

**Single Letter Names Working Group (sl-wg) Teleconference  
TRANSCRIPTION  
April 24 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 April 24 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://gns0-audio.icann.org/sl-wg-20070424.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

**Attendance:**

Greg Shatan - IPC sub working group chair

Neal Blair - CBUC

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

**Absent - apologies**

Jon Nevett

**ICANN Staff:**

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Glen de Saint Géry – Secretaria

Coordinator: Yes, ma'am.

At this time, I just want to inform everyone that the call is being recorded. Should you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Glen, I'm going to ask you to do the roll call.

Glen Desaintgery: (Okay).

We have got Patrick Jones, yourself and myself. Then we have got Avri Doria, Neal Blair, Alistair Dixon, yourself, Marilyn, and (Mike Rodender).

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Glen Desaintgery: Did I miss anybody?

Marilyn Cade: So we are missing our colleagues from England.

Glen Desaintgery: (Ian McEvedy).

Marilyn Cade: Yes, okay.

Glen Desaintgery: And Greg Shatan.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm sorry, I'm not online at the moment. Does Greg give the estimated time of arrival?

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Patrick Jones: He said "a few minutes late."

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Then what I think I'm going to do is use our time to just - to make sure that we all have a sense of the documents that we are going to try to address today.

And I think one thing Greg may want to do before we end the call today is do a kind of a temperature, a thermometer assessment of where do we think we are in completing our work on each of the things we're still doing, what other external context do we need to make, and what additional drafting do we need to do on the areas of work that we're responsible for.

The thing that comes to my mind that is most outstanding at this time -- unless I - and I may have missed this -- is the scheduling of an actual consultation with experts on IDN. Am I wrong on that?

Patrick Jones: I think you might be.

Marilyn Cade: Oh good.

Patrick Jones: Because we already - I guess the whole working group has already had a consultation with experts on IDN that was held on March 1.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: What I'm doing is collecting some inputs that I'll then circulate in a format similar to what you guys already received over the weekend...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: ...in the (foetal), you know, that was the template.

And I have sections to add on the definition of character in single and two-character IDNs...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Patrick Jones: ...that include some outreach for the experts but we have the potential to schedule a call with experts probably next week.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: (So), what I'm going to do is circulate my materials first, and then if there is a lot of questions or if there is a feeling among the subgroup that we get more value out of having a call, we could certainly do that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I (guess) that's what I wanted to just determine, Patrick.

My sense on the timing, in order to work backward from the (chair), you are going to deliver your written work as I understood it and you would try to have the expert sort of standing by in the event that people feel the need for a call. Is that's the way you wanted to approach it?

Patrick Jones: I already have given Cary the call and details.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: If he would be available, he could potentially call and participate even in this call today.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: I left it up to him to decide that and I wanted to, I guess, get a chance to give Greg that heads up that that can be an option, but with all of the other calls that have happened today, it's been a bit difficult.

Marilyn Cade: (Sure).

Patrick Jones: It's probably not going to happen today.

But he could be available next week if we wanted to do a - I guess we'll decide today when our next call is going to be and we could do an individual call with Cary and other IDN experts if there's value in it.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Comments for May 1?

On this, I have not - I'm afraid that tonight is my scheduled evening to look in detail at your work, Patrick, although I had glanced at it.

Anyone else have thoughts on, you know, right now do - are you seeing the need for the consultation with experts to give Patrick more of a heads up or do you want to wait until you have a chance to see the full documentation?

Patrick Jones: I can say that I'm - I am pretty close to being able to circulate something within - if it doesn't happen today, it's going to happen tomorrow to the full (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Which means that by the time of our call, our - (Chuck's) call of the full reserve name working group, you probably would have something in our hands?

Patrick Jones: I hope so.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: I'm doing quite a few things at once so - and I think this is like my fifth or sixth call already today so I'm doing my best.

Marilyn Cade: That you're doing phenomenally. I'm very impressed.

Anyone - shall we propose waiting then until tomorrow when we see the document?

I think the important thing for us, Patrick, also say, for myself and someone - anyone else to jump in, I would probably like to have the idea that the experts are available. So as I walk through this, I could ask questions, if they, you know - as they come up.

And sometimes I find that the dialog with others really stimulates questions. But I noticed, you know, it sounds to me you've actually done that.

The one thing that I think is still needed and I need to go back and review for my own purposes the - both the GAC principles on geographic and geopolitical, and, you know, I think one of the things we need to remember is the GAC has made it clear to us that they intend to provide further guidance on IDN, find...

Man: (Okay).

Marilyn Cade: If I'm...

Patrick Jones: And we - that's probably going to come in San Juan.

So, what I see is where we're able to help them is to put together something that could guide their work between now and San Juan.

Marilyn Cade: I agree. I'm just noting that in whatever your write-up is that you do on geographic and geopolitical name...

Patrick Jones: You know, we're only on single and two-character name.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I'm looking at - sorry, I was looking at something that you would send out on IDN.

Patrick Jones: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So - oh, sorry. So your point being the GAC did not provide any guidance at all on geopolitical and geographic because the interpretation is that the two-letter strings in IDN will not necessarily overlap with geographic.

Patrick Jones: They're still trying to decide how to handle that.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: And I think if they get some guidance from reserve name that helps them, you know, that's something we should do.

You know, there are many scripts that don't allow for a country name to be reflected in two characters.

Coordinator: Greg Shatan has joined you.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Hi, Greg. We'll catch you up on where we are then I hand the chair back to you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, thank you for starting the call, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

My only point, Patrick, was more than I was just thinking about whether there needed to be a footnote or (something) which noted that there would be further input from the GAC at a later date.

Patrick Jones: I don't thin we footnote it, I think we make it very clear...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: ...that will happen and it's likely to happen in San Juan.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.



So where we are, we were just sort of reviewing Patrick was reviewing for us so - the status of his work and noting that he thought he would have a further output probably tomorrow by the time (we) reserve name working group and that he had at least, for the placeholder and for Cary and potentially other experts on IDN, to be available for a follow-on interactive discussion with the subgroup.

Patrick Jones: And this would be...\*908

Man: Right.

Patrick Jones: ...in addition to the call that we've already had with Cary as the full working back on March 1?

Marilyn Cade: Don't let me ask my wrap-up question while Greg is...

So my wrap-up question is, really, do you think that - this is a question for everyone really.

Do we think we need to do that call with the subgroup or do we think that, given the importance of the IDN issues that offer for further interaction with experts would again need to take place at the full (reserve) name level?

Patrick Jones: Can I respond to that?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I'm just putting the question out.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Patrick Jones: I think you guys should see what I put together and I make that decision.

Marilyn Cade: Anyone else wants to comment on that before Greg takes the chair.

Alistair Dixon: That would certainly be my preference. This is Alistair. I would certainly prefer just to see what Patrick sees.

I guess my other comment on here, I think it maybe we're just having a call for our issues; I think that would be would be worthwhile.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg.

My opinion is that, if we can coordinate a call for the larger group, that's great, but we need to have the call for this group so I wouldn't want to lose or delay our need in order to meet the need of larger group. So, it's kind of a balancing issue.

Marilyn Cade: Or - okay. Or - it's Marilyn, Greg. Or schedule the call to our group that make it open in case anyone else wants to join.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I think, regardless, we would - we could make it open for others from our - from the larger working group that want to join but with the focus being on what we need to know to make our recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: And the goal being that that call would take place next Tuesday at this time or whenever you will schedule or whenever you schedule the next call.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Can I hand you back to chair?

Greg Shatan: I will take back to chair.

So thanks for you, Marilyn, taking - getting us started here today.

Marilyn Cade: And really, all we've done is the roll call which Glen can you fill you in on and then just gotten a brief update from Patrick, so.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Well I think where I would like to start today -- unless there are objections -- is to pick up on our call yesterday with our technical experts and see if there are further salt base on what we hear from our technical experts or some things that we want to discuss among ourselves based on what we thought we all took away from our call with the technical experts.

Marilyn Cade: And Greg, can I just mention -- this is Marilyn -- that I did a - as I said, I would do, I did sort of a summary of what was discussed and draft recommendation and sent them out to the full list and the paragraphs are all numbered.

I'm not suggesting we need to walk to that but I did my best to capture what I thought I heard and what the draft recommendations might be.

So that's there as a document for you to figure out if you want to have people review it separately or you actually want to address at some point today.

Greg Shatan: Right. And thank you for doing that, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Welcome.

Greg Shatan: So if there is anybody who has comments now on what we heard from the experts, we'll open the floor to that but...

Marilyn Cade: I have one if I could. It's Marilyn.

You know, I - we were yesterday talking to two technical experts just about technical issues, and it was really, you know, several times, they noted that they were only answering technical questions and that they may also be policy and political questions.

So, I wanted to just note that, in addition to talking about the technical issues, I think we need to talk a little bit about the interplay.

And I know one of our assignments is also to look at what the GAC has said anything in their principles that is relevant, and I have not done that yet.

Greg Shatan: Nor have I.

Mike Rodenbaugh: The GAC's principle on new TLDs don't really give us much guidance at all, I would say.

Marilyn Cade: And that's Mike, is that right?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

British working group, I don't think there is anything specific in there for this working group.

Alistair Dixon: I would think there would be one potentially but it's simply more of an IDN issue and they have the blocking of country name.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, but that's different, that's not really...

Alistair Dixon: Well, well, no, not necessarily because there maybe one - some probably two-character names which would be country name and two-character IDN which would be country name.

So, I think - I mean that is one potential issue.

Patrick Jones: Yeah, there is another potential issue and that 2.4 of GAC principle is very clear that says, "To avoid confusion with country code on top of a domain, no two-letter gTLD should be introduced."

Marilyn Cade: Right. That is the one I was thinking about.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I thought that would too but I felt we've - we're not really talking about that anymore.

Patrick Jones: Right. We...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct?

