Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference

7 March 2007

18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 7 March 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

The transcription has not been corrected for language accuracy, nor for correctness of spelling, etc. and in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. This decision was made by the Chair, in the interest of efficiency. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/RN-wg-20070307.mp3

is posted on page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC - acting chair for teleconference 7 March

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Dan Dougherty - IPC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Edmon Chung - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council IDN

wg Liaison

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Absent apologies:

Caroline Greer - IPC

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the conference coordinator. Today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

If you need assistance during the conference, I'll be standing by.

Thank you. You may begin.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

I want to welcome everyone and just remind all of us, my name is Marilyn Cade. I am the Chair for the day.

Chuck Gomes, who is our chair, is on the call, but on mute and he can intervene and provide clarification or additional information if needed.

I'm going to just remind everybody that when you speak, try to remember to identify yourself with your first and last name so the transcribers will be able to attribute your comments.

And listening through the speakerphone is fine, but when you speak, you may want to pick the handset up or use the headset to make sure that people can hear you clearly, but also the transcription gets picked up and will do a good job.

And Glen, I'm just going to ask you, do you have a sense of win. I think we're backed up a little bit on getting transcriptions.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. They're coming through Marilyn, and they are quite to (look) it again to be posted today.

Marilyn Cade: Fantastic. That will be a great assistance to all of us, both on the subgroups and the full group and to Tim, in his support of helping to put together the final report. So I'm really pleased to hear that.

And for those of you who weren't familiar with the transcriptions, well, they're not word-perfect, there's just a really fabulous background in case you've missed the call as well.

Let me just review the agenda today and ask if there are any additions or changes and then I'll - we're going to spend much of our time today walking through the four subgroup reports that we have not yet focused on.

That is ICANN and IANA related names, which is the repeat review and discussion. The first time we will have walked through the single and
two-character labels today, the (compile) names report will walk through, and the geographic and geopolitical names, which is a second walk through for that one as well.

Then, I just - I do want to then ask people to be thinking when we get through this, I'm going to go to each of the group and ask you to give us your view of the percent of completeness that you think you're at in your subgroup. And I am also just going to mention to people and ask Chuck to be thinking about this and come back and share some thoughts about it later.

Right now, the Saturday and Sunday is set aside at the list of meetings for working sessions and for preparation sessions for consultation with the Government Advisory Committee on two sets of public policy that they will be discussing with the council and their expert bodies over the weekend.

So new gTLDs will be discussed with the GAC on Saturday and Whois on Sunday, but the plan is to have a report from each of the working groups of council that would be IDNs, protecting the rights of others and reserved names at the Council Public Forum, which is Wednesday and that public forum begins - Glen, I think at 8 am?

Glen Desaintgery: Eight am or 8:30 am, I think.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Okay. So either 8 am or 8:30 on Wednesday, and the expectation would be that each of the working groups would make a report. Probably the Chair would make the report, and then there will be public comment that's how the council is typically done in the past.

So, you guys want to be thinking about not only the completeness of your report, but your group and your subgroup is going to be there and the kind of expertise that you build up in your subgroup, so that you would be able to neutrally manage and fill any questions about the

recommendations from your subgroup, even if the recommendation is the need for continued work.

But I just want you to be thinking about that so when we get through these reports that we can have a bit of discussions, and then maybe ask Chuck at that time to come back in and give some thinking as the Chair about how he might see managing that report and making sure that there is an opportunity for feedback from the community.

The council will then meet. And then, of course, part of the question that the working group will need to include in its final report, which is due to be concluded and delivered to the council on the 16th is what is our recommendation about whether we are continued for that 30 days or whether our work is completed and the council should make other plans to continue or conclude work that is not yet completed.

Just to refresh everybody's memory, the way the statement of work read and the council approvement of the statement of work was that we would conclude our work by Lisbon. And if we were to be continued, it would be for a 30-day period to conclude specific work.

So, the final report that Chuck will be wanting to take into Lisbon as the Chair needs to include that recommendation of whether or not the council is asked for that additional 30 days and what would be done during that 30 days.

Can I pause and ask if there are any questions about that?

So let me just say one other thing that as we walk through this and I'm going to ask each of the presenters to make their presentation. And then I'm going to open it for a queue of questions.

I want people to remember that while we're trying to get to (wrap) consensus on Straw recommendations, in some subgroups there will be Alt1 and Alt2. So if that's where your subgroup is, you should be thinking about whether you need to have a Alt1 and Alt2 recommendation.

But those should be as minimal as you can make them. And we then need to get the full group support to the recommendations or any enhancements to them, so that we don't have a lot of duplicate recommendations unless we absolutely need to have options in there.

But in some cases, there will be a need for - there won't be consensus in a subgroup on a particular recommendation, but the goal is to get to as much consensus as possible at the full group.

So can I - at this point, start Tim, turn it over to you, ask you to walk us through your report, and then I'll take the queue for discussion and questions on your report.

Tim Cole: Okay. Let's get the speakerphone adjusted properly.

ICANN and IANA Reserved Names. The - there was a background. It's that - it's an overview of the current status. It gives out the Table 1 sets up the gTLD and question, and shows that the changes -- some changes by date of agreement from PCS - PSO to CCNSO, etcetera.

But those names are set forth there. They're also ICANN - IANA related names and they're set forth in Table 2. There's no controversy about them.

The justification for the ICANN reserved names was that they're essentially acronyms as it relate to the organization structures or bodies and functions as they have evolved. And the schedule of reserved names was borne of a new gTLD registry agreement early 2001.

The basic point with consultation of ICANN officials is that no one recalled any record of any public or private document that describes the rationale for having scheduled names list or that describes the reasons why particular strengths were included or excluded.

The - some members of the working group on Reserved Names believe that ICANN and IANA should not be able to reserve this. Other entities must register names in order to keep them from public use.

Patrick Jones has a new point that's raised in another context that I've included at the chairman's direction, and that is just to say that ICANN and IANA would like to be able to deregister - sorry - de-reserve and register these names if justified for particular uses in the future.

IANA's reserved names have much the same - from as before it is not a set of documents that describes, but they are reserved, but they are things like AFRINIC, APNIC, ARIN, EXAMPLE, GTLD-SERVERS, IETF, etcetera.

The - so that inquiries there did not, you know, come up with any other answers than the obvious ones as they relate to the basic functions of IANA.

The recommendations now established in the format that Chuck put forward so that at the top level in ASCII, the question as for more work, the answer is for some, yes.

And my recommendation is that ICANN and IANA reserved names should continue to be reserved pending a decision of the GNSO to vary this status. So it may - they may not always continue to be reserved, but at the moment, they would continue until a decision is made otherwise.

As for the IDN implications, the only concern that was raised by Masters Mohan and Carp was in relation to the word "example" where it alone of those reserved names might be - I think the words were reserved in ACE encoding. In other words, it might be reserved in languages other than English for particular purposes, but that was on open question.

For all, but the word "example", such as for LATNIC, IETF, etcetera -- these names were to be simply kept as individual designators without translation.

The - again, at the second level, the recommendations are the same as for the top level. For the third level, it's reserved in the case of .pro and .name as appropriate or as the GNSO direct, and the IDN implications were the same as above.

In other words, this was appropriate to have in reserve for particular registry such as .pro and .name that was fine, but there is no change in the IDN. The only one that might be subject to translation is that the correct word was "example". The rest were simply to be kept.

In terms of consultation with experts, basically, we simply inquired of ICANN and said, "Well, what is your position on these things?" And they have asked that they be kept reserved. And they have said, they have started a documentation search regarding these reservations and we'll make contacts with those involved in making the reservation.

One point made by Dan Halloran was that in relation to IANA or ICANN in terms of the reserved names, if they were disputed, the entire UDRP process is under the (unintelligible) of the ICANN. This would have the effect of making it appear that ICANN was sitting in judgment of its own interest. He thought it's a better way to avoid this possibility was to keep them reserved.

The paragraph on IDN implication states the views of (masters) Carp and Mohan that they were to be kept as integral designators without translation with the exception of the possible exception of the word "example".

As Ram Mohan (would) find the equivalent and reserve them at that time, don't try to translate them referring to the acronym. And that sort of that's where it is.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I'm going to take a queue, but I'm going to start with a question for you Tim.

Tim Cole: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: I understood your recommendation to be that the GNSO might decide
                 to change status at a later time.

Tim Cole: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Let me just be sure that I understand the recommendation there.

                 I think one of the things yet to be determined is actually what the
                 process is to make a change in the reserved status, and that is what I
                 think the GNSO does need to discuss after it gets this report from the
                 working group…

Tim Cole: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: … that is everyone - the full report from the working group.

Tim Cole: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: Given that ICANN has not unreserved names except for those
                 categories in the appendix, which say that they maybe unreserved.

