Single Letter Names Working Group (sl-wg) Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
7 May 2007 20:30 UTC,

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Single Letter Names Working Group (sl-wg) Teleconference on 7 may 2007, 20:30 UTC .Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or

inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to

understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an

authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/SL-wg20070507.mp3

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

Attendance:

Greg Shatan - IPC - sub-group chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Jon Nevett - Registrar

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Absent apologies:

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: I would like to inform all parties, the call is being recorded. If you have

any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan, and welcome to what hopefully will be the last

call of the single and two-character name subgroup of the reserved

names working group.

I think our task at one level at least is simple enough which is to go through Patrick's latest draft of the subgroup report dated 6th of May, 2007 and see if we have any changes or issues that need to be surfaced or discussed.

I think Chuck raised a few points that we will follow along as well in his email of May 6. So we'll make sure to hit his points as well.

Any opening thoughts before we start turning pages?

Hearing none, I think we can proceed.

The definitions of character, symbol, tag name, (day) label, and U-label, single and two-character labels have all - are unchanged from the prior draft.

It's nothing we can kind of pass them by. And I think we should start pay a little more attention now to the recommendations starting on Page 5. And I'll just start off by reading the recommendation and then we can see if there's any - is there any changes? If not, we'll consider them essentially final from the subgroup that is.

Recommendation Task 2, category symbols, we recommend the current practice be maintained so that no symbols - hyphen to consider for use at any level unless technology at some time permits the use of symbols.

Any minority thoughts; majority thoughts?

We will consider that one closed.

Recommendation Task 3a, single and two-character IDNs at all levels, single and two-character U-labels on the top level and second level of the domain name should not be restricted in general.

At the top level, requested strings should be analyzed on a case by case basis depending on the script and language used in order to determine whether the string should be granted for allocation in the DNS.

And there's an asterisk at the end there. Patrick, what's the story on the asterisk?

Patrick Jones: The asterisk refers to that there's more explanation in the body of the document.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick, it's Marilyn.

I know that you've used that in several places. I'm thinking you may need to explain that somewhere and you might want to use something other than an asterisk on Page 4 for explaining Victoria's resigning, because right now, you know, there's no explanation for the use of the asterisk.

Man: Could I make a suggestion that - I think, just putting a footnote at the bottom of that page and then just referring to the page or to which the asterisk at this point refers to, Patrick.

Marilyn Cade: If this template allows footnotes.

Man: All right.

Greg Shatan: Right.

If not, we can kind of put a note at the end of the table or at the beginning of the table or something.

Marilyn Cade: No, no, I actually - I'm looking at Page 8 and there is a footnote there. So maybe…

Greg Shatan: Which will be okay - yes, it does look okay then.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah - Patrick, could - would that work?

Patrick Jones: Yes, that works.

Greg Shatan: Great.

Marilyn Cade: And then just use something other than an asterisk on Page 4. Use - I don't know - a pound sign or something, so.

Greg Shatan: If we're doing footnotes, then we can use the asterisk because the footnotes will be number, so.

Patrick Jones: There's probably - asterisk is probably not required on Page 4.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: It's probably unnecessary and I can take it out.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Good, good, good.

Greg Shatan: All right.

So far we've taken away an asterisk and added footnotes.

Examples of the IDNs include stuff like (cantread.com), stuff like (cantread.icom, .ezm).

Patrick Jones: So let me add a little bit to this…

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Patrick Jones: I know Marilyn you've asked in the past we sort of speak with IDN experts and get their feedback on these recommendations and I had had a lot of feedback from Cary and Tina and until the weekend or until this morning, I hadn't really heard that much from Ram Mohan…

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Patrick Jones: …but he's now replied back to me and he says that the original recommendation, the one that's in there now is not a bad one but its practical impact will be to limit registration of one and two characters at both the top and the second levels as a registry operator, that is the kind of rule I would implement if this recommendation was adopted into that input domain.

Marilyn Cade: (Leave it) one or two characters at the second level.

Patrick Jones: Well, he says its practical impact…

Marilyn Cade: …heard you.

Patrick Jones: Its practical impact will be to limit registrations of one and two characters at both the top and the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Can you explain why?

Greg Shatan: I can't - and I don't see it at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I don't understand.

Greg Shatan: Which is on case by case basis recommended.

Patrick Jones: Well, he's reading that - it's going to be hard to manage analyzing single and - that the U-label review at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

So this is sounding to me like this is the very important piece of feedback, and even though it's late, it's critical and this is sounding to me like based on his rating these questions, we might want to say that more work is needed to - and I'm really just stating this off the top of my head; but our intent was not to limit registration of - in general, right…

Greg Shatan: I think part of their problem is, you know, looking at the - instead of looking at the table, I'm now looking at Page 10…

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: …of 37, which is Recommendation 2, and I guess one question is whether the recommendation task number and our recommendation numbers should line up, but it reads a bit differently than what's said here.

Marilyn Cade: But (let me) because Patrick hasn't had a chance to include Ram's comment.

Greg Shatan: Well, I'm thinking - I'm saying - all I'm saying is that the table on Page 5 and the text on Page 10 actually (sounds like slightly) different recommendations.

What it says on Page 10 is single and two-character U-labels on the top level and second level of the domain name should not be restricted in general, that track.

And then it says, instead, requested strings should be analyzed on a case by case basis. It doesn't refer to as the top level. So maybe Ram is looking at this and seeing the status being that case by case basis is at both the top level and the second level.

So I guess when you figure out what our recommendation is; is there recommendation to analyze strings at both levels on a case by case basis or to - only to do so at the top level?

Patrick Jones: Well, it should definitely be to analyze them at the top level.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Patrick Jones: I think that we should start with that.

Marilyn Cade: We just started that. And then Patrick, as I understand the first, that into the first paragraph on 10, registry, they proposed release of two-character strings at the second level provided that measures to avoid confusion with corresponding country codes were taken.

Patrick Jones: Well, what this - that's trying to be inclusive of the effort at the ccNSO and the GAC level of dealing with internationalization of the ISO list.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

So that's going to take second level registry analysis - the registries are going to have to take some kind of proactive step either to reserve names that make up confusion or review applications at the second level.

And what he's saying, I think, I mean, in reading that, a registry would have I think two options -- review every name that it's applied for or reserve names that they think are confusing.