Patrick Jones: This is just we should make reference to that section as an update to the two-letter ASCII section of our report.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. That's fine.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that still needs to be explored with the GAC as said on the council last - that longer-term thing.

And I do see one other policy issue here though and that is obviously we heard that there maybe some technical issues in single letters at the top level, ASCII.

What about the inevitable applications for, you know, Unicode version of single letters? As you know, you can create essentially the ASCII alphabet in Unicode and I would expect that we will see some of those applications for - in IDN TLDs at least.

Patrick Jones: I have some language on that and I'm going to distribute that hopefully tomorrow.

I think we're going to run into the same problem with single-letter ASCII names as we will with Unicode characters that are - that can't be decomposed into smaller characters.

Like for example, a Cyrillic “r” or Cyrillic letters post confusion issue and that’s different than a single-character in Chinese scripts or Japanese or Korean.

Marilyn Cade: Can I ask - okay, so I capture that in my - thank you, Patrick, that was helpful.

I’m trying to remember, I know there was a discussion with the GAC about the overriding principle and I remember this because it came up on the call between PDP05 and the GAC, the Monday call, where the GAC has a principle which talks about diversity.

And the question Philip Sheppard, acting in the chair, asked the question of “Should diversity trump” - or maybe it was (Chuck) -- asked the question of “Should that need for diversity and competition in infrastructure provider trump the security and stability principle?” And the answer was, in my view, no.

So that to me would - you know, I’m sort of assuming that we have an underlying principle ourselves that none of our recommendations will trump security and stability and reliability, one of the core that we’re not going to - we’re going to be careful in that adherence to the core values, right?

And that’s just an overall assumption of any of the reserve name working group recommendation.

Greg Shatan: I guess there’s nobody has a follow-up to that.

Marilyn Cade: Because it’s awesome.

Alistair Dixon: I think there is - I guess there are some issues that I think and probably have been raised in Marilyn's note that I think it would be worth discussing. I think one or two, I don't think had been.

I mean this maybe was the 1535 issue. I wasn't quite clear about that. I think what - was that particular one we're concerned about having a single letter that second letter and single letter at the top level and the problem with visual confusion with country code, I'm not clear on that one.

Marilyn Cade: Tell me again, I'm sorry. What's the paragraph number?

Alistair Dixon: Let me see. Thirty-four.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Alistair Dixon: That was - sorry, that was a browser issue where some browsers (extend) a single letter.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible).

Alistair Dixon: It was an (extension).

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I got to have (Steve), you know, I was not working - I'm not working from the transcript, I'm working from my blog notes. I got to - I send this to (Steve) and to (Mark) to take a look at.

(Steve) described this in pretty good detail.



I think there's some applications that do that besides the browser but some browsers do it. So I just need it for him to explain which layer is actually being helpful.

In one case, the application fill then the middle zeros that exceeds the strings of - a string of numbers, and the middle zeros are missing, it inserts them before it moves forward with routing.

In this case, these are just the example that many of us get type ADT into common browser or (Calci-CLEAR) or Yahoo! or whatever, and you get .com appended even if .com is not the TLD extension.

Alistair Dixon: Right.

Marilyn Cade: But - so there are two examples. One is an application that enhance numbers and the other one is this one that he gave about browser.

Alistair Dixon: The .com one presumably that's not just an issue to single or even two-character TLDs, it would be an issue for all potential new TLDs.

Marilyn Cade: You know, that's why I'm sure that the example belongs here. The - (Steve) referenced to RFC 1535, noting that there are conflict, you get conflict in names when - between different levels.

Alistair Dixon: Right.

Marilyn Cade: And to resolve or append something else on to help.

So, I - you know, when he was talking at that point in the discussion about the example - I'm just going to fill out an example of A dot A or X dot A.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And the application - in that case, that's not a browser, that's an application that gets confused when it sees the same single letter on both sides of the dot, as what I understood, but we will ask him to clarify that.

Alistair Dixon: I guess one of the questions could have arose in my mind about in relation to this issue and - the numbers issue, I mean I know that the numbers are a problem but I ask the question if, say, letters at a particular level and numbers at the top level, is that a problem?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I didn't (object)...

Alistair Dixon: I (differently) asked this and...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: ...particularly in the recording.

And I feel that wasn't a combination of letters that, say, you know, cat dot A or so cat dot one would not be - basically, I that wasn't a problem because it's not an issue in terms of...

Marilyn Cade: No, but, Alistair - no, it's not a problem in and of itself that you can't allocate it because there are already numbers in existence.

So, if you don't - you've got a - and Patrick should probably...

Alistair Dixon: Well I haven't quite finished what I was going to say, Marilyn...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, sorry.

Alistair Dixon: And I guess my question is it seems with that with the single letters and potentially numbers, we maybe - I mean one solution would be supposed to have specific role for - if those (in domain) we allocated would be to have specific roles for those types of domains.

So, for example, if you're going to allocate single letters, you could not have any single letter at the second level for those names. I mean they would, you know - but that you could have - are just specific reservations.

Marilyn Cade: So maybe you could give an example?

Alistair Dixon: Well, for example, you could - because of this concern about say A dot A or the concern about one dot one or one one one dot one, you could - for A dot A, for example, you could have - you are not allowed A dot A, you're allowed AA dot A or you're allowed, you know, dog dot A, but you're not A dot A. And equally with numbers, you are not allowed one one dot one, you are allowed dog dot one.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, let me answer with a - that then said example...

Alistair Dixon: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: ...that you're very familiar with.

(And that being) said, (Mark) has moderated some - some of the second levels are moderated. And so they had the ability to make a decision on name-by-name basis because they approve it manually.

In the sponsored TLDs where names are validated or vindicated, there's a manual approval.

I think what you're describing - and others should speak to this. I think what you're describing would be the need to have a moderated allocation process in order to - or has some kind of automated process. I don't think you'd be able to use just the first-come-first-serve, you know, you have to have a bunch of names or things that are on reserve for - and then just figure out - the registry would have to prevent registration of the categories that are on reserve, right?

Alistair Dixon: Yeah. So you could, for example, numbers, you would basically - there would be a requirement that as you're going to have to have numbers at the top level, the numbers at the second level for that TLD would be reserved.

Marilyn Cade: Well, okay...

Alistair Dixon: I want to say, well, we - that is probably prohibited would be for the more accurate description.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg.

I think that, you know, the issue, as we look at for the new TLDs as opposed to existing TLDs where, you know, the dye is cast in certain ways. But if you have - if you're going to allow single letters at the second level, you can't allow single letters at the first level vice versa if you allow single letter. If you want a single letter gTLD, then you can't have single letter - second level domains in that TLD, so there's kind of either-or type situations where you could end up with different combinations.

And I guess in the sense that it makes the matrix more complicated because there are basically if-but-then sort of decision, you know, moments that would not be taken into consideration, so, one can say that there's no problem having a single-letter, second-level domain, that's only true for certain types of top-level domains and not true for other types of top-level domains.

Marilyn Cade: So one question. I don't know, and that I think it sounds like a good follow-up question for our technical experts.

Alistair, maybe you would want to write up the examples that you're proposing.

Maybe a good follow-up question for the technical experts is "Can you have dot one, dot two or dot nine if you prohibit numbers at any other level in the string -- third level and second level?" That's one question I think you were - is that right?

Alistair Dixon: That's right, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And the other question you might want to write up and ask the technical experts would be “Can you have letters at the top level if you prohibit a single letter to the top level - sorry, if you prohibit single letter at the second level in that particular TLD and is there any application interaction that they would point to?” And I would assume the answer is no, but I’m not a technical (G) wiz.

But probably, you would want to send that to the technical experts and ask them to respond to the (template), right?

Avri Doria: I just want to stop this. I’m sort of worried about us, I mean, because what I got from them is that this particular (cordism) may or may not be an issue.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: In other words, I mean, this was a piece of writing in 1993 and there’s a particular RFC that he’s referring to and it was to support a piece of backward compatibility at this time.

Marilyn Cade: Which one, Avri?

Avri Doria: The dot one letter - one-letter dot one letter, that particular concern based on what RFC 1535, which was a 1993 which I went in red yesterday...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...after the meeting...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...and, you know, and leading it.

While historically, this (cordism) does exist, it really bothers me, I think, or at least worries me that - first of all, we're not sure that that's still an issue just because there happens to be a 1535, and when we transition from, you know, the old NCPs and the old (ARP) to this and the old (host.tech), what we is the split.

So, I guess - I think we're jumping then gun on this one and saying that, you know, "No single letters unless no single letters in the second level" which, of course, we know is not enforceable. And so - and I really think we're jumping the gun on this one.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm with you, Avri. I think we deal - we don't have much infill at all about the scope of these potential problems that we're (dealing).

Marilyn Cade: So guys, I'm going to (refer) you to the ideas of possible potential for further work, but I want to ask Avri a question.

And I guess before I ask the question, I want to be careful that we not entertain ourselves with the art as possible and ignore the necessity of the art of the feasible and practical.

So, there maybe further work that needs to be done because some people go "I'm not convinced" but I think we need to finish the work on the low-hanging fruit as well.

Avri Doria: I personally think this one is low-hanging fruit.

Marilyn Cade: I understand, Avri.

I don't agree but I wrote up the suggestion that (McPatton) made for a future study on this...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: ...as a possible way to approach it.

I think it may not be low-hanging fruit for political reasons but the - it seemed to me that (Mark) identified a potential approach to figuring out whether or not it's at least can be reach with a ladder.

Avri Doria: Right.

Oh, and I have no problem with, you know, saying that, you know, "This is probably" - okay, it's my twist that this is probably not a problem but certainly it should be confirmed.

But then to take the (extra), (Steve) say, "And therefore, we should prohibit second levels, I would just sort of say basically that this needs to be investigated, it needs to be confirmed, the 1535 is really not relevant anymore and, you know, however, that's done, and move on from there and not, you know, make a decision based upon (cordism)."

Marilyn Cade: I hear you but I need to clarify something.



