welcome.

((Crosstalk))

(Ray Fassett): That's really wonderful.

Glen de Saint Géry: What I think is that you should form the committee, the four of you.

(Ray Fassett): Uh-huh.

Man: Good idea.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes. And then you'll get everything that you want.

Coordinator: Denise Michel has joined.

Glen de Saint Géry: Hi Denise. Welcome.

Denise Michel: Hi Glen. How are you?

Glen de Saint Géry: Fine, thanks. We've got Dirk Krischenowski on the phone, Werner Staub Chuck Gomes, and (Ray Fassett).

Denise Michel: Hello everyone.

Man: Hi Denise. Hi.

Tony Harris: Hello. Tony Harris joined.

Glen de Saint G ry: Hi, Tony. Welcome.

Chuck Gomes: We've got a small enough group that we should be able to just wrap this thing up.

Glen de Saint G ry: Absolutely.

You have probably all seen the apologies from (Bruce).

Man: Yes.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Is Liz going to chair this meeting?

Glen de Saint G ry: It seems so.

Man: Okay, fine.

Werner Staub): Now this is (unintelligible)...

Glen de Saint G ry: She just joined.

Werner Staub (Unintelligible).

Liz Williams: Hi Werner

Werner Staub Hi Liz.

Liz Williams: How are you?

Werner Staub Not so bad.

Liz Williams: Good. Thanks for sending the comments in.

Werner Staub Yeah. I'm sorry for having on so late. There was such (unintelligible).

Liz Williams: No, no. You only - and you scared them with the wire in terms of me putting together the comments with all the photocopies for the meeting. So, thank you for that.

Glen de Saint Géry: Liz, shall I run through who we've got on the call?

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: And Philip Shepherd has sent his excuses, he can't be on.

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Glen de Saint Géry: We have got Werner Staub, Dirk Krischenowski, Chuck Gomes, (Ray Fassett), Denise, Tony Harris, and yourself.

Liz Williams: Lovely. We might as well a little bit then...

Glen de Saint Géry: And we have got excuses from - who can't be on the call, Tony Holmes.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Bruce) of course, (Ross Rader), and Cary Karp.

Liz Williams: Sure, lovely.

We might just wait a little few minutes.

Glen de Saint Géry: And the call will be recorded and transcribed.

Liz Williams: Thanks Glen.

Chuck, are you there?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I am.

Liz Williams: How are you?

Chuck Gomes: I'm good.

Liz Williams: Good, good, good.

Listen, you're in the same boat as Werner and Dirk's comments. Your things have been printed out and put into the compendium of comments. They're going to be distributed to the group in Sao Paulo.

And so, just because you are early, it doesn't mean to say you're disadvantaged in terms of...

Chuck Gomes: No, I - yeah.

Liz Williams: Getting in. Yes. So that's all done today.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't think that I really would be, I just...

Liz Williams: No.

Chuck Gomes: Because it's been a while, I thought it might be - not be bad that just (Ray)'s...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Yeah, yeah. But that's all done for you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Liz Williams: And the IPC and the BC are in the same situation too.

Glen, were you expecting...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes. Liz, we have - just have - Marilyn just joined us.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: And we have Kristina Rosette who is our new council member for the IPC.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: And Olof has joined us.

Olof Nordling: Yes, indeed.

Liz Williams: Hello Olof.

Olof Nordling: Hi.

Liz Williams: Are you there safely?

Olof Nordling: Well, yes. I am safely here and I've got no Internet connection whatsoever and I am on the mobile so...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Whatever happens with the connectivity that remains to be seen.

Liz Williams: What I might do is that I'm conscious that it's now five past eight, Glen, I think that if I press star-0, we could start the recording and the transcription...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes. Will you please...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Thanks.

Liz Williams: Hang on a second.

Coordinator: Good afternoon and good evening. Thank you all for standing by.

At this time, I would like to inform you that today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Thank you. You may proceed.

Liz Williams: Thank you, operator.

Glen de Saint Géry: Liz, we have just been joined by Ken Stubbs as well.

Liz Williams: Thanks Ken.

Glen de Saint Géry: And by Dan.

Liz Williams: Lovely. Thanks Dan.

Okay. Everyone, I'm a very poor substitute for both (Bruce) and for Philip, but I wanted to just run through a couple of things that we wanted to do on the call tonight. I expect that the call will last about an hour, unless anyone wishes to go any longer than that.

There's a couple of things that I want to draw your attention to. First of all, I'm hoping that everybody has received the draft, final report which was released on the 14th of November, and to ensure that you had also received the ICANN staff discussion points which was released at the same time.

And Kristina particularly, who's new on accounts. So Kristina have you found your way around the draft documents yet and do you have what you need?

Kristina Rosette I - yes, so.

Liz Williams: Good, lovely. Okay.

The main objective of the meeting is to answer any questions you may have about either of those documents and to elicit further questions which could be addressed in the Sao Paulo meeting and to ensure everyone's ready for the new TLD public forum which would take place during the Sao Paulo sessions.

The other thing that I would like to cover, and it's only from my perspective and I'm having add things to the list, is three elements. One is about (architecture) processes and the quantum of fees and the evaluation phase. And I will appreciate very much further discussion by the group about the distinction between policy and operational matters.

And, of course, everyone realizes that on Sunday of this week, we're going to be having a working session with the operational legal staff in Sao Paulo.

The second thing is selection criteria and allocation methods. The distinction between selection criteria and allocation methods are quite complicated at the moment.

And then, any questions to address people's concerns about the Sao Paulo new TLD forum and the connections between the GAC forum

and the other discussions that we'd be holding, particularly with respect to the IDN working group.

I'll just also note that a number of comments are being received by different groups. Those that we already have in place are from the IPC and thank you to (Caroline Jakodie) for sending those in, and (Fautah), from the BC, Philip has sent me some comments, Chuck has sent comments, and (Vana) and (Dick) have sent comments.

And if anyone has any other responses to the documentation, then I'd be grateful if you'd send those so that they can be added to the binder of materials that we'll be distributing to the group on Sunday afternoon.

