Avri Doria:	Okay, it's a minute after and we probably should start, and the recording is already ongoing?
Nathalie Peregrine:	Yes, the call is being recorded, Avri.
Avri Doria:	Okay, thank you. So we'll go through the agenda and then get to the roll call, and hopefully a few more people will have shown up in the meantime. So after the roll call what I'd like to do is have Dev talk to us about what's going on in the Review Group and I see he's online so that's opportune. Then I'll just give a quick update on the extension of Applicant Support charter item which included a letter being sent. Then basically I want to get into an update on gTLD issues – I think this is where the bulk of the meeting time can be spent, looking at the rollout issues, looking to see if we have more to add and asking the people whose names are listed as tokens what they think we should be doing about it.
	And then it's basically to look at the Toronto meeting or meetings – and I guess that's scheduled for Tuesday, interesting – and start talking about an agenda for that. That is possibly the worst day for me and I thought I said that before, but anyway, any comments on the agenda other than the ones I've been muttering under my breath? Oh, and then there's looking at the action items and any other business. Any comment on the agenda? Any item that needs to be changed? Did I hear an almost word? No? In which case we'll go ahead with the agenda and I'd like to ask for the roll, thank you.
Nathalie Peregrine:	Thanks, Avri, this is Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the New gTLD call on Monday, the 27th of August, 2012. On the call today we have Cintra Sooknanan, Yaovi Atohoun, Hong Xue, Rudi Vansnick,

Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Alan Greenberg and Avri Doria. We have apologies from Rafik Dammak and Olivier Crépin-Leblond. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you – this is Avri again. At this point I'd like to ask if Dev would like to take us through the At-Large New gTLD Review Group status.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thank you, Avri. This is Dev Anand – I hope I'm unmuted.

Avri Doria: Yes, I can hear you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, it's Dev Anand Teelucksingh here for the transcript record. The gTLD Review Group so far has well is still receiving comments for possible submission to the ICANN comment forum regarding comments to the evaluation panels or on objection grounds. To date we have received comments on one application submitted under objection grounds – it was regarding for the gTLD string .book by Amazon EU and was submitted by Internet New Zealand which is an ALS in APRALO.

That was submitted on July 26, and the comment was posted on the gTLD application dashboard as comments received; and we had a conference call on August 6 to discuss it but we decided not to submit the formal comment because the comment was dealing with something outside the scope of the application. It dealt with whether TLDs should be open, meaning open to members of the public; or having it closed, meaning it's only available to the applicant. And

actually this was one of the items that was referred to this working group, so perhaps we can have a discussion on it under 'any other business.'

The applications comment period has been extended by ICANN until September 26 and so we now have a new timetable. So we have until September 10 to get comments from At-Large for comments related to application panels or on objection grounds. So we have until the 10th so that we can then review it, come up with a draft formal statement if any and then send it to ALAC for possible review. I think that's the summary of it.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks – this is Avri. I have one comment before opening up the queue, and that's that in referring to it – I think I may have mentioned this in an email but I don't know, but Evan had already placed on our gTLD issues list an item on private generic word registration. So I don't know if we need to cover it under 'any other business' though we can. We'll certainly be bringing it up under that category; I don't know if that makes a difference.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah, that's true, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, would anyone else like to mention anything or ask any questions?

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi?

Avri Doria: Excuse me, who is this?

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi.

Avri Doria: Yaovi, please go ahead.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi speaking. My question is a more [graph] question, just to know if on the item, the list of the applications we have now, the strings – my question is to know if we can expect a correction on that list, like an African is saying there is something wrong in his case; like if instead of "ABC" we have "ACB," something like that. So my question is if you think that or if you've thought that ICANN may make the correction to the list of the strings – that's my question.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, I understand your question and Dev, if it's okay I'll take that one.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, no problem.