                 And given that the appendix has a statement that says express -
                 except with the agreement of ICANN, I think maybe we ought to flag
                 that recommendation with a question mark and ask what impact would
                 be the process to change the status at a later date. Would (it then) to
                 take only a recommendation from the GNSO, or is there a view that it
                 would have to take a board level approval because it's policy,
                 etcetera?

And I don't know the answer to the question. I think we just need to flag that question.

Tim Cole: So, really the question is, what process would unreserved them?

In other words, the premise of my recommendation is that GNSO could vary the status and it may not be the GNSO, so you're saying it could be the ICANN board itself.

Marilyn Cade: I'm asking the question of, you know, it - does the GNSO could recommend the change in status?

Tim Cole: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And I think that's what you said, right? The GNSO…

Tim Cole: No. I had - I used the word "decision" rather than recommendation. I can put in recommendation here or change it to (capture) your meeting. I didn't wish to be categorical, but the thing I don't know the answer to myself.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Tim Cole: I was just talking it over with Chuck and that was a sort of pending your, you know, I was trying to accommodate actually.

If you want my basic view, if I don't think there's going to be a hope and hell of these are going to be unreserved. But certain other members of the working group thought that they should be….

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Tim Cole: … unreserved, and I was trying to accommodate a view here.

If you had my view, I will simply say keep them reserved. But since people were - some people thought that they might wish to have them unreserved, I was trying to accommodate that future possibility.

However, that is accommodated, that's fine.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I want to open this up to others. I just wanted to flag that as a question…

Tim Cole: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: … that I think the working group needs to ask itself overall…

Tim Cole: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: … and take into the recommendation to the council on any changes, and that is do - does the working group think that that GNSO council should be able to propose a change and that change will be made, or is there - and does it vary across the different subgroups or in some cases, is there going to be a situation where such a change would require board agreement?

And, you know, I haven't had a chance to go into detail thinking on that. I don't know if Chuck has - or (Mark) want to comment on that at

the end when we get to the report. But it's a question that I think ought to be raised overall in relation to our recommendation.

Tim Cole: Okay. Got it.

Marilyn Cade: But let me take a queue and see who might want to ask questions at Tim.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'd like to - or make a comment based - related to what you just said.

Marilyn Cade: Great. Avri?

Michael Palage: Palage.

Marilyn Cade: Mike Palage, yeah.

Anyone else?

Chuck Gomes: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I do - well, I have one question for Tim.

Marilyn Cade: Why don't you - why don't we - let you ask first since you're off mute, and then we'll go through the rest of the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. It's a short question.

Tim, one of the issues that came up in the IDN meeting and we've talked about since then is the terms http, https and html. I don't think I heard you say anything about those in your report.

Tim Cole: No. Because when I checked it out, Chuck, I found that I'm supposed to deal with those three letters not in this one, but in the NIC Whois - the other three-letter report. So I worked - I found out that they were not reserved as, you know, and I put that language into that report.

I was apparently in error in putting them into this report in Version 12. I took them out and Version 13 does not have them in. They're going into the other one.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. And I think that must be okay because Chuck has come back on mute.

So I'm going to go to Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Hi.

Yeah, I just wanted to sort of emphasize what you were saying. I think that everything both these working group does and the new gTLD, you know, taskforce, etcetera is not immutable -- everything can change overtime. So I think the general question is what needs to be asked on any of these recommendations, what is the necessary processes? Is it another PDP process to change what gets decided this time around?

Marilyn Cade: Another PDP process just to be clear, Avri, for some who might not be involved in the present PDP process, PDP '05 is dealing with PDP -- December '05 is dealing with the policies for new gTLDs, and the

question we had hoped to do as much work as possible in making recommendations relative to those policies -- to these working groups speeding in additional recommendations and completing (word) areas that haven't been thoroughly examined.

So your question, which is an excellent one is, are we going to achieve some of that to our work? Will a separate PDP or multiple PDPs be needed on some of these topics, some of these…

Avri Doria: That wasn't necessarily. I mean, yeah, that would probably be ancillary to what I was saying.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: But basically, once the decisions are made…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: …vis-à-vis this gTLD process…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: What will be the process for changing it? And if it's a regular PDP process including reserved name, then if we want to go through a change in the contents of that list, either addition or deletion, what is the process? Is it the PDP process?

Marilyn Cade: Okay. And so, can I just offer - can I ask you a further question?

You were involved, I think, when we did the - you have to refresh my memory, but some folks were involved when we did the PDP on New Registry Services.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And that PDP was about establishing a framework of guidelines handed off to the staff who then actually developed the procedures.

Avri Doria: Could be, that could be, (yeah).

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I just want to be sure I understood…

Avri Doria: I mean, that's not for us to decide unless we want to recommend it. That's the question.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you very much.

And Mike, can I turn to you?

Michael Palage: Yeah. Tim, I appreciate the attempted changes that you've tried to make. Unfortunately, not to be an American lawyer, I don't think they probably reflect the legal president that this report is setting.

And, just don't - and I guess my question Marilyn or Chuck if you're on mute is, how would I be able to go as either in appendix to this or something to provide what I think are the legal president to the setting? And potentially, as I've articulated in other emails, ICANN interfering with the ability of other rightholders to have used of their names. So that's my question is.

I don't think we're going to resolve it on this call. I want us to - in the order of efficiency get through the other reports. I'm just - I'll go ahead and document what I think is very imprudent in action on behalf of ICANN insisting that these names continue to be reserved.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So I'm going to….

Chuck Gomes: Marilyn, can I jump in on that?

Marilyn, can you hear me?

Michael Palage: I hear you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And Mike, what I've indicated in the - everybody - first of all, we have to be able to decide as a group whether we're going to approve in given recommendations, same as putting this forward for the whole group to consider and specifically debate that tomorrow in the call.

But in cases where there are exceptions to the group position, I will ask those who have a different opinion to write a minority opinion and that will be inserted in this deck, after the table of the recommendation is what I'm thinking right now.

Okay. I want go back on you, but I wanted to clarify that.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, thank you.

Yeah, they just reiterate what I think our understanding (is).

I am however going to offer something -- a thought to all speaking as the Chair for the day. I get a little concern about the fact that sometimes I think we all forget that we're being recorded and transcribed, and that we are speaking to an audience of not necessarily native English speakers and not necessarily people who are drowning in the acronyms of ICANN.

So, maybe as we ask our questions, we will - we should try to also not just give our names, but also not speak in acronyms where possible, but also try not to use a language that comes across as being hostile. That's not necessarily what's being meant, but it can come across that way in the transcription.

And let's go onto the next report. And I'm going to - Patrick, right now, where we are is, I think that we could do Tim Ruiz's report, and then do you third and still give us plenty of time to - if we stand 30 minutes on Tim's report.

But the thing I'm little bit worried about, I think your reports never had - this report that you're going to do has never had any discussion and there will be a lot of discussions on it. It might take more than 30 minutes.

Patrick Jones: That's fine.

And just to note, I'm reading this report on behalf of Mike who can't be available since he is the leader of the subgroup.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So maybe I will go ahead and have you do that to make sure that we can have complete discussion on it, and just give our apologies

to Mike for not being able to change the orders since you have to drop off.

Are you prepared to go ahead?

Patrick Jones: Do you want me to go ahead now?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: Sure.

Our subgroup has had a pretty big task to cover all the issues related to single and two-character names at the top level and the second level. And so, we've divided up the categories into single and two-character symbols -- the first and second level, single letters and numbers at the first level, single letters and numbers at the second level, two letters and numbers at the first level and two letters and numbers at the second level.

Rather than spend a lot of time on each of the categories, maybe I should skip ahead to the role, and then go over the star recommendations. Is that sound like a reasonable fast-forward?

Marilyn Cade: I want to be sure that everybody understand why we divided it into the multiple categories, and that was because we felt that they maybe treated differently in terms of a recommendation and that's what still being debated. But that's why we have so many sub-categories.

Patrick Jones: That - and there could - definitely maybe a need for more work on individual categories.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible)

Patrick Jones: There are technical issues or potential technical issues or potential policy and political issues related to some of the categories. And so, in order to move some of them forward, we separated them out.

Marilyn Cade: Terrific. So do you want to just go ahead then?

Patrick Jones: Okay.

On - to start with single and few character symbol, today, only ASCII characters are permitted in the DNS. This would be letters X and Z numbers 0 through 9 and the hyphen dash.

The period has a special status; it's permitted at the separator for labels, and no other symbols are permitted in the DNS -- the left of the TLD.

There are some discussion that - is probably required on symbols at the top and the second level. And I'll discuss the recommendations a little later, but I want to move on to the next category, is single character, letters and numbers at the top level.

We have an RFC 1035 that we've included in the background material and that they - the main names must start with a letter, end with a letter or digit and have as an interior characters only letters, digits and a hyphen. And there are also restrictions on links. Labels must be 63 characters or less.

ICANN has received in the past an application for a single letter TLD. This came in 2000 for the .itld, the application was not approved.

And we - the subgroup feels there maybe potential user confusion issues and other technical issues that are identified related to single characters and numbers at the top level.