I didn't hear them telling us that there needs to be any provision in the second level. As a matter of fact, both of them said that single letters are working at the second level.

Avri Doria: Right.

No, the single letters at the second level when there is a single letter at the top level.

Greg Shatan: That they felt absolutely so...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: That - and so might...

Greg Shatan: It might be a problem.

Avri Doria: ...and needs to be investigated further.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: But then we were going into a discussion which it seems to me we were going into a discussion about "Well, it's okay to allow it as long as in the contractual condition. One says that..."

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, yeah.

Avri Doria: So, and I think that success is going too far because that sort of entrenching the (cordism) as opposed to sort of saying, "Yes, there's something here that needs to be checked just so that we've all got

clear consciences, but let's not established a war based on that (cordism).

Greg Shatan: Well I think - this is Greg.

I guess where I would want to see us go if possible is, you know, toward - you know, we've identified this issue which, if it goes one way, a 1535 is still a problem that, you know, at least so long as it is a technical problem this, you know, A dot A type domain combination, you know, could not exist. But if that problem goes away or if that problem has essentially already gone away, then those types of combinations won't be a problem.

And I think we need to, you know, work, you know, on a technical - kind of a recommendation for further study and we need to be, you know, kind of specific about going toward that.

I think the - you know, I share, to some extent, to technical experts, concern that you don't want to just assume that because of time, a problem has been solved.

On the other hand, I don't want to take it as we see it with them that because a problem once existed, it will always exist.

Marilyn Cade: So, Greg, I 'm going to make a proposal though.

I really - it's Marilyn speaking.

Can we focus on the - I put the possible potential for further work and study.

Can we focus on the earlier recommendations - draft recommendations to see if we are close to finalizing any of those, go back to the technical experts with questions in writing, and then assign some of the folks who are most enthusiastic about this to do the hard work of putting together the request of what a study would do and try to get a draft, you know, at least to draft that line of what the study would look at.

I think both the experts noted we would need to - and, you know, we need to talk about who has to approve the study, would it need to be approved by the board, who's going to fund it, who is it report to. I try to capture (some of that)...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't think we need to answer any of those questions. We can just say that if further work is to be undertaken, this is what we see as might be done and all those other questions to be figured out later, if ever.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I just thought if you wanted to really put something serious forward, you want to do more work on it.

Greg Shatan: I think maybe "serious" isn't quite the word, but I would say that the more direction we can give for the next steps after this working group is over, the more likely it is that people might pick up on it quickly.

I wouldn't get bugged down if we have to. I'm trying to kind of pre-design a study, but if there is some wisdom that we can impart to those who might take things the next step, with the ultimate result, you know,

we - being, you know, technical discovery or confirmation, I think that would be better.

On the other hand, you know, it's better for us - we should be able to come out within the time we have left with something that indicates where we think people should go. If we can give more details, that's good, if we can give less details, that's fine too, if the details seem to be limiting rather than directing, then we probably should stay away from them.

I think the ultimate result to my mind is to discover how many of these, you know, reserve or quasi-reserve names or character combination at the first and second level, we can identify as "no longer meeting reservation," or indeed, you know, "not even being reserved at the current time."

Alistair Dixon: I certainly think our recommendation as a study as necessary, I think our recommendation should include a study, if that being identified as potential (information), I think that should be part of our recommendation.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I would agree, Alistair. And I think we shouldn't get bugged down right now on whether how detailed their recommendation of the study...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Greg Shatan: ...should be.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You know, let's just keep the work going, let's follow up with further questions to the experts and some of these ambiguities and work towards create - you know, turning Marilyn's draft here into text we can use on our report.

Greg Shatan: I would certainly agree with that.

Thanks a lot.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Marilyn, did you intend to send this to the entire working group?

Marilyn Cade: Of course, I thought that's what we all need to do, right? I think (Chuck) told us to do that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Did) he say we would prefer to talking about it first?

Man: Then I think our internal notes. These are kind of working notes for the subgroup.

Marilyn Cade: Guys, remember we opened the call with the technical experts to anyone who is interested. And I did say it's very preliminary and haven't even been discussed by the subgroup today.

So, you know, okay, our apology.

Man: That's right. I think you probably just wait (than left) the call, you could have talked about a few words spitting issues and then send something out that we all agreed on, it's really too late now.

Man: I would say let's just be careful about what we - as our group circulate to the larger group only because it's impossible for anyone of us to write something that reflects - that isn't, to some extent, reflected of a position.

Man: Right. When you send out this, you know, three-paged document to people and they read it, when we edit it, send that around again, few people are going to be interested in reading it again. So, you know, it's just in the interest of saving people time and putting our group effort rather than single person's effort.

Marilyn Cade: Properly (chasing).

Man: We'll just - I think it is a good point.

But also have to thank Marilyn for the great deal of work that she put in not only keeping up with everything that was going on but distilling and providing us with this, you know, great head start...

Marilyn Cade: I think...

Man: ...in our discussion.

Marilyn Cade: I just now as confused is I just used the heading that Patrick have used on the IDN working group.

So, gosh, I really apologize. Why don't I post to the full list and apologize to you, Mike ?

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, that's not - we don't need to do that but I think we should...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Let the words of this subgroup takes place within the subgroup, and then when we have a - something that is the work product of the subgroup, we can give it to the rest of the working group. Or if it is not, you know, then we should provide, you know, opportunity for minority statements to go out along with it as we did previously. I think that that's just the issue.

But, you know, just as I made the mistake of posting to one of the groups, our call-in numbers, you know, to find that that is a, you know, something that shouldn't have been done when pointed out with those numbers, if they are put out here, we'll be, you know, public whereas they can be circulated though other methods that will, you know, retain some level of confidentiality.

We all - and this all a work-in-progress and that's why this is a working group (because we're in that). We're all trying to get this right so I don't think we need to labor at this point any further, but I think, you know, there's a great deal of good work done and we just need to kind of maintain some kind of internal working (unintelligible) since this is the - this is kind of a kitchen document to my mind to - and to keep it amongst us, and documents and others would circulate, I think we should all try to keep them amongst the gnso-sl-wg.

Marilyn Cade: Wait.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I just - I'm going to just challenge something.

You do understand all of you that all of the documents must go to the archive.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, and they will be found and that is true.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I just want to be sure everybody...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ....people weren't assuming that the subgroup was keeping things, everything has to go to the archive.

Greg Shatan: No, I understand that. All I'm saying, I think that the work of the subgroup, while it will be public, will be seen as work of the subgroup whereas something that is posted to then full group maybe seen as something that comes from the subgroup to the full group as opposed to something that comes from my member to the full group. So I think that's just the distinction.

And while we are kind of working out our position, some which will ultimately be consensus positions, and some of which will be consensus of minority, and some of which may not reach any consensus. Whatsoever, we just need to be remindful that we're operating in a group of people with different opinions and different views.

Anyway, enough of the - of that discussion.



I think it would be helpful, as Marilyn suggested earlier, to look at the - there's one or two ways we can go being kind of the (anarchist so) I'm not convinced that either way is right.

One is to go through Marilyn's document and - which we have read in the past that some of us maybe just getting, well, run this call and discuss the issues right there.

Second thing would be to go back to the initial recommendations in the Lisbon report and try to, in essence, knock off some of the ones that are not only low-hanging fruit but a fruit that's actually dropped to the ground that can be bugged and put aside.

Patrick Jones: Well, Greg, can I jump in?

Greg Shatan: Please.

Patrick Jones: The document that I sent around to the subgroup on Sunday morning was a cut-and-paste from the March 19 for our working group (at work) that they have the recommendations and everything that I previously gone through that process and was tried to fit into the template that (Chuck) and Liz are using to feed into the new gTLD process. And I think that should be the starting document.

I already see tweaks and edit that need to be made to it but that's fine, but perhaps we can use that as a starting document and work from there.

Greg Shatan: Patrick , I think that's a very good point because that really is should be our working document since that is the prior draft report but buffed up and brought forward to where we need to be.

Marilyn Cade: And I just want to be clear, Greg. This is the just a working document. I didn't intend for this to be our report.

Greg Shatan: I understood. It's just that it maybe mistaken and since it emanated from - nobody would think it was our final report but it might be mistaken...

Marilyn Cade: Then emanate...

Greg Shatan: ...by those outside of our subgroup.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, I think people know the difference between a group and a member of the group but - so we're going to work from Patrick's paper?

Greg Shatan: Yes, let's work from Patrick's paper, but clearly, this is going to be a process of bringing, you know, the concepts that, you know, you've outlined in your document in here and, you know, discussing them, changing them to some extent, but bringing them into this document.

So if we could look at Patrick's document which he sent on Sunday, that I think would be helpful.

Man: And then I think we also maybe, Greg, should consider a list of follow-up questions that we wanted to ask?

Greg Shatan: Absolutely.

Man: And maybe do that as a group rather than send - you know, have bunch of an individual sending lifting unclear questions.

Greg Shatan: Right.

No, I think - well I think that if somebody gets started with a list, we can try to build on that I think.

Marilyn Cade: And so can I just ask where I'm going to find because this is the twenty-second single and two-character before a template, Patrick, is that right?

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, great. Thank you.

So I'm sorry. What do you - do you want to walk through that line-by-line, Greg?

Greg Shatan: No, not at this point. Actually, what I'd like to do is jump to Paragraph or Section 5, the Recommendation Summary.

Man: What's that at the bottom?

Greg Shatan: It's on Page 5. If you scroll through the document...

Man: Right.

Greg Shatan: ...it begins at Definitions and Executive Summary -- Executive Summary Section 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Recommendation Summary.

Man: Got it.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. I'm not at least - if I can find the document in different format, I'm having trouble figuring out where you are, so why don't you just proceed and I'll catch up.

Greg Shatan: Okay, this is - that there's a table here titled Recommendation Summary. It has four columns, Statement of Work Member.

Marilyn Cade: Right, there I see the five, sorry.