Avri Doria: Unless you have an authoritative answer also, or semi-authoritative.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, only from what I've read on the ICANN's website… Very well. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh here. Thanks, Yaovi, for the question. Regarding whether applicants can change any details regarding their application, ICANN in their conference call or webinar I think earlier this month said that they'll be issuing several what they call CQs or clarifying questions for supplemental information from applicants. And I believe it was something around close to 50 applicants that will be receiving these, and it will be giving them an opportunity to respond because there were gaps in what they submitted – like they did not submit appropriate letters of support and so forth – things of that nature.

As to whether they'll be making any specific changes let's put it this way – I don't think they will allow changes at this point that will significantly alter the evaluation of the application.

Avri Doria:
This is Avri; I'd like to add something to that if I might, and this was from a discussion this week at the ICANN-Studienkreis where these issues came up, and it's indeed looking at the correction – and I'm not disagreeing with anything Dev said; that is looking at corrections actually on the strings, like several applicants who indicated that they made a typo or some other kind of clerical transposition error in writing the name of the string. They are currently looking at several of those and the indication I got was that there might indeed be a few typographical error, clerical error string corrections. I have no idea about which strings and what indeed constitutes typographical or clerical error – that we'll find out when they inform us of changes to strings. But indeed they are looking at some changes in that respect.

And this was in a talk given by Olof Nordling. So you know, as I say I'm only giving secondhand information but that is what was mentioned in Oslo last week. Any other comments or questions? Okay, if not I guess I have one last question: on that one comment that you received, are you currently now going through the process of seeing whether you submit a comment on it?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:
This is Dev. Well, the comments are still open now because the application comment period has been extended. So additional comments could be submitted but I don't, well… Given that the issues raised are dealing with issues that are I think outside of the Review Group and more in scope for this working group to decide on, I don't think any comment will be submitted on that – at least not on those grounds. Maybe someone could come up with comments on another aspect.

Avri Doria:	The community input (inaudible).
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Yeah.
Avri Doria:	Okay, I just wanted to make sure. I saw that that was the case but I just wanted to make sure and get it on the record as it was, that at this point that's not being worked on. Okay, thank you. Any other questions, comments, issues on the Review Group? Okay.

Then moving on we have the letter, and I very much appreciate everybody's participation in the review of that letter over the past month. That letter has been submitted to Olivier for submission to At-Large. Olivier did get back to me and acknowledged receipt of the letter and acknowledged that it would be an item of discussion, I'm not sure he said at the next At-Large although that's what I'm assuming, but he did say by the At-Large. I don't have the letter open in front of me but that's what I recall of it.

That's about all I have to say on it at this point since I have no new status on the issue. Anyone else wish to comment or question? No? Okay, great, then I'll leave that one and when I have more information I'll certainly come back with it to this group, either on the list or if we have a meeting it will be then at a meeting. Okay, moving on to #5: it's the update on the gTLD issues. I think we're just coming in now to the time when this becomes our primary work item, and it's the one that's determining how much work we have to do, how often we have to meet, whether we're meeting in small subgroups that are developing the [theme] better and brining it out to this group – how we're working with those issues.

So there's a lot that fits in this area. It's still relatively amorphous and it's still sort of working its way out, but anyhow, so far on the list that I've been keeping is we've had several issues brought out. The first one is obviously a nonissue anymore, and I did put the URL in the agenda – the first one's obviously a dead

issue unless somehow digital archery gets resurrected and then I'll add a note saying nothing happening there.

On TAS and the glitch, as we have discussed not to pursue that and I assume that if that ever changes somebody in this group will raise an alarm and sort of say for whatever reason we need to go back and review that. I probably won't mention that again. Then there's the outreach program for new gTLDs, which I think at one point we had a lot to say and I think that was sort of the genesis of the requested new charter item; and that those issues will probably be covered under that new charter item unless that new charter item is rejected and then we can come back to reviewing it as a new gTLD issue. I see a hand up from Hong. Yes, Hong?

Hong Xue: Hi, Avri. If I remember before the Prague meeting I raised the Trademark Clearinghouse that it would be an interesting point but we didn't have time to talk about it in Prague. And probably it's not the time to talk about it-

Avri Doria: Actually I was going to ask you to talk about it.

Hong Xue: Alright, that's good, so that's what I want to say. I'm okay to talk about it whenever we're done.