The next category is single characters at the second level. All the registry agreement -- all 16 agreements provide for this reservation at the second level.

The policies have been in placed at least in the mid-90s when John Postel reserved all the remaining single letter names in the name of IANA. Six common - that names had already been released, and those names are grandfather then.

And Kim Davies in IANA has provided some research on the number of possible combinations of single character names that are already in the DNS within the ccTLDs as well as gTLDs, and that's included in the material.

And why don't I skip ahead (unintelligible).

It appears that the original purpose on reserving single characters was driven by technical concerns. Those could be addressed through further work and two-character reservations based on concerns about potential confusion with two-letter country codes.

This brings me to the next category.

Two characters, letters and numbers at the top level. Today, two-character TLDs have only been released for country code and this is based on the ISO 3166 list. This list has been used by IANA and ICANN since the mid-80s. This goes back to RFC 920.

This is done because IANA is not in the business of deciding what is - is not a country. And so, IANA is live on the list that's created by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. This is also has been put into RFC 1032 and RFC 5091.

We have received - the subgroup has received correspondents from Chris Disspain, the Chair of the ccNSO as well as from IANA that strongly recommends that the current reservation remain in place. And I'll bring this up and cover the Straw recommendations in a moment.

With regard to two characters, letters and numbers at the second level, in 2001, .aero as opposed limited release two-character - two-letter airline code. And the GAC issue to communicate, but noted based on the WIFO to report that if two-character names were to be released in domain and the gTLDs, they should be done - released in a manner that minimizes the potential for confusion with any country codes.

And this recommendation has been included in 14 of the 16 gTLD register agreements. We have languages put in to the report.

And since 2001 ICANN has received either on a one-to-one basis request from registries to release one or two-character names at the second level, or as recently with (pot) name proposal to release two-character names at the second level that will be shared and also use as email addresses.

Since then, ICANN also received and posted a request from .cat to release three - two-character names for universities that serve the Catalan language and linguistic communities.

This brings us to the Straw recommendations. Do you want me to take a break right now or I can answer questions or just proceed into the recommendations?

Marilyn Cade: I just think it is probably helpful to tell people that as you proceed into the recommendations, you might want to just describe sort of the fact that the subgroup is divided on some and in agreement on others to feel that that's the stage for going the recommendation.

Patrick Jones: Okay. The first recommendation is on symbols and we recommend the current practice be maintained, but no symbol other than the hyphen and the dot be considered for use at any level. And this is because there are or could be potential technical issues related to any other symbols in the DNS.

The next recommendation was on single-letter and number TLDs, and this was an area that were - that is not agreement within the subgroup.

Alt1 is - we recommend that single letters and numbers be allowed at the top level. Alt2 is we recommend that single letters and numbers be reserved at the top level. So it's a pretty big gap and we'll let the full working group discuss that further.

On two-letter top level domains, again, this was an area we did not have - in the sub-group.

Alt1 recommendation number one is that we recommend the two-letter TLDs be allowed, provided that measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding county codes are implemented, and that a standardized approach should include - should be used that ensures consultation with the ccNSO, the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency and where technical issues are identified the Registry Service Technical Evaluation Panel.

Alt2 is we recommend that current practice is allowing two-character names at the top level only for CCs remain at this time. The subgroup has been strongly encourage to retain the use of the ISO 3166 list, and there is a risk of collisions between any - if two-character names were allowed to be released at he top level and a country was added to the ISO list in the future.

Another recommendation on one letter and one number as well as two-number TLDs. This requires further work and discussion among technical experts before any other recommendation can be made.

The next category was single letters and numbers. That's three different recommendations on these.

Alt1 is that a registry could propose release of single letter and number strings through the process for new registry services.

Alt2 is that currently reserved names -- single letter and number names maybe released through a framework to be developed which treats the release and allocation of single letters. (Unintelligible) by allocating them by an auction to parties with demonstrated rights, allocates fund

to benefit ICANN stakeholder interest and reduce future dependency on registry-registrar contribution.

Alt3 is a - in quotes a drop and grab model putting the names into the secondary market for auction and sale.

Next category is on two letters and numbers at the second level and the existing registry agreement provide a method of potential release of two- character ASCII names at the second level.

We've been through the process for new registry services provided that the proposing registries implement measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes.

And I think that's it.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Patrick.

So, I want to - I think we're doing fine here to allow discussions - by topics and again, because we have not walked through this report before, I want to take this in some detail and make sure that other members of the full working group have a chance to ask questions.

So, I just want to pull up and I know that I did not do a formal roll call before, Glen, so I'm just going to read in the record the members of the working groups on the call.

So, we have Marilyn Cade, Avri Doria, Victoria.

Victoria, help me you're your last name.

Victoria McEvedy: McEvedy.

Marilyn Cade: McEvedy. I'm going - have to work on that.

Tim Denton, Edmon Chung, Chuck Gomes, Dan Dougherty, Tim Ruiz and Mike Palage.

(Unintelligible) show is on the call at this time.

Alistair Dixon: I'm on the call too, Marilyn. It's Alistair.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, Alistair. You're not showing up on my faithful screen.

I'm glad we're doing this roll call to know that you're with us. Thank you.

So, have I missed anyone else?

Okay. I do want to walk through this and…

Sophia Bekele: And, I guess, I was in mute. Sorry, this is Sophia.

Marilyn Cade: Hi Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: But - so, Glen, if you'll just note in addition to the folks that we're seeing on the screen view. We have Alistair and Sophia.

Okay. Let me start out with the report, and I want to be sure that we - just I want to go section-by-section quickly and then get into the discussion.

Anyone who have any questions about the overview and background?

Okay. Any questions about our discussion in 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 where we go into more detail, 1.6 we go into more detail explaining this and giving the background in detail on each of these.

I'm going to take that as no and pause to thank the primary researcher and author of much of this work, Patrick Jones, for all the work he's done, because he's been a fantastic. We relied on him for a huge amount of this and, Patrick, we should say thank you for that.

Let me move to two -- the role of the name reservation requirement.

And there we basically have outlined our understanding -- largely the additional purpose of reserving serving single characters was driven by technical concerns, and two-letter reservations appeared to be based largely on concerns about confusion with two-letter country codes.

And that is the - I think what our research have indicated to. Are there any comments on that from anyone on the call?

Then I'm going to move to Straw recommendations and a discussion line to anyone who wants ask the group questions about Straw recommendations.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I have a question.

Marilyn Cade: Great, Avri. Let me see if anyone else wants you join you in the queue.

Michael Palage: Palage.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, we have Avri and Mike.

                  Did I hear you coming off mute? Maybe not.

                  So we'll start with you Avri, and then go to Mike and see of anyone
                  else wants to ask questions after that.

Avri Doria: Yeah. In terms of technical detail being the reason for something, I
                  noticed that in one case we say, no, I think it was to do with symbols
                  that we don't know there might be technical reasons for some. We're
                  not - and I, again, we're not sure (as I have) seen from the technical
                  side, that while there are maybe some symbols that have a technical
                  issue, there are other symbols that appear not to. So in that case, we
                  say no because there maybe technical issues.

                  In other places, we recommend that the technical issues be studied
                  and I have a report in front of me right now, so I can't name which one,
                  that - do you know that sort of the deliberations or the study continue
                  until we really know whether there are technical issues to not do
                  something, or it's permissible technically to do it.

                  So, I'm wondering if there was a real difference between why in one
                  case know even that we're not sure, and in the other case, well, let's
                  wait and see until we are sure.

Marilyn Cade: You know, I'm going to try to answer - make sure I understand your question, and then let Alistair and Patrick comment, but I want to be sure I understand your question first of all. We that the subgroup has the recommendation that is about symbols at all levels

Avri Doria: Right. And we say that they should be continued to be reserved…

Marilyn Cade: And…

Avri Doria: … because there might be technical issues.

Marilyn Cade: And I'll come back to that so, what we - the report separates the discussion about technical issues, about numbers and letters from symbols and then says, symbols should be treated universally and that's what you're questioning them about, right?

Avri Doria: Basically, yeah. I mean the question is…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Avri Doria: … we're giving technical details different ways and different issues and I'm just sort of (that line).

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. I did - I should where to have a little bit and that is I guess, some of the research on this, but let me see if Patrick wants to comment or Alistair before I say anything about the symbol issue.

Patrick Jones: I actually don't have anything to add on the symbol issue. We received feedback from a number of experts and others, and most of what

they've said is that symbols should be allowed in the DNS other than the hyphen. Maybe someone else can add more to that.

Alistair Dixon: It's Alistair here.

My understanding was symbol - the problems of symbols is that use an encoding and this has been about the use of (being) - uses symbols on the DNS for that reason.

I think, Avri, you were also (though) you're asking what were the technical reasons in relation to these other characters. And I mean, I think basically, I mean, there are two different technical reason for like this on - and the for single letters and been - and numbers in two letters.