Greg Shatan: (It's name) category, Domain Name Level.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Yes, thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

So we're all together here from - on the same page of the handbook, unabbreviated recommendation.

Patrick, do you think this is the best place to start that I do which is your document?

Patrick Jones: Sure, that's fine. That's fine.

Greg Shatan: I think it's - it puts right in front of us as to where we...

Man: I think it shows 3B, the two ASCII letter-number combos, I think has probably been changed to release...

Greg Shatan: Let's start from...

Man: So we need - what we...

Greg Shatan: Let's start from the top if we could.

Man: Sure.

Greg Shatan: 3A, Definition of Character.

Where are we on a definition? (Kenneth), are you working on it?

(Kenneth): That's coming with my idea and material. So I hope to have something to send around with the subgroup tomorrow morning or later today.

Greg Shatan: Great. Thank you.

Next.

(Kenneth): Probably tomorrow morning.

Greg Shatan: I don't want to make you work all night.

(Kenneth): I am anyway.

Greg Shatan: I guess, well, I didn't say, I guess, all night.

Single and two-character IDNs. I mean here we have...

(Kenneth): Okay.

Greg Shatan: This is - you have, say, domain name level all, so first and second level draft in recon, so this will also be coming in your package so you may work home later.

(Kenneth): Forthcoming, yup.

Greg Shatan: Great.

So then that does bring us to the first thing labeled 3B, single ASCII letters at the top. All we have here right now is more work.

I'd say, "based on our call with the technical experts," I'm not sure if that's quite right...

((Crosstalk))

Man: However, we put there "as a placeholder" from the materials that were in the 19th of March report.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Man: Pretty much all I've done is bring them from that report and put them here as a starting place.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Man: Greg?

Woman: Greg?

Man: We're doing that more work now.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Let me say this which - sorry, I interrupt.

But - if we're - the first thing here is to see if there are things here where we don't have more work, where the work is essentially done.

So, let's move pass that one, let's put a "placeholder" there and remember they'll come back to it, and look at single ASCII letters and numbers at the second level.

Man: I've changed.

Marilyn Cade: But, you know, are we going to ask actually have to make 3B 3B1 and 3B2 in order to - because the consultation we had with the technical guys indicate that they - you know, I think we got into this discussion that Alistair was raising. They recommend again releasing single numbers at the top level, right, and I don't see single numbers at the top level in our...

Man: It's here.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry?

Man: Third line at 3B, single and two-ASCII numbers.

Greg Shatan: Two-ASCII numbers.

Marilyn Cade: On 3B, it says, "single ASCII letters and numbers and domain name levels as second."

Greg Shatan: What - then after that?

Man: Below.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, and...

Man: It's one below there, yeah.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Unfortunately, we're stuck with four 3Bs just because of the format of the Statement of Work.

Marilyn Cade: I see, I got it, okay.

Greg Shatan: I guess, informally, let's call them 3B1, 2, 3, and 4. If you look at 3B3, single and two-ASCII numbers at the top, we have more...

Man: That's (right).

Greg Shatan: ...work concern for technical issues, so.



Structurally, you know, to some extent, we're stuck with the Statement of Work structure.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But - yeah, wow.

Greg Shatan: There's a number of different ways to organize this matrix and none of them would be perfect so - or if there's a perfect one, I can't think of it.

Marilyn Cade: Are we going to find - just for an example, are we going to find, you know, for instance you take 3B - I guess I would think that maybe for our working purposes, we would be better off to label them 3B1, 3B2, 3B3, 3B4 just so we can keep them distinct?

Greg Shatan: I think we should do that if we can.

Woman: Or...

Patrick Jones: We can do that, but let's not really get hung up on (what's just taken up before).

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no. I'm just talking about what we talk through then, Patrick.

So, for instance on 3B3, single and two-ASCII numbers, aren't we going potentially to have different recommendations in detail for a single letter at the top level and single - and two - two letter - two-digit at the second level?

Man: Potentially, I would bid four numbers at the top level. We would have a recommendation that would apply to number.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Man: That would be - I mean that - either - I mean that seems to me there are two options, one, we basically - they continue to be reserved, or two, that they'd be released but with restrictions at the level.

Man: Or there'd be more work done.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh:...an issue.

Man: Yeah. I'm sorry, Mike . They were different and we need to be more work without a (doubt).

Man: What I was thinking is that on single and two numbers and on single letters, , both of those probably, you know, to the extent of those, could be released sometimes, there needs to be more work and studies done obviously. There've been issues that potentially - potential issues identified. So, to release them, those issues are going to have to be resolved through a study or research.

Marilyn Cade: So, so...

Avri Doria: On which one?

Marilyn Cade: 3B1 and 3B3, Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well just call them by the category name.

Man: Single ASCII letters and single and two ASCII numbers.

Man: At the top.

Marilyn Cade: At the top.

Man: Top.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: I think we already got a pretty definitive answer on the numbers on the single and two numbers.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. Right.

Avri Doria: I think that one was pretty much set at needing because of the IP address issue needing to remain on the reserved issue that there wasn't really a technical issue that needed to be resolved there if there's just...

Man: Okay. I mean, it was unclear to me how - what scope for that problem was though, honestly, whether that's - is that a (DNS) resolved or issue or...

Avri Doria: No, that's...

Man: ...an application issue, right?

Avri Doria: That's an application issue that basically application, by and large, look in the top-level domain (base) there for number and go "Oops, it's a number, it's an IP address."

Man: Got you, okay.

Avri Doria: And that that's not going to change because even new applications are using that.

And so until IP before, where there's a way, which I don't expect to happen in my lifetime or even my kid's lifetime, I think that one is low-hanging because it just remains close off.

I think they've - I think they were pretty definite on that one and that in terms of the second level...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm comfortable with that.

Avri Doria: No problem.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: In terms of the second level was no problem.

Man: There's just been there the IDN issue that we talked about that I've mentioned before too is what happens when somebody wants to do an IDN version of a single number?

Avri Doria: Yup, now that would...

Man: We're probably not going to be able to do that.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: Why not?

Man: Well, but...

Avri Doria: In other words...

Man: WE can talk about that later.

Avri Doria: ...that doesn't have the same technical problem. Yeah, we may not need to get into that now but that doesn't have the same problem...

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: ...because the (fault) where it's going to look at it, it's going to be (XN dash dash gobble).

Man: Exactly.

Man: Well, yeah, that's true, that's true.

Man: Okay.

So then I think what about two-ASCII letter-number combos? On those, are we comfortable the other way because I think they've...

Man: That again...

Man: ...said there was no issue, right?

Man: At the top level.

Man: Yeah, at the top level.

Avri Doria: Yup, that was not a problem.

Man: That was not a problem.

Marilyn Cade: It wasn't a problem at the top level or...

Avri Doria: And in any other level.

Marilyn Cade: At the second level, right?

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: Right, which is 3D on this chart, the last line of this chart.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: So there was - I thought was there an issue of ordering, right?

Marilyn Cade: There is an issue of ordering that I couldn't tell from the ref notes I took. I just put in the question saying "We needed to ask about the ordering" because I can't remember whether we asked...

Avri Doria: Well, we did. There was no problem, as I remember, I could be wrong, was ordering when it was numbered digit where the number - where the ordering became critical within the dash.

Marilyn Cade: And I capture that.

Avri Doria: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Yup.

I guess I would like us to just ask the question.

Avri Doria: Well it might be good at the end when we think we've taken everything that they've given us and we say, "And these are things we understood, you know, please check them to make sure that we didn't misunderstand and here are the open questions."

Marilyn Cade: Greg, I have a question.

How do you plan to capture? So you're assuming that the writeup on the technical consultation would go in under the expert consultation and that's where we would capture this kind of detail?

Greg Shatan: I think so. That would be a good proposal.

Marilyn Cade: And...

Greg Shatan: But obviously, I'm open to discussion.

Marilyn Cade: And who do you plan to have write it then?

Greg Shatan: That is a good question. Do we have any volunteers?

Marilyn Cade: Well I already wrote something and I got - well, thanks for it.

Greg Shatan: Oh, no, I thank you for you, Marilyn.

Man: I thank you for it as well Marilyn, I'm planning to use it (and build on top of it), ask further follow-up questions. You know, they said, I think, a lot of it can be incorporated.

Man: Well, this had some issues with some of your characterizations, Marilyn, as you might imagine.

Man: It's just a procedure. I think it was only a procedure that was even discussed.

Marilyn Cade: But my only (issue) is you need to figure out who's going to write it that's...

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: Yeah.



(Jimmy): I've got to go to another call, folks. So I will be on the call tomorrow.

Marilyn Cade: (Jimmy), could we figure out before you go who's going to be doing the drafting, because, you know, leading aside characterizations that's taking their point, something have to be drafted.

Alistair Dixon: I'm having to draft my question - over questions that are raised earlier if that would.

Man: I have some questions as well.

So Alistair, why don't you and I do that, put together a list of questions and circulate it to the subgroup and they can build up with that.

Man: That would be helpful. I think Marilyn was actually asking a different point which is who will write up the report on the experts on the results for our expert discussions.

Man: Marilyn essentially done that, we just need to...

Man: Yeah, yeah.

So I think that, you know, Marilyn have, you know, done (Yoman) work to get us started and I'd maybe perhaps, Mike since you're the - you have the most variant - or maybe you'd have the most fond dealing with her characterization, you might want to try to do a second draft and then we can kind of ultimately, you know, as the pendulum slings, come back to something...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Man: ...and we can all look at.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Honestly, I read through, I only had a few comments about it and then some other further questions that came up. So, I will do that.

Alistair, if you want to send me your questions, and what I'll do is send around Marilyn's draft with some edits and questions and we can build from there.

Man: Thank you, thank you..

And I think at for that - at that point, I can take a crack at kind of editing and also making it more kind of final inform and the like and then we can also hopefully ask Patrick to help a little more too.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks all. I got to run.