Avri Doria: It's one item further than where I was. The second item was the outreach program for Applicant Support – that's also part of the charter extension; and then the next item I had was Trademark Clearinghouse with Hong as the token holder. But first I want to go to Yaovi with a question on anything higher. Please, Yaovi. I can't hear you.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yes, my question is when you talk about the outreach program for New gTLDs – is it for the next round? It's not clear for me. The outreach program for New gTLDs – is it for the next round?

Avri Doria: Well, that is actually I think, assuming that the item gets approved it really depends. I think it's obviously for some action after the current round. Whether it's for what is euphemistically called "the next round" which can be two, five, or ten years from now depending on who's talking and who's joking; or whether this group comes and makes a different recommendation, different than just "Let's wait for the next round and do it right" is for that discussion to develop assuming it's approved as a charter item.

So I guess partly the answer is yes – in some sense it's for our next round because we can't change the outreach that was done here. In terms of this round, that group will certainly evaluate why – the broader issue of why there weren't more applications from Africa and Latin America. And I'll just take a quick aside to tell you an interesting comment that also came up in the ICANN-Studienkreis in Oslo was an argument from a staff person sort of saying "Well yes, there aren't many from Africa and Latin America, but if you look at the number that there are that's pretty much as many as there are already gTLDs in the world so maybe it's not that bad."

You know, that was an interesting comment from them. I don't want to take it up now but you know, this group may have other things to say about the goodness or badness of those outreach levels. In terms of the Applicant Support, I think it's also the same – that there will be discussion about it and was it right, was it wrong, what flaws did it have in this round; and then making recommendations about some way of ameliorating the situation which might be the next round or there might be something more creative which I at the moment don't know what it would be. Does that answer the question?

Yaovi Atohoun:	Yes, thank you.

Avri Doria:	Does anyone else have a comment on that issue before giving the floor to Hong on trademarks? No? Okay, Hong, the floor is yours on the trademark issue.

Hong Xue:
Okay, I have a very short briefing on this. Before the Prague meeting two service providers were appointed: one is Deloitte for the management of the trademark database; another one is IBM for technical management. What is really interesting is that both service providers appointed by ICANN are both new gTLD applicants so I guess there's no conflict of interest issue involved here.

I've seen the discussion evolve on the list, especially the comments made by Alan and Rudi that are very insightful, actually. As Rudi said, the trademark protection measures does involve cost to consumers, to users, and this is something we should be working with – especially whether the user should be paying for the trademark protection, and especially as Alan commented very correctly now the cost model is that the customer of the service provider should pay. Who are the customers? Of course the trademark owners, the holders need to pay whenever they submit the trademark into the database. But on the other hand, the primary customers actually [model] themselves as registries – new gTLD managers. They have to pay for that.

And it seems that it would be very expensive, and we all know I guess in this highly competitive market they can still transfer quite some cost to registrants. Of course Alan had made the argument here that registrants are different from users, but these are very much the key points we can think about right now. So back to you, Avri. I'm happy to work on this topic along with other colleagues. Back to you, Avri.

Avri Doria:	Okay, thank you. And I'm going to go to my two people in the queue, and I'm going to go to them in a second – I just want to give one quick update. There was also in Brussels a two-day meeting attended mostly by new applicants, and I don't know whether the meeting was announced and posted more generally. I know that Sala and I and a couple of other people – perhaps Rudi whose hand is up – listened to it remotely. I know one again, interesting thing that was said was "Well, yeah, it doesn't matter that they have conflict of interest because IBM won't work on IBM-ish things and Deloitte wouldn't work on Deloitte-ish things." Whether that's an answer to that, I know that's one topic that did come out of there.
	But I also know that there's some documents that will be open for comment, and that's the main point I wanted to get out of that meeting; and that perhaps you and the group of volunteers that gather around this particular topic would also want to take a look at. Yaovi, you still have your hand up – is that from before or is that a comment… Okay, thank you. So Rudi, you're first. Thank you.
Rudi Vansnick:	Thank you, Avri – Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. First of all, the whole New gTLD Program has been delayed due to partly the trademark owners, and they got in fact their benefit through the launch of a Trademark Clearinghouse where in the meeting in Brussels, the two days' meeting in Brussels it was clear that there was no consensus yet in the process of the Trademark Clearinghouse itself. For me and to me it looked like they were trying to get from the community the best way to do it, and I think they want us to be involved and to help them in structuring their process; and at least there should be some return later on to the community, too.
	When I see that Deloitte and IBM are both organizations, companies that are defending trademarks themselves already, what I am missing in the concept of deploying such a mechanism is the participation, active participation in the mechanism through the other constituencies such as At-Large or NCSG. I think that we need to [place] in the discussion. I understood from the meeting in

