

**Single Letter Names Working Group (sl-wg) Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
April 30 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 30 2007, at 20:30 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/sl-wg-20070430.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

Attendance:

Marilyn Cade - CBUC
Neal Blair - CBUC
Alistair Dixon - CBUC
Greg Shatan - IPC
Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager
Victoria Tricamo - EA to VP of Policy Development (covering for Glen De Saint G ry)

Man: We start the recording, so they'll probably come on momentarily.

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the conference coordinator.

At this time, I would just like to advise everyone that the conference today is being recorded. Should you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Woman: I guess it's too late to...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...wonder if that's an opportunity to get out of more work, huh?

Man: Yeah. I think we're being on that point.

Man: Welcome, everybody. We're now underway, and we're recording this meeting of the - character subgroup of the reserved names working group. And we've had a number of contributions coming in. I admit that I'm one of the (now keepers) who has not yet put any contribution, although I've been stuck in my hotel all day and not at the conference I am here to attend.

Woman: Oh, it's too bad.

Man: It is.

So I think we've had some email traffic today, and I thought maybe we should start with some of the issues that we were emailing about regarding, you know, experts, how to deal with, you know, technical expert contributions and ending the other things that we've been dealing with.

Woman: Can I just ask, because I'm not online right now? The - looking at your list of assignments, can we disperse (above) before we do that? How many responses have we gotten? We've gotten six and seven, I know, because I submitted both of those since Neal was traveling. Have we gotten any of the others?

Man: Let's see. I think we got one other. Correct. Let's see.

Man: I looked at too, (Lisa), names at the top label. And to my review of it, at least I couldn't see anything that needed to be changed. So, I didn't change anything.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Okay. If you could just send an email for the record...

Man: Okay, cool.

Man: ...it would be helpful. That's good news.

Woman: So we - so, is that - we just have two actual...

Man: Let me see.

Woman: ...recommendations to review.

Man: I thought that we had one more, but I (unintelligible) my inbox here to find it.

Woman: I'm surprised Avri is not on the call. I was thinking she could join us these week but not next week, but I'm maybe confused.

Man: She's been emailing. But I'm a little surprised she's not on for some, you know, in some place where she can at least pay attention to the...

Woman: Well, what I might propose is, if we do just have the two that one thing we might do is just start at Page 1 at (Patrick's) draft and go page by page as well.

And because on - and then figure out what needs to be done, because on Thursday, when I'm sitting in for Chuck, I want to be sure that the sub - the task force, the subgroup leaders have a good understanding before they come in to that call. You know, is their report 70% done, 55% done, et cetera? You know what I mean?

Man: And that's a good suggestion. I appreciate the advance warning as well, so, (that you all) worked through it.

Further - you're an asset to the subgroup. So, I guess I would like to start with the issue of the expert recommendations.

Woman: Yeah. You joined us actually and we were talking about that when you came on. And I'll just bring you and Alistair up-to-date on what I had said.

I'm very familiar with the PDP and what ICANN's task forces. Some people accused me of having help to (raise) the PDP that's just because they're old and as old as I am. But the section that Liz pulled down and suggested that we try to view - is that lease feasible to the task forces appointing experts.

There are two mechanisms at ICANN, two references to external expert advice. There's another document that's not relied on that was - that very often, it was developed (to win grand foresight) to the

previous calendar was chairing an admin group and if you tried to address how experts could be identified and retained.

But again, in obvious cases, you know, the board has -- under 11a -- the ability to establish expert advisory panels. What we have in the PDP process is this concept that the task force can solicit the opinions of outside advisers, experts or other members of the public in addition to those of constituency members.

This opinion should be set forth in a report prepared by such outside advisers, label that's coming from the outside adviser, accompanied by detailed statement of the qualifications and experience and the potential conflicts of interest.

We actually -- historically, within the task forces that I've been on over the years, from time to time -- have reached out to people and asked them to participate in conference calls, provide their opinions. We've often even hosted this kind of concept of an open mic and tried to invite experts.

But we haven't appointed those folks as outside advisers. And the challenge I see is that, the people who we reached out to, and that would be Ram and Tina and Cary and (Delavan) and Mark McFadden. Those are just the ones whose names I recall.

None of them were appointed as outside advisers to the task force. They were invited by working groups to share their views.

And - so we didn't - when we contacted them, give them this criteria, that's in the PDP, I'm wondering if a solution might be to take the

relevant section of the - of Patrick's report, the relevant recommendation, send it to the relevant expert and ask them to please review that section and give us an email that notes whether they concur with the way we've described their participation under 3, Expert Consultations.