Man: Thank you.

I think that's a good - that's a procedure that should work again. We see further only because we are in the shoulders of (John).

Man: I think that's actually right.

Man: Anyway, back to our table.

Marilyn Cade: So we've just written under 3D and 3 - so we've done 3B top, single and two ASCII numbers continue with their status. And on 3D, we've written release and allocate, is that right?

Man: That's for two ASCII letters and numbers at the second level?

Marilyn Cade: Right now, what it says is "Registry is made, proposed to release provided that measures are taken to avoid confusion with corresponding country codes."

Remember that part of the discussion previously had to do with the fact that - let me give an example. C1 may look like CL to the users.

So, we're basically, here, saying, you can release but we keep the statement that we make registries, make proposed release blah-blah-blah-blah, and that's the present state-of-the-art I think, isn't it?

Man: Marilyn, I see two ASCII letters and numbers, the last category?

Marilyn Cade: Oh, sorry, I'm looking to the combination. Sorry.

So you're right that's 3B- wait a minute. So we don't have a...

Man: I think we may need another line here.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I...

Man: Because the combination of one ASCII letter and one ASCII number at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Which are already allowed.

Avri Doria: Right.

Do we have to deal with that issues and that issue...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...is all ready prior I mean the new gTLD has a sort of prior blanket on the confusability issue.

And so, I don't know that we need to - I mean that's always going to be the case in every category and I'm just wondering, do we need to worry about it specifically in this category?

Marilyn Cade: Well it's just in our Statement of Work.

Avri Doria: It seems redundant to me.

Man: Are we on the - let's go by the reserve name category. And are we on the category two-ASCII letter number combination?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Man: Okay.

If we need to rename this category to be one letter and one-number ASCII combination, that's fine.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: It's a clearer...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: ...in the next page.

Marilyn Cade: I would say we do, and if we rename it, our risk is there's no technical problem and then you just keep the abbreviated recommendation, right?

Man: Are we - sorry, are we talking at the top level or the second level? I think we are getting confused between the...

Marilyn Cade: I was looking at the second level.

Man: So that's the bottom row of this chart?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: That's called two-ASCII letters and numbers not at this one - two upwards that's called two-ASCII letter-number combination at the top level?

Alistair Dixon: That reserve, at present now, I mean is this actually in the Statement of Work?

Marilyn Cade: Well this is seems to be taken from the Statement of Work.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Well I mean what two-ASCII letters and numbers but...

Man: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: But is zero an ASCII letter-number combination at this particular level, is there a question in that Statement of Work? Because I mean we've already got (unintelligible). So that's the next main issue?

Man: And other combination too?

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, and other combination.

So is that actually part of their Statement of Work? Do we actually need a recommendation or with just being complete?

Greg Shatan: Well, this is Greg.

I guess one thing is our recommendations in large part out there to deal with new TLDs. So what's out there in current T:Ds may not - doesn't completely answer the question.

Man: Can I clarify where we are with this category?

Greg Shatan: Yes?

Man: Okay.

Man: Previously, our subgroup considered this category as its two ASCII letters to two numbers or its letter-number combination, they were all together. And there was - the first part is, you know, that these categories are all reserved provided that registries can propose measures to avoid confusion with any country code.

Marilyn Cade: At the second level?

Man: We're only talking about the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: And so there's the ISO list...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: ... and then there are letters and number combinations on the second level that aren't - that are treated differently in all available (unintelligible). It's - we've already sort of taken care of this category already.

The category at the top level is different. And that's where we should focus our energy because I really, since this bottom category is one of the subgroup and the full working group already dealt with.

Marilyn Cade: Right, that's what I was thinking.

So, maybe we - the way it reads right now though is two ASCII - this statement I think this means AA or one one. And I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah. It's AA, one one, A1, B3, 3M, that's all in that bottom category or 88.

Marilyn Cade: But it's only a combination because two-ASCII letters at the top level.  
So this is - right, this is two letters...

Alistair Dixon: It's a catch all at the moment.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: It catches everything.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think this is summary chart so...

Man: Yeah.

Man: I think in the interest of brevity, maybe it was made a little too brief.  
This is any combination of two - any combination of letters and  
numbers of which there are two at the second level.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Yeah.



Marilyn Cade: So it probably should say “two ASCII letters or number or two - two numbers or combinations”?

Man: That's fine

Man: Right. Whatever - however we want to phrase it...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, okay.

Man: ...but that is the subject.

Marilyn Cade: That's...

Man: So this is AA, A1, one one, 1A...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so...

Man: ...and any other combination you can think of letters and numbers that fits into that parameter.

Marilyn Cade: So then to go two-ASCII letter number combination, the question I have...

Man: At the top level.

Man: At the top level.

Marilyn Cade: At the top level.

The question I had that I can't tell from my note that Avri I thought maybe remember this, I did not - I couldn't tell whether the order matters like if it was one one dot one M, is that okay, or would it has to be one one dot M one?

Avri Doria: Yeah. My impression is that whether they did that whole discussion of three common - three (comments) gotten rid of the problem of the ordering.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, but three (comments) at the second level?

Avri Doria: Yes, I understand.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Avri Doria: And but that's followed through and because there isn't (appear) a number in the end.

As I say, you know, I would suggest that we just mark it as "acceptable" and then just confirm that that's properly understood.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: And that's actually what I proposed, right, that we need to just ask. Okay.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Well I think we need to ask about the whole level of understanding at the end, you know, just sort of send it to and say, "Here's what we got, you know..."

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh. Okay.

Avri Doria: ... as oppose to singling it out at something where we need to further ask.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So...

Man: What's left that we haven't talked about?

Two ASCII letters at the top, the preview of the recommendation that maintain reservation based on the ISO 3166 list, no further work.

Marilyn Cade: That be - yeah, that's the one that has to do with conflict of country codes.

Man: Right, right, the ISO 3166 list being the list of country codes.

Man: And that had a consensus, I believe, of it -- well, maybe not, that's too strong -- but agreement among the whole working group...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: ...before.

Marilyn Cade: And single - okay, yeah.

And then so we just read down from the top at some - so we have made changes.

Greg Shatan: We'll go over this kind of one more time.

Definition of character, Patrick will be providing in the next day or so.

Single and two-character IDNs, Patrick will be providing a draft recommendation again in the next day or so.

Single ASCII letters at the top, this has changed.

Marilyn Cade: And that - I thought we talked about - I thought we agree that needs more work but we want - but there was some agreement to elaborate a little bit more at the work, the direction of the work might take.

Avri Doria: Yeah, the single ASCII at the top needed a study.

Greg Shatan: Now one of the things that I was - that I thought I took away from our technical discussion yesterday was that, not so long as there was not a single letter at the second level, single letters at the top in a given TLD would work.

Avri Doria: Yup.

And with the second case of single at the second level, the only possible hitch is (some old software).

Greg Shatan: So it seemed that this kind of needs to be divided into kind of two which is that it would be suitable to allocate a single letter at the top so long as that TLD did not allocate any single letters at the second level.

Avri Doria: Yup. But that's where we couldn't get agreements because enforcement at the second level is such a sketchy affair.

Marilyn Cade: But it's being enforced now pretty rigidly. But where - at the generics, it's not being enforced in this country code.

Avri Doria: Because they don't have the problem because it's always two letters.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Right.

I think that if a new TLD were created of a single-letter TLD at the top, it would have to have a suitable enforcement mechanism for ensuring that there were no single letters at the second level.

Marilyn Cade: Well why don't we add that in some way to the examination of the further work as ask for an exploration of "Is this suitable?"

One thing that I put, Greg, in the first - in the draft of questions that I originally wrote was, you know, are there ways - I think the original Question 8 was, "When the questions are identified, to what extent and like in the consequences be managed?"

I think what you're describing might be one way of managing the...

Greg Shatan: Right. So if the question is, is it feasible from either a technical or enforcement point of view to prohibit single letters at the second level?

Marilyn Cade: Right.

And in order to - so the study could also examine whether restricting single letters at the second level can alleviate the concern about single letters at the top level, right?

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's actually interesting because another way of putting it is that the current provision single letters at the second level is removable except for the case of single letters at the first level.

Marilyn Cade: And so when you see that a question and put it into the studies.

Greg Shatan: Yup, I think that sounds feasible.

Marilyn Cade: And that's the technical question.

I will say that may not resolve other questions but maybe I thought that answer the technical questions.

So that just elaborates on the abbreviated recommendation...

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ...case study and then a few more questions need to be developed, okay?

Greg Shatan: Right. But I think what I do want to point out there for single ASCII letters at the top is that the - there's a kind of branching issue here that if you accept that there will be single letters at the second level, you have to deal with certain issues that may exist and we need to do a study on those and a few.

It is feasible to enforce or technically prohibit single letters at the second level than single letters at the top shouldn't - there shouldn't be a technical problem with them according to our technical experts.

Marilyn Cade: I'm not sure that's interesting because, you know, I mean they just basically said there are single letters at the second level despite, as far as I know, in the .com, .net but a lot more in the country codes. So we probably ought to ask the question of "Is this a domain-specific issue?"

Greg Shatan: Right. And I think it is, you know, it will be. I mean, in part, there's an issue, it goes back to what I said earlier which is, you know, "to what extent are we making recommendations for future TLDs and to what extent are we making recommendations about the further management of existing TLD. If it's the first, then the fact that existing TLDs have certain characteristics or don't, to some extent, irrelevant because new TLDs can be managed differently.

And we're making a recommendation about how to handle existing TLDs, then we take them where we find them with, you know, those that have single letters or letter-number combinations, you know, just that eliminate certain possibilities or at least certain variables down the line.

Woman: I think there's also little value in having one with your name policy, and if something works in one place and it's been shown to work in another place, so that's good clue for the new gTLD.

And yes, you're right, our work mandate is only the new, but one would hope that, you know, there would be a single reserve name list for ICANN to cope with.