Brussels that (inaudible) was going to modify the existing document. It would take something like a week and there was hope that there would be one or two weeks' period for [count]. Is this a new way of bringing up comment periods in ICANN? I think that we would have at least more than two days to comment on this. So I think there are a lot of questions that need answers particularly on this typical [TI, TH] issue. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you, and it sounds like you may be a volunteer to work with Hong on presenting options to this group. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'll maybe let Hong go first with her comment and then I'll come in afterwards.

Avri Doria: Okay, Hong – the floor is yours.

Hong Xue: Thanks, Alan. Well, well, well – I forgot something and thanks, Avri, for reminding me of this Brussels meeting. Actually there was a group to design the whole structure for the Trademark Clearinghouse and I was in that group. The name of the group was Implementation Assistant Group – IAG – and we've been working since last November until March this year. There were a lot of discussions and different models were presented to the ICANN staff, but eventually they delayed the whole process and in June suddenly appointed two service providers.

Rudi was very right – there was no consensus on this model, on this model of implementation at all; and there were many other options and including the appointment of service providers; [such as rather] they should be regional providers – none of this should be a distributed model. And in that case there

will be competition and there will be cuts to the cost, and it would have reduced the cost and it would be more reasonable to consumers. But for these it was not accepted, and now there are two set service providers who were appointed; and why so many people protested this Brussels meeting by not attending that. I guess only a small number of new gTLD applicants attended the meeting because those people were not happy.

They're not happy about this whole design at all, and so there were some other discussions on whether the exclusivity could be broken apart from the cost or the high charges. So these things are now being discussed in the sort of trademark groups. So nothing has been decided. We need to think about comments not only for the current design in this round but also as Avri said for the future rounds of new gTLD applicants, to warn ICANN that the same mistakes shouldn't be made again and again. Back to you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I can't get too excited about this one. The implementation clearly is problematic and there's a lot of work to be done. At least there is some work proceeding, there are discussions being held. I find the connection to users and even registrants – registrants, not the big companies who are protecting trademarks but from the At-Large perspective we're looking at the small registrant. I think the involvement, the interaction is minimal and I'm not sure that this is one of our high-priority items that we should be focusing on.

Certainly the process could have been done better, should be done better but I'm not sure it's really an At-Large issue. That doesn't mean it's not of interest to some people in At-Large but I'm not sure it's something that we want to be taking up the fight for. There are other people who have a much larger stake in the ground than we do, and from the point of view of the costs being borne by users – well, the cost of the registry is borne by users and the profit of the

registry is borne by users. That's the nature of the model we're looking at, and I don't think there's any surprise that the Trademark Clearinghouse is going to be paid for partially by the registries.

The registries objected – they wanted it free but that's not the way that it came out, and I don't think it's going to be resolved at this point. I'm just not sure there's enough in it for us to be putting a lot of effort into this, other than individuals' interest in the subject. I'm not sure when we're going on to whatever the next item is but I think our involvement in the URS at this point is the crucial one.

The URS is designed as one of *the* crucial protection mechanisms for the new gTLDs, and as far as I know it's dead in the water at this point. It's being claimed that it can't be implemented and I haven't seen any action from ICANN yet – maybe I missed something – on the issue. And I think that's a user perspective, a user issue because the credibility of ICANN is being brought into question and I think that's something that we need to focus on a lot more and get a statement out quickly than the Trademark Clearinghouse.