The single-letter concern as I understand that is there are two concerns -- one is a concern about risk for the security and instability of the (unintelligible) - from single characters with mistyping and also concerns about visual confusion, what single characters like O and zero or one and L.

And then - as far as the two-character TLDs are concerned, that the concern was confusion around in relation to the CCs -- the country code.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Okay. Can I follow-up?

Marilyn Cade: Oh, yeah and then we'll go into Mike after, but let me let you finish.

Avri Doria: Okay. So - okay what I was really dealing with were the technical issues are being treated indifferently into different (bases).

I guess the other thing that concerns me at that point is one, and that we're widening the notion of technical to deal with security or misunderstanding or the confusability issue.

Patrick Jones: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: And not with what I would consider strictly technical, which is, it makes the DNS technical systems, the software, the look up sale in some manner.

And so what I'm really, I guess, concerned is that we're not sort of saying, let's truly understand what all the technical details are, and if a particular symbol - I think the fact that symbols might be use in coding is a strange one because letters and numbers are use encoding also. So, I'm not really understanding the reasons and perhaps such as I haven't seen them.

From the technical side, I have seen that there maybe some DNS technology reasons why some of the symbols may indeed cause problems. I have not seen that sort of totally understood in this totality and sort of a list of all the symbols and what problems they cause.

And so, that the blanket (television) or the blanket reservation without technical understanding and review that equal across all the category concerns me, and then - but that's more of tomorrow's topics, and - but I understand now.

Marilyn Cade: Avri, then let me ask you a follow-up question and then go on to Mike.

So, it sounds like you're suggesting that the group might want to consider instead a modified recommendation that says - so, I think the recommendation was we're recommending not be considered the release at this time at any level, but we didn't - the group didn't go on to say we recommend further detailed analysis related to each of the symbol. Is that what you would be…

Avri Doria: Basically, yes. The same phraseology that was used, as I said, I don't have to report in front of me, but there's specific phraseology used later about some of the categories where they thought there might be…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: … technical issues.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: So that same terminology is what I am saying. I don't understand the difference.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, I think that's well-noted, and I certainly - Alistair and (Don) that who are on the subgroup, we'll take note of that and that's very much appreciated.

Can I go to Mike now?

Michael Palage: Thank you, Marilyn.

I guess my comment has to do with, I guess, recommendation 3.2 - the (2L).

I was wondering if either your self or Patrick would be able to discuss some of the dynamics that were involved regarding these two alternates Straw recommendations, and I'd like to hear the viewpoints of the members within the committee before possibly (waiting) and articulating on that particular recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: We had this discussion in the group and that was whether we should show- have a show as support for each of the Alt. Is that was you're asking for?

Michael Palage: As I said, I - before commenting, I would like to understand the members within the group to discuss this on a much more detail basis. I would like to hear their concerns and their views and that will help me then provide a basis for making my comments.

So, who is in favor and why and who is opposed? Who is in favor of Alt1, and who is in favor of Alt2, and if possible, if those members could articulate the basis of their support for the particular recommendation it would help me.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Patrick, do you want me to do that or do you want to do that?

Patrick Jones: Why don't you take (a lead) there?

Marilyn Cade: Sure. Let me do this is in summary fashion and then give Mike a chance to do a follow-up.

I think we try to capture it in our document and in the recommendation. The recommendation received from the feedback we received from IANA, from the CCNSO chair, who is also a manager of a CC and from - informally, from some government who had also expressed their concern about collision indicated that there were sufficient, and I will say to me, indicated that there was sufficient concerns about changing the treatment at the top level that would make this very problematic and controversial for ICANN and for all of us.

Michael Palage: So, this is single letters? I mean, single letters at the top level? That's my question.

Patrick Jones: That's the typo in our report so, Mike is referring the 3.2 and, Marilyn, you went ahead to cover two-letter TLDs, which should be actually by 3.3.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, Mike. I was.

Michael Palage: Okay. And as I said, let me, for the record, I guess, I agree that the two-letter were reservations.

Again, that's - I'm probably in agreement there. I don't have an issue.

As Patrick said, on the original 3.2, which is single letters at the top level and that's what I'm trying to.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I will address that.

The Alt1 was supported by (Mike Brodenbach).

Michael Palage: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And I will let Alistair speak to whether he supports one or two and I supported Alt2.

Michael Palage: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And I think my - so I'll let Alistair speak whether he supported either one of those.

I think idea of further work was discussed some detail in the working group and that we didn't capture that in the recommendation, but they're certainly was consideration that before there was any change in this area that there would have to be significant additional work.

Michael Palage: Okay, thanks.

Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Do you want - oh, sorry. Do you want me to explain more?

Michael Palage: Yeah. I'd like your input on this, and since we don't have (Mike).

Alistair Dixon: Sure. I might - I guess my inclination will be for Alt1.

Well, the two reasons put forward for reservations are single letters and numbers where first, the risk is mistyping, and secondly, they knew the confusion with at least some characters.

Now, they were some research done by ASCII in relation to single letters and numbers at the second level, and whether these concerns is around mistyping in particular were actually a legitimate concern. And it was sound at least in that report that the likelihood of mistyping was quite low. And so therefore, that particular board recommended the release of a single character at the second level.

And, I guess, my assessment would be that on that basis, single characters at the top level might also be considered. But I guess my view is further research is certainly required before this Straw recommendation strengthens in any way. I think it is truly a Straw recommendation at the moment.

Michael Palage: Thank you, Alistair. That actually is very helpful and actually almost is exactly in-sync with what I was thinking.

I specifically noted in that section on single level, top level - single-letter, top level domains, the point about potentially user confusion.

I saw that if that was going to be the basis to go with Alt2 or to deny Alt1, I thought that was potentially equally be applicable to the use of single letters at the second level. So, I fully agree with that logic there.

Notwithstanding that, I do tend to lean towards Alt1, perhaps along the lines or what you would just comment that this is just something I just, again, just like to put out for consideration is perhaps altering Alt1 to say we recommend single letters be allowed at the top level, unless, prior to the commencement of the next TLD round, there are valid document and technical provisions or reasons against these types of TLDs.

And the reason that I just sort of put that out for consideration to the group is, I think all too often we have seen things in ICANN take the slow road to wherever, and I think what we need to do is I don't think there has been any technically documented reason against this provision.

So, I think we should put the (unintelligible) on those that might believe that there are to come forward within the next, you know, six to eight months and document that. I think that would be very prudent.

If we just leave - if we go with the current Alt2 saying that we need some more research, that more research unfortunately in ICANN terms may take years if not decades. And I think, you know, unless there's a valid technical reason we should, if you will, favor in terms of these allocations.

So with that, I mean - I think Alistair, what you were saying that - would you agree or disagree or is that something other people on the group would like to comment on as an alternate between those -- the two state of recommendations as they are now.

Alistair Dixon: Certainly, Mike. I would support your proposed recommendation, but I will let others speak - three of you.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I'm actually going to try to move this along and see if you could do the rest of that question, Mike.

I'll be at the list so, lots of other people could comment, because we do need to go to the rest of the report and then move to the other two reports we haven't heard from and we're now at the top of the hour.

So, Mike, I ask you to post to that question to the list so that others could comment to?

Michael Palage: Not a problem. I will do that now. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Alistair.

Can I go back to a queue and see if there are any other questions about the rest of the recommendation?

I'm not hearing any. So, I just want to make a comment about where this could be in terms of technical consultation, and that is we're not nearly as for long as we had hoped to be, and although there are some questions to some technical experts, we're kind of getting questions and answers in bits and pieces.

And so, we're going to have to do something more aggressive about getting technical feedback which we'll be trying to do over the next week in order to have that done by the time we get into the final column (15th).

I'm going to go to Tim, if I can for the Controversial Names report.

Dan Dougherty: This is Dan Dougherty.

Can we go back to Mike's question since there are other people in the queue and there are questions? Could we give him a little more time in that?

Mike, are you saying that you're proposing a third alternative for, I guess, what is 3.2?

Michael Palage: I guess, it's not a third alternative. It would be a modification of Alt1, which says we should go for. There's no reason for us not to go forward, so I would recommend going forward.

But in case there are technical reasons that we do not fully appreciate within this group, we should at least allow the technical community to bring these forward going the next three to six months as ICANN begins to finalize the RFC process for new TLDs.

So I'm trying to put (owners) on the technical community to come forward because if in fact there is a business that would like to move forward with a business model or innovate something, I, you know, to me, I always prefer to innovation unless there is a technical reason to, if you will, halt that or impede that innovation.

Dan Dougherty: And I guess - just to better understand. I know what you said about trying to shift the (owners) to others that if there are concerns to come forward with it so it doesn't delay the process.

Is that and I'm just wondering out loud, is it better to sort of shift (owners) in that way to move it forward or is it better just to make the recommendation that could be allowed?