Avri Doria: Well, at this point - this is Avri - wouldn't they also have - limitation that they don't know what's going to happen with the ISO list, and that's where if you're being careful to avoid the ISO list, you have to basically not do anything at all.

Patrick Jones: Well, they don't - and this is why I included examples of existing registrations near the bottom starting on Page 12. These are, right now, registered domain names within .Biz that and they're in either Chinese or Japanese script.

You know, these are able to be registered right now. And I don't know - maybe you want to allow for - review on a case by case basis by the registry depending on what script is.

Avri Doria: Uh-huh.

Did he - he didn't object to the recommendation, he just clarified the…

Patrick Jones: I'm going to - I'll forward his note to the full subgroup.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Patrick Jones: His first email said, "Patrick, thanks for the note. There is no technical or IDN issue with this recommendation. I would like to point out that the recommendation that all one or two-character IDN strings must be allocated on a case by case basis, opens up a new set of issues with regard to who will review this application and decide to issue the names or not, what is the timeframe for such applications to be processed.

If this recommendation is implemented, then the reserved names working group needs to be aware that they are effectively blocking one or two-character IDN registration tending the creation of a review and allocation process. I assume that the working group is aware and okay with this track."

Avri Doria: Okay.

Patrick Jones: Now, further discussion, he sort of realized that at the top level we didn't mean - this to be treated any differently than any other TLD application that comes in. They will be reviewed, (and start) by the same criteria as a - any other TLD.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I have a couple of questions.

                 So the problem was Mike Rodenbaugh's minority statement is that it doesn't make reference to the ISO (316, the 6th list). Is that - we issued that?

Patrick Jones: Mike's recommendation was made within the original report. He hasn't made any recommendation in the existing 30-day period.

                 And in general, Mike objects to, you know, maintaining the existing registration for the ISO list.

Man: Right, right, okay.

Patrick Jones: But, you know, I don't want to put any words in…

Man: You know, I was just wondering - I mean, because I guess the second part, the second question I had was is Ram's reaction because of the way we have - as rather than should be released we have - should not be restricted and he's sort of reacting to that should not be restricted.

So he's sort of reacting to the sort of negative phraseology.

Marilyn Cade: I don't think that he's reacting to, I think he's pointing out we're calling for an allocation methodology and we hadn't acknowledged that. We had just said registries may propose release. So we didn't say who they were going to propose it to or what criteria they should follow.

Patrick Jones: I mean, she says the recommendation is okay, that we need to realize that we're recommending blocking of one and two characters.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: And we're not blocking them across the board, they're being sort of filtered.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: Which may not be the right word but I'm…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: That's a roadblock.

Avri Doria: Roadblock, they're moderated in some way, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: I mean, I thought the basic rationale for this was to deal with primarily the confusingly similar problem of, you know, (unintelligible).

Isn't that the rationale for why there is a need to sort of have a few kicks along the way.

Avri Doria: I have to think it was. The only thing I can think of is that it was a confusingly similar both to what exists or numbers - and to think that may come into existence for example a revised ISO List.

And there is also the third case of confusingly similar to things that exist - elsewhere or something that looks like a number and a letter or two numbers that aren't two numbers.

So yeah, I mean, it always seems to have confusingly similar as it states, but there's different variance of the issue.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: And one of them is the things that are potential, not things currently in existence.

And it sounds like that they are right, we did not indicate how any, you know, who reviews - different signs is that they're confusingly similar test that ICANN already does, is that the public viewing that, you know, first ICANN - it works okay or there's the one where it gets published and people say, "Wait a second, that looks confusingly similar too." And then it goes into that process.

But I'm not sure that we were taking that there needs to be yet another process for reviewing those.

Man: No, so I'm wondering whether if we perhaps with the recommendation that is at the top level work with that string should be analyzed on a case by case basis.

Could we just add reference to the - you know, this is just - what we're talking about here is the analysis that goes on for release of new gTLDs.

Avri Doria: But the other part is they were saying something at the second level but we're not exactly saying what…

Man: Yeah. Well, I think we need to be specific about that, don't we?

Avri Doria: Yeah, and that's where the registry says, if you tell me there's a what but you don't tell me what the what is, maybe the easiest thing is to just not allocate.

Man: Yeah. I mean, shouldn't we - I mean, it seems to me that the two things that we care about is one, they're consistent with the IDN guidelines, and two, that's - 8166 problems…

Patrick Jones: Well, and in this report, I did include examples of names that have been able to be registered. So I don't think we want to continue to block out one and two-character IDNs at the second level.

Man: No.

So - and those ones that have been registered, I mean, the basis for the registration is just, you know, they are consistent with the IDN

guidelines and consistent with any other requirements, which - and I thought the only other requirement was the 8166 call the restriction.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick, the way this is - the way the example is written on Page 5, the first example you gave is a - then the common probably net character, is that right?

Patrick Jones: Yes. So that will be an example of a single character at the top level.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: So there's a dot and then the character and then a comma and - and then a two-character .com name and then a comma and a third level (star C) name within an existing TLD.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: So I tried to cover all the top level, second level, and you know, there is an existing third level example.

Marilyn Cade: This is a potential single character IDN, not an existing IDN.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

                  So I could say - I mean, examples of IDN include for - well, however you want to say it. But they are examples of a - that is a potential.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

I'm trying - I'm - so Alistair, what changes would you make in the recommendation though.

Alistair Dixon: I'm just trying to figure out the wording Marilyn. But basically what it needs is reference to something like at the top level requested strings should be analyzed on a case by case basis sort of in the new gTLD process or, you know, (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: You know, it just basically needs reference to - the process that is used for the analysis, which to me is the just the release of new gTLDs and with - this is just a particular spatial type of new gTLD which is an IDN.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: After case by case basis put in - in the new gTLD process depending on script of language that that was then tick up your…

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: I think it's on Page 10 rather than saying instead at the beginning of the sentence, we would say at the top level.

Patrick Jones: And then at the top level requested string should be…

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

And I think we also need to make reference to the new gTLD process there too.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: And then I think we need to be just clear at the second level what we are seeking and I - as far as I know, I mean, there is no - I mean, I think the only two requirements that I am - can see here is one the ISO 3166 list and second, the fact that I need to be consistent with the IDN guidelines.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Alistair Dixon: And I mean, there are plenty of examples of confusing similarity in an existing gTLD.