Avri Doria: Okay, I have a comment and two questions for you and then I'll open it to others. First, I think on any of these issues if a member of the group has brought it up, if a member of the group can get other people who think it's an issue to develop a statement then the group as a whole can discuss and recommend. I don't see this group deciding "No, we don't want anyone to work on it." I think the absence of anybody working on it means that it's not being worked on, but I just don't see it within the notion – and perhaps others see it different, and we can decide that the issue these three people want to work on, is it important enough for the group to consider?

In terms of the URS, I just want to make sure that A.) that's an issue you wish we'd add to the list; and then B.) immediately on adding it to the list my question for you is, is this an issue that you want to put work on? Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I'll go through everything you said. I didn't mean to suggest that we not work on the Trademark Clearinghouse. I'm just saying that in the overall ranking of things I don't think this is one of the more crucial things from an At-Large point of view. That doesn't mean we stop working on it if we have people interested in doing something. If I implied that then I misspoke. In terms of the URS, yes, it is something I think we need to add to the list. I think we need to get a statement out; I'm happy to draft one. I think it's a very short statement that we would like the ALAC to advise the Board that this is something which we need to get off the pot on and start making it at least look as if something's happening, because right now it doesn't look that way and that's of crucial importance. So yes, I am willing to work on it. I don't think it's a huge document that we need to produce; it's simply a statement saying "Get going." Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So I think there's probably two action items in that – one of them I've already filled which is to add URS to the rollout issues list with Alan Greenberg as the token holder. I've got a statement on here that I've also added in the notes – we'll draft an initial statement. I'd like to recommend that anyone else who wants to work on that statement with Alan, contact Alan on it. It's sort of the way I see any of these things running, is that the person with the token and anybody who wants to work with them lets them know and they deal with the work.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, it's Alan – one clarification. If this afternoon I can post something saying we're scheduling the first meeting and this is what's happening then the item comes off our list until [the issue gets] details. Right now it's the inactivity that's my only concern.

Avri Doria:	Okay, thanks. So that one's added, and of course the other part of the action item is for this group or for Alan and friends to produce a first initial statement for this group to discuss, and I'll put it on the agenda when there is such a thing. And if it needs to be done before our next meeting we can discuss that, too, but let's get there.
	I want to go back now to Trademark Clearinghouse and make sure that no one else has any comments they want to make on it before moving on to the next topic that's currently on the list. Any further comments on Trademark Clearinghouse? Yes, Hong?
Hong Xue:	Oh, well okay, I agree with Alan that this may not be our priority but it's something that's triggered interest in this group so we can spend some time on it. But I have to say I'm happy to work with Alan on the URS as well because it's also a trademark protection measure. I want to say that Trademark Clearinghouse is the central design of the whole trademark protection measure in the future. The URS is expedient, is a fast track for taking down a domain name, and to verify the trademark rights you have to go through the Clearinghouse. So they're actually related. If you believe URS is a threat to free speech, is a threat to registrants' rights and it's relevant – it's related to the Clearinghouse part. Okay, that's what I wanted to say. Back to you, Avri.
Avri Doria:	Okay, thanks, and I have Rudi with his hand up. Please, Rudi.
Rudi Vansnick:	Yes, thank you, Avri – Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. As I mentioned in the chat room I'm volunteering to continue on the message that I've launched directly after the Brussels meeting into the mailing list, and I will try to ask for some support to get something on this Trademark Clearinghouse issues in order to be able to respond to those that expect something from us.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So basically I've got Hong and Rudi working on the Trademark Clearinghouse if I understand correctly, and we have Alan and Hong working on a possible URS. As I say, if anyone else wants to work with them just let them know and I'm sure that they'll include you. And obviously we'll go through this again as needed, either through regular review during these meetings or if the people from these groups raise a higher priority flag saying "Okay, we've got something we would like to discuss; we can certainly then work it on the list." But it'll certainly remain on the agenda.