Michael Palage: The only reason I - that the reason offered that compromise was in attempt to, if you will, bridge the gap between Alt1 and Alt2. In listening to Marilyn's initial concerns, she said that there might be technical reasons.

So, I was trying to find a middle ground between the Alt1 and Alt2, which appeared to be diametrically opposed. So, my proposed rewording of Alt1 was to sit there, and in tradition of consensus building, find something that's neutral, but we all could, if you will, rally upon. That was my attempt.

Dan Dougherty: All right.

Marilyn Cade: And I'll just make a follow up comment about being very permissive versus being conservative when you're trying to achieve change in an environment where the technical community feels that they ultimately need to ensure that nothing significant breaks in the introduction of change.

Certainly, putting a recommendation out that says we need to identify whether there are technical reasons and otherwise, we recommend moving forward. That's what I suggest that Mike post something proposing a modification.

But one of the things I think people need to keep in mind is technical opposition - strong opposition from the technical community to change. So, probably cost heartburn if not more at the board level, so we do need to think about what the documented rationale is for a change if it is post or concerns are raised by the technical community.

Avri Doria: Can I comment on that effect?

Marilyn Cade: I'm happy to take a comment on that and then I want to go on to the controversial names and report things.

Avri, why don't you take the floor?

Avri Doria: Okay. I mean, I agree with you that if there is some technical reasons, of course, one should go against the technical committee. I think one needs to be very careful though in deciding that one has identified the technical committee provisions.

That could be - I mean, involves its own process, involves its own investigation and has various technical points of view. I know we claim that technology is an absolute (truth) type of change, but indeed technology does have a various opinion. So, we need to be careful about indicating that a few voices represent necessarily an entire technical community.

Certainly, when a few voices raise the banner, we need to investigate, but we shouldn't estimate that we have the conclusions.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly, Avri. Thank you.

So can I turn to Tim now?

Tim Ruiz: Oh yes, Marilyn. Thanks.

Just (post) to the most current version of the report to the list this morning, so I apologize to the short time frame you have to take a look at it.

Kind of describing some of the conceptual changes that were made to the report or a lot of the change are structured in (nature).

In Section 1.1, we (knew) a lot of that material to (unintelligible) Section 1.1, and restated the current draft recommendation as currently is I think was that Marilyn's previous versions of the report.

So the current draft recommendation in the PDP December '05 final draft report is strings should not be contrary to public policy principles instead of the Governmental Advisory Committee draft that are principal.

And then we followed that with the - what we feel the four principles that apply to that particular statement or term of reference.

And then, we added to that some background information from the discussions that took place within the committee of the PDP December '05 committee, and as to why there was - support there was for that particular committee. And I won't go into detail onto that right now.

We also included them another section for discussion that's issued by subgroup members, only to the subgroup members could add comment in regards to the - either the GAC principles themselves or perhaps the discussion that took place among the different PDP committee in support of those GAC principles.

And I won't get into detail in those either if there's questions, I think would be best that there are - the member whose comments or the - but there questions about that.

Then we - 1.4 controversial names in the ccTLDs. We added an additional ccTLD previously. We have included US, IM, CM. And we also added SC in the current version of the report where some domain names are completely barred for registration, while others are reserved for the rightful applicant.

Several of the types are groups of names that are barred and reserved within the ccTLD have some correlation to current reserved name groups within gLTDs that we've been accepting. And some are - go beyond that, and they have a group called (misleading) group of names that are barred or yes, they're barred actually that because of the format or there - they could be confused with social security numbers or with other phone numbers that are reserved for I think such as an emergency call.

So then, getting into a roll of controversial reserved name-- the roll of those names, our research has shown that there's no apparent existing category may reserved at the second level with gTLD that are controversial.

The role of controversial second level names within several ccTLD varies and includes an array of concept such as protection of natural interest and legal activities (up send) and even social orders, and that we're seeing as the confusion with things such as social security numbers, phone numbers -- those kinds of things.

So then, in the Straw recommendations, the first thing to know is the definition of controversial names that we use in this report, you know, it'd be a name that qualifies the TLD under the then surveillance (unintelligible) criteria. But it does not fall under any other reserved names category and it's disputed for some reason other than the fact that it falls into another reserved name category.

Looking at the recommendations then, we've - we have some agreements on the first part of this proposal. I think there's consensus that we propose treating a category called Controversial Names for use at the top level only.

The process is also proposed to deal with either reserving or un-reserving these names during in the application process they (don't) want to be new gTLD.

There is a different proposal as far as how - what that process should be. The first is proposed and supported by Marilyn Cade and myself, and we're proposing that the process will be time-limited, shouldn't result in development of new categories of reserved names, although some controversial names might end up being considered highly controversial.

The approach would allow us a string that is proposing through that controversy or significant question to be put into the whole standard while the areas of dispute or controversy are addressed, both adequate and the finite time frame associated and at the disputed area fixed in the application or the end of the process in (queue).

Avri Doria has an alternate proposal, and to summarize her, if you can correct me where I might be wrong, but, then this process already exists. It's been a new process as (unintelligible) for handling controversial names.

Process that exist is the public comment period, the advice of the advisory bodies and in cases where there is national law that prohibits certain label, then the national law should apply to any applicant within that jurisdiction.

And in cases where processes of international law allows enforcement of one's nation's law an applicant from the different jurisdictions, then we'll start that this should apply.

And then again, we agree on the third recommendation which is a process or a lack thereof described in one of the alternatives (and two above). And those could be applied to new or existing strings as well under other reserved names categories that maybe geographic and geographical names or others and a process may apply equally well to main at the second level.

I'm sorry. That all applies to the top level ASCII string.

Looking at the top level, IDN strings, we feel more work there is also needed. The recommendations that we're making may apply equally well-tight in this copy although, but certainly, it's much more complicated and so more work we need to be done there.

At the second level for ASCII, we feel no more work needs to be done. Process is a (finite) to deal with controversial names, and the second

level should be left to the discretion of the gTLD registry operator, (steps) in that registry operator must comply with the applicable local law and regulation.

The second level for IDN, again, we feel the same thing would apply and also that work would be needed and it should be left in the discretion of the gTLD registry operator, again, with the exception of the (unintelligible) with local law and regulations.

Now, looking at this third level for ASCIIs or IDN and fill the same principles that we just - with the same recommendations, we just laid at the second level for both ASCII and IDN would apply in the same way to any gTLD that allows registration at the third level.

As far as the recommendations for the expert, actually, no experts at least at this point have been consulted. Questions will be developed if because we decide experts are needed.

Experts might include relevant context from the various ccTLD registries and particularly, those that we put in examples in the report. And we also recommend that whether within this working group or perhaps within (unintelligible), at some point, experts on process within international law should be consulted and have similar issues regarding controversial names are treated.

For example, the French government issues on the use of the word (Nazi). So that's what our report is at this point, I guess, we'll open up for questions.

Alistair Dixon: It's Alistair. Can I join the queue?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Alistair. I'm going to take a queue. I just want to note to people that I'm going to allow 10 minutes discussion max on this, because I want to be sure that I allow some time for Mike to comment on geography and geopolitical.

So, I have Alistair in the queue. Who else do I have in the queue?

Avri Doria: This is Avri with a question for you.

Marilyn Cade: Avri?

Avri Doria: While the report was going through, did people want to briefly - I know that Tim and I had some issue - discussions in there, and I wonder whether the people wanted to read these or whether those should have quickly been gone over, because I think when he was going through the report is that - and the people that made them should probably be the ones to talk to them, or is that not necessary at this point?

Marilyn Cade: Avri, I'm actually going to beg your indulgence to ask people to read them and post questions, because I want to be sure that we allow some time for Mike to report on his report, and we're going to be running out of time. Is that okay?

Michael Palage: Marilyn, this is Mike.

I mean, I have been making changes to the report since the first draft.

Marilyn Cade: Can I…

Michael Palage: They've not yet been circulate it to Avri and John. So, just from a timing standpoint, I don't know how much time I would need and if in fact there are issues that I think we want to discuss.

I mean, geographic names were always viewed as, if you will, one of the highest level fruits to begin with, so…

Marilyn Cade: Mike?

Michael Palage: Yes?

Marilyn Cade: Can I speak to you on this and then turn to you?

Michael Palage: Well, I just wanted - as the chair, I just wanted to let you know that particular issue from an allocation point.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Mike.

Can I finish the queue?

I have Alistair. We'll take the question from Avri and see if anybody wants to ask questions of the people who make comments, and then we'll turn to Mike for his report.

Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, I have to speak.

Actually, Avri's suggestion would probably - actually have addressed my question. I'm just wondering to understand basically, the reason for the alternate recommendation…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Alistair Dixon: … in terms of process because, I guess, the question in my mind is why applicable - or laws or international laws wouldn't apply, and why it was able to have an additional process on top of that?