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: …at the end that one and two-character labels at the second level should be consistent with the IDN guidelines.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: Okay. Should be released consistent with the IDN guidelines or available for registration.

Greg Shatan: I think available for registration.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, provided they are consistent with the IDN guidelines.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Greg Shatan: Anything further on this single and two-character IDNs at all levels in the table?

I don't think so.

We'll move on then Recommendation Task 3b, single letters at the top level.

Marilyn Cade: Before you go on…

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: …can you just go back to a point that I think Alistair made or you made maybe. How are we going to get the numbers between the recommendations and the - you know, right now they're saying Recommendation Task 2, Recommendation Task 3.

Patrick Jones: Don't confuse (statement) of work number with our recommendation number.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

So I was wondering about the recommendation number, maybe ought to be - should there be a reference in this grid…

Patrick Jones: I could easily insert within the recommendation box…

Man: Yes.

Patrick Jones: …the number with correspond.

So for example, on symbols, statement of work number says Recommendation Task 2 and next before I start with the text of the recommendation itself, just put the Number 1.1.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Greg Shatan: And I think that would be helpful.

Marilyn Cade: Works for me.

And then should we get rid of the confusing label of Recommendation 3, Recommendation 4, and just have, you know, so it doesn't make sense to have like a scientific back and forth here.

So Recommendation 1.1, let's call it Recommendation 1, maybe it should just be called 1.1 symbol.

Patrick Jones: Well, we don't want to change the format, but…

Greg Shatan: Is this part of the template?

Patrick Jones: Yeah, this is part of the template that Chuck and Liz wants…

Marilyn Cade: Okay. There may be and ought to be Recommendation 1 instead of 1.1.

Patrick Jones: That's fine.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm just thinking, later, when we get into the full report…

Patrick Jones: You know, it's not that big a deal. So in fact, there really isn't a need for it to be 1.1. It could just be recommendation and a number.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, yeah, good.

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: So, okay.

                  Sorry back to the…

Greg Shatan: Back for our regularly scheduled programming.

Patrick Jones: So I'll fix it.

Greg Shatan: Here are the recommendation for single letters at the top level is, we recommend continued reservation of single letters at the top level until completion of a technical test.

                  Based on the outcome of the technical test, discussions of methods of allocation can be considered.

                  Examples include .a, .z…

Marilyn Cade: So I have a question about consistency with the text in the…

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: …and I'm going over to Page…

Greg Shatan: Page 14.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, I think here the - because of the lateness of my submission, the table didn't change.

Marilyn Cade: So Greg, you made this change?

Greg Shatan: I did make this change.

Marilyn Cade: But this is not - I mean, I'm - so you may change this but this is the first time that we've seen them.

Greg Shatan: No, these were circulated before the four working group call.

Marilyn Cade: But why - what is the - I don't understand the, if necessary, a completion of a technical test.

Greg Shatan: Well - looking back on our discussions with our technical experts, it was not clear to me what the tests we were recommending was because it's not really spelled out here what the test would be.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

                  I'm still trying to do that and Mike Rodenbaugh didn't want to go into that level of detail…

Greg Shatan: (My concern), if we say that there are some unknown tests, there's no way anybody is going to know what it's going to be, it's kind of like (out to me)…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: …at that point. And I think we need, if we're recommending that there's actually a test that our - that must be performed and it's a particularly test or at least testing a particular issue, we need to identify exactly what the issue is…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: …and why we're having a test for it…

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Greg Shatan: …or else, you know, after, you know, further consultation on technical experts that maybe that there's no need for a test. I just don't know that we're at the point where I'm not even sure that the test is required. That's - and I, you know, I kind of want to work through that and get this one done. But…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

I'm of the opinion that the technical test is required and I did offer to - out of it but Rodenbaugh did not think that was necessary. I'm not unhappy with the way you proposed this.

He - but I just think we probably - I just think I had not caught your suggested change. And I didn't understand why we would touch and if necessary the test in parenthesis in one place and not another.

They should probably be just consistent.

Greg Shatan: No reason, it was just, you know, style, not substance.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: I have no problem with making it consistent either. Having the parens in both places or removing the parens.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Well, why don't we just remove the parens…

Greg Shatan: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: …and then what you didn't describe here is how we would - did you intend to describe what the further consultation with technical experts would be?

Greg Shatan: No - that open-ended. I mean, at this point, I think we can - I would prefer to have a little more drill down on what it is, you know, what the concern is and there is some, you know, discussion about being a, I think in the rational section - some concern at the software.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: The DNS application software level.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: Or call a certain older DNS software applications incorrectly resolved.

Marilyn Cade: And what is the right that was discussed by the technical experts? What is the insert here, however, we have no evidence that - is more of a concern to single-letter names and it's the longer string.

Greg Shatan: The sentence has been bothering me for a long time, if there's potential user confusion from mistyping single letter.

You know, I don't think we have any linguistic or typing experts that would say that a - that a type that is more likely to mistype a single letter than it is to mistype a long string and - I'm not going to, you know, so I'm no expert so I can't, you know, kind of throw my own two cents in here but frankly my own two cents orally in this group is that you're more likely to see somebody mistyping a 20-letter name by, you know, mistyping any one letter than they are to mistype a single letter, with the exception of, it's not so much mistyping but miscomprehending a Q for G a large - an upper case I for a lower case L or that sort of thing.

So it's not really so much, you know, the typo (squatters) like to go after longer names rather than shorter ones because - I hate to use them as a - as experts but in a sense they are because they're, you know, looking to make money.

Now, they go after a longer strings and people tend if they're typing more letters each time they add a letter, that you know, it seemed to me to add to a likelihood of at least string as a whole will contain at least one wrong letter.

Alistair Dixon: This is about visual confusion, not mistyping. So I think this - that paragraph doesn't need to be - changed, I think - it needs to be changed too and maybe potential user confusion because of the visual similarity between some digits and single labels at the top label, I think that's what - chance to…

Greg Shatan: Right, and also between some letters and other letters, at least…

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, exactly.

Marilyn Cade: But - yeah but, I don't think, you know, your - I think Alistair's enhancement is the better clarification because this is not - this is with mistyping its user confusion and that's what is labeled.