Marilyn Cade: And Liz, it's Marilyn, I have a question...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Yeah, go ahead. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Because the BC is working through some additional comments, I don't know if we're going to get them. We may get concluded, but we might not get them done in time for the binder. Should we, in that case, just bring copies with us?

Liz Williams: If you wouldn't mind, just bring one piece of paper or two sheets or whatever it is and then I'll ensure that they are copied and added to this. What we're trying to do is bind everything in one place.

So for example, the new TLD stuff or the PDP (unintelligible) stuff and the IDN working group stuff is all being set up in separate binders. So just do your best.

The stuff that Philip has released already has been included today in the binder.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Liz Williams: So if you have additional material then that would just be an addendum for the meeting. And presumably, you'll have that prior to Monday, if you're going to have it at all, if that's right.

Chuck Gomes: Liz, I have a question as well.

Liz Williams: Yes, (unintelligible) Chuck. Go to the question first.

Chuck Gomes: I have reviewed, I think, all of the comments that have been distributed so far, the recent ones, and certainly respect and encourage all the constituencies to do that.

But one of the things I see happening that I'm concerned about, it looks like there's - some of the comments are trying to get us to go backwards and reconsider some issues that I thought we were already past as far as the committee is concerned, for example, the sponsored TLDs only.

Is there thinking that we're going to go back and revisit some of those in this?

Liz Williams: Chuck, can I take that question and others until we deal with the others because then I want to take the group through the ICANN staff discussion point document and the document...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That would be fine.

Liz Williams: If you don't mind, would you mind if I did that first?

Chuck Gomes: No.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) problem.

Marilyn Cade: In the sense - did you do a roll call already?

Liz Williams: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: I know you...the recording.

Liz Williams: What I'd like to do, Glen, is if you wouldn't mind, would you mind doing a roll call? And just so that everyone knows, I've asked Glen to transcribe the call because it's very difficult to run a call and keep up with the notes that people want me to take to incorporate into an updated version of the final report, which is our main goal -- to get that done after the Sao Paulo meeting.

So, Glen, if you wouldn't mind just doing a quick roll call, please.

Glen de Saint G ry: Yes, certainly.

On the line, we have (Dick Kushinovski), (Vana Schtalp), Chuck Gomes, and Ray Fassett who are (unintelligible) observers.

For the staff, we have Denise, Olof ,and yourself. And we have Tony Harris, Marilyn Cade, Kristina Rosette who is the new IPC member, Ken Stubbs - sorry, Dan Halloran and Craig Schwartz, Thomas Keller, Ute Decker, and Alistair Dixon.

Liz Williams: Thank you very much to all those people who've joined since we started.

Were there any further questions about what we wanted to cover in this hour-long call?

Marilyn Cade: I could just have one other quick question.

Liz Williams: Yeah, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: It's merely for informational purposes. And I assume because Craig and others are on the call.

When we say introduction of new top level domains, ICANN staff discussion points, these are intended to be questions to us from the operational staff, is that right?

Liz Williams: The collation of questions across the organization, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Liz Williams: And I have to say that I - and I want to put on record my thanks to the other colleagues in the Marina Del Ray office who have been very, very involved in putting that document together. And I'll step the group through how that was all done and the main points of that document as we go - that will be the first thing that we do.

But yes, if you wish to address questions specifically to Craig or to Dan then go right ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Later, later. I just want...

Liz Williams: Later.

Marilyn Cade: I think the fact that Craig is on the phone has actually answered one of my questions which is how do we go back to the operational staff, and so I thank Craig for being on the call and making it easy...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Sure.

The other thing that everybody - the other thing that everyone should know is that Craig and me and others in the internal group have a regular Wednesday call for implementation issues, and much of what we discuss goes around the houses before we have a public call like these.

Were there any other questions that anyone wanted to raise before we start?

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry, (Matt) mentioned, Liz, the apologies for (Kirk).

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Glen de Saint Géry: He cannot be on the call because he has got another call at the same time.

Liz Williams: Lovely. Thank you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Liz Williams: Okay.

If we can then to the two documents that we have going into the Sao Paulo meeting, the first is the draft final report which is the representation of the committee's work so far. And that - and I want to thank everybody for all the work that they have done on that.

The other document is the ICANN staff discussion points. And if you've all printed out those documents, I want to turn straight to section - to Page 2 of that document, Section 7.

And Section...

Tony Harris: Say this is the staff comments, right?

Liz Williams: Yeah. Hi Tony. How are you?

Tony Harris: Hi.

Liz Williams: Yes, it is the staff discussion-points document.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Because I have...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: That's fine. I've got questions (unintelligible) actually.

Liz Williams: Sure, okay.

What - Section 7 on Page 2 of the staff discussion document are to set out where, I think, we need certain clarification and that is quite a comprehensive couple of pages of things.

So perhaps, Tony, if you want to ask your question, I can try to answer it straight away.

Tony Harris: Yes. On 7.2 there is reference to independent experts (unintelligible). And I'm a little alarmed at this concept because, I mean, independent experts can be - they can be tremendous personalities of great fame and renown. But if they're not really fairly familiar with what's involved in a gTLD and how, you know, how this may perform and once it's released.

What guarantee do we have that they won't just shoot down a valid application just because their business education tells them well...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: This might not be a good idea.

Liz Williams: Yeah, yeah. Tony, I really hear that question and I bought a lottery ticket today in the same hope that I win the lottery and I never have to answer these questions again.

But seriously though, these are exactly the kinds of questions we need to address as we're - first of all, at a constituency level. So for example, you may well have comments on the staff discussion points or indeed on the paper - on the full committee report itself that would flesh those out.

And you will see very, very specifically in Section 7.12 and it says the draft recommendation suggest that we have to view tasks including the establishment of several expert or independent panels. And there's a couple of questions that we need to answer there, not on this call but certainly with respect to discussing the ICANN staff discussion points and the new TLDs report in the context of the Sao Paulo meeting and...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Well, actually, you know, 7.12.2 says that - it talks about experts who can advise on the string selection.

Liz Williams: Exactly.

Tony Harris: That's something that also alarms me.