Marilyn Cade: Tim, do you want to comment on that if you want me to summarize from our discussions -- the discussions we have in PDP '05 in Amsterdam and then subsequently?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Why don't we…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I just want to refresh people's memories that we discussed about concept in Amsterdam and in a couple of other - of the PDP '05 working sessions about trying to make sure that we didn't - that we had a process by which people could - was disputed and maybe disputed is a better word than controversial.

But if the name is disputed, what is the process that would allow us to the queue to go forward in terms of processing applications, and people to be able to deal with the dispute and potentially get back to and not have to wait - not clog the queue up, but also there's all things

that might be simple to resolve. Otherwise, they could pay a significant amount of money and for an application and then find themselves lost in limbo and have to restart the process at another point.

So in some ways, Alistair, the whole idea of this category was to try to figure out at the top level a mechanism to speed things on a fast track and have a process to let a disputed name, and that might be a better phrase, comeback into the queue as soon as they had dealt with the challenge, so to speak.

Alistair Dixon: Okay. Thanks, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So, I don't think that disregards anything else about letting, you know, and considering what it would take to dissolve the dispute, because the dispute could be the name you're proposing I have a trademark on, right?

Alistair Dixon: Right.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim, if I may add something to that deeply if it's all right?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Alistair Dixon: And, you know, as I've read over and over these two alternates, my own feeling is that they're not that far off, I mean, I think, and Avri is correct. I mean, there are going to be public comments that could raise issues, there are going to be advice from the advisory committees that might raise the questions for us.

International laws might apply - all I want to do is to be sure that there's something in place that will allow these disputed or contested controversial names to stay in the queue, so to speak, maybe in some kind of (stay) hold status while that's being resolved.

And if it's resolved positively, then that application can be end of the queue, so it had been to be dumped out and start all over again. And so that's my desire, so I'm not sure that these two alternates are really are that far off…

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Tim Ruiz: … that in the thinking.

Marilyn Cade: Again, I (think) that was the intent originally.

And I think, Avri, you might want to comment on whether - well, actually, did you have any comment on this?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I guess, when I looked at the general process that we've been going through in new gTLDs, there is a whole comment and challenge period that's being talked about in there, that doesn't take names out of the process, just takes them out of the first part of the process and put some (slow path).

And I think that general comment and challenge mechanism are in and belong in the general new gTLD mechanisms.

One of the things that I'm arguing and want to make specific here is that certainly for this class of names there is nothing special required,

and that because of, you know, the reasons given above that the trademark in ccTLD aren't necessarily applicable to our case.

Issues, I think it is like - issues basically that we shouldn't allow a veto by a single government. Issues that are sort of beyond the purview of ICANN to adjudicate that these either go to national laws or whatever.

So, anyone could challenge and comment just as they do now. And yes, one hope that we don't have a system where we're into end games that basically let a whole process go through and, I guess, (gain) at the end by an advisory committee that sort of, oh, you know, we work in different time frames, they're not far - we stop everything you're doing now, and, you know, but - so as long as that process would not gain and as people's pointing out, we cannot design a process that cannot be gained in some way by someone were all clever, some cleverer than others.

So, it was basically the point I'm making here is that nothing special is required for this class of names. We may want to give it a specific name and say controversial names are this class of names that I have no problem with giving that category and designation.

But I just don't think that, you know, anything new needs to be done for that it can be handled within the processes that are being created for new gTLDs and, you know, then it needs to go to national and international legal process.

Marilyn Cade: Avri, it's Marilyn. I think actually if someone who was involved in PDP '05 as you were, my understanding was that this is the process that

we're referencing. When we say that there would be an (in) thing could comeback in, but what - we can take that up.

But I would think one other thing that Avri's (missed) guidelines (all) Tim's attention is this issue of making of - raising a concern about a veto by a single government, and I think that's important points that you would called attention, Tim.

Any other questions for Tim or for Avri?

Alistair, are you okay?

Alistair Dixon: No, that's very helpful. Thank you, Marilyn.

I mean, it's - it actually strike to me that this, I mean, it seems to me given what you both just did, I'm just - I'm wondering actually is there much of a difference here in terms of these two alternate recommendations ultimately.

If actually effectively what you're saying is that basically the purview of that's being developed in PDP '05 is the one that should be followed, I mean, I'd agree with it.

Avri Doria: Can I comment where I think there's a difference at this point?

Marilyn Cade: You can. But before you do that, can I just ask you to think about something and then include that in your comment?

Avri Doria: Of course.

Marilyn Cade: I'd have been thinking that this needs to be renamed as disputed or
                  challenged names rather than controversial, because controversial is a
                  loaded work. And so I might just ask you to comment on the name of
                  the category, include that in your comments if you could?

Avri Doria: Okay. If we were making a general proposal that did not deal with the
                  whole notion of controversial names, but we were making a (meta)
                  proposal that for all disputed names, if everyone at the category that
                  we've been talking about reserved names, perhaps then, you know, I
                  would have to look at it differently.

                  But what we have in this case is we have basically a two-level
                  recommendation. One, we say is four what we call controversial
                  names and that is, you know, one of the things that we were mandated
                  to think about and may comment on. We recommend this process.

                  Now, this process is different than the process we currently have in the
                  main gTLD proposal.

                  And - okay, then we go further. Assuming that you'll accept this for this
                  category of names, then we go one step further and maybe you should
                  think about it for all the other names.

                  So, it's reverse of where if what you're talking about is that we
                  removed specific considerations of controversial name and we're just
                  making a recommendation for how within the overall gTLD process,
                  any challenge including, you know, trademark challenge, including, you
                  know, and any of the other categories we've come up be treated to that
                  then that's different. I mean, I still need to think it through because I'm

not that quick at thinking it through how it would apply to (every) or the others.

But, you know, but we're not doing that. We've cut out specific set - specific category. We've given that category a definition, you know, sort of an implicit definition, you know, it's not totally explicit but we all know that it means, you know, dirty words and words that people don't like and God words and stuffs like that. And as long as it's pertaining to that class of words, then there is a difference between the two proposals.

Marilyn Cade: So why don't we take that up within the subgroup and to have more conversation about it, and see how close we can get whether we are in fact divided. But - and we may be divided on some things and not on others and come back to the group by its (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: I think that makes sense Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I'm going to turn to Mr. Palage, and ask him to update us on where he is, because we're going to have through - I think we've got plenty of time to do that Mike. We're at about 1:27. It would be helpful to have you give us an update.

I didn't realized we didn't have an updated report, so maybe you could just give us a sense of where the group is and we could take some general questions and then come to a wrap up.

Michael Palage: Sure. Where the group is, is we're looking into a number of the reports. I mean, specifically the WIPO General Assembly which took up the

recommendations of WIPO2 regarding the protection of geographic names.

Unfortunately, the primary person that I was interfacing with (unintelligible) at WIPO was out of the office last two weeks. She see actually joined one of the calls yesterday so, part of, if you will, the gap and being able to document some different things on there, we sort of been on hold waiting for, if you will, on some feedback from WIPO, where I can tell you some of the issues that I - the questions that I am looking to do is in the general assembly meeting of WIPO, which is held in Geneva back in September to October 2002.

One of the draft recommendations talked about the protection being - with regard to geographic names. The protection should be extended to all
top-level domains, both gTLDs and ccTLDs. That was the original draft recommendation report.

However, on November 15, 2002 when the standing committee on the wall of trademarks, industrial designs and geographical indicators issued the summary report by the chair, the chair actually only called for the protection should be extended to all future registrations of domains in the generic top level - in generic top level domains.

So part of what I am looking at and again, I apologize for being an American lawyer is to see what changed from the reservation on all TLDs versus just generic TLDs, because if in fact we are looking at providing Sui Generis protection, which are not, if you will, recognized by the law, I think we need to be very careful on the recommendations that we make.

Again, this goes back to some of my previous comments regarding the ICANN and IANA Reserved Names. You know, what we are providing in that subsections or subset of names is Sui Generis protection that does not exist in any other law.

So, that, if you will, is where we're at, the fact that it appears that the majority of the group is going to go ahead with the recommendation of IANA and ICANN names is something that we're probably going to have to account for in this subset of names because it does directly touch on Sui Generis protection of rights that have never existed before. So that's where the group's at.

Marilyn Cade: Sure, Mike, let me ask you if you would to - I happen to know what Sui Generis protection is that I just suffer from having lift through the database efforts to have a database along the United States for number of years.

I don't suggest that everyone - could you give us a couple of minutes if you could please explaining why you think that having reserve status equates to creating Sui Generis protection, and I'm not asking you to be long and elaborate on it but a couple of minutes, and then just, if you would start out like explaining quickly what Sui Generis protection is.

Michael Palage: Sui - it's a Latin term. And basically, it is - what that means is you were providing rights that do not exist before.

So, in the context of the database protection, which was a very, if you will, highly debated topic back in the late 90s.

Under the US, there - under the database, a mere compilation of a database whether the Braille is not (protectable) under copyright laws.