Man: I think even now although it's not and that...

Marilyn Cade: There's not as much - there's a little bit of variation, but once you take out the (premium) name issue...

Woman: Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...there's really some growing - there's a lot of consistency except at the geographic and geopolitical names.

Man: Right, I think that's true and I guess that if we continue to prohibit single letters and - at the top level, the ability for consistency at the other level - at the second level is much greater, if you decide that we would want to try to find the format under which you allow a single letter at the top level, then things might need to change subject to our technical discussion because that's where it seems like you begin to run into problems and then maybe some other top-level issues in a single digit or even multiple digits that could cause problems at the second level, but that if you avoid them, then everything else can kind of stay in consensus or get - keep moving closer to consensus.



But to some extent, does it make sense to stifle development at the top level in order to increase consensus at the second level?

Marilyn Cade: Well...

Man: That's kind of the policy question that's way out of scope but...

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Top levels of - you know, you can't do a lot of harm to the Internet at the second level.

Man: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: I mean you can if some of the really large zones fell over at AT&T and Verizon and Yahoo! and a bunch of the other big zones, CityCorp, et cetera (unintelligible).

Man: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: You could do a huge amount of harm.

But you would be affecting the registrants, you know, the subregistrants, you know, if you're talking about - when you're talking about the top level, you do have the ability to do more harm generally.

Man: I understood. I think, as we're looking toward this and not clearly doing dot A, you know, it opens up of the greater scope of technical harm and also if a greater variants of the current practices or, you know,

creates needs and concerns at the second level that don't exist, you're not going to do dot A.

Marilyn Cade: You know, I'm just going to say one thing about reserved names.

Spending a huge amount of time on reserve names, when I think, overall, the new gTLD policy, hopefully, is going to be about introducing something other than single letters and numbers.

Man: True.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: Unfortunately, we are the single and two-character subgroups so that's we - that's our last name (life).

Marilyn Cade: Are we doing with this chart again?

Man: Let's see. We'll I just going back through it again, we're almost done.

Single ASCII letters and numbers at the second level, our recommendations was release contingent upon development of a suitable allocation framework.

Is there any controversy about whether that is still our recommendation?

Assuming that there are not, I think the caveat to that is that this would not work in a - if there are single letters or numbers at the top level

from a - or may not work.. (They believe), technical concern is raised if the - if we're talking in the context of a single-letter, top-level domain.

Marilyn Cade: I thought this recommendation was approved. I - we're not - this recommendation is already been approved, right (Patrick)?

Patrick Jones: Well, this was the recommendation in the 19 March Report...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: ...but, you know, we could go back and refine it if there is interest in doing that.

Man: Well, I mean, that new information it seems to me on this one, with respect to single-letters at the top level.

Marilyn Cade: I don't - I'm not...

Man: I think, other than that, that's really fine.

Marilyn Cade: I'm not - I'm really concern. Are we reopening? Because it isn't - this is in the March 3 report that are we - I hope we're not talking about - I thought we were talking about doing a study and asking for further clarification about what could exist at the top level.

I hope we're not suggesting that we're going to try to undo the recommendation to release single ASCII letters and numbers and go ahead and try to move forward on that because lord knows when that that study would take us.

Greg Shatan: Well, I don't think that the study would prohibit or inhibit the recommendation in domain that consisted of more than a single letter or character...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: ...whether a numbers or character.

It's only that circumstance, which we discuss yesterday, of singles, digits or single characters at both the top and second level, the A dot A issue.

Marilyn Cade: So, maybe we could explain that, Greg.

You know, I just want to be - I hope we're not undoing work we previously done, and the way you characterized, it sounded like your thought was you would assume that this recommendation could go forward and (chill) this that are more than one letter, while the study is being called for.

Greg Shatan: Yes, that would be my - the way to characterize our recommendation.

But I think it would be imprudent at least to say that this could go forward even in a single-character TLD.

Marilyn Cade: But we could - we can say that but we, also, I think, have to be really pragmatic about if - you know, if we're calling an IDN to fund a study, there's a big difference between the will of the community to fund work on IDN and potentially the will of the community to fund work on something that's going to benefit 26 parties as well.

Greg Shatan: (Few) as any parties.

But, well, 26 times the number of different TLDs there were such more than 26 parties.

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no, on top - with the top level.

Greg Shatan: I see what you're thinking.

Marilyn Cade: Yup.

Greg Shatan: Well, the fact that we recommend a study because there's insufficient technical understandings, you know, whether a problem that may exist does exist.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: And if there is - if the will of the community is that they don't care enough, then the study will remain undone and the reservation will essentially remain in effect.

Marilyn Cade: So I just want to be sure we we're - we weren't starting over on this for anything other than the areas we think are being studied.

Greg Shatan: No, I don't think we are at all.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: I think it's just that it's a little bit of a refinement because the first recommendation was - didn't distinguish between single-character TLDs and multiple-character TLDs as a...

Marilyn Cade: So that means we need to have a link between paragraph that explains the link between the call for the study in this but note that and leave the recommendation as it is just have that explanation, right?

Greg Shatan: Right.

And underlying this is the fact that while we've, you know, talking about each of these in the vacuum, you know, something at the top level in the vacuum and something at the second level in the vacuum, what happens at the top level influences whether something can happen at the second level and vice versa. So, that's why this chart (SMC) is four-dimensional but it can't be, so.

So I think that covers single-ASCII letters and numbers for the moment. At least, you know, the (gross) characterization of what needs to be refined there and what is still is kind of fully vague and already decided, single and two-ASCII numbers at the top, more work concern for technical issues.

Marilyn Cade: But we changed that to continue reserve status?

Greg Shatan: Yes. So that, as I say, I'm ridding of what was there and indicating...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, okay, okay.

Greg Shatan: ...what - making sure we understand what we think should be there.

And then next, we have two-ASCII letter-number combinations. Again, it was more work which is at the top level.

Man: So this category now, one ASCII letter and one ASCII number combination?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, it is and it's one - yes, it's one letter, one number in any order.

Man: Right. So this excludes dot one one, it excludes dot AB, it's only dot 1B or dot B1.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

You know, this is - remember (Chuck) has asked us to have examples. I'm kind of thinking hopefully.

Man: We should add another column to the chart which is an example.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: That's not a bad idea at all.

Man: That's fine.

Man: Yes. Since we constantly go back to examples, it's just the human tends to work best in the concrete.

So again, two-ASCII letter-number combinations, dot 1B, dot B1, more work because that's still our recommendation.

And what does that "more work: mean? It means there's something better than that.

Marilyn Cade: Avri, I thought the recommendation here was - that was clear. You thought the order - that there was no question on the order and I thought we needed to verify that there was not a question on the order.

Greg Shatan: Okay, so we need clarify which error...

Avri Doria: Right.

You know, all I was saying is, yeah, we need to verify everything.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Yes, but - right.

But specifically, this is one where there was a complete lack of clarity or recall by the group as to whether the order mattered or not which...

Avri Doria: Not so sweet. I'm pretending I do remember.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

And I'm sorry you can...

Avri Doria: I'm the only pretend that - so I...



Greg Shatan: And your memory, you can tend to - is that does not matter or does matter?

Avri Doria: That it does not matter.

Marilyn Cade: And Greg, it isn't that my memory fails me, it's that I'm unclear on if I had numbers at the second level, such as the example I gave one one, then what - can I have 1M or do I have to have the M first?

Greg Shatan: Right, I understood.

Avri Doria: Specifically, I asked that question but - yeah, I was - (but doesn't), but yeah, I mean, someone should rely on my memory.

Greg Shatan: Yes, we'll ask the experts again.

And I guess the question - assuming what we found or what we recall we found was if it's that dot M1, it's not a problem, it could be allocated.

Avri Doria: Yeah, everyone seems to feel they remember that.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

And that if it isn't a problem, then both dot 1M and - or if there's no difference, then both dot 1M and dot M1 should be allocated.

Woman: Uh-huh..

Greg Shatan: And if there is a difference, then there maybe a problem if the number comes first.

Marilyn Cade: And if there is a difference, there were just need to be a rule.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

So let's clarify that with our experts among the other things that we're clarifying with our experts.

Now we have two ASCII letters at the top, maintain reservation based on ISO3166 list, no further work, just one where Mike Rodenbaugh was kind of had the minority view.

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Mike has a view as an individual. So that's an individual view as opposed to minority view.

Was there any support for that on the council for taking that up?

Avri Doria: What's the difference between a minority view and a view of an individual?

Marilyn Cade: Well...

Man: I'm no sure that there is one.

Marilyn Cade: Well, Avri, in a taskforce, this is just a working group, but in a taskforce...

Avri Doria: Yeah, so it's the working group, right?

Marilyn Cade: ...then you have to have a constituency position.

You can have an individual point of view while a constituency might have a minority point of view.

So - and there is no constituency...

Avri Doria: Yeah, but the way we were working on this whole group, if you remember, I think it's in the - at Statement of Work and that we use very much the same methodology that was used in IDN is that there's strong support, some support, and ultimate view.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: So...

Marilyn Cade: But I was asking...

Avri Doria: ...the ultimate view...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...with our view is just that one person is enough, I believe, to make an ultimate view.

Marilyn Cade: It is, but I was asking whether there was any support on the council for reopening this. Because it doesn't mean you can -- we can't put the

minority statement in here but I was just asking a question of whether the council was supporting - confronting the GAC on this.

It sounds like we don't know.

(We might want to)...

Alistair Dixon: I think it was acknowledged as an issue but I'm not aware that it's gone further than this.

Marilyn Cade: It's acknowledged that - Alistair, you think...

Alistair Dixon: Well, Mike present a - my recollection is that he posted about, you know - that posted about what sort of - posted about confusability and, you know, it was like - that like the C1, C0, that sort of thing.

But we haven't really - the council hasn't done anything further on this as an issue.

Marilyn Cade:: So, I would say that we keep the recommendation we have, and if Mike wants to have a minority statement that he adds that he writes that.