Anything else on Trademark Clearinghouse or URS before I move on to the next topic which is vertical integration and price caps on incumbents, which was placed on the list at a previous meeting I think by Alan? But first any last words on trademarks and URS? Okay, then – Alan, I turn the floor to you if you have any comments on what's happening, volunteering what's happening on the vertical integration and price caps on incumbent [companies].

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I raised the issue when you mentioned it last time – I'm not sure what is still open at this point.

Avri Doria: Has anything been done? If there are no issues I can mark it as no further issues.

Alan Greenberg: I mean I had raised the issue with regard… Let me see if I remember now. It was with regard to the [introduction] of vertical integration for existing gTLDs; that is, that ICANN had said that one of the possible implementations is for the new contract to be adopted en masse, or on whole, which removes price caps from the larger gTLDs – and that I found that, and I believe ALAC made a statement on that already that that was unacceptable. So I don't think there were any other issues on vertical integration that we'd raised. I think it was just the

issue of price caps coming along with it and I believe we did issue a statement about that already.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I can mark it "Statement made by ALAC – no further action." Does anybody disagree with that and have a different position on this one? Okay, in which case we can move on. I just think that's (inaudible). Okay, and that comment has been added to the list and I see that it's there and it's marked.

Okay, the next one we have is the one that was mentioned earlier: the private generic word registration, which Evan had brought up. And in a note, you can see I tacked the note from the Review Group about it. I don't know – is Evan o the call? I don't hear Evan, I don't see him on the list. Does anybody else want to add anything on it beyond what we've already discussed, beyond that there's an issue to be discussed. Do we want to open this up for comments? If we do I'll put myself in the queue with a personal comment but first, are there still people that want to make comments about this issue before moving on?

Seeing no hands going up, a personal comment from Avri Doria, and certainly not as Chair of this group – I believe from my recollection when we were discussing new gTLDs all the way through, that this private word so-called registration or application was something that was always going to be possible and came under various names. And while we never talked about an example such as "book" we certainly acknowledged the fact that one could apply for a name and only use it as an internal. There was never any discussion that of course they could only apply for their branded name, or they could only apply for their trademark names – that was never a consideration in the discussion.

Sure, some applicants – and in fact, at the beginning it wasn't even a corporate applicant; that was only imposed by ICANN on its own later. It had initially been even an individual applicant that wanted to buy the last name "Doria" and use it only for her family would have not been an issue. And if my name had been "Book" or "Cable" that was never discussed as what about if it's a generic word that you want to use for your own? So I guess I personally have never

seen the issue in this one but I recognize that people do, so of course it's on the list and that's sort of my personal take on that. Any other comments now that I've opened that particular door? Yes, Alan?

Alan Greenberg:
Yeah, we're in an interesting situation on this. The Applicant Guidebook says nothing about the whole issue; it makes no restrictions whatsoever on the whole process. And people have validly based on those rules applied for these kinds of domains. The only out that I see, other than as you mentioned the community of book readers raises a community objection or something like that – and I'm not quite sure one can put a strong objection on those grounds since that kind of group is not particularly universal – is the Board did allow itself the right to refuse to put any domain in the root, to delegate any domain if it was not in the public interest.

It's not clear exactly what rules they would use to do this but that escape hatch is there. But I don't think any escape hatch other than that is currently within the rules. Now, the Board has on a regular basis made changes to the rules – the elongation of the comment period is one of those; and the Applicant Guidebook does say ICANN can change the rules as we go forward. So maybe we should be pressing for some sort of change, but I think anything we do has to be in the context that there's nothing against it in the rules right now and any action we take is going to be extraordinary and potentially attract lawsuits. And I think we have to do it with a firm understanding. It's a bit late to be changing the ground rules based purely on a theoretical debate at this point. Thank you.