Liz Williams: Indeed. And frankly, Tony, what we need to do is to drill right down to the points that still concern people and we need to go back to the work of the committee which is represented in the draft final report and say where do we need to seek further clarity on the recommendation, what other questions do we need to ask, what things do we need to put in place to make sure that we don't overburden an application process with a series of implementation issues which are way too comprehensive and way too expensive and way too complicated for us to actually implement. And that's why it's very, very good that Craig is on the call.

Ken Stubbs: Liz, would you put me in the queue please?

Liz Williams: Yes, Ken.

Any further questions on - in relation to those particular sections? And Ken, you're first. Anyone else?

Marilyn Cade: Me, I'd like to be in the...

Liz Williams: Marilyn.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck, please.

Liz Williams: And Chuck.

Ken, go ahead.

Bret Fausett: And by the way...

Woman: Yeah.

Bret Fausett: Bret, I joined...

Liz Williams: Bret, hello.

Bret Fausett: Five, ten minutes ago; I didn't want to interrupt but...

Liz Williams: Thank you.

Did you want to be in the queue or you're just telling me you joined?

Bret Fausett: I'm just using this as an opportunity to say hello.

Liz Williams: Lovely. Thank you. Okay.

So Ken, Marilyn, and Chuck.

Please, Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Well, I think more importantly means and getting down to the actual nuts and bolts of the composition of a lot of these independent panels and so forth we're talking about, I think we need to make sure we have a process that ensures that the selection of the independent panel is done in not just an open and transparent feel but in a process that ensures credibility for any decisions that the panel makes.

So I think you could probably use them as an example of at least how I feel should be done right is the selection of the panel or new chairman for the registry services, the one that Lyman chairs. And I think if we ensure that we have a process that gives its people that, in effect do understand the process, do understand the impacts that they're making since I would show the same concern that Tony would have about this and that you mentioned as well.

Liz Williams: So thank you, Ken.

Marilyn, would you like to go ahead?

Marilyn Cade: I think Chuck was next.

Liz Williams: I beg your pardon.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, not a problem. I thought you were Marilyn, but it's okay.

Liz Williams: It's the chance we're going to have to take.

Chuck Gomes: We won't fight over that.

Tony, I do think your comments are very important and I think one of the things that we've emphasized on this committee all the way through is that there needs to be objective measurable criteria and minimization of any subjective evaluation.

And I think one of the things, to the extent that we do use experts or committees or whatever they be in this process, it's critical that objective criteria be given to those people in their task. If it's left wide open for them to decide without giving them some criteria upon which they can measure, then I think we have a problem.

And what you're concerned about, Tony, would be that my fears would even be larger.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Chuck.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I guess I'm going to offer two cogs. One is we did do a significant amount of discussion that led to the creation of these recommendations, but we also did recognize in that discussion that we did need to think through more detail along the criteria or the kind of like the - what are the elements that the institutions would be made on.

And I do think, Tony, in our discussions, I believe we did make an effort to recognize that we are looking for evaluators with the kind of expertise that can in fact be relevant to the decision and the role that they're playing.

I think one of the things that happened when we captured the recommendation, and I saw this that it looked like we were saying there would be - I understand somebody suggested there will be seven different kinds of experts. I don't think that was ever the intent in the discussion, and so it's good to have this brought out and got into in more detail to determine where the ICANN staff would feel the need to

turn to a set of experts, what are the general categories of experts, and can that be done through the creation of a flexible standing panel, something along the lines that's been discussed - that has been implemented in the existing - the new registry services with different kinds of expertise on standing panel.

But, as is happening with that panel right now, five or six people are being tapped, not all 20 of them, based on any particular new registry service application and based on the characteristics of expertise that are needed.

So that was certainly in my mind as we were thinking about it. But I think it deserves, when we get together in Sao Paulo, more discussion and more elaboration.

Chuck Gomes: Could I follow up on that?

Alistair Dixon: Can I also be joined to the queue, Liz, it's Alistair?

Liz Williams: Chuck, yes and Alistair. Anyone else who wants to join at this point?

Ray Fassett: (Ray) will join.

Liz Williams: Thank you, (Ray).

Man: Yeah. And Marilyn, I think you're right on that. I just wanted to add one thing. I think also that we - there was not really intent on the committee's part to define a very rigid structure for doing some of these things, but rather to create some flexibility for staff to devise

mechanisms like you're suggesting where it might - can be a standing panel that's used for different things.

It wasn't rigid, I don't think. Is that a correct interpretation of what we did?

Marilyn Cade: I'll just speak for myself as an individual participant.

That was - I think I thought we were created in kind of a framework.

Man: Yes. That states it much better than I did.

Marilyn Cade: If it were the same intent?

Man: Yes.

Liz Williams: I'd like to come back to that framework construct in a second.

Alistair, would you like to go ahead?

Alistair Dixon: Thanks Liz.

I just think there's another element that I think is important to address the concerns that Tony raised, and as well as what Chuck said about the importance of having objective criteria. I think it's important that the decisions of the panel are transparent so that all parties can see how the objective criteria has been applied. I think that's an important check on ensuring that the criteria are objectively applied and ensuring that basically the panel is doing its job.

So, I just want to ensure that there've been elements included as well.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Alistair.

(Ray)?

(Ray Fassett): I'd like to agree that, you know, independent panels bring a degree of complexity, and also agree that the objective, overriding objective is to bring objectivity to the process.

So with that said, I think it's important to provide scope and what is string contention versus what is string opposition.

String contention has to do with phonetically or visually confusing to a user, or there can be all kinds of reasons why some party somewhere may want to oppose.

My understanding of the purpose of the panels was to really focus in on the concept of string contention when that or this should arise for ICANN staff as opposed to a bunch of panels to try and get through string opposition.

Liz Williams: Thanks (Ray).

Could I just bring the group back to the things that will happen, I think, in the new TLD forum and then in the working sessions that we'll have in Sao Paulo?

The intent of Section 7.12 was to look from a staff perspective at the way in which the recommendations were fleshed out in an operational

sense. What it really means though is that if you turn then to the big document which is the way in which the committee have represented their work, it requires that we go back to, for example, term of reference to recommendations and think very clearly about the language that were used there.

So for example, the committee might wish to think about the elements and the recommendations where they say, this is a policy recommendation and this must look like this, this should be like that, it will be like this rather than, for example, the rather less strident language of dismay and this could (unintelligible) possibly.