There may be potential user confusion and maybe it's to say mistaking single letters and digits for each other…

Greg Shatan: Right or misperceiving - it's a perceptual issue, not a finger, you know…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: …coordination issue?

Alistair Dixon: The finger coordination issue is between Q and W, not between L and 1.

Greg Shatan: Exactly, right. On the keyboard, exactly.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: I guess the word mistyping - kind of misdirected me and I - then perhaps others…

Marilyn Cade: Right. My target to that, I think I wrote the original sentence.

Greg Shatan: No prior to - require.

Marilyn Cade: So - there may be potential user confusion from visually mistaking single letters and digit…

Greg Shatan: Or just certain single letters and digits?

Marilyn Cade: Certain - good, certain single letters and digits and then just - because the example there, period, full stop.

Greg Shatan: And maybe if we work towards visual similarity in there somewhere, it could be helpful.

Marilyn Cade: I'd say it's a visually mistaking.

Greg Shatan: Visually, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And maybe potential user confusion from mistaking certain single letters and digits that put the examples and due to visual similarity, is that okay?

Greg Shatan: Something like that.

Alistair Dixon: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Patrick Jones: Marilyn, can you send me the language so I can drop it in?

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to read it to you because I'm going to disappear after this due to a oversight of doing something for another client. So I'll be gone.

                  There may be potential user confusion from mistaking certain single letters and digits.

                  And then the example, due to visual similarity.

                  So that took care of that. If we go back to the previous - and then we just took out the parenthesis on the previous thing, right?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: I think that, you know, again, going back to the table, I think the table here should track the recommendation on Page 14.

Man: Okay.

Greg Shatan: Which I think is sort of timing issue essentially.

Marilyn Cade: But the - so Greg, here's the problem.

                I think we do recommend continued reservation of single letters, at the
                top level until further consultation with technical experts and if
                necessary completion of a technical test.

Greg Shatan: Right.

                So I'm saying, is it Page 14, this - which you just read at the beginning
                of, should go into Page 5…

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: Which, you know, didn't talk about the further consultation of technical
                experts.

Marilyn Cade: Right, I see what you mean. Okay.

                So if we make that change, then I have a question for you on - are you
                okay with that, can I go on with another question?

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: In the last site -- the one, two, three, four, five, six -- in the six
                paragraphs of the rationale, we should change the word - we should
                use the word may, shouldn't we?

Allocation of single letters at both the top level and second level in combination may cause certain older - incorrectly resolved. But what I recall from our experts discussion…

Greg Shatan: I think that's right as well.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Got it.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

You haven't heard from either (Delavan) or McFadden, have you?

Man: No.

Marilyn Cade: Neither have I, although, you know, I posted - included a posting to the list. So maybe you know I can figure out how to track them down.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

We still need to fix that - under consultations of experts.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: It's an insert by, insert link…

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Patrick Jones: …sentence to be updated.

Marilyn Cade: Why don't we…

Patrick Jones: (The technical)…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Patrick, why don't we just say there we make reference to the transcript, why don't we just say the transcript for that discussion can be found in the subgroup archive?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And then you and I will follow up to see if we can nail them down.

Greg Shatan: And hopefully we can, so.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: If you'd say that would be great.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Greg Shatan: That repeats in a few different places here, obviously.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Greg Shatan: So going back to the chart on Page 5, I think other than tracking Page 14, there shouldn't be any other changes to single letters at top level so I think we can move two single letters and digits at the second level, unless there's anything more on this - from the point of view of the table.

Recommendation Task 3b, single letters and digits at the second level released contingent upon the development of a suitable allocation framework.

Examples include a.com, i.info.

If single letter TLDs are unreserved, reserve single letters at the second level in these domains.

Alistair Dixon: …as we need an example. So we should have (b.c).

Greg Shatan: (Right). (B.C) should be reserved.

Alistair Dixon: Yes.

But the thing that we need to agree is various comments. I don't know - I've been seeing them from Chuck in response to that those (read line) words and in this recommendation.

And - but I couldn't see precisely what he was getting at because he seemed to be saying if you release them in, say, existing TLD that would somehow for particular approach in TLD that had it to being released, so.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah…

Alistair Dixon: And I couldn't understand why that would be. I mean, you know, you've got existing TLDs now which have names reserved, which were used in other TLDs.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Alistair Dixon: So I can't see why just because your release say a.com, why that - reservation of (a.a).

Marilyn Cade: I don't either, and I - because the technical issues are different, not…

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, exactly.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

                  I think actually, it is very interesting. I read it, I just didn't understand it. If you're trying to avoid registrations like (b.b), that it seems like B would have to reserve at the top level because it's already reserved as a name at the second - already registered being at the second level in - I think the, you know, let's say we have a new 14 character name - (probably joke) whatever…

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: …and B is (allocated), it's B.gobbledygook, okay?

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I don't understand why that effect, the recommendation on (b.b), given that (b.b) is related to technical issue.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah I mean, it seems to me that this is no different from any other TLD, you just, I suppose the contract with the registry operator, you just say, or I can just say, "You must not - you must reserve the following characters and/or following second letter - second level domains." And that's - they basically the 26 letters of the alphabet.

And then I can't see why that isn't something that can be done. It's precisely what's done with other…

Man: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: …you know, with existing domains.

Greg Shatan: So there's something in what we've written that somehow Chuck is reading something different into it because even reading his most recent email, I just can't follow what he's saying. I'll read it here.

He says here's what I was envisioning, Greg.

Single - one, single-letter names are released on the second level before the top level. Two, b.tld is registered. Three, single-letter names are released at the top level after the above.

Four, the single letters, and digits recommendation at the second level and the most recent draft report, you know, by Patrick as the following sentences -- single-letter TLDs are unreserved, reserved single-letter at the second level in this domain.

That means that b.tld would have been reserved if it wasn't already registered, but because that is all ready registered, you could feasibly end up with the registration b.b.

I wasn't suddenly trying to avoid that or did I misunderstand something, but it's just that…

Man: I think he misunderstood something.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, Greg. And again…

Greg Shatan: Yeah. I think he misunderstood something.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. My conclusion is he misunderstood something.