And if they concur with the recommendations or they have any additional comments they wish to make, which will then be attended under the expert consultation, and tell them we have a very short turnaround.

But it limits the amount of writing they need to do and focuses them on the sections that we've asked them about.

Man: I think that's a good suggestion. I think - and I was concerned about imposing, you know, too much on the experts, especially since, you know, we have a short time frame.

I guess the question whether that will (fly) with Chuck and Liz and, you know, with ICANN. I know it's not among the list - and neither Chuck nor Liz, are among the list of representatives is what I'm saying. So I'll make sure we're playing by whatever rules we should be playing, right?

Woman: I...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...not getting - by rules we don't need to be.

Woman: Yeah. You know, there's not a lot of clarity. I think it's a little late to be saying to the working group, "Here's the task force rule that you have to abide by." I just don't know how feasible it is.

And I also don't know how we would, you know, if we want to designate these folks as outside advisers, I don't know what additional time we would need in order to get them to write a report.

Man: I don't think it's the time we have.

Woman: Right. I'm not sure any of them would agree to write a report.

Man: Right, even if we gave them a month and we're giving them a week or less. So, I think the report is kind of out of discussion. At most, you might get some, you know, quick email back, and I think that would have to be the report as it were, you know, a couple of paragraphs.

Woman: Uh-huh.

Man: So I think...

Woman: So...

Man: ...the concern about Chuck and Liz I think raised at - and I understand conceptually where they're coming from is that, trying to use verbatim text from or as opposed to characterization of what experts may have said or concluded is seems to be the better approach.

And it provides, you know, back up for the committee's conclusions or at least for the citations by the group as to, you know, what we're

relying on or what we're counting or discounting from the technical people that we spoke to.

Woman: I remember the impression that the assignment to the members of the task force concluded on their own reading the RFC, as well.

That was certainly something that, you know, we went through in the early part of the work. And so, you know, that I don't think we would be, you know, I think in the report, one of the things we've done is to document what we view as resources, right?

Man: Yeah. Yes, that's true.

Marilyn Cade: So I'm just looking at Page 11 of Patrick's report as an example.

Man: Okay, we'll turn to it.

Marilyn Cade: And on the three consultations with the experts, it's - this is the - this is a behavioral summary of what happened. It is in a verbatim scripting of, you know, of the exchange of emails. The emails are all in the archive.

Man: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So...

Patrick Jones: Marilyn, this is Patrick. Is there a problem with the way I've laid it out in...

Marilyn Cade: Not at all. I was suggesting that's exactly what I thought.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Man: So, you got it right, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I was saying, I thought that section was supposed to do was describe what we did. Consultations to place with this person, we had a conference call, we read the, you know, and then we had some questions.

That's what I was thinking we were putting in there. So, that's why I didn't really understand where we would plug in quote from experts.

Man: I think the issue was whether we would somehow put in what the experts - what information the experts gave us.

Marilyn Cade: So, let's skip on one where - let's look at that one again. Right now, with the single - and two-character IDNs, I'm assuming that no one has any emotion around that, so we can talk about it.

This is a backward description; the group has some opportunity to sign off on it. What else - using it as a model, what else would be added - the recommendation is that they - that single - and two-character you labeled should not be restricted in general. They should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. (Unintelligible) blah, blah, blah.

Man: (Another one).

Marilyn Cade: And - so that's the recommendation. And then, they're nowhere in this. And I'm not suggesting they should be, nowhere in this. In here is the back and forth that's taken place.

Patrick Jones: Well, and maybe I - and this is Patrick again. Maybe I can explain that what I've done is, it's still down many conversations between...

Marilyn Cade: Exactly.

Patrick Jones: ...myself and Ram and others into something that's readable and understandable and clear...

Marilyn Cade: Exactly.

Patrick Jones: ...rather than give you the pages and pages as back and forth...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Again, I think the only - the work - that's the only workable way we could do this in this timeframe and Patrick, I think it's...

Marilyn Cade: Patrick.

Man: ...the right approach. I mean, the concern is, you know, Liz indicated that my approach somehow isn't the right approach, so.

Marilyn Cade: And Patrick, I was just - so for instance, you know, if - and this is - just as an example, I would just say, if under the - and somewhere in this report, there ought to be a reminder to people that they can find the archive of - so for instance, this says, the (full iron) working group had

a conference call with Cary Karp and Ram Mohan, blah, blah, blah.
There's a transcript available for that, right?

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So, if that - and the reason I'm using this is I think it's a perfect example, Patrick, so I'm taking on this. So, if that had insert link to transcript and then everything else stay the same, and then I flip over to six or seven or any of these others, I would think that what we're doing in the expert consultation. So now, I'm looking at Page 16.