So I'd urge each of the commenters that have spoken up in this particular point to go back to those sets of recommendations and say - and look clearly about - look clearly at the impacts of the recommendations as they stand on, for example, implementation and cost of the proposed recommendations. And that's the same for each of the sections that we have outlined in the staff discussion points.

The other element that we need to take into account of course is that these recommendations in draft are going to be exposed to the comment of the broader Internet-using public and the other advisory committees and the supporting organizations, and they'll be exposed to the confirmation of further constituency input.

And I just urge each of you to, if you're (unintelligible) recommended to go back to your constituency and to make sure that the positions that we have represented in the committee report are the ones that you're happy with as a constituency position.

Were there any further questions on that part on section - on selection criteria, Section 2?

Kristina Rosette This is Kristina Rosette Can I be added to the queue?

Liz Williams: Sorry, I didn't hear who that was? Who was that?

Kristina Rosette This is (Kristina).

Liz Williams: Yes. Anyone else for queue?

Go ahead, (Cristina).

Kristina Rosette I was hoping I could get some clarification about in terms of reference to Selection Criteria 2.2 particularly with regards to grants and the system of grants that is discussing connections with the application fees.

The first point I would have - the first question I would have is it's not entirely clear to me from how this is worded whether a decision has - a recommendation has been made to go forward with the grant process or whether that is still under consideration.

Liz Williams: Speaking from my side, (Cristina), it's still very much under consideration.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: There's still draft recommendations.

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Liz Williams: The person who suggested those kinds of options, Mawaki Chango from the NCUC and is not on the call.

And Glen, could I just check with any of the NCUC that's on the call?

Glen de Saint G ry: No. Mawaki is sick

Liz Williams: Fine.

Glen de Saint G ry: And Robin Gross has excused herself. She has got a conflict with another call.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Sure. Thanks, Glen.

(Cristina), I suggest that what we should do is specifically no to your question...

Kristina Rosette: Uh-huh.

Liz Williams: And specifically go back to those who suggested those particular elements of the recommendation and double check. It proposes from ICANN side and we've outlined the staff discussion point.

Many additional - I don't want to use the word "burden" but I use that in the most positive term, but it poses upon the organization some significant responsibilities if that is actually what the committee intends and I think that we need to test those recommendations a little further.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue on this point, Tony Harris?

Liz Williams: Yes, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: And can I get in the queue as well, Liz?

Liz Williams: (Kristina), were you done or...

Kristina Rosette Well no, I had a follow-up point because it showed to me that one point that I think we need to consider in evaluating whether or not to recommend that grants be available is to make sure that we're clear as to how far down the line those grants would have to go.

For example, if it is decided to implement a grant system for purposes of sharing of de-shifting for applicant burden, with that same applicant, if there's a contested auction, so to speak. If you ended up with that kind of situation, would that same applicant then be eligible for an additional grant to allow them to compete in the auction and if so where do you - what dollar ceiling do you put on it?

I think these are just issues that I think we need to make sure we clearly flesh out. And I'm not - again, being new, it doesn't seem to me that that has happened yet.

Liz Williams: (Kristina), thank you for that. It's very valuable to have fresh eyes at this point of the process. So, could I urge you to take that up in the conversations at Sao Paulo? And could I also urge you to discuss those particular things and to understand completely what the intentions of those proposed recommendations were?

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: Just so that you know, it's Mawaki and Robin Gross from the NCUC.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Liz Williams: And as you get in touch with them when - prior to being in Sao Paulo...

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Liz Williams: ...to make sure that you've got all the information you need.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Liz Williams: Tony, did you want to go ahead?

Tony Harris: Yes. You've got the 10.7.6 in the staff comments or...

Liz Williams: Yes.

Tony Harris: ...considerations on this about grants. And I think I've made this point before, but basically, from - I mean, everybody knows I'm going to be at the gates with an application and representing a nonprofit entity.

But I feel a little bit uncomfortable about giving out grants happily to everybody because it doesn't seem all that fair perhaps to what happened to previous applicants. And also, it does pave the way for people who could say, well, that's - it's a hit-and-miss thing -- if I get through, fine, it won't cost me anything.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Tony Harris: And you're going to have an awful waste of time, a lot of applications that possibly don't meet qualification at the end of the road. And, I mean, what are you going to gain by this?

It much - it would be much better if people had to pay for the application fee. And you can say, well, if you qualify, if you are selected, you get through the selection process, then you could apply for, you know, 40% or 50% rebate or something because of the fact that, you know, you're a nonprofit entity and for the public welfare or something and (unintelligible).

Liz Williams: Tony, just a point of clarification. Presumably, you're not speaking as then an ISP representative, you're speaking as somebody who's not dissimilar to (Werner or (Dirk) who are interested - very interested observers in the process.

It's really important that you put those points on paper and send them to me so that they can be considered in the set of parameters around discussing these particular elements because we have to balance a number of competing objectives and...

Tony Harris: Well, actually from...

Liz Williams: ...that's what the board will be expecting of me to do when - in the production of a board report.

Tony Harris: Yeah, fair enough. But speaking as an ISP rep, I think, you know, our industry would also be happier if it isn't all that easy to just, you know, throw things in and see if I'm lucky.

Liz Williams: Yeah, exactly.

Tony Harris: It goes to being, you know, really having a solid case, solid backing for what you're doing and some muscle behind it. Okay?

Liz Williams: Thanks, Tony.

Marilyn, you were also in the queue, would you like to go ahead?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

The business constituency in the past had expressed concern about the issue of registrants falling over because they don't have sufficient financial resources to operate through a lean time or they don't have sufficient technical resources, et cetera, et cetera.

So I think this is probably a little bit consistent with Tony's last statement that I think we'll be very, very cautious about subsidy models and instead, we'll support the idea that through consistent terms and conditions and through stable processes and transparent processes, as much as possible, there'll be a known fee and an amount of time that can - that applicants can adhere to the idea that we would create a subsidy model that ICANN has to operate is probably not going to receive support from the business constituency.

And our observance would be that that's putting ICANN in - ICANN itself in a role that is far beyond what its, pardon me, staff thing, this core competency, running a foundation, or even diluting and deterring the - all of us from the work that we really should be doing.