Greg Shatan: And the question is whether other readers, since Chuck is a pretty sharp reader would other readers be similarly confused or is this - does Chuck somehow just have a mote in his eye on this particular point.

Marilyn Cade: So I…

Alistair Dixon: I'm just wondering whether the lack of an example is causing the confusion.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly.

Greg Shatan: I think that's what we need. It's kind of maybe an if-then example. If .a is allocated or unreserved then, all single-letters in the domain - in the tld.a would be reserved.

Man: At the second level.

Greg Shatan: At the second level in that domain only or something…

Man: Yeah, exactly.

Greg Shatan: …examples kind of getting rather robust but…

(John):   Now, the only issue we would have deal with and I think it's
                dispensable is that there's always been a strong feeling in ICANN that
                all registry should be treated the same.

                So you're saying - we'll be saying that a.com is available to be
                registered but a.b would not be.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick, I'm going to push back pretty hard on that interpretation
                though. When you say they should all be treated the same…

(John):   This is (John).

Marilyn Cade: (John). Sorry. I'm going to push back on that though, right? When you
                say they should be treated the same, yet, we did allow .moby to have a
                different business model. And they're allocating some names to this
                unique business model.

(John):   Yeah, I don't, just for the record, don't disagree with you. I'm just
                pointing out an issue that may be raised and that may we might have
                to address.

Marilyn Cade: But…

(John):   Because my feeling is that similarly situated registries are being treated as equitably in that…

Marilyn Cade: Right.

(John):   …all registries that are single-letter half level TLDs would be treated the same.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: Well, I think we are treating them all the same because we are basically saying if they are, you know, - issues, they can't be released but we have - technical issue.

Man: Yup, no, that's a good point too.

Greg Shatan: All right. The technical issue is limited to where there's a single-letter are both at the top level and the second level and somehow, that's not quite making an…

Alistair Dixon: And I think you are proposed waiting, Greg, addresses the issue at least (as far as I can)…

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: …see it.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Patrick, do you want me to try to shoot you something afterwards?

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Okay. I hopefully be able to recapture that or listen to the mp3 transcription or, you know, read the transcription, recapture it there from the (charge) of the transcription.

I'll say that…

Marilyn Cade: Do you want me to get the transcription in time?

Greg Shatan: No, probably not.

Example - anything further here on single-letters and digits at second level?

Marilyn Cade: But it's over - under rationale.

Greg Shatan: Okay. And what page is that, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I got to find out where I am. Sorry. You know, like always you - wait a minute.

So rationale is on Page 17.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, but I don't have a question about 17.

Greg Shatan: Okay. Good.

Marilyn Cade: I just had a question about 18 but it's the same - I think when you read
                 18 -- I'm sorry -- when you read Page 18, the last sentence there which
                 I think is what we are trying to say based on the discussion that we just
                 had.

Alistair Dixon: And to say again, I think probably needs some examples.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: Just to make sure it's…

Marilyn Cade: And - hey, Greg, I think you might actually say for example in a new
                 gTLD of multiple characters, the single-letter category would not need
                 to be reserved while in the - while single-letters at the second level
                 would need to be reserved in single-letter TLDs until the problem
                 described above has been eliminated.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, something along those lines.

Marilyn Cade: Along those lines, yeah.

Greg Shatan: And after another monkey wrench into the work, but there's the issue
                 of reserving all TLD names at the second level such that if TLDs - if all
                 26 letters let's say and 9 numbers or reserved as single-letter or single-
                 character TLDs, wouldn't that then require the practice of reserving
                 them in all subsequent new TLDs.

Marilyn Cade: I found this discussion amazing because in the previous, much earlier, PDP '05 discussion, we talked about this. I think it was in Amsterdam. And people pretty much rejected the idea that it would be very feasible to do that since the likelihood of applications will include a large number of generic names. And the vast majority of generic names are registered all ready in - at the second level…

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: …and the number of existing gTLDs.

Alistair Dixon: I mean - yeah, I would have thought if for example, you know, Telstra - the telstra.com and if Telstra wants to register .telstra, well, fine, it's up to them. I don't need to go and tell, you know, very soon that's going to happen and seek their - permission for that to happen.

Greg Shatan: Right. Or if somebody wants to do .fun, what do you do about fun.com and fun.net…

Alistair Dixon: Exactly.

Greg Shatan: … does that mean that I mean a new TLD after .fun can't register fun.tld, but if it's grandfathered into the existing TLD.

Since that's part of our group's work, I would propose to stay away from it if we can.

Man: When…

Greg Shatan: I know its part of the four working groups' consideration and we did give that to (airing) on last week's call.

Man: I mean this is - we are just talking about a special case of single-letters because of a particular technical problem.

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Man: And that's - and I think - I mean, and if we make it clear that that's special case, well, I can't see how that carries over into other areas.

Greg Shatan: I don't - yeah, it may not. It may not.

                 Anything further than single and two digits - single-letters and digits just like where were - sorry - where were we -- we were still at single-letters and digits at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: So I think we have to on Page 19, choose between "may" and "will" - oops, sorry. I'm on the wrong page.

Greg Shatan: Yeah. I think you are.

Marilyn Cade: So, I'm done.

Greg Shatan: Okay. Let's - I think there'll be a few more changes need to made in the body of the text as well if you want to cover those now, Patrick.

                 And on Page 18, in that single sentence that's above the - in the section Consultation of Experts.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Greg Shatan: The single sentence in the middle. It should read I think "while it appears that single-letters and digits at the second level can be released.

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: And then just above that the "must start with a letter"…

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: There's a footnote elsewhere in this report that indicates that there was a follow on RFC that indicated it could start with a digit. I just - I apologize I didn't identify that footnote but I…

Patrick Jones: No, that's RFP 1123 and I'll reference to that.

Greg Shatan: Great.

Marilyn Cade: And, Greg, clear as the - clear as what you're referencing because I thought we had picked that up before this it.

Greg Shatan: We did pick it up in a different place. It's just not picked up in this place.

Marilyn Cade: I see. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I got it. I see.

Greg Shatan: There are multiple similar reference (just) throughout this report since this is all like of a seamless Web.

And I think we can go to single and two digits at the top level.

Here, the recommendation is, we recommend continuation of the reserved status for digits at the top level in order to avoid potential confusion with IP addresses within software applications.

