

GISELLA GRUBER: Welcome to everyone on today's New gTLD Review Group call on Monday the 21<sup>st</sup> of January. On today's call we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Yrjo Lansipuro, Seth Reiss and Adela Danciu. Apologies noted today from Justine Chew, Kenny Huang and Eduardo Diaz. And from staff on today's call we have myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, and also that staff will be taking action items, so if you'd be so kind as to clearly state the action item for the record. Thank you, over to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Gisella and good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the New gTLD Review Group conference call on the 21<sup>st</sup> of January. And just to go right into it, because we do have a packed agenda, a review or update of the Review Groups' statement of interest. I should mention that of course there has been one change, and I probably should have mentioned it on the previously call during the Toronto meeting; that's as Chair of the Review Group I have now become an ALAC member.

I started my term as an ALAC member at the end of the Toronto meeting. I don't anticipate this being any particular conflict of interest, although of course if anybody has anything to say about that, obviously you can do so now at this point. I'm not seeing anybody saying anything or such. Oh dear, we seem to have an echo somehow.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

Okay, I'm going to continue and hope that gets sorted out. So there have been no comments or anything on that. I think we can then move onto the next agenda item. As everyone knows, the deadline for At-Large comments for suggesting possible objections to gTLD applications and/or strings was the 16<sup>th</sup> of January 2013 and this was done to allow as much time as possible members of At-Large to comment on applications. And for us now to look at the comments so far and to encourage further comments on what have now been posted to the gTLD dashboard.

So we received several comments, and I hope everybody is at a computer here and is able to read these comments that were posted. So starting off first with the .Amazon, I just listed in alphabetical order. A comment was received on .Amazon; I'll post the link in the chat there. And this comment was received by Vanessa [Crowell], and it was a short one, stating that she stresses her concerns about the application .Amazon. And this is made by Amazon EU S.a.r.l.

And she says that the Amazon is a region that encompasses a large part of the territory of several countries of South America, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Surinam and Venezuela and is well-known by its bio-diversity. The name "Amazon" identifies this geographical region as well as the largest river of the world located also in the region. So the ecological importance of Amazon and the fact that it's a geographical region with its own people, communities and culture should prevent a private company from using this name as it is proposed. This string should only be used to develop and promotion and protection of this region and by its people.

---

Now as you know, the ALAC is planning to object to a gTLD application on two grounds – limited public interest, and I'll post the link here, and on community grounds; I'll just find the link and post the link here as well. And those two links, if you open them, you would see that I have the excerpts from the applicant guidebook was included on these two sections here.

So, first impressions on that, on the comments on .Amazon; the floor is now open for comments or questions. Before anybody else continues – I see Seth has raised his hand; go ahead Seth. You may be muted – star seven to unmute. I'm still not hearing you Seth.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi this is Heidi. We're going to see if he's muted.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. Seth, if you can hear us, which you can, have you enabled the microphone on your computer because we do not have you on the audio bridge. Seth I'll get the dial-in to you.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: This is Tom Lowenhaupt, do you hear me?

MALE: Yes Tom we can hear you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry, who was that that spoke; my apologies.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: This is Tom Lowenhaupt.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Alright well, technically you're not really a member of the Review Group, but until Seth can make a connection go ahead Tom.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: I was just hoping to assist your efforts in any way that I might. I realize it's a somewhat complicated situation with having raised the objection, but we're also part of the At-Large structure and we thought that our contributions in terms of why we submitted the objection and had you any questions about it that we might be able to assist. So I don't know if there's any reason...

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay well thanks. But right now we're reviewing the comments on .Amazon at this point.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say something while we wait on Seth?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Please, go ahead.

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. I want to say this, and in context of the whole idea of having a word, a common word elevated to the rank of a property; common word elevated to the rank of property. Because believe it or not, that is exactly what a domain name system does. And so, I want to make this comment in that context. I, like most, would be quite concerned if any common word and the applicability of using that word in communication of any kind is hostage to the fact that this word is now a top level domain label.

I am concerned that that could even be the case. What we have seen to date is that the context in which these words are in contention is when they are used with delimited by the period before that name. So for example, a domain name that is hotel.amazon or something like that or carlton.com; that nature. So long as there is no attempt to generalize any kind of restriction to the name and the use of the word, I think the only way some of the objections will stand is if you totally upend the domain name system.