Single letters and numbers are widely delegated to second level, blah, blah, blah. We've assumed there's a technical reason, (called the peers) so they can be released. So, this is when we're going - where we're working on - we're working on, I think.

But the expert consultation section, I think just described what the process is, that we went through an expert consultation and identifies any experts that we spoke, too.

I'm not assuming it gives the back and forth. I would assume that the archive will have the back and forth, and that in the background, relevant information - or in a rationale, relevant information will be reflected.

Patrick Jones: That sounds fine to me.

Marilyn Cade: And because I don't see any other way to do it if the council reviews this and says, "Well, we feel the need for a report written by experts," I think at that point, they would have to actually invite a balance for their

experts to give them a more detailed report. But I think the documentation we're providing for the review of the information source list, and this is going to have to go out for public comment, right?

Patrick Jones: This report that we're working on right now?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I think the - I'm just trying to remember the hierarchy, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: I think that the new gTLD report...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Patrick Jones: ...which - however many pages it ends up being at the end...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: ...when it either goes to the council or when it's being reviewed by the council, then it goes out for public comment.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly, exactly. That's my point. So, this will be a sub-report.

The working group on reserved names and on pro and - am I missing one - reserved names, the works done by the two - by the working group will be inserted into the full PDP passport.

Man: I think so.

Marilyn Cade: Therefore, all of these recommendations are going to be subject to public comments. And if the technical community feels or if others feel, you know, object to the recommendations, that will be the time for them to raise additional validation or justification, et cetera.

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So - and that's how I'm seeing it. I don't know - and that does - that still means I think that we are to try to make sure the transcript with the experts are clean as possible, but I still like the idea of sending the recommendations that are related to the telephone consultation we have with McFadden and (Delevan) to them and ask them to give us an email comment on the recommendation, the rationale, and how we described the expert consultation and reference (those suggestions) such as RFP.

That email will go into the archive. Right? But it should be posted to the subgroups, right? Then, if they could do that before next Wednesday, then we would have the ability to make sure that the recommendation, where they've been consulted, have the benefit of them saying, "Yes, this is what I said. No, you misunderstood me."

And if we get the request to them, I'm just thinking, you know, really - and maybe if the drafters stand there, draft recommendations to that, isn't it only five draft recommendations -- four, five, six, seven?

It's single letters at the top level, single letters and digits second level, single and two digits, single letters, single digit and two letters at the top level, those only five - that's not a lot to ask them to comment on.

Patrick Jones: Now, wait a minute. We're asking them to comment on all of the recommendations?

Marilyn Cade: The ones that are - that ones that they talked to us about.

Man: That would be not the IDN one.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: So that will be out. I'm not sure - and I guess they talked at least briefly about all the other ones.

Patrick Jones: I think that the two letters at the top level on any combination of two letters and digits at the second level are pretty much resolved.

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: You're right. You're right.

Man: You're right.

Marilyn Cade: So that then, we need to go to them and we've - and I - you're right. I'm looking - and we basically took that off the table.

Man: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Right, Patrick. Good.

So, you just made the list shorter. Right?

Man: I think there may be four or five that are still kind of in play or at least that, you know...

Marilyn Cade: Four.

Man: ...or discussed in more detail.

Marilyn Cade: It's four.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Single letters at the top level, single letters and digits at the second level, single and two digits at the top level, single letter and single digit combinations at the top level, because two letters at the top level are resolved, and combinations of two letters and digits of the second level are resolved, too. We didn't talk about that, either.

Man: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So that's only - Patrick, (I count) but it's four, right?

Patrick Jones: Yeah, that's fine.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: When we get through - and I want to bring up something about symbols that's come up since I...

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Patrick Jones: ...sent my latest draft to the subgroup list.

Marilyn Cade: So Greg, my suggestion would be that we write a practice recommendation is and I can do that and send it to you and others to comment on, post it to the - to Chuck and to Liz, but I'm also going to suggest that needs to go to (Halerin) because this is an interpretation of a PDP and how it applies to a working group. Working groups are not standard operating practice. And the council establishes the rules for its working group.

Now, that might change in the future with revisions, and hopefully, the stable incorporation of working group into the council's work. But this at least gives us something that I think is achievable and doable and doesn't - but still, puts the experts in the position of making a statement that can be relied on.

Man: Right. This is what we'd like to do, but without, you know, an over - and overall, it is too (rigid).

Marilyn Cade: Well, and I can imagine neither one of them are going to agree to write us the report on those four topics.

Man: No.

Marilyn Cade: So, that's what we were talking about and, you know, as an approach to this. If that's being a manageable approach, I can put that in email and send it to you and others, and then we can send it to Chuck.