Liz Williams: Thanks Marilyn.

Were there any other points in relation to either that element or others that people wanted to bring up?

Chuck Gomes: That element meaning Section 7?

Liz Williams: Section 7, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Section 7.10 I'd like to comment on.

Liz Williams: Yes, go ahead.

Anyone else would like to be there? And that's the section which refers to the draft-based contract that is provided as part of the...

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Liz Williams: ...documentation.

Marilyn Cade: And I want to be back in the queue to ask a question later.

Liz Williams: Sure, Chuck and Marilyn.

And anyone else on...

Tony Harris: Yes, I have one question -- I'll get in queue -- about different points.

Liz Williams: Tony, thank you.

This is in relation - just so that - if people don't have the document in front of them, this relates to Section 7.10 in the ICANN staff discussion document about base contract content. And I've got Chuck and Marilyn and Tony.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. First of all, I think that, as a committee, the most important point we wanted to make was that a draft-based contract be available as part of the RFP so that any applicants have the best possible picture of what they're getting into and that that contract not be provided after the RFP is out.

So, in my mind -- and I think the registry constituency feels this way -- it's not so critical that the base contract be a part of the report itself, although that would certainly be nice, but it is critical that it be available when an RFP goes out and not later than that.

And really, in my opinion, ICANN has established a big part of that base contract through recent contracts that have been negotiated. There have been a lot of similarities and so forth -- whether all of those carry through or not, is another issue -- but it doesn't seem to be too unreasonable to expect that at least at the release of an RFP.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Chuck.

Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I support what Chuck just said. But my question is a slightly more general question.

There's a couple of places where I can see that there may be - for instance, one of the contributions that the BC may make or it may come as an individual is an elaboration on 2.5.2.5, which is about reserved names.

And I - my question is a more general question. I refer you off to 4.5 which says there should be a clear sanction process. I don't think I saw - I may have missed it. I don't think I saw a question in the staff discussion points that asked for more information about the sanctions process and...

Liz Williams: Marilyn, did you mean the compliance with the contract, is that...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I'm reading 4.5 in the - on Page 27.

Liz Williams: Yeah. Okay, thank you for pointing me to it.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. It says there should be a clear sanctions process outlined within the base contract blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. But I didn't see any reference in the staff discussion about what we had in mind, and that would seem to me that the - one of the issues where - and going into more detail on our upcoming meeting on Sunday, we ought to at least address that.

Liz Williams: Marilyn, that's a question for Dan. And I've got some other things that he'll want to refer to in a second, so perhaps I'll just finish this queue and then enable Dan to speak if he wishes.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just - I was just pointing out some areas where - and I think you did on 4.10, which is on Page 28 where we suggested there should be a consistent approach with respect to registry fees.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: That may be another one where we need to ask the question that you may have about what did we intend by that?

Liz Williams: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: But - so I would point out those two things and then ask the question of where we make the proposing because, as we've all reviewed this, we have seen another area that we think needs a bit of elaboration. How do you see - you had said that you were going to send forward the BC comments, the IPC comments, comments from the registry constituency that Chuck provided.

Liz Williams: Yes. Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: So, that would be - do I - can I just verify that's your suggestion for any of us who might see something that we think needs to also be elaborated on or considered, we should just give that to you in written form.

Liz Williams: Indeed. That would be terrific. Very, very, very helpful.

It doesn't matter that it doesn't make it into the balance compendium of things that will be taken forward for the Sao Paulo meeting. It matters that people have got it written down and is given to me and then I'll put it into my vast lot of binders and it eventually filters its way through the report.

It also means that I have sets of questions that (Bruce) and I have spent quite a bit of time preparing for the public forum, and we float those questions in a number of different ways to ensure that we get a diverse set of feedback.

So, if you could send whatever you wish to me as soon as you can, that would be lovely.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Liz Williams: Thank you.

Tony, you were also in the queue for that one.

Tony Harris: Not for this point -- 7.5, 7.8, and 7.11.

Liz Williams: Why don't you just go ahead then we'll start another queue. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Okay, 7.5 is about auction.

Liz Williams: Yeah. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: That's something I am dead against. I mean we've talked about the concept of me-too in strings and how this is undesirable. If you have auctions, you're opening the gate to me-too applications, and you may have people - organizations who have really done, you know, (unintelligible) of preparation for this, stepping up to the gate, and somebody who's heard about it is there too because he's got his fee in his hand.

So if you don't take - if you don't evaluate competing string proposals on the merits of the support they have - when I say "support," if they're a sponsored TLD the support for the community they're representing or they say they're representing...

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Tony Harris: And by support, I mean, signed and sealed letters that are completely solid. Somebody who has perhaps more money or a latecomer could come up - could walk away with the award.

Liz Williams: Tony, that's been a great bone of contention for several months now, and I'm pretty sure that you are aware of (Ross) and (Nielsen) and others who've looked at rather simpler ways of resolving string contention. We're actually talking about string contention - competing applications for the same string.

Tony Harris: That's right.

Liz Williams: So I'll be very grateful if in Sao Paulo you would like to flesh out your ideas about that particular section because it's something that the staff has spent considerable time on balancing the parameters between

objective, timely, binding, finished, low risk solutions for determining the end of a problem, and the problem being two applicants or five applicants or ten applicants wanting the same string. We have to have some simple way of resolving that problem, but I understand your hesitation.

You had two other points that you wish to make on separate elements?

Tony Harris: Yes, very short, 7.8.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Tony Harris: The (unintelligible) recommendations might require public posting of string applications in internationally recognized publications as part of a notification process. Potentially, the applicant would pay for the publication.

I've never hurdled this before. I admit I wasn't at the last meeting; I was in the Belgium meeting. But my point is, anybody who came before us didn't have to go through this so it doesn't seem all that fair. And what's wrong with having it published in the ICANN Web site and that being sufficient?

Marilyn Cade: Can I get in the queue, Liz, to ask a clarifying question about...

Liz Williams: On 7.8 or on something else?

Marilyn Cade: It's on 7.8 and...

Liz Williams: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: Then I'm going to go back...

Liz Williams: Sure. Sure, Marilyn, no problem.