And I am looking seriously, and I hope for others to convince me of the likely harms that would be inherent to this new list of high level domain names from the evidence we would have accrued from the ones that are now existing. I have not seen any major ones and I want to know what they are. And I'm seriously looking to be (inaudible), thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay thanks Carlton. Is Seth on the audio bridge now?

SETH REISS: Yes.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Welcome Seth, please go ahead.

SETH REISS: I guess my point of view is that we've been empowered to look at two issues, one is community objection grounds. And the comment from Amazon I assume is coming from the perspective of the Amazonian community, so it's an appropriate ground and I'm not sure how we subjectively decide which of the community grounds is appropriate and which are not. It's my preference to send them all on, because they do seem to fit within our remit and I am not sure how we judge that one community or one person representing one community has merit whereas another community or the fact that we get two objections or three objections from a given community.

In other words, I'm not sure I want to be in a position to subjectively say which communities' objections are meritorious as long as the objection is coming from the community and is based upon terms of inequity. And I think that I've expressed this previously, it's my personal preference that generic terms of geographic terms not be monopolized by a private entity. And I'm going to bring in Mr. RJ Glass's comments, put forth in a separate string; I think he was very eloquent.

Pretty much stating that the private interest and trademark interest should be secondary to other interests, including community interest in this case. So it would be my, I would personally be in favor of putting all objections that are geographically based forward for further consideration. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay thank you Seth. Okay let me just ask a question here. Like I said, we have two grounds on this we can object on – limited public interest and community grounds. Can I get a sense of the room, and I would like to see people putting ticks or objecting, or disagreeing I should say, I don't want to...Do you think the comments regarding .Amazon falls under any form of limited public interest objections? My personal opinion reading what limited public interest entails is that it does not.

So can I get a sense of the room whether people agree with this; that the comments raised so far on .Amazon do not fall under limited public interest? Just so we can document it and move on on the record. I see Adela is saying yes, Seth says yes, Yrjo is yes. I see Carlton is typing – understood. I just want to remove that from consideration formally. Okay, I'm seeing no one disagreeing. So let's look at the community objection grounds.

Now again, when we look at the community objection grounds – and again I'll post the link – actually the applicant guidebook goes into some detail about it, and it mentions four particular tests. And in fact, the objection must meet all four tests in this standard for this objection to prevail. For the objection to be successful the objector has to prove that the community invoked is a clearly delineated community; community opposition to the application is substantial; there's a strong association between the community in both, and the applied for gTLD string. And fourth, the application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interest of a significant portion of the community to which this string is explicitly or implicitly targeted.

---

So, from those four tests, I think that would be how we will look at the comments on .Amazon. You have community grounds where the community expressing opposition is clearly a delineated community, and there are four points there. Again, I hope people are opening up this in their browser and looking at it because I don't really want to recite the entire thing. So once you look at those four tests – I see Yrjo has raised his hand; Yrjo go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yes thank you. Even before we go to the four points there is this point of what community or what the new gTLD string is explicitly or implicitly targeted for. And how I see this thing is that this objection grounds exist when there is a community and somebody wants to have a new gTLD targeted to that community. However, in this case, Amazon the company, the book shop whatever, they are not targeting the Amazon community only. They are certainly targeting the entire world with using this name which is their, of course, trademark and name of the firm. So for that reason I think that this objection has no merit. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Hmmm, okay. Anyone wishes to respond to that or have any particular thought on this? Okay Yrjo, let me just ask a follow-up question. Apparently the application – and I should mention that as noted on the comment on the Wiki page, there is a GAC, Government Advisory Committee Early Warning on this, essentially expressing the same sentiments as was posted on the Wiki page. I think how Amazon is



---

intending to use this application is that it intends to run it as a closed term; meaning only for use by Amazon's private company.

So if the community can be clearly defined as a community that exists as far as the Amazon basin I should say, then since that community is not able to have access to any of the domains under that TLD, then that would be possible grounds for community objection? And I note Adela's comments there too – I'm talking about the targeting aspects here, if you read what which is the third point.