Examples include .3 and .99.

Patrick Jones: We should make the language that's on the table track the language that's in the body later on.

So why don't I cut and paste this recommendation and put it in the body starting on with Page 19. The language is (visible) to difference.

Greg Shatan: And where are you looking in Recommendation 5?

Patrick Jones: Yeah. Within the table, the, you know, Recommendation 5 and then that language doesn't quite track the language that's in the…

Greg Shatan: In 1.6?

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: On page - bottom of Page 18 in my (printout). Yeah, it's a little bit different so.

Patrick Jones: Yeah. So they should be the same.

Greg Shatan: Yeah. Good point.

Anything further on this, list on the table? Now, we can move on to Recommendation Task, 3B, single-letter, single-digit combinations at the top level.

Applications maybe considered for single-letter, single-digit combinations at the top level in accordance with the terms set forth in the new gTLD process.

Examples include .3f, .a1, .u7.

That seems fine.

Recommendation Task 3D, two letters at the top level.

Yes?

Marilyn Cade: Are we going to talk about the task of 1. - of recommendation (6)?

Greg Shatan: Sure, we can go back and forth. I haven't quite been going back and forth. So we can do that. So this is Recommendation 6 which is single-letter, single-digit combinations at top level. It starts in Page 20.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. And one thing that ought to happen is what's on - we all use the same examples. And - so you use 3f, a1, u7 instead of lo and 2k.

Patrick Jones: Yup.

Marilyn Cade: And my suggestion is get rid of the paragraph in italics and move the text of the paragraph that follows into the middle of rationale -- that's really clear. It was intended to be, I think.

Sorry about that guys.

Greg Shatan: (Do you able to steal) drums somewhere in your office?

Patrick Jones: Are you in the Caribbean, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Don't I wish? Don't I wish?

Then so - then I would read the rationale as follows "Combination of numbers and letter exist at the second level and there appears to be the technical provision to a single letter and a single digit of combination at the top level."

Then you have insert, "There maybe further considerations regarding how numbers and letters maybe mistaken for each other by the user due to…" and Greg, what's the term we used before -- visual similarity?

Man: Visual similarity.

Marilyn Cade: "…visual similarity. So start the word "appearance" due to visual similarity such as lower case - such as the Number 10 versus the combination of the lowercase L and the uppercase O where users searching for domain names were numbers that are allowed at the second level and the user is searching for 323.lo that's types 323.10. Numbers at the top level are not recommended, see Recommendation 6."

I think that would just follow that second sentence then I don't - actually agree that user confusion that says if ordering not means significant, user confusion would not be different than with names at any other level or of any longer links.

I think user confusion on - is still going to be the same even if the numbers are - even if the digits are reversed then it's now uppercase O, lowercase L, but still it's going to look like the Number 1.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: All right. So I propose, again, (strike) the italics paragraph and just take the text and put it at the end of the first sentence and write the New Edition in red there and (strike) puts in the square brackets because that paragraph takes care of it.

Man: Yeah. This is a secret (unintelligible) you're talking about, Marilyn.

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: And I mean, I would just to make sure that it's clear that we are what - does the - words after the IO or the LO lowercase L and uppercase O, that needs to be in round brackets, not the square brackets just to show that we are - if it isn't in brackets (set).

Marilyn Cade: Right. And but - and it probably should be in - right - in typical parenthesis.

Man: Parenthesis, yup.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And then, down in "Consultation with Experts", just insert that, instead of "link to transcript", just say, "our transcript's available in the subgroup archive".

Man: (You know).

Marilyn Cade: I'm never going to work on another working group that Patrick is not on. And Patrick is probably saying, oh, yeah.

Greg Shatan: I'm thinking just (the how to fit).

Marilyn Cade: Do I hear that?

Greg Shatan: That was Greg, not Patrick. Just being a devil, living up the most potential as my last name.

Patrick Jones: Okay. I picked up those - all the comments.

Greg Shatan: Great.

Marilyn Cade: I mean, we asked on Page 20, we asked (Delevan) for (segregation) on the RFCs so I'll put that on our list of things to ask him and Mark about Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

That could be last thing that is up hanging out here is the expert concurrence and clarifications.

Marilyn Cade: Yup.

Greg Shatan: You know, I'll just go and work around (Clamby) University and look for somebody who's - looks like (Steve Delavan).

See, does that bring us to end of the single-letter, single-digit combinations?

Marilyn Cade: I think so.

Greg Shatan: I think it does as well. So we can make - move on Recommendation Task 3D, two letters at the top level. And this says, we recommend that the current practice of allowing two-letter names at the top level only for ccTLDs remained at this time.

Examples include .au, .de, .dk and there's an asterisk here which will become a footnote.

Man: (Set).

Greg Shatan: And here we have Mike Rodenbaugh's minority statement in the task. Otherwise, there's - hasn't really changed. So I think we can call it "closed" unless there is some last minute reconsideration.

That's enough time for last reconsideration. We can move on.

Recommendation Task 3D, any combination of two letters and digits at the second level ASCII.

Registries may propose - should that ASCII be there in that - in the domain-name level?

Patrick Jones: No, it's not necessary.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Registries may propose release provided that measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes are implemented and examples include (ba.aero, uv.cat, 53.com, 3m.com, e8.org).

That seems straightforward and let's just take a look at the recommendation itself.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, never mind.

Greg Shatan: Recommendation 8 itself could not change with - have the double asterisks there in the recommendation, the asterisks here as well means we're kind of sort it out.

Marilyn Cade: Patrick, it's just a style thing that just strike the word recommendation as beginning of that paragraph.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

That was a carry over from the last report.

Marilyn Cade: Right, right.

Greg Shatan: When the templates changed two or three or four times it's often hard to keep scrubbing back to task. It brings us to the end of the recommendation table and we did manage to cover a number of the actual textural sub sections as well looks kind of just take a quick look at any changed pages we didn't hit already.

Let's see I'm turning pages frantically to see if there are any change pages that we didn't already hit

So far I'm finding none on Page 20. I think that brings us in. I did not find any within any of the recommendation section.

Summary of relevant information sources (yes) I wonder if this has been updated to bring in any newly added resources that were added themselves probably there weren't any for the different references.

Okay, great.