Tony, I just want to address your question there. You'll be aware that when we did the new TLD process we did an international call for takers. And I don't remember you being in the Washington meeting, but we had eight presentations from the 11 respondents that we received for the call who are expert takers.

We've learned that the ICANN Web site is not sufficient as a notification methodology for ensuring sufficient "advertising" of a decision. And 7.8 was particularly suggested to deal with the way in which governments might wish to respond -- and not very many governments, I would think, log regularly onto to the ICANN Web site to look what we are all doing. And this is a suggestion that was used to ensure that the way in which we resolve string contention was fair and was broadly advertised and it needs further discussion.

So, I understand your hesitancy. I have to say though that just because we haven't done it in the past doesn't mean to say we wouldn't do it in the future.

Chuck Gomes: Could I get in that queue on 7.8, too?

Liz Williams: Thanks Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: And what we're trying to do is look for best-practice procedures for dealing with notifications. And I'm sure that you'd be aware of, for example, shareholder notifications and large debt notifications and actually regularly advertised in the international press as a way of fulfilling shareholder requirements. And that was one way that we had come up with, with ensuring that there wasn't string contention and then people couldn't claim that ICANN hadn't done its job in sufficiently advertising the process. But I understand why you're hesitating.

Man: Liz, very shortly.

Liz Williams: Sure.

Tony Harris: I mean this could take you off the table. I mean that could be more expensive than the application fee of \$45,000. Okay? I mean if you really did (fit it) internationally.

Liz Williams: Exactly, and that's what we want. This is the reason why we're posing the questions -- we want to see where there is a pushback, where there is a problem, where there is some analysis that needs to be done. And for example, anyone who watched the advertising process for the TLD process for takers that international advertising can then - can pay - cost \$45,000.

Tony Harris: Thank you.

Liz Williams: Yeah. So...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Just so you know, we've done the costing. We've done the costing on it.

And just to address your point about \$45,000 application fee, there's certainly no guarantee that the application fee for new TLDs would be \$45,000.

Marilyn, you want to...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: Liz, would you put me in the queue too, please, Ken Stubbs on this issue?

Liz Williams: Yes. I've got Marilyn, Chuck, and then Ken.

Anyone else?

Ray Fassett: Yes, (Ray).

Liz Williams: Thank you, (Ray).

Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. My comment is fairly - I think it's a general comment to the entire document and maybe a suggestion for how we might think about working on this document.

I think we may be putting the operational staff at a disadvantage by filtering everything through the policy staff, so I apologize for that. But

for instance, what I've seen in the document is, in some cases, something that I, having been at all the meetings and been heavily involved in this, I'm not always - as I read this - of this particular document, I'm not always in agreement with.

I feel that there is a strong need for further dialogue between the operational staff and the policy process, not just this paper but much more of a best discussion.

One question that I would have to the staff, for instance, is maybe a better question to us would be, when there is potential string contention and the policy recommendation might indicate that a public - that more visibility of the application is needed on an international basis, what are the different kinds of affordable options that we would recommend to be explored and (unintelligible) forward, again, (unintelligible) way so that the applicant would know there's a (unintelligible) of additional cost and what the range of that cost may be because I do agree, advertising fees can be extremely high.

So part of it may just be how this is worded.

But secondly, I do have a question about RFC 1591. I love RFC 1591. It's my favorite RFC, but I'm not sure I understand the reference to it here.

And then, secondly, on 7.5. The way 7.5 is ordered, it appears to give initial preference to the idea that auctions are a preferred method to resolve contentious issues or scarce resource issues. In fact, there was no agreement to that within the taskforce.

And the second part of that sentence, these suggestions need to be balanced with the views of others who contend that detailed comparative evaluations are the only way to make choices between applications.

I think we need to be really careful in how we convey things in a very neutral way.

Liz Williams: Marilyn, I appreciate your point there, and I take responsibility for that because I drafted it.

What I was trying to say was, there was still disagreement and that disagreement need not have come on the public list. Numbers of people have come to me and said we should resolve this in this particular way and I've said, yeah, well, we need to go back to the group or we need to tell them what they want.

What I was trying to represent there was that there was a - two sets of continuums that needed to be balanced between the two and it was quite a difficult process. I wasn't your total intent that there was only one way of doing things and - or there were - might be no choice between two things, so further clarification there is helpful.

And I appreciate, now that I've reread it as you were speaking, that it might have read that way and I didn't intend it to be that bold.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

And my final comment is just on 7.4.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Clarification is required regarding reserved names to ensure global and multicultural considerations are taken to account when developing any reserved names list.

Liz Williams: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: Can you - can someone point me - I agree totally, I'm not in disagreement. I'm assuming that that is in reference to - and we did just really begin this discussion and there's a very, very light placeholder in 2.5.2.5 on Page 11. Is that what the staff was - is that where the staff is referencing?

Liz Williams: Yes, it is. The reserved names list is a very, very interesting issue and I think it gets us - for example, Avri is not on the call but Avri has been a very strong advocate of no reserved list at all but we know that that actually doesn't exist in existing contracts.

Marilyn Cade: She's - I haven't seen that posting on the list.

Liz Williams: No, what I meant was she's been a very active discussant to say there shouldn't be any names that are reserved in any way because that is censorship. So that's one end of the discussion and I don't need to paraphrase Avri's view in any way.

But there's further discussion that needs to take place about - this is a very general and diplomatic point about the way in which, for example, governments or countries or linguistic communities or religious

communities might wish to have their names represented and reserved.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Liz Williams: This is not just about...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Liz Williams: ...for example, dot XE or dot local host or dot example or dot whatever it happens to be like dot ICANN or dot (lamro) or dot (Afroniko) or whatever it happens to be.

This is a much broader discussion about whether we will provide guidance to applicants about names that really, frankly are off the table.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Thank you. That's what I was looking for. Thank you.

Liz Williams: No problem.

I had Chuck and then Ken and (Ray).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tony, it seems to me that your concern on 7.8, at least partially, would be mitigated depending on the timing of when the posting of the strings occur. I don't think that posting should occur until after the end of the application process - after that process closes.

And if that's the case, then it wouldn't be possible for somebody to jump in because the string was posted and then compete with you in that regard. Is that...