When that decision came down, I believe it was (feist), in the (feist) decision. There were certain members within the business community that sought to get that protection and unabated that under the auspices of trying to harmonize it with the EU Law, which does recognize the compilation of database or if so, if you will, Sui Generis is the protection that is providing right that did not exist before.

So, that has been part of my - the basis of my legal reservations in connection with the ICANN and IANA names because the recommendations that we take in connection with that subset, in my opinion, will have a direct impact on what we as a group will have to do in connection with the geographic and geopolitical names.

With regard to the reservations of that, I'm trying to look in the WIPO report and I think I have quoted this before and it should be in the final report, hold on, and again, I…

Okay, here's the quote I'm looking for. It's from paragraph 287 of the second WIPO report.

Both points lead us to conclude that we have reached the limits of what can be achieved legitimately through the consultation process such as the WIPO Internet domain process or any similar ICANN processes. In other words, we agreed those co-mentors who are of the view that this particular question is more appropriately dealt with by government.

And that leads to Recommendation 288, which says it is recommended that the question of protection in the gTLDs of country names and names of administratively recognized regions in the municipalities be further considered in the appropriate intergovernmental fora in particular with the view to a discussion on the needs for new international laws for the protection of country names. So…

Marilyn Cade: So, thank you. But I want to - sorry, let me just restate my question.

Michael Palage: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: It's very helpful. But you were equating the creation of a reservation with creating Sui Generis protection?

Michael Palage: That's right. We - that is correct.

If someone - what we are doing, when someone cannot register domain name…

Marilyn Cade: But with the - in your opinion, Mike, according - I just want to be sure…

Michael Palage: It's not - can someone, right now, for example…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Michael Palage: I was talking with a trademark attorney who has a client - who has a United States federally trademark register for the term ASL.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Michael Palage: That attorney - the client said, can I register this name?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Michael Palage: The response of the attorney was, no, you can't.

So what ICANN has done is they have denied a business who has a nationally federally-registered trademark from registering that domain name at the second level.

And that to me - sorry, is ICANN saying, we are going to provide - we're going to exert rights over a subset of names. And what I think is important and what I've tried to raise time and time again in connection with that subset is what we do there, has a direct impact on the recommendations that we make with regard to the geographical names.

It's, you know, because what the government's are going to say is, it's fine for ICANN to come up with a subset of names, which it thinks it should protect, and it exerts protection on that. Why can't we have the same rights? It's a classic at, you know, the criticism will be do as I say not as I do.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Michael Palage: So, I'm trying to see - I'm trying to harmonize and reconcile the positioning in regard to IANA and ICANN names with what we do here.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, I want to take some questions but I just want to ask another - so, I just want to be sure that I understand you're equating the

creation of a reserved status with creating rights. And I'm not commenting when where are the other, I'm just trying to understand that that was quite you as - that you are not - does your subgroup support that or are we - is that still under development?

Michael Palage: Well, I'll ask Avri, what she feels on that. And she's on here.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Michael Palage: This is what I've been formulating, if you will, as an American lawyer, my apologies again, but, you know, Avri, John is not on the call, what are your comments on this?

Avri Doria: I guess, I'm still thinking about - I think I tend to support it. I tend to not be - probably for decent reasons.

In other words and just probably I should wait until I've formulated those more on reading. But, it wouldn't necessarily have lawyerly reasons for not wanting to reserve the names of all countries. I can see that notion and I can certainly agree that it's reasonable, probably have different reasons for not wanting to make such a grand addition to the list of reservation.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Do we have other questions for Mike?

Mike, I do have a question, and it has to do with stepping back and looking at political realities, because one of the challenges we have I think is there are technical issues to address, there are policy issues to address, and there's political issues to address.

Has your group talked about the political issues related with - I'm not personally convinced that creating a reservation list to create rights that I don't think that - and that means that a party can say, because his name is on the reserved list, it gives me trademark rights or some other associated or adjacent.

But leading that aside and we can talk about that.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: What about the political issues related with the fact that several governments have expressed very strong concern about and there is in fact, in the gTLD draft principles a principle that addresses, if governments have such a concern, right to reserve - what about the political issues related there?

Michael Palage: Well, I would go back to exactly the WIPO2 recommendations. They recognized these conflicts. They recognize the different governments and they, you know, again, I could read, you know, they've already stated that they have reached what they think is the end of what can be done through consultative processes. These are people which, you know, this is why this is high-hanging fruit, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. Okay.

Michael Palage: And again, just to sit there, but to go and let's look at - I think the GAC recommendations sit there and call for the names to not be reserved. The GAC principle is actually - I think is it reserved at no cost or used at no cost?

Marilyn Cade: No. It's reserved at no…

Michael Palage: It's a reserved at no cost.

Now, what happens is you get into a situation here of - and this goes to some of your other things as well, if some things reserved, what's the process by which a name, if you will, is allocated. You know, having dealt with the (affiliates) as reserved list of geographic names for the last five years.

Those names are reserved and, if you will, when a government wants a name, they come forward, we unreserve it and then, allow them to register it through an ICANN accredited registrar, you know, that, you know, if you will, that sort of works in that scenario. So I, you know, just (meant out) that's another data point.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So I'm going to have two more questions for you and that is, if you would just summarize for us very quickly where you think your group is on the consultation with experts, and you said it was high-hanging fruit, can you give us a sense of whether tomorrow or early next week, you think you would have Straw recommendations?

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Marilyn, can I just have your question?

Michael Palage: Sure, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: It's Alistair.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Alistair Dixon: I'm just - I'm just wanting to understand - given the situation with country codes, whether it - or at least makes us our country names are concerned that that had any implications for how to treat these names.

Michael Palage: It's interesting that you raised that Alistair.

The one - and I believe - one of the original draft proposals in the WIPO2 final report, that's wrap before the final talked about providing a reservation of the two-letter country codes at the second level, right?

Alistair Dixon: Right.

Michael Palage: However, final report did not contain that reservation. And one of these questions that I do have - that I've submitted to WIPO is, you know, does the fact that does not appear mean that that recommendation - it logically follows if it was there and it's been taken out, then the position is it should not be reserved at all of the second level. And I think that is really consistent with what our group was - that single letter and two letters were stating.

So, I don't think that the CCs actually help with the broader geographic and geopolitical terms. There's sort of a distinction and in the WIPO2 report. They do break that down the subset as far as ccTLDSs and geographical identifiers.

Marilyn Cade: So, Alistair...

Michael Palage: Does that answer your question, Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Yes, I think it does. You know, thanks, Mike.

Michael Palage: Okay. And I'll send you the - I could send you the paragraph from the WIPO2 report that explain that in detail so you could key in on that.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Great. And Mike, when do you - question of further consultation with experts, are there other experts you're thinking about consulting with?

Michael Palage: I've contacted WIPO. I've contacted the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the person who is responsible for geographical GIs, as they're called, geographical identifiers. And I've also identified but have not yet spoken to someone at the International Trademark Association who chairs the Geographical Identifier Committee as noted in my original draft report.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Michael Palage: It is very doubtful that these experts will really, if you will, reach consensus but we'll, if you will, be potentially be helpful in documenting the existing positions which most sides have been entrenched on for, you know, a rather long period of time.

Marilyn Cade: And the idea of when you might have Straw recommendation? Which might just include further work or refer it here or refer it there. But...

Michael Palage: I mean, what I'd like to do is I'd like to discuss that with Avri and John...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Michael Palage: ... and further particularly with regard to the other sub-committee report regarding the IANA and ICANN and so, I'd like to discuss it with them and as far as getting something to the group, as I said, I should have some time over the weekend to, if you will, knock this - I think knock-out something by the end of the week and allow Avri and John to, if you will, collectively circulate comments of - I would say as a target date, Monday.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I'm going to warn Chuck if he's still on the phone, and I think he is, but he may want to be prepared to come off as mute, but I have a couple of comments.

I want to run to the list of folks that I have still on that call and make sure that we have documentation of who's on the call now so that we can - I have Marilyn Cade, Glen, Avri, Patrick, Victoria, Tim Denton, Edmon, Chuck, Dan, Tim Ruiz and Mike Palage.

Avri who's still doesn't show - yes, here you are Avri, and I'm missing still Alistair and Sophia. Do I have anything else on the call?

Glen Desaintgery: Marilyn, can I fill in for you? You have got Sophia Bekele.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Neal Blair.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Tamara Reznik.

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Glen Desaintgery: And Greg Shatan. Have we missed anybody?

Marilyn Cade: Terrific.

Chuck Gomes: And Marilyn, I am off-mute.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And I'll stay off-mute for the rest of the call. (I hope it) goes too long.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. What I want to do now Chuck is actually go around the group and just remind people that tomorrow, we have - they have an extensive session with you on the chair, you've distributed a draft of report.

We also have groups who still have I think significant work that they're trying to wrap up. And I thought it might be helpful to kind of hear from people and from you what the guidance is on - what kind of flexibility you see given that you have between tomorrow and the 15th and the final report needs to be reviewed and agreed on the 15th so that it can go to the council on the 16th.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question before we start? This is Avri.