I'm seeing people talking, but I'd rather have people vocalizing. Adela, could you just state what is the problem to prove the second point? Carlton is on mute... Okay, Adela is not able to...Well I'm seeing more people typing rather than I'm seeing anything else. Anybody wish to take the floor before I continue? Going once, going twice...alright, I understand now what you're saying Adela. You're saying essentially because there's only been really one comment that it's probably representative of expressions of opposition, and therefore proving point two, which is the substantial opposition becomes part of the proof.

Is that what you're saying Adela? There's one further comment also on this; the fact that various governments have objected to .Amazon – I should say have posted Early Warnings about .Amazon, and apparently it was several governments that expressed support for it. Let me just find the warnings very quickly. I'm just trying to find it on the website. Alright, well I realize that I'm seeing more and more people typing in stuff, so I'm just going to say if nobody has anything to add on this, I just want to then move over briefly to the next one.

---

We won't make a formal decision on this regarding community objection as of yet, but just to give people some ideas to think about. The next one we received comments on was on .cba. Now this is one regarding the Commonwealth of Australia, and the comments received – and I'm going to put for .cba – is here. .cba, what some persons have said that this cba is representing the province of Cordoba, which is a province and a city in Argentina.

So, again I'm thinking there's no limited public interest objections again on .cba as well. The question then becomes does the comment so far relate to any of the four points and is this something too similar to Amazon.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton, can I speak?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Please Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. Again, I feel that there is a concern that is slightly popular but within the context of what we have to do and the measurement sticks that we have to use, I cannot see this standing as an objection that could be supported by the ALAC. In the first place it's an acronym. And to the extent that it's an acronym, cba could mean [Caribiole] or you name any one of them anywhere and everywhere.

So the fact that it is about an acronym is even weaker than the Amazon argument when you measure it against either limited public interest or

---

the community objection grounds to which we must subscribe to make the determination.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you Carlton. I think tentatively I would agree with you because to me, in my mind, cba does not, it does appear to be more of an acronym. And I see Seth is also agreeing with you on this point as well. Can I get other comments on whether Adela, Aziz or Yrjo, whether they agree with Carlton on this? Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. This is Yrjo Lansipuro for the record. I agree with Carlton. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay and I see also that Adela also agrees. Okay. Then just to state them for .cba then there are no limited public interest grounds, first of all, and regarding a community objection to .cba, given that it's those three letters, because it's an acronym it does not, I should say clearly target the community called into question. That therefore we should not consider any further comment on .cba. Can I get either people agreeing or disagreeing with that?

So, we are not going to consider .cba, we're not going to consider any further, based on the comments received, looking at this on any limited public interest or community grounds. Okay I see a tick from Adela, I see a tick from Yrjo. I see a tick from Carlton and Seth also. Who else is on this? Aziz, what are your thoughts; do you agree or disagree? I just

---

want to get for the record that all the persons on the Review Group agreed not to consider .cba on any objection grounds whatsoever.

Is Aziz on? Okay, Aziz also agrees. Okay, great so let's move on now to the next string that we received comments on. This is on .nyc. Okay, Thomas has posted some comments as well as some background information regarding this. I don't know whether we want to repeat it because it's really a long set of text. So if anybody has any initial thoughts regarding .nyc...Going once, going twice – let's see...Seth do you want to take the floor rather than type it?

Okay, Seth is saying that nyc falls in the same general category as Amazon. Okay and Carlton also agrees with that. Any, again, I want to get what other members of the Review Group think, so Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah, I'm sorry, I was just going to put a checkmark there.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So .nyc falls under the same general category as Amazon, alright.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: I'm sorry, may I speak for a moment?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thomas? Okay but briefly.

---

TOM LOWENHAUPT: I'm just curious whether that was a limited public aspect or the community that you were just speaking of? There's clearly a community involved here.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, but people are saying that there is no limited public interest grounds on which we could object on regarding .nyc. But there is a possibility for community objections based on the four tests that, similar to .Amazon. So, looking at the chat therefore on this issue...and thanks Heidi for putting in some...I have to say it's very impressive the acronyms for cba there. But anyway...

Okay, anybody has any particular comments or question regarding the comments posted on the Wiki regarding .nyc? Going once, going twice, going thrice...okay. Alright, just so that we can come back to Amazon and nyc, let's look at Patagonia, which I believe was the next one on the list. Now I'm going say perhaps that there will be similar concerns as was pointed out for Amazon and .nyc, that there are no limited public interest objections regarding Patagonia, but there may be possible community objection grounds for Patagonia.