Avri Doria:
Okay, thank you. You have indeed presented some possibilities. Okay, Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:
Thank you, Avri – Dev Anand Teelucksingh here. Just to follow up on what Alan said, and I think what you said also, Avri. I mean what is the concept that is being raised here that generic names should somehow not be closed to only a

single applicant or to their subsidiaries but open to the general public? I mean to me this raises questions that I think have been accepted before, that is that generic names are available under existing TLDs as well as existing ccTLDs for that matter. So if there's a policy saying that well, generic words shouldn't be closed how does that relate to generic words in the second-level domain, and so forth? Then by that reasoning book.com should not be allowed and so forth, and then you can take it even further. Let's say using "book" again, what about sub-generic names, like romance.book – to me I just don't understand the rationale for this.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks, Avri – Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. It's an interesting question and issue that Alan brings up here, and I even had some difficulty to understand how ICANN describes or defines public interest. Because saying "public interest," do they talk about the Public Interest Registry being the PIR or they mean the whole group? It's for me quite an amazing discussion. They say "We want to defend the public interest," well then they've failed in other aspects of this famous Guidebook. So I think we should bring up this and try to get some more clarifications on what would happen if the Guidebook would be modified or if some items would be added to the Guidebook? Would this allow some applicants to withdraw with reimbursement of the money they paid?

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I think anything is possible. Perhaps this is a personal comment, I don't know, but within the multi-stakeholder notion that is ICANN insofar as it is that, I think when people or groups like ALAC or GAC or some of the other advisors at the moment say "We believe this issue is in the public interest" we start to have a definition of what ICANN means by "in the public interest." So if ALAC in this instance or specifically this group felt that this

issue of .book was a public interest issue – I don't think it has any relationship to PIR. I think that if they decided that then this group could certainly propose that that issue be looked at that way, and that the Board consider it as a public issue on the following grounds.

So I think that's exactly the kind of work that this group can be doing – despite my view on it – can be doing and should be doing if it is at least a consensus… I mean if there's a few people that believe that such a public interest statement could be written and they decide to work on it, and then this group looks at that statement and develops a consensus around it in terms of recommending it to ALAC, I think you have the start of what is an operational definition of public interest by multi-stakeholder process. So I have no problem in saying yes, the Board could make such a decision especially if ALAC and GAC recommend it, especially if ALAC recommends it, especially if GAC recommends it. So I think there is a path should we want to take it.

Anyone else want to comment on that? And as I pointed out in the chat, Barnes & Noble have had book.com for a while. Yes, Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, I think if we decide that we want to make a comment on it we have to make sure the comment is factually correct. There's been an awful lot of rhetoric out there that generic names must be available for everyone to register under and things like that, and a gTLD cannot be restricted; and yet we have many gTLDs right now that are restricted. And this goes back to the ones ICANN manages, not manages but it's done out of their offices – .arrow, .museum; we have .gov, .inc, .edu. The gTLD space is littered with restricted gTLDs, so anything we put forward better pass the sanity test of not making false statements as its basis. Thank you.

Avri Doria:

Thank you. Yeah, and I interpret that to mean that if you hear of such a letter being written it's a good chance you might volunteer to edit it; and certainly if it

comes to this group we can count on you for fact-checking. I hope those are reasonable assumptions to make. And as I say I don't know; Evan isn't here. This item is listed under his name. I'm hoping that if anybody does believe a statement will be necessary, talk to Evan; and if, Alan, you have concerns about this sort of statement that's another reason to volunteer to help write it, to make sure that your concerns are dealt with.

In any case, any more on this particular topic? We've certainly given it a time. This set of issues will be one of the main drivers of our ongoing meetings, and as the smaller sub-teams that self-establish, self-identify come together and work on these things then certainly we'll cover them at the meetings. Andrew… Okay, that was an agreement mark, not a wish to speak mark. And you were agreeing with Alan's point, which point – the one he spoke or the one he wrote in the chat?

Andrew Mack: Hi Avri, this is Andrew. I was agreeing with what he was saying just in his [last turn] after that. There is an awful lot of this stuff already out there that relates to generics, and whatever we propose has to pass the smell test, you know? It has to make sense. If it sounds like we're proposing to unwind things that are already there I think we undermine our position.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I personally believe that everything that this group has to pass on has to pass the smell test but that's just me.