Tony Harris: I wasn't making that point on 7.8. That was about the auction.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I thought you were concerned about the public posting of the string.

Tony Harris: No, the public posting of the string - my concern here is cost.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tony Harris: The cost can pay for the publication. And Liz just said, yeah, we figured, you know, advertising would be \$45,000...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

Tony Harris: ...which was great news, I'm ecstatic about that.

Chuck Gomes: But am I correct though that there wouldn't be any public posting until the close of the application process?

Liz Williams: Yes, that's right, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Liz Williams: All right, Ken. I have you Ken then (Ray).

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. I think I have a relative - could be a relatively simple solution to Tony's concern.

Basically, rather than having individual applicants post in an internationally recognized publication, the best approach would be to have that to begin the process, ICANN post an international publication the fact that the authoritative site for information on new strings was whatever ICANN deems it to be, their Web site or something like that.

Then, all you would need to do at that point in time would be - for string contentions would then be, you know, string applications to get posted to that specific site of what you would have with the ICANN doing the publicity work out front of the application. And at that point in time, in some government methods, that's their issue, you know, and not specifically a cost burden on any application.

Man: (Unintelligible). Thank you, Ken.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Thank you, Ken.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: For serving us a whole bunch of money.

(Ray), did you have further comments...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thanks Ken.

Liz Williams: ...you want to make on that part?

(Ray Fassett): Yes, 7.8. I think it's important to be careful not to mix and match terms, I'm misunderstanding which is to determine whether there is potential string contention.

The only way as I understand it that string contention can occur was if two or more applicants filed for the same string or filed for a string that is phonetically or verbally or visually confusing to an existing TLD string.

It may be better worded to state to determine whether there's potential string opposition because that's not the same as contention in the spirit of the...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: No, it's not the same. It's not the same. And I just want to - this is a negative example. For example, (Ray Fassett) and his group proposed dot B-O-O-K, book. There's no other applicant. There's no string - there's no contention for dot book -- and I just happen to be looking at my bookshelf.

But, everyone hates (Ray Fassett) and they absolutely don't want him to be in control of any other single registry, so they're going to vote and they're going to call every single congressman and every single

senator and they're going to oppose (Ray Fassett) being in control of any other registry at all ever.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Wait man, let's...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: That's the difference between...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Just as a point of order, this is an example, since this is being transcribed...

Liz Williams: It is an example. It's an - thank you, Marilyn. It's an example.

Man: Thank you, Marilyn.

Liz Williams: And I'm using (Ray) specifically...

Marilyn Cade: You're welcome.

Liz Williams: ...because (Ray) understands what I'm doing and he knows what I mean.

(Ray), do you understand the distinction...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: Yeah, I understand. I guess...

Liz Williams: ...between contention and opposition?

Ray Fassett: Yeah. I think what I'm trying to say is that if...

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Ray Fassett: If the entire TLD round is well-publicized by ICANN that this is happening and so forth internationally upfront, then that sets the community on notice to be, you know, to be paying attention, if you will. And then if they see something they want to oppose, they can oppose. But that's different than placing the burden on the applicant to see if there is contention because contention is defined as...

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Ray Fassett: ...phonetically or visually confusing to an existing string or a competing applicant string. That's my only point.

Liz Williams: (Ray), what I'll do is I'll take an action item on that to make some better definition in the committee's document about the distinction between contention and opposition because I think it's necessary to spell it out.

Ray Fassett: Great. Thank you.

Liz Williams: And I will do that.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Liz Williams: I'm conscious everyone that it is 20:58, and I wanted to take into account any other points that anyone or questions anyone had to make either on the staff document or on the committee's document as it's drafted.

Tony Harris: I have one.

Liz Williams: Who was that?

Tony Harris: Tony Harris.

Liz Williams: Sorry, Tony. Go ahead. Yeah.

Anyone else on the queue for that one?

Tony Harris: I just had a comment about the very contentions issue of renewal. I'd just like to...

Liz Williams: So Tony...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: On any wrap up-points for either document?

Tony, go ahead.

Tony Harris: Okay, 7.11 considers for the first to the application cycles. There should be a defined number of applications allowed through that system.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Tony Harris: In other words, explore the desirability of working to reduce the number of applications and limiting the number of approved applications during 2007, which is not a bad idea, but how are you going to do that and be fair?

Liz Williams: You're going to answer that question, Tony.

Tony Harris: No, I don't think so. I'm just wondering...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: ...where this came from because...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: ...you had - in the last round you had ten applications, I believe, which is not an inordinate number really. And I mean, how many would there be this time?

Liz Williams: Well, Tony, we've been trying to actually answer that exact question so that we can do some very sensible scaling and fixed-for-purpose application processing implementation. And Craig and I and others in the organization have been trying to work out the number of applications we think we might get.

We can do a fairly good rough analysis, but we certainly can't get down to 10 to 15 or 50 to 100 or anything like that. And one thing that we

certainly don't want to do is build a system that's designed for 10 and get 1000 or build for 1000 and get 2.

So, we're doing a couple of things in parallel. One is regarding some more...

Tony Harris: Well but...

Liz Williams: ...market research and the other is we're really trying to drill down to say well, what happens if we get either end of the spectrum.

Tony Harris: But wouldn't the size of the evaluation panel or participants be defined once you have the strings and we've closed the gate?

Liz Williams: That's a question for Craig to answer. I doubt that he would be happy doing that from an implementation perspective because it doesn't provide us enough ramping-up time to provide a system that is fixed for purpose.

Man: Tony, we have, in the committee, I think it was emphasized that we wanted ICANN to be geared up and ready to go...

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Man: On this.

Tony Harris Okay.

Man: Again, for timeliness.

((Crosstalk))

Craig Schwartz: Yeah. If I can speak up, this is Craig.

We've been trying to actually approach this process in two distinct fractions. The first being what do we need to do to create the system to run the project or run the - and being round as opposed to how do we actually run the round

So, in a sense that that panel of experts or (unintelligible) will measure technical criteria, all of those structures need to be in place before the round start because once you have an application that maybe needs to be dealt with through one of these outside resources, it has to be in existence if this process is going to be timely.