Alistair Dixon: Is the RSC list a complete? I don't see - what was it? Fifteen…

Greg Shatan: Yes, 1535 means to be…

Alistair Dixon: Yes that's what I'm talking of.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

How many people on this call who read all the RSCs?

Marilyn Cade: I've read some of them but I'm not going to say I understood them all.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: …which is not their 11…

Avri Doria: (I've read mostly).

Marilyn Cade: Sorry Avri.

Avri Doria: I was just saying that I've read mostly.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: 1123 is there.

Marilyn Cade: It's there.

Alistair Dixon: But 1535 I don't think is and…

Greg Shatan: No, unless we include it.

Alistair Dixon: I don't know whether there's any others that I'm missing out?

Patrick Jones: I will do one final check to make sure I picked up all with the RSCs that referred to in the document.

Greg Shatan: Great.

Any further issues, questions before we kind of talk about final tasks and next steps? Floor is open.

Okay, the floor is close.

I think the next step - the most important next step is to track down our beloved technical experts and to try to get to our concurrence and clarification were noted.

If we can't get it then we'll discuss to deal with the art of the possible and getting this completed and edit accordingly but will be best to get the concurrence inline with our discussed protocol.

So who is - just to clarify for the record Patrick and Marilyn, are you choosing our technical experts.

Marilyn Cade: I think so.

Greg Shatan: Okay, great.

Marilyn Cade: It sounds like a good job to the Internet you tested.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

And other than that Patrick, what other guidance or notes drop-in clarification, elucidation, do you need?

Patrick Jones: The last minute text from - like Greg you mentioned from…

Greg Shatan: Example.

Patrick Jones: Yes. If you want to send that to me, I will turn around at some point late tonight a updated deadline with a clean version and then everyone comment on it and if it looks okay then we can send it on to the (core) group.

Greg Shatan: Okay, I will send that example shortly after we get off the call consistent with a couple of other things I need to do more quickly than that.

                 If there's anything further, now is the time to raise it because otherwise we will adjourn and see each other on Thursday's call.

Marilyn Cade: Greg, I just had one other comment.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: In Chuck's global note after listening to the…

Greg Shatan: Good point. We should take a look at those and just make sure they're - hit his points.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

                 Like - as a minority statement he said please be prepared to submit minority statements for the full working group report Wednesday.

Greg Shatan: Actually, I got Chucks email here in front of me, let me go over…

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Greg Shatan: …the points other than the -- but other than the point we already
discuss about the single letter TLD issue.

The third level recommendations.

I notice you do not have any recommendations to the third level. I
understand that any of such recommendations that only apply to new
gTLDs registered names to the third level but the recommendations for
the second level applies to third level as well. I think the answer to that
is yes.

For those domains, the truly register names for the third level. If so
should be fairly easy to modify recommendation to accommodate this,
however you handle this we should include recommendations to the
third level to cover any new gTLDs proposal or registered names with
the third level.

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick. I thought earlier or maybe it was a couple of weeks ago
within our 30-day extension period we decided that third level names
are not part of our work.

Greg Shatan: Yes, it was decided it was out of scope which hit me especially hard
since I was on the third level sub-committee.

Patrick Jones: So it doesn't make sense to me that sort of squeeze third level names
in our report.

Greg Shatan: I will agree, I think we should discuss that on Thursday because that seems inconsistent because the only third level names that I discussed in my report was those that were registered, never part of the business plan of those particular TLDs so…

Patrick Jones: I would say we not waste a lot of time trying to squeeze it in.

Greg Shatan: Yes, let's not and let's move on IDNA recommendations.

                 So you had the wording of your IDAN recommendations relative by some IDN experts.

Patrick Jones: The answer is yes.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

                 Okay, so that's them. Minority statements, we've already covered -- now, it also say's here -- I note that minority statements are included for supporting information section of the report that assign but they should also be included right after the recommendation table.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, do you want some…

Greg Shatan: Right, before the body. In essence kind of at the end of Page 6 or there's a blank Page 7 that should contain a minority report before supporting information and after the table I guess the minority statement should be there.

                 You got that Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Yeah, I guess I can add…

Greg Shatan: Yeah, it means just cut and paste them.

Patrick Jones: Yes, but it's displaying them, are we going to have a separate table that's minority statements and reference the particular recommendation that they come from or do we insert them underneath the full sub-group recommendation and mark that it's just a minority position.

Greg Shatan: I think we should have a separate table - it seems to what Chuck wants and at that way we don't have to (mark-up) the main table.

Patrick Jones: Yeah, there aren't that many of them.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Patrick Jones: It's unfortunate that Mike couldn't be on the call because it could be that he doesn't have problem with our IDN recommendation but it's a carryover from though, you know, maybe if there's a way to have him review our recommendations and see if just minority statements are still out.

Greg Shatan: I can send him an email after this call to see if his minority statements are still valid.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: I would use the word applicable.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Okay, I'll start to email now so it fits on my desktop.

Okay, Section 1.5 Consultation of Experts.

Paragraph say's further work maybe required before any recommendations to be drafted on potential release of single digits at the second level given the definition of domain name in RFC 1035 and it start with letter.

At the same time we did not recommend further work on this before releasing these. What are you thinking in that regard? Would it be better to recommend release of letters only at this time and release of digits after additional work is done.

Marilyn Cade: And at the same time - what is the RFC he referenced?

Greg Shatan: 1035, that must start with a letter but I think that's as we indicated that there's a follow on ours - 1123, I think it is modifies it and says that it can start with a digit.

Marilyn Cade: I don't actually know - Patrick, do you know - or maybe we got to have to look at this.

Greg Shatan: This isn't a recommendation for a single letters and digits at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: We may have to look back at - the way if you look at those (two RFCs).

Patrick Jones: RFC 1123 updates 1035.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: So it doesn't have to start with a letter.

Marilyn Cade: Well -so I think our answer back to him should be in reviewing - our
                  review of RSC 1123 is that it's an update to 1035 and that would mean
                  that single characters could be released as well, single digit, sorry - we
                  release as well.

Greg Shatan: do we need to even have that sentenced now that we know that RFC
                  1035 essentially doesn't say that anymore?

                  And I think there's also - just looking at the same page Patrick, just
                  above consultation of experts the second to the last paragraph has
                  another discussion of RFC 1035.