Can I get any – okay, Seth is saying that yes, there are possible community objection grounds; that there is a [description here] versus a commercial enterprise with no relationship to the community. Just can I see whether people agree with this comment or not; that it there are possible community objection grounds for Patagonia as per Amazon and .nyc? Olivier, please go ahead.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev, it's Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript records. I'm just wondering why you are – just a question on process – why are you all mixing Amazon, .nyc and Patagonia? I thought that these would all have to be considered separately.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Thanks Olivier. It's really just as clearly – okay, we're establishing that so far we're looking at each of these strings in question and so far there are no limited public interest for the previous strings that were previously brought up – Amazon, cba, nyc. And that we identified that there are possible community concerns regarding Amazon; possible community concerns versus nyc, not for cba, and possibly for Patagonia.

The reason why is because yes they have to be treated separately, but also if there is an objection on limited public interest for example, that has a separate objection process, as such an objection under limited public interest. And then if there's for instance on community grounds, then a separate objection has to be filed on community grounds. I hope I'm making the process... [Guys], the intent here is to just simply make sure if there are any concerns under limited public interest or if there any concerns on community. Because there are like two potential objections that can be filed under those things.

I'm not really comparing it as such, but it seems to be that the concerns raised for Amazon are the same concerns raised for nyc and the same concerns related to possibly Patagonia. Does that make myself clear? And as I was pointing out, we're just trying to draw analogies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. I'm glad that you mentioned this for the record. You do have to remember that this does constitute an important record of the process by which those applications are being considered. And I just want to make sure that there is no misunderstanding that an analogy might be made between one and the other when of course each of these is considered on a case by case basis. That's just the reason for my intervention, but I'm glad to hear that it is the case; that each is being dealt with separately.

And yes, when you do say one might argue that you would have a similar situation with .Amazon and .Patagonia, but then if one looks at the details of the case it might be that the two are entirely different. So I think that really each would have to be looked at separately, that's all. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Understood. And again, I don't think we're going to be able to go that deep dive and analyzing all the facts behind establishing whether all of these four things can be proven for each of these strings and so forth in this call. This is more just to get the preliminary look on this. The next steps would then have to look at okay can we prove each of these, can we apply the four tests. And probably divide the work up for the strings that we think that the tests should be applied to for the strings that we think that community objective grounds is plausible. But thanks for that.

---

Okay so, I lost my track of thought here. I'm sorry, we're looking at Patagonia. Any other further thoughts or comments, other than what Seth had mentioned? Going once, going twice, going thrice – okay. So, let's look at the next comments received, and this is comments received on multiple strings by RJ Glass. It was not really a specific comment on a particular application, and I just wanted to know what other persons who have read this, what are their initial thoughts regarding the comments from RJ Glass.

I know Seth made mention of it when you had talked about Amazon. Do you want to take the floor to say something on this?

SETH REISS:

Yeah sure. I was just impressed with the thought process and I thought it was insightful and it's a good comment for the overall process. I'm not sure there's anything we can do with it other than thank Randall for bringing it forward.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks Seth. I would agree with you. I mean it just seems to be very general comments on the new gTLD process itself or the new gTLD program in general. I don't know if there are any specific issues in it that could be referenced in the New gTLD Working Group, which is looking at comments that were made by Internet New Zealand previously, and IT for Change. Anybody has any initial further comments regarding the multiple strings by RJ Glass?

Going once, going twice...and that is correct Adela. I see in that statement, the mandate is restricted to specific objections, yes. So there



---

doesn't seem to be an easy way to apply any of what RJ Glass is saying to a particular application. But that's my impression of it obviously, somebody can disagree with that. Yeah sorry, what's that? Okay, very well. I think we can also forward to the New gTLD – for this one then, we can acknowledge Randall's comments and ensure that it gets looked at by the New gTLD Working Group, which is tasked with coming up with At-Large comments on the whole new gTLD program itself.

Given that this is really not within our mandate. Is that okay to proceed with regarding treating the comments on multiple strings by RJ Glass? Okay, Seth agrees. I just want to seek agreement, or even if you disagree, I want to make sure that everybody is clear on this. We're going to refer this to the New gTLD Working Group since it's a comment related to the new gTLD program and not on any application as such. Okay, Seth yes, Yrjo yes, Adela yes – I'm not seeing Carlton on there.