Man: Let me ask what the recommendation. Is it that there should be no two-letter TLDs?

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: Or is it that there should be no two-letter TLDs where there could be confusion within - with a ccTLD?

Marilyn Cade: At the top level, there's a provision against two-letter TLDs because of potential confusion with country code as well as outright collisions, at the second level, it's different.

Man: And the reasoning for this is put into - if you scroll down the Recommendation 7, all the background information is there.

Man: Right.

Man: IANA has said that they strongly recommend that the current reservation for the ISO list be maintained, the ccNSO has said that, and the GAC says most recently is in their principles in Lisbon has said that too.

Marilyn Cade: And come to think of it, I think Mike's minority statements are already in there.

Man: Yup, they're all there.

Greg Shatan: Okay, so...

Well, I would - let's - I would prefer to discuss this with Mike on the line.

So it sounds like we are moving toward maintaining where we are on that, but I just want to give everyone a chance to represent their own opinion.

Marilyn Cade: Greg, I just need to understand something. I understood that we we're not reopening the previous work, we were working on the areas that we weren't done on, and I thought this was a complete work.

Greg Shatan: That maybe I just want to make sure that, you know, we have as much, you know, kind of full and fair discussion and I don't think it's fair to kind of, you know, lock the door and throw it away.

The key on this one with Mike absent, we may end up doing exactly that same thing with Mike present, I just prefer to do it...

Marilyn Cade: Sure. But I'm...

Greg Shatan: ...structurally or procedurally...

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Greg Shatan: ...you know, if somebody is an interested party on a particular thing to let them...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: ...you know, talk through.

As a general - generally, it is true we are - you know, if it's done, it's done...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: But we are trying to refine things, and if there is new information, just, you know, as we talk to the technical experts, we realized that we need to look at the top level and second level in relation to each other and not merely, you know, in rules at each level. So - then that's a refinement.

And if there were a refinement here, you know, to some extent it's like, you know, opening up - I hate to (make) a lawyer, and since I know - yeah. I'm a lawyer and not everybody is, which is a wonderful thing.

But, you know, like you can get a conviction overturn, if there's new evidence, but not merely because somebody could make a better argument about the existing evidence.

Avri Doria: Not even (if there are not).

Greg Shatan: So...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so, are we...

Greg Shatan: It's a similar thing.

So I think that - and we've already talked two-ASCII letters and numbers which is any combination at the second level of number or letter or number-number or letter-letter or number-letter, letter-number.

Marilyn Cade: So we're done with that?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

So I think that brings this of - to - an understanding of what is really pretty much done and what has some at least technical study attached to it.

So we're done.

Marilyn Cade: Actually, we're not done.

Greg Shatan: NO, I know we're not done.

Marilyn Cade: Shouldn't we actually - so we'd talk about the chart.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: We've talked about the - and the reason I'm pushing this, you may have seen an email from (Chuck), but (Chuck) is reminding all of us that we don't actually have until May the 10th to get the work done.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: And that we need several days of time.

I would actually thought from my conversation with (Chuck) on the 1st, what I'm going to be chairing for (Chuck) that we are going to be the reviewing and discussing subgroup reports and final form subject to questions and inputs from the broader working group.

So, looking at that ,you know, I'm kind of concern about our timeline and I wanted - before you got on, I asked the question of, you know, "Where do we thing we are on our timeline," recognizing we really just



delegate all of our works to Patrick, we need to do further work ourselves. "What work do we need to do?"

We've got the assignment you gave to Mike to take the (rough draft), but I did enhance it, fix it, send it to you for you to put it into a more appropriate format, right?

Greg Shatan: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: We've got...

Greg Shatan: And that's on the technical experts.

Marilyn Cade: We've got...

Greg Shatan: Non-IDN.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

We've got Alistair and Mike developing further questions, some of which we've brainstormed, some of which are in my draft document and what else need to be drafted.

And then we've got the question of, on the idea and stuff, that's probably next week's work, right?

Greg Shatan:: Yes.

Man: You know, well, you're going to get tomorrow...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, sorry, I meant talking about it.

Man: Yeah, right, yes. So you have the rest of the week to review it and then we can talk about it again early next week.

In the meantime, I think we need to where we can make add-ups to the recommendation section.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: You should view that.

Marilyn Cade: Right, right, right.

Greg Shatan: And I guess the question there is whether we want to try within this group to assign certain sections to certain people so that they could - so they can't just have everyone editing every section. I mean if you put this all up on a Wiki and have everybody edit it, but that would be...

Marilyn Cade: So what...

Greg Shatan: ...difficult at best.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. So, great.

Why don't you pick a page and call - and let's just talk about what, for instance, you're thinking about in terms of - you know, I'm actually looking at Page 8 and - which is single ASCII characters and letters at the top level where there's a recommendation, a rationale, expert consultation and references.

And so, that might be an example of where, you know, we've had an intensive conversation, we've taken technical consultation. This is one that's right for editing because of the discussion about the suggestion that we call for a study, right?

Greg Shatan: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: So are you - It might be best since - you know, you don't have any clients who are interested in single letters at the top level, right, according to your issues...

Greg Shatan: I do not.

Marilyn Cade: So...

Greg Shatan: I am complete agnostic on this.

Marilyn Cade: So maybe you would want to take some of those where other parties, myself included, have an interest?

Greg Shatan: I would be happy to do so, so...

Marilyn Cade: ICANN to declare an interest in the top level.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Do you want to go through this?

Greg Shatan: Let's go through this quickly, time is - I need to wrap this up at 5:30.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I think so.

Greg Shatan: My time, 5:12 now.

Marilyn Cade: But if you would be asking assignments, people could draft and come back in, you know, in the next two or three days.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Next. So let's move to Recommendation 4, single ASCII letters and numbers at the second level.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...of what?

So one is done, one is assigned, two is assigned - three just got assigned to you, sorry, I got it. I'm on your page now.

Greg Shatan: Right.

So, Recommendation 4 which is on Page 10, "single ASCII letters and numbers at the second level" obviously quite a bit written already and we'll be looking for someone non-interested to edit this.

Marilyn Cade: So it think that there needs to be more work on this too though because we haven't talked about allocation methods.

And I agree that - I think somebody who doesn't have an interest to work on it, but I'd like to continue to enhance that work that isn't done and people can then edit it against it.

Alistair, would you be willing to do that one?

Alistair Dixon: I guess I will.

And also, on allocation, we decided last time that allocation is out of scope, so, unless we can group.

Marilyn Cade: But it's not out of scope for the terms of reference. And I wrote the Terms of Reference and allocation is reference and it's also a reference here in our contingent fund development of a suitable allocation framework.

So, if somebody needs to put forward some ideas on how to establish allocation method...

Greg Shatan: I guess this is a question, "Do we need to or do we nearly need to say that there should be a suitable allocation framework?"

Man: Marilyn, can I add to this?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: Before Lisbon debate that happened in the working group was - and we are pretty close to listing, I guess, four or five different allocation options that could be considered.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: And then several of the working group members expressed an objection that it wasn't 'till the working group to come up and suggest allocation method that that should be probably be done through the further work not at this group but maybe a group after this one.

And there was debate and that's just...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: ...made it clear that there are opposing viewpoints on this point.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

I think we need to say something about how a suitable allocation framework gets developed. I'm not suggesting that we need to write and agree on a definitive one but I think we need to say something since we point out that there needs to be a suitable allocation framework and that the call for establishing that is actually in the Statement of Work and not that we need to (define) it that...

Man: Marilyn, that we need to just call for an allocation framework to be developed?

I don't - I would think that, you know, there are so many out different - there are variety of allocation frameworks that have been developed. And I would think it would be up to - so far it seems that's been up to each TLD, the (APTI) registry to develop and then have it approved by ICANN.

Marilyn Cade: Actually, for - just real quickly. For the most part, the allocation method, unless it is approved by ICANN, is first-come-first-serve.

Man: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: Can I...

Man: And then we get into Sunrise issues and the like and then we get into - after that, premium names and other kind of, you know, fund option in RSP methods and the like.

Marilyn Cade: So right now, what the three said that "While it appears that single letters and numbers at the second level can be released, further examination of allocation option is needed."

So, I could submit a minority statement on that and somebody else can edit it.

Can you tell us what you mean by references? You mean just a link that we' consult? Can somebody give us an example of what should go into references?

Man: The references section which is currently blank?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: I think that is merely kind of the bibliography, if you will, for the section.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

So, did you actually wrong interpret that Alistair?

Man: Or you're in the process of being volunteer for that?

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Well, that you may sound that we are walking into (unintelligible) volunteer.

Man: If there is one you would prefer to this one, that maybe the time to say so, but I think no one will walk away without something to say, so.

Alistair Dixon: I mean I've always - I - generally, in the process of a volunteer to do a single letters at the top level. That's what I generally (pursue) with that.

Man: Well if you - so that's the one that I volunteered myself.

Alistair Dixon: So you've volunteered.

Okay, I can do this one, sure.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Okay, I'll put your initials next to this one then.

Marilyn Cade: Single and two-ASCII numbers to the top level, I certainly don't have an interest in that. I'll do any of the others that you want to - that you want me to do.



Man: So let's put your initials down next to this Recommendation 5 for the moment.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: And then if people want to engage in horse-trading, I have no objection to that. This is one as I take a 10% cut.

Recommendation 6, two-ASCII letter and number combination at the top level. There's not much written here at all.

Avri, would you like to say you're correct at this one?

Marilyn Cade: Can I?

So Recommendation 5 is single and - so this is the Number 1 and 11.

Man: This is really - this is only - this is a digits-only.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And then, and in 6 is the combination. I got it, sorry.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I got it.

Man: We have more recommendations when we have people.

So, I mean it seems to me, to some extent, the Recommendation 5 is simple because - or simpler.

Marilyn Cade: Five is very simple and I was hoping you had noticed.