Patrick Jones: Yup, do you mean we should really take that out?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Tell me what page you're on Greg.

Greg Shatan: Page 18 of 37.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: I'm looking at the paragraph that begins - towards the top given that single letter or number second level domains there's a parenthetical of that RFC 1035 definition.

I think that perhaps all of these 1035 references can be kind of taken out because it's a red herring.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, well, I think that was drafted early.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, before we found the 1123.

Marilyn Cade: I think I've even may have drop the bill.

Greg Shatan: I think since we now have more complete knowledge that indicates that that -- essentially that part of 1035 has been overruled or change.

Marilyn Cade: But is it better to say RFC 1123 specified that a domain name can start with either a letter or digit.

Greg Shatan: You can certainly say that I just continued references to RFC 1035 closing a problem.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Greg Shatan: For a single digit at the second level just kind of needs to be - maybe it needs to be reference at once as being not a problem because 1035 has been clarified by 1123 and that a digit can begin a second level domain.

Avri Doria: That's a good…

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, so…

Avri Doria: I just like what you said.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah and that could just be at the end of that - and then strive to 100 consultation with experts.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, because now we don't have to deal with that anymore kind of ask and answer those words…

Patrick Jones: Okay, I'll pick up that sentence out of the MP3, the transcript.

Greg Shatan: Okay and if it somehow doesn't make - perfectly, you know, send me something Patrick, I'll get back to you on a Blackberry.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Greg Shatan: It's - but it sounds something like XYZ.

Marilyn Cade: Hey, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: On Page 19 we need to either provide examples to strike the reference for example.

Greg Shatan: Where are you exactly? I'm on the Page...

Marilyn Cade: On 19 it now reads, an addition to that DNS software there are also legacy software applications that will interpret certain numbers such as (OO) are admitted and starting numbers into a string and that's causing misdirection, as I said, five examples.

Greg Shatan: Yup that if we can't get an example from (Delevan) or McFadden or somebody doesn't recall one that was discussed and I think we should - we'll strike the parenthetical or just maybe one last chance at getting an example from our experts would be part of the last chance of getting anything from out expert.

Marilyn Cade: Greg, this is the example they gave. This is as an example that…

Patrick Jones: Yup.

Greg Shatan: I guess the questions what software applications are these?

Patrick Jones: Well, maybe I should - this is Patrick again.

                 This bracketed statement was added by Mike in his projections and I honestly don't know if it needs to be here but I'll leave it to the rest of the sub-group to decide that.

Greg Shatan: If our - it would be helpful I think in making the point if there --if our experts gave -- had an example of what these legacy software applications might be.

Marilyn Cade: You want - the application.

Greg Shatan: If they can't supply one, give the name or a function so that just…

Marilyn Cade: We can ask.

Greg Shatan: Something that could kind of put a little more specificity to that.

Marilyn Cade: Sure Greg, we can…

Greg Shatan: And if we can't get an answer, then the whole -- then the parenthetical disappears.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, they can ask them.

Greg Shatan: Yup, let's just ask them and if they don't have any answer, you know, then we'll just remove it and move on and if they do have an answer we'll supply it which will, you know, give added support to the statement which is always a good thing to get added support (for anything).

And let's see the consultation of expert section here does need to be cleaned up as of the other one that have the blanks and the square (racquets) and if there's any other of Chuck's points - I'm almost done with Chuck's points.

Section 1.7, Recommendation 6

The first paragraph starts with applications maybe consider for two character name. For clarity I suggest that you say, applications for new

ASCII gTLDs maybe considered four names combining one letter and one digit.

Marilyn Cade: It now say's applications will be considered for two character names consisting of a single letter in a single digit and we just have to rework that.

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Maybe instead of consisting of, we can say combining so - or read application maybe consider for two character names combining a single letter and a single digit in either order comma at the top level.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Greg Shatan: I think that makes the same - slightly less…

Okay?

Technical experts Chuck say's make sure that you identify its positions and qualifications of technical experts so that readers know why they are considered experts.

We do not need to do that every time you refer to them but probably should do at the first time their reference or at least point to where their qualification can be signing a report.

Marilyn Cade: I thought we had - so we need to divide links to their bios.

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

And if there's an easy bio we can drop in as a reference.

Marilyn Cade: There is for both of them. I've got - I see Mike provided McFadden at the (IC) - at the ICANN (with the) and thousands of - I can mail them both to…

Greg Shatan: Patrick?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: That'll be great.

Patrick Jones: And I also describe what I did in this -- on the call anyway.

Greg Shatan: I think we should for those people who are limited to hard copy we should have something in a report itself so we know that, you know, (Steve Delevan) is -- who he is and Mark McFadden is who he is and (that's if) couple of guys pushing shopping for it's little deposit bottle kind of a middle broadway.

Marilyn Cade: (This is) a skeptic.

Greg Shatan: I'm from Missouri.

Marilyn Cade: No, you're not because you don't pronounce it correctly.

Greg Shatan: I know, I've never been to Missouri actually I hate to say or Missouri or any of…

Avri Doria: I don't think you need to hate to say that you've never been there.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

                I hope to go there someday.

Avri Doria: Good.

Marilyn Cade: And given that I am form Missouri, Greg.

Greg Shatan: You are.

Marilyn Cade: I am.

Greg Shatan: I learn something new everyday.

Marilyn Cade: Fun.

Avri Doria: I think I'll live in Missouri.

Marilyn Cade: You don't want to go to Missouri.

Greg Shatan: I want the barbeque.

                And see the arch.

                Anyway, that is the end of Chuck's comments and clarifications and if there isn't anything further I think we can adjourn.

                Last chance - any call for further comments or anything.

I think everyone (has rendered) speechless or mute so I think we can adjourn this call. I thank you all for all your efforts on the sub-group and for tolerating me and helping me be a chair to you all and I think this is a fantastic report and I applaud all of you and I have to specially applaud Patrick since nearly everything came out of his probably bloody stamps of fingertips by now.

Marilyn Cade: Great.

Greg Shatan: And it's been a pleasure and honor to work with all of you on this particular subgroup.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Alistair Dixon: Likewise, thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you all and we'll see each other on Thursday's call.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: Thanks.

Woman: Bye, bye.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Bye.

END