CARLTON SAMUELS: You can mark me down as agreed.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Great, excellent. And then the final comments received were comments on .Africa. I'm trying to now find my agenda page right now. Hold on a second while I post the comment. Here is the comment received. I found it. This is a comment that was; actually I don't think there's much to be said for this. I don't think there's really anything that could be done. But – unfortunately there seems to be an echo here.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry Dev, this is Heidi. I think that's from the AC room. Gisella, are you able to determine if that's someone with their audio on their AC?

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, it's Gisella here. Yes it is someone with the audio from the Adobe Connect room. Just to remind you that if you are on the phone bridge, as well as the Adobe Connect audio, please do mute your microphone. And Seth has just said that was him. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks for that. So just to go back to the comment that was received by .Africa, it wasn't very clear – I posted a link to the comment that was received. I don't think there's really anything that needs to be done by the Review Group because if anything it was more of an endorsement of one of the applicants for .Africa. I don't really see any need to act on it as such. Anybody have any, does anybody disagree or think that there's any further action that needs to be taken regarding this comment?

Okay, so regarding this comment on .Africa, there is nothing further to act on because it was more a comment expressing support for an applicant, rather than coming up with an objection concern. So we're not going to act any further on the comment made on .Africa. So let's just make sure, if everybody agrees can you please, I just want to see some ticks here. Or if you have any comments obviously, please do so. Okay Adela, Carlton, Yrjo, Seth and Aziz, okay I'm seeing ticks all around on that; great.

---

Okay so now we have now gone through an overview of all the comments received on the new gTLD dashboard. So to proceed on the next steps here, we are going to do a little more investigation on the comments received on .Amazon on community grounds. We're going to look a little bit more deeper on .nyc on community grounds. And for .Patagonia we're going to do a deeper investigation on the comments received on .Patagonia on community grounds.

Now what does that mean by doing a deeper look? As the community grounds page shows there are like four tests that we need to look at more closely. And it's important that the objection must meet all four tests in the standard for the objection to prevail. So, the work that needs to be done will be to look more deeply at the comments on .Amazon, .nyc, .Patagonia – those three strings. And to look to see whether the four tests that are for community grounds can be applied to those applications.

We're not going to proceed further with .cba. We're not going to proceed further on .Africa. And regarding the RJ Glass comments on multiple strings, we'll refer it to the New gTLD Working Group for their input.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Dev, just for clarity – this is Heidi – for the .nyc, was that going to be the same as for .Amazon and .Patagonia? So it does not meet limited public interest but the Review Group will do more in-depth research on whether it meets all four tests of the community grounds objection?

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Correct.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Seth do you want to take the floor to post this to – okay, I see Seth is raising a point that we need to consider how we are going to determine whether the objections are substantial. Well again, I think this is where us as Review Group members are going to have to figure that out ourselves. Because if it is that we cannot prove that point then it's going to fail the test and therefore, how should I put it... Any objection statement will not likely succeed. So go ahead Seth.

SETH REISS: Yeah thanks. I guess my concern is what is expected of us in terms of determining whether something is substantial. You know if we just look at the number of comments on the dashboard we're not going to get to substantial. So my question is whether something else is intended or whether our responsibility requires us to go investigate outside to determine if something is substantial. If it's just a matter of number of comments then I don't think we're going to get there on any application in any case. So I'm thinking it might mean something more than that.

And I'm not sure we should be concerned with proof. I don't know if our remit requires that we have proof so much as a genuine concern.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Thanks Seth. Well you see, if we are going to draft any potential objection statements based on the comments received, and I'm using "if," now we have to show that the four tests that were described in the applicant guidebook – community, substantial opposition, targeting and detriment – those four factors or four criterion are met. And you're right and that's something we really have to think carefully on.

If there are not many comments from At-Large, how do you prove that there is substantial opposition? I have to think a bit more on that. Does anybody have any initial thoughts or comments on this, from the Review Group members?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Seth has his hand up. I'd like to hear what he has to say.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay Carlton, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, Seth has his hand up.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh sorry. I thought Seth had his hand up from before and he's taken it down now. So Carlton, do you want to say any further thoughts or?