So, but the cart really does have to come before the horse on that side.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Craig.

Alistair, I have you also in the queue for dealing with contentious strings.

Alistair Dixon: Yes, Liz. I'm sorry to bring this up (unintelligible). I just want to draw attention to Philip's post of the BC position in relation to renewal expectancy.

Liz Williams: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: And just to note that we have refined our position in relation to renewal expectancy and we're saying that there should be renewal expectancy

for sponsor TLDs. But for or other TLDs, we are still in favor of (competitive) bids.

And I'd just also like to make a comment that we are trying to ensure that this systems approach in relation to this PDP as opposed to - or as well as PDP '06, so I just wanted to draw that to everybody's attention. I imagine this is something that we would probably wish to discuss at Sao Paulo.

Chuck Gomes: Could I follow up on that.

Liz Williams: Please Chuck. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Just another example where I think there's an effort to go backwards. We spent a lot of time on this, and granted there was unanimity, but there was strong enough support for the position that's stated, and to go backwards now I don't think it's a wise or prudent thing to do.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Chuck.

Marilyn Cade: Can I get in the queue on this?

Liz Williams: Anyone else, Marilyn? Anyone else?

Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade : I think we have to be careful not to suggest that clarification is going backward. These are still draft comments that are - we were all out seeking further support and input from our constituencies.

The clarification that Alistair has provided is a clarification that has been reviewed with the constituency.

I'm aware because I am part of PDP '06 that there is a question about the same topic in PDP '06. And our view has evolved to think that we need to have some understanding of consistency across renewals and to ask the question of whether the policy processes that then are going to be implemented by the ICANN staff should in fact be (unintelligible). And that is - some would say that that could be viewed as going back while we would say that that is a clarification that we think this taskforce and the other taskforce do discuss because the staff are going to be in a position of having to implement whatever the policy or the business policy is.

Chuck Gomes: And I have no problem with clarification of a constituency's position.

Liz Williams: Thank you Chuck.

Everyone, I just wanted to now turn from the specifics of both the staff document and the committee document, and they are two distinct pieces of work. And I know - I thank everyone for the commitment to the staff on the production of a staff interaction point and the committee on the work that they have produced in the draft final report.

I just wanted to be sure that everyone is aware of what's taking place at the Sao Paulo meeting so that we can be sure that we cover the work that needs to be done at the Sao Paulo meeting.

Number one, on Sunday afternoon is a working session for the way in which the work of the group will play out during the week.

Number two is...

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry did you say when that is?

Liz Williams: Sunday afternoon and - sorry, I should have just opened the file with my calendar, but I didn't.

(Dianne), can you just tell me off the top of your head when the session - the working session is on Sunday afternoon for the group?

Glen): The time hasn't been put in stone yet because we're still waiting for Bruce and some details, but it will be Sunday.

Marilyn Cade: But I need to raise the point, Liz, that you may not be aware of that the whois taskforce has been - a commitment's been made to them that they won't meet until Monday afternoon because many of them are not arriving in time.

Glen): Sunday afternoon, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: For whois? I think...

((Crosstalk))

Glen): For whois, but this will probably be in the morning.

Marilyn Cade: I just - okay, I misunderstood, I thought Liz said PDP '05 would be in the afternoon.

Liz Williams: No. Beg your pardon, Marilyn, let me just - there's a general GNSO council working session. There'll be an implementation face-to-face meeting with the staff as well on Sunday and that will be where we can discuss in more detail the elements that we brought up in the discussion point.

On Monday afternoon, of course there's the 2:30 to 4 o'clock session on the new TLDs forum, and then there's the remainder of the week on the constituent-approved constituency meetings and the GNSO public forum, again, at which the new TLDs work will be brought up.

There will also be, of course, the GNSO GAC working session that will take place.

And Olof, are you still there?

Olof? No, perhaps the mobile phone...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: The GAC have apparently made some progress on the drafting of their public policy principles, and Olof and I were speaking about that the other day and we'll be giving more input on that.

And the - just to round off Alistair's point about the issue that he raised about registry renewal, the PDP (February 6) group will be meeting on Monday morning between 8 o'clock and 10 o'clock to refine their draft policy recommendation.

Is there anything else anyone wanted to ask about anything at all?

Okay. Thank you. I'll take silence as (unintelligible) okay.

Does everyone have all the documents that they need to (unintelligible) or in time to send me (unintelligible) if one knows where we can use it and one knows what the documents contain.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. So, we would be looking at a timeframe then or a timeline when we get together on Sunday morning or when we might be thinking about publishing this for comment. I'm not expecting us to have, but we'll be thinking X number of (unintelligible) Sao Paulo meeting or something like that.

Liz Williams: Yeah, sure. My intention, Marilyn, is to work with the group to produce - because this - the final report is still in draft, and my intention to produce the final report for consideration by the council.

I would expect the second council meeting in January so that everyone has time to confirm their constituency position, provide me any (unintelligible) information, taking to account the GAC input on public policy principles, taking to account anything the ccNSO or the or the (effect) or the (affect) might have about the technical criteria.

And just before we finish, I draw your attention to Section 8 which is regarding consultations with other supporting (unintelligible).

It is the intention of the staff to, of course, seek the advice of the Stability and Security Committee and, of course, the GAC and (unintelligible).

So, on the impact of the draft recommendations as they stand, so Marilyn, to get back to your point, I would expect that the draft final report as it stands is turned into a final report in the last week of January and discussed by the council. Once that's done, a public comment period is run and those public comment periods - that public comment period is the usual 21 days that we have, any percent of comments that are taken into account there, and then I produce the board report in time for the Lisbon meeting in Portugal in March.

Does that give you a bit of closer idea about the timeline?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

Liz Williams: Any other questions from anyone else? Great.

Could I also urge you just to send me any particular comments that you want included in the next day or so. I leave on Thursday for Sao Paulo and will be out of email contact on Thursday and Friday morning.

Man: Thanks Liz.

Liz Williams: If there's no other comments, then I'll close the call.

Thank you very much to everybody.

Man: Thank you Liz.

Liz Williams: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Liz Williams: Take care. Travel safely everybody.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Liz Williams: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye, bye-bye.

END