Man: Yes, I noticed, it's very simple.

Marilyn Cade: And do we have a time, but we don't have time to debate this.

Man: So perhaps we should do...

Marilyn Cade: Are you trying to get me to?

Man: Yes, I am.

Marilyn Cade: But wait a minute. Let's see if you actually have (two) aside.

Man: (Unless)?

Man: Well, Recommendation 7 and 8, I see as done.

Marilyn Cade: Right, exactly.

Man: So if they're really pretty much done, then maybe we're out of those to be done.

Marilyn Cade: I'm really not sticking my tongue at it, my chairman, on the phone.

Man: What do we had in video phone?

So maybe that takes us to the end then in terms of assignments.

Marilyn Cade: And so, are you still giving Avri 6?

Man: If Avri will consent.

No, it says 6 is already done.

Marilyn Cade: No, 7 and 8 are done.

Man: Seven and eight. And so 6 is still open for...

Avri Doria: I don't have a follow-up (unintelligible).

Man: This is two ASCII letters at the top level and since - we can't give this to - or rather I - maybe we shouldn't give it to Mike because he got the minority statement in it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, no, no.

Recommendation 6 is letter-number combination.

Man: I'm sorry.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's A1, C3...

Marilyn Cade: (CIF).

Man: Never mind.

Two ASCII, that's right.

So if this is ASCII letter and number combination at the top level which is a little confusing to write about it. Let's say, if somebody to clarify this one?

Marilyn Cade: So, Mike could do that one there. Right, because he doesn't expressed any view on that.

Man: Right.

Well let me put his initials next to that one and inform him.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm trying to avoid (unless ) we're something but...

Marilyn Cade: Well...

Avri Doria: ...got my own group that I'm behind writing on....

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I was just kind...

Man: Right, since Avri is a chair/Tier1 and member of another so we'll...

Avri Doria: So yeah.

Man: We'll give you a free ride at this time, we have to buy drinks.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) or buy drinks, yes.

Marilyn Cade: So, to me, it looks like...

Man: We have Neal Blair.

Marilyn Cade: It looks like the only thing that's needed on 7 and 8 is to try to flash out the references and just do an edit. Is that...

Man: Unless Neil would prefer to do 6.

Neal Blair: You know, actually, I see 7 and 8 as basically complete unless there's anything else to do, but pretty much those of two are done.

Man: That's given the references there.

There are no references for 8 or...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...no, it goes over to the next page.

Neal Blair: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, I see., yeah. Oh I see (unintelligible).

Neal Blair: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: That's great. I was just looking at the reference and thinking - yes, I see now.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: I think it gives everybody something to do except Avri who has much to do elsewhere and Neil will have to do something at some point.

Neal Blair: I'm available.

Man: Great.

Well you'll be on our (ballpen).

Neal Blair: Right.

Man: This probably means to end up closing.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so, do you want to do this by the end of the week, I would say?

Man: Yes, I think given the timeframe, we should, you know, take our sections, edit them, I guess use track changes so people can see the edits and circulate them to the group.

Marilyn Cade: And follow the format that Patrick's sent.

Greg Shatan: Yes, keep everything in Patrick's format. Just lift to your piece out out and then edit it and then it can be plunked back in.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, the one question that I'm - so each of us then instead of Mike - so on the expert consultation, the materials that are available to us are the MP3, the transcript, and the summary notes that I did, is that right?

Greg Shatan: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Because we're not rewriting a single document on expert consultation, we're plugging in a relevant section, right?

Greg Shatan: I think that is the case.

Actually, I'm going to - Neal, can I ask - actually ask you to do Recommendation 6 since you've been on the whole call and Mike...

Neal Blair: Sure.

Greg Shatan: ...is not here and he would just be a little bit smoother if we handle it that way?

Neal Blair: I'd be happy to do so.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

And I'll put your initials then next to Recommendation 6.

Marilyn Cade: And so, we're actually not - we're not going to get it a redraft from Alistair and Mike on the draft I did only because everybody is going to plug in the relevant information on their expert consultation.

Greg Shatan: Well I guess we won't have a section -- an overall section on consultation of experts -- rather there will be a section within each recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: But you can, and the way that you'll see from the transcript - it's up to you Greg, but you'll see from the transcripts, there was a lot of floating back and forth.

Greg Shatan: Uh-huh, right.

Marilyn Cade: So, I don't know if you...

Greg Shatan: Let's do this about that Let's - let the - there's enough, I think, to be done aside from the Expert Recommendation section that if we can let those who are going to buff up the Expert Recommendation section, do so.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: And people work on the other sections of their piece...

Marilyn Cade: Oh again...

Greg Shatan: ...and then can bring in the revised version of the expert section?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: That we will kind of, I think, under the process just a bit more.

Marilyn Cade: That's sounds fine. I guess it's okay.

So, can we just schedule for next week?

Greg Shatan: Yes, we need to schedule for next week.



And next our all hands, our working group call is - is that Tuesday, May 1?

Marilyn Cade: I think that...

Man: I thought it's Thursday, May 3...

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Man: ...unless we move it.

Marilyn Cade: It's Thursday, May 3. That's the day I'm in the chair.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: Yup.

Greg Shatan: That's Thursday, May 3? Okay, good.

Marilyn Cade: And it's my intent to walk through the subgroup reports. According to my conversation with (Chuck), it's my intent to walk to subgroup reports with the full groups commenting and asking questions of the subgroups.

Greg Shatan: So we really need to be quite far along by then.

So I think we need to - just need to look at the earlier part of next week as when we can all get together and given the - and this is kind of two-hour band and kind of the Eastern mid-afternoon or I should say Eastern US mid-afternoon where we can do this, let's just look days, is that work?

Man: Tuesday at the same time we started today's call, workable.

Greg Shatan: That doesn't work for me. Unfortunately, that's one monthly internet committee of INTA will be meeting and that's, of course, I'm part of that.

Man: What about Monday?

Greg Shatan: Monday is good at this time either at 3:30 EDT or 4:30 EDT time.

Marilyn Cade: Alistair, does it matter to you?

Alistair Dixon: That's fine for me.

Avri Doria: Talk to you later when I have some.

Marilyn Cade: Where...

Man: That's fine.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Woman: Are you going to be in Europe?

Marilyn Cade: I've got two to four government meeting on Monday that I have to be at.

Greg Shatan: So, shall we say 4:30 Monday?

Marilyn Cade: I can do even 4:15 but 4:30 is great, but if you want to do 4:15 because that - I mean...

Greg Shatan: Well...

Marilyn Cade: I can throw them out of my office.

Greg Shatan: Well, let's say 4:15 then...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...on Monday and that is April 30?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Man: I actually probably prefer 4:30.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Greg Shatan: Okay, then that's 4:30, Monday, April 30, 4:30 Eastern Daily Time, I'm sorry, to be a chauvinist to Eastern Daily Time, I should worldly and go by UTC but I...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...(unintelligible) UTC.

Marilyn Cade: And so - and then we have the third is the actual full working group. And then we would have only one final - you might want to go ahead and think about a one-hour of follow up to just tentatively, because on the 8th, I think (Chuck) is considering all the subgroups are done by the 8th.

Greg Shatan: Right.

What (Chuck) has said in his email regarding timing is "I will leave it to the subgroup to continue their work without my interference, but I do want to make one comment and this is important to realize that we really do not have until 10th of May to continue working. On 10th of May, the full working group will have to approve final recommendations so several days of lead time should be allowed before then. I would suggest that subgroup report should be completed, including final recommendation, not later than 8th of May at the latest, 8th of May being a Tuesday, two weeks from today at the latest, but I'm open to discussion on this. The key factor is the ability for the four working group to take final action on Thursday, 10th of May."

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, but I don't - I really caution again, these are robust reports, and imagine you're going to have - how many subgroups are there?

Greg Shatan: Well, there are at least three that are fairly active.

Marilyn Cade: So, that means on the 10th...

Greg Shatan: It's five altogether.

Marilyn Cade: On the 10th of May, we're going to be reviewing three 25 to 30-paged report?

Greg Shatan: Correct.

Man: If we need to try to schedule the subgroup call on Wednesday the 2nd, or as bad as it is, Friday the 4th, we could do that or even Monday the 7th.

Greg Shatan: I would think either Friday the 4th or Monday the 7th is better only because we will have the benefit of the Thursday, full working group call.

Marilyn Cade: Right, yeah.

Man: I could do Friday at the same time we did today. I could do Friday at...

Marilyn Cade: Friday is - that would be morning for Alistair.

Man: Yeah, I know...

Alistair Dixon: Today is a public holiday for me too, so.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, yeah.

Greg Shatan: Well, you get to enjoy your wonderful country and I guess it comes with a few small downsides relating to...

Alistair Dixon: (Unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: ...those in the last blessed parts of the world.

Alistair Dixon: True.

Marilyn Cade: Alistair.

Here, if it's - I mean if we had a lot of work to do, which I don't actually think we could we would, we've a lot of work to do than - I mean on Friday. If we think we have debate and discussion to do, I would assumed we could submit on the 7th.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's right.

Greg Shatan: Sorry, go ahead please.

Man: Oh, what I was just thinking, isn't it something we should look at after our next call?

Marilyn Cade: You're probably right.

Greg Shatan: Yes, so let's reserve...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: You know, with the possibility of being meeting either on Monday or Friday the 4th or Monday the 7th, you know, we will discuss that, you know, lock down one of those two times at our next call. And a lot of

that depends really on what shape our report is in so I think that - I hate to say it, but if we need more writing, I would want to have the meeting before the weekend to allow the weekend for writing.

Man: Right.

Man: I really need to jump off now so...

Greg Shatan: And I do too, I'm about to join another call, so.

Marilyn Cade: And Greg, you're just going to give Mike an email or something about the time?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Perfect.

Greg Shatan: Well thank you all and I will - we will see each other on the next full call tomorrow.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk)).

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Greg Shatan: Bye-bye.

END