Marilyn Cade: Please.

Avri Doria: The final report - now, I know we keep talking about our final report as in something that is finished. But is the final report something that is finished or is it really a snapshot of how far we've got with some of the low hanging finished and some of the high-hanging perhaps not finished?

Chuck Gomes: All right. Comment on that Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Please.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. On the 16th, in our statement of work, we have to deliver our final report with regard to our assigned task that was, you know, and it's a finished work the 16th, okay?

                 Now, as Marilyn pointed out at the beginning of the call, there is the chance and I think it's probably high and we may be able to (enforce) that, if we want to, but if the council will ask us to extend their work for another 30 days. So, there could be another final report after that 30 days.

                 Avri, I think what we need to answer the question more directly. My opinion is that we need to present a final report on the 16th.

                 Now, elements of that report may say something like - this is one we frankly didn't finish, and so, we need another 30 days to try to come up with something more.

                 So, we're not going to be done as we've already indicated, with everything because we've already indicated in several cases that additional work is needed. Does that answer your question?

Avri Doria: Yeah, pretty much.

Marilyn Cade: And Chuck, I'm going to ask you to actually comment further because one of the things that I think not all of us have done yet is to realistically assess what is our sub-group recommendation for concluding work. So it isn't just work isn't completed. But here are the next - here's the timeframe and the process by which we think the worst could be completed.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Let me - before I talk to that, can I make a couple comments on what I heard today…

Marilyn Cade: Please.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ... at least for two other groups.

Tomorrow - and this is for everybody first of all, tomorrow in our call, our goal in the call is to specifically look at the Straw recommendations and try and convert them into working group recommendations. That is the primary part of our agenda tomorrow and that's going to take quite a bit of time.

But I - by the way, I appreciate what went on today which should facilitate that.

Now, in that regard, there's - and then, a comment on two other reports today - by the way, let me thank everybody for all the work that's gone

into this because it's been tremendous and very, very commendable.
So, let me appreciative for that as well as being appreciative for
Marilyn chairing us today while I was driving.

And by the way, I'm not driving at the moment. I've pulled on to a
parking lot, just outside of San Francisco.

So the - with regard to the single-character and two-character domain
names, one of the things that is really important and I sent (there's) an
email earlier today that you include in your recommendations have to
do with IDN.

When you're actually (unintelligible) recommendations into - and by the
way, it's okay to make a separate cable for each of the multiple
categories that you created. I assume you already realize that. That's
fine.

But one of the designs on the table to make sure we fill all areas and
your recommendation with regard to IDNs regarding single-character
and
two-character are very important because we could decide for
example, and I'm not suggesting this recommendation.

We could decide for example, to keep the reservation requirement for
single character or two character names and ASCII, and not
recommend anything for IDN and then, a potential outcome of that
could be that someone registers an IDN top-level domain that when
you convert it to the Unicode version, from the Ace version, you get a
single character name.

And so, that's something that's very important that you consider in your recognition, and I think that Ram and Cary provided us some help in that regard.

But you need - one of the things that's unique about single character and

two-character, you have to be careful about the reverse from the Unicode or the Ace version back to the Unicode. That could result in a single string and so, you definitely need to make recommendations in that regard.

And for those that (unintelligible) group, are they any questions on what I'm saying there? Does that make sense?

Sophia Bekele: Yes, Chuck. This is Sophia. This is my personal view.

Yes, I think I agree completely with you at the top level, second and third level. And those had to be very much treated differently from the ASCII.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and again again, we have to have recommendations in that regard. Otherwise, we'll have a whole and what the result could actually be.

Sophia Bekele: Well, we can bring it from the IDN working group tomorrow when we're discussing the issue, if you would like?

((Crosstalk))

Sophia Bekele: ... with Ram about it.

Marilyn Cade: Can I ask a...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That would be great.

Now, I know that time is running out. So, let me also talk about the geographical and geopolitical.

As my understanding that you've done all of the work on this without any consultation with Avri and John, is that correct?

Sophia Bekele: Not completely.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. I'm glad to hear that. I couldn't - I wasn't sure. I'm glad to hear that.

((Crosstalk))

Sophia Bekele: We hadn't seen the last version yet.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. It's very important in my opinion that the three of you as part of that subgroup do a, you know, consult and that if - assuming you can come up with some sort of a (rough) consensus that you've put that forward or you put alternatives like everybody else has done.

And I would encourage you not to wait until after the weekend to talk with one another further following this call and my thinking there is that, Mike, what I heard you say - it sounds like you're leaning towards a particular recommendation.

I don't think you have to wait until your report is totally finished to be able to get to, you know, talk among the three of you about the recommendation and test each other's thinking and possibly actually deal, you know, come to terms on a recommendation that you want to put forward before you even finish all the writing of the report.

That I think is important sooner rather than Monday because as you will see when I, you know, in the agenda for tomorrow's meeting - which I think I asked (Linda) post so you may be able to see it on the side. I don't remember I emailed it or not, so I didn't want to confuse things with this meeting today.

But after tomorrow's meeting, there is a very short turnaround time. I'm asking that any final work to be done on the report -- individual report be sent - I think I said Tuesday, close the business Tuesday because we're going to have to do some things between then in our meeting on Thursday, the 15th after which we have 24 hours to make any final addition.

So we can't be, we really can't be working on individual reports next week. We need to be working on the final report and also, steps going forward. So any questions on that?

Marilyn Cade: Hey, Chuck, it's Marilyn. So that would lead me back to the idea that people need to be sure that they're focusing as well on what their recommendation is to conclude work if because - they may find themselves unable to conclude work and they need to do simultaneous thinking about what is the process to conclude their work?

Chuck Gomes: Right. And if any of that has to extend beyond our final report or this
                part of our work, then we're going to have to have recommendations in
                there to that effect.

Marilyn Cade: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Now actually, from what I'm saying, I think we're in pretty good shape.
                The only report that I haven't seen is the - other than a very early
                version of the geographic and the geopolitical names and that, Mike - it
                wouldn't hurt if even the version you have right now is sent around for
                the whole group to look at tomorrow.

                It'll be really nice tomorrow if, you know, the three of you had come to
                some sort of a rough consensus on recommendations or alternative
                recommendations so that we'll hear those tomorrow because Thursday
                is too late to be considering, you know, taking final votes on
                recommendations in absolute necessity, we might have to do that. But
                it's going to make it very awkward and difficult for us to finish our task.

                Now, even if you guys could communicate some tomorrow in our call
                when we get the geographic and geopolitical names, that would help
                too. But it'd be nice if the three of you talk about your
                recommendations between now and call tomorrow.

                Okay, Marilyn Cade, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I'm pretty much ready to ask people if they have further questions for
                you and to wrap the call up, Chuck, if people have no further questions
                for you on guidance.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I hate to be the one to ask one more question.

Marilyn Cade: All right.

Avri Doria: I'm constantly trying to clarify things.

                 Chuck, when you were talking about the idea and I'm not asking about
                 the geographical, I think will try. On the idea of what you meant to say -
                 I'm trying to understand if you meant to say that using a different script,
                 one could produce something that looks like the single-letter A in
                 ASCII.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: In some scripts.

Avri Doria: Right, right, I understand. Okay. Some scripts might have something
                 that looks like an O, so it looked like you had a single letter O...

Chuck Gomes: I'm not actually saying it looked - I'm not talking about the issue of
                 confusability with regard to like a Greek A and a Roman A. What I'm
                 talking about (if) someone could put in an application for a new TLD
                 and in a language and that could…

Avri Doria: Oh okay. So, for example, a (demo), and at it could be a single demo
                 in Hebrew.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, well, it could be a single letter and it could convert and the only thing, you know, to a single letter in a...

Avri Doria: In another language?

Chuck Gomes: Right. Yeah.

Avri Doria: I guess, I'm still confused because the A name is always more than one character. But of course, you have many cases where the U name would be a single character. That what you're asking.

Chuck Gomes: And that's what I'm talking about...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ... Avri, right there.

Avri Doria: Okay. So...

Chuck Gomes: That's exactly what I'm talking about.

Avri Doria: So the question is a definitional one. Are we worrying about the appearance of one letter, i.e., U-name or the DNS entry of one letter.

Chuck Gomes: But, and I don't know what the answer to that is...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...and I think that's a really important thing to be considered when we're talking about the single-character and two-character name.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah I was just trying to clarify the question on my mind and you're asking for both. Do we care about U name single or do we just care about (maybe) single.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I am.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I think we are at a wrap here.

Chuck, thank you very much for persevering even though you were driving and lending the additional support to this, and thanks to all of you who called in and participated so actively. And I think we need to wrap the call up so that we can all go back to work.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: My pleasure. Bye everyone.

Man: ...Marilyn.

Man: Bye-bye.

Marilyn Cade: Bye-bye.

END