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. The word “substantial” there is troubling in this interpretation. Because first of all, you have to define and circumscribe that community and then you have to see how much of this community is substantial. Is it a community of 50 and it’s substantial? Does it mean five of them? I don’t know. It’s a really difficult thing to kind of put your arms around in the practical sense. To me that has always been the [gravity] of this whole Review Group thing. There’s very little capability embedded in the process to objectively measure some things, very little.

And you can’t due to the time allotted. Or you can’t certainly do it without putting some coin in the process, and we don’t have coins to put in the process. So that has always been my position. It requires good men to make some judgment calls and I think we’re doing the best with what we’ve got.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah indeed. I should mention that the applicant guidebook says regarding substantial opposition, it says, and I’m quoting from the applicant guidebook, “If some opposition within the community is deterrent, but it does not meet the standard of substantial opposition, the objection would fail.” It will fail.

CARLTON SAMUELS: But it didn’t tell you what substantial opposition is. And it didn’t even give you a methodology to circumscribe the community. You cannot assume in this instance that community means every internet user, because I don’t think it does mean that. But then what subset of it and

---

how do you circumscribe it, what are the methods that you use, how do you define it. It's like serving a piece of land. I know the land is so much and so big, but where do I put the markers to determine finally how much I have. I don't know.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. And this goes back to if there were more comments to really have a conversation regarding this.

CARLTON SAMUELS: And Seth says something there in the right, which is... It's where I am at. He says that I'm not so sure a process of putting forward objections that have proven to have substantial opposition, but that may have substantial opposition. You're quite right. Because I can't measure what substantial opposition is, it's a judgment call. And collectively I think we are doing the best we can when we look at what we have seen against the criteria that is laid out for us. And that's the point I'm making.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm also prepared for my judgment to be disqualified by the ALAC.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry what's what, sorry? I didn't catch that part.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am also prepared for my judgment to be disqualified or qualified, as the case might be, by the ALAC. So I know I'm not making the final decision here, but I am making a decision based on what I think is reasonable and rationale. And the ALAC in its wisdom, collectively, may disallow it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks Carlton. Well, given that we have, we have to do a more closer look at the community grounds, and look closely at the four tests – yeah, and just to state for the record I see Adela is also agreeing with Carlton. So our next steps will be to look closely at the four types for the community objection grounds; to look at the three strings in question that merit further attention or further review on community objection grounds.

Now the thing is this though, our timeline is not quite limited now. There's not going to be that much time between now and literally the first week of February in which to try to come up with any potential statement for any RALOs to review and then for the RALOs to then consider what the RALOs said regarding the objection statements. So my question is this – I was thinking the way the JAS Working Group worked, they had like two conference calls in the week.

Do you think that we should have another conference call where; we could comment on the list certainly obviously, but have another conference call where okay we've got the four tests; we've looked again



---

at what the comments said, and we think yes or no that it should proceed further with any objection statement, or of course, otherwise.

So if we want to have a next conference call, do you want to have another conference call on say the end of the week, which is Friday, or the first thing next week, which is on the 28<sup>th</sup>. Initial thoughts? Do we want to have another conference call on Friday or do you want to have a conference call on Monday.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev, sorry. Was that to me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well staff could certainly advise whether...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah either or, Friday or Monday is equally fine. Would a Doodle be better for everyone?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think so. Okay I see Seth is pointing out the time zone issue. And also a Doodle would then consult with other working group members. Okay, that's probably a good idea. So if staff can then do a Doodle so that we can have a call on Friday or Monday to go over after we've looked at those three strings, and then decide further whether to proceed with trying to draft any community objection statement or not. Okay? Great, so I hope that action item is recorded. And any other business

because I know we're going slightly over an hour here at this point; my apologies for that.

Going once, going twice, going thrice – okay. There have been no further comments. I think we can adjourn the call. I want to thank everybody for the call here. And again, look closely at the community objections and the four tests and look at whether this system really be successfully applied to the three strings that are in question – .Amazon, .nyc, .Patagonia. And then the next conference call we'll then make a more decision whether to proceed with any objection statements or not, or whether it doesn't meet the test and so forth.

Okay? Thank you all so very much, and take care. The call is now adjourned.

[End of Transcript]