Andrew Mack: Point taken. That one struck me as more obvious than others.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Any more on these issues? Is there any new issue that someone feels, like all this talk of other issues has made them think such-and-

such needs to be added to the list? Not that we'll discuss it today but I'll add it to the list. No? Okay. I request that anytime anybody in this group thinks of an issue that needs to be explored initially as we've been doing with these and then more diligently by a sub-team, please let the email list know so that I can add it to the table list.

Okay, ending that one; then that comes to the Toronto meeting and we've only got seven minutes left on this. Heidi or somebody, can you talk to us about the meeting? And did I really agree to it being on Tuesday? That was stupid of me. But anyway, please… Anyone from staff able to start us on this topic? I guess not.

Heidi Ullrich: Hi Avri, sorry – I was on mute. I'm going to ask Nathalie if she can answer that, and maybe she if she can't she can get some responses.

Avri Doria: Okay, otherwise I mean we can put it off but I guess we have to start planning for the Toronto meeting and that means an agenda. If it's scheduled on Tuesday then it's scheduled on Tuesday and I'll deal with it. Of course, that's usually the one day that people who pay for me to go to the meeting want me to do other stuff so that's why. But anyway, anyone want to think of things that need to be on our agenda other than having a face-to-face meeting where we talk about some of the tougher issues that really need a face-to-face type of discussion? Anything that anybody wants to put on the list at this point? Otherwise we'll come back to this in our next meeting and we'll come back to this on the list.

Okay, pending action items – did we have any that weren't covered yet? I don't have the list in front of me… Okay… There's the pending action items and [I don't see]… And the first one was done – Avri to fill up rollout issues table chart and add references; I've been doing that. Members of the New gTLD Working Group to send suggestions for that – that's been open as a perpetual

issue. And Alan to raise CMR as an issue – he did. So I don't think we have any pending items in that.

So moving on now to the 'any other business.' Anybody have any other business or anything I've gone over incorrectly that we need to go back to in the last four minutes?

Heidi Ullrich: Avri, this is Heidi; I'm sorry.   I think I had a question regarding scheduling. I thought you meant the next New gTLD Working Group meeting not the Toronto meeting.

Avri Doria: No, I meant the Toronto meeting.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so what was your question?

Avri Doria: My question was it's down here as agenda development, so that's part of what we need to do; and also I was really being upset at myself for agreeing that it would be on a Tuesday, because I'm assuming… I remember you talking and asking and us talking about schedules, and I'm totally amazed that we put it on a Tuesday but I have to take responsibility for that. Alan, you have your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Regarding the URS statement I'm not sure how often we're going to be planning meetings, and I know we haven't gotten to that item yet but I would like to know what the process is on going forward with this one or do we have to wait for the next meeting of this group before passing it on or what?

Avri Doria:	Okay, before going back to Toronto, I would think we can follow the same process we followed and which I think worked with the letter to ALAC about the charter item – that once there's a statement we put it on the list, we give a little bit of time for discussion; if there's no substantive issues then do a several-day last call on it. So once it's been done a process can be done in a week or two, so even if we're doing our meetings monthly it does not need to wait for the month.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay, thank you.
Avri Doria:	And going back, Heidi, to the Toronto meeting, we can keep working on the agenda online.
Heidi Ullrich:	Okay, thank you. And also [if we need to change the meeting time we can anticipate that].
Avri Doria:	Yeah, if it's possible personally I prefer it not be on a Tuesday. That's just the one day where I tend to have bunches of other obligations that relate to those who funded me going to the meeting. I should have realized that when we talked about it before; it was just seeing the starkness of Tuesday made me go "Oh, but that's the Stakeholder and Constituency Days within the GNSO," and I attend several of those and usually have reports to make and other sorts of things in my dual existence between an SO and an AC.
	So but we can talk about that offline and on the list as needed. Anything else at this point in 'any other business'? In which case I thank you. Our next meeting is, Nathalie can say but I believe it's three weeks or four weeks?

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes, three weeks is correct.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we'll be meeting in three weeks. And anything else at this point? In which case we actually filled the whole hour. We had some good, substantive discussion. We've got a bunch of those actions going on, and I thank you all and we'll talk to you in three weeks and of course on the list. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]