Man: Yeah, have some other comments on that recommendation though in the call.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry.

Man: I was, you know, seeing if anybody else had comments to make before we (facilitate) a recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, right, right, right.

Man: I'll take it from the phone that you should go ahead and circulate that recommendation for comment by the subgroup.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. We're going to do this very quickly, right?

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: So you just want us to go to the subgroup. And when do you want to try to make a decision and go to Chuck and to Liz and then...

Man: Well, just sign off from the other members of subgroup just, you know, an "I agree" or "please change this," otherwise, I agree email. You know, we should get that up to Chuck et al, you know, if possible, today or certainly no later than tomorrow. But as soon as you can get, you know, a rough consensus from the group...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: ...it goes on the call and...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...we're not on the call, we'll check their email.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So the people not on the call are...

Man: Mike Rodenbaugh and Avri.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: And (John Miller).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Okay. I will do that when we finished them. And I'm just going to use the subgroup list.

Man: Yeah, the (RNSL)...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Man: ...(group).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Now, if later on people want to surface it to the general group as an issue for other working groups, let Chuck kind of take the first (hack) at it and then decide how he wants to, you know, bring it out to the rest of the group.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: So, there may be an issue that other, you know, subgroups are dealing with or they aren't dealing with that they might need to at least consider.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Did you want to go through the recommendations you received in, the draft?

Man: Sure. Why don't we do that? I think yours are the only ones we have, so.

Marilyn Cade: I think, Patrick, you had something you wanted to talk about. Do you want to do that first?

Patrick Jones: Sure.

Man: Yeah, let's start with Patrick, because I think he's - more at the front of the book, anyway.

Patrick Jones: It's around the - over late in the week, the updated template.

Man: Right.

Patrick Jones: And we have a lot of issues with it. So, hopefully, this is - looks okay to everyone. I added the definition of character, information on single- and two-character labels for IDN, and then the last working group call, checks it for us to put back in symbols.

So I did that and then received some quick feedback from Cary Karp and also from William Tan, who is (New Star's) point person on - for many IDN for top (biz).

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: We have symbols slightly wrong. And so, I will propose that you will send around an update to the subgroup. And I want everyone to take a look at it. Basically, we're pretty close. It's just the way it says right now is that symbols are not - quite accurate.

So, what I'm going to send around is language that technical experts can sign off on, and it's accurate. It's what we're using in our - in ICANN's IDN glossary right now, so.

Marilyn Cade: And you're talking about the treatment of symbols in the - in IDN...

Patrick Jones: No...

Marilyn Cade: ...as opposed to...

Patrick Jones: ...no, I'm talking about treatment of symbols in general.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

I look forward to seeing that. So, you're talking - so we would start with the change, then, on Page 2, is that right, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: It's going to go in Page 9...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, but Page 2 starts with symbols (they're not supporting) the DNS.

Patrick Jones: Yes. So, (in the) recommendations, Page 2, symbols and - I got some new language to add there.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, and then on Page 9.

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: It's not quite technically accurate. So, I wanted - want the report to be as technically accurate as possible, and I have language (that is).

Marilyn Cade: Great.

Can I ask a question when you finished, please, about the write up on character?

Patrick Jones: Sure. I'm ready. So, if you want to talk about characters.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. It would be useful, Patrick, for the lay person to have a sentence that's used to be in something that I drafted, but I think it may have eroded out over time, and it is that - this isn't the definition of character but that a character in - the term character encompasses symbols, letters and digits. What - this definition is about character when it comes to discussing IDN.

Patrick Jones: You know, it's - we have a lot of push back and forth over the past two weeks about that. And basically, if we can't come up with an easy one-sentence explanation of what a character is, I had tried to, you know,

at least - even a definition, perhaps, take out the phrase for the purposes of discussing IDN, because it's really for the purpose of discussing the naming...

Marilyn Cade: Why?

Patrick Jones: ...and, you know, Cary really wanted it - that clarification put in there...

Marilyn Cade: I understand. But Cary is a really wonderful IDN-specific expert, and they average non-IDN user of which there are several millions lead to - and the readers need to understand that in the DNS, a character may be a digit, a letter or a symbol. Otherwise, our whole report doesn't make any sense to them.

Patrick Jones: I think we could probably come up with something that works like that. And I wanted Tina to be on this call, and of course, she's out of the office today. But, you know, I think we can come up with something like that.

Marilyn Cade: Sure, because...

((Crosstalk))

Patrick Jones: I agree.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...ideas are important and we're all committed to them, we have to reach back to back of their ASCII TLDs as well. And most of our report,

when you kind of break it apart, has got two phases to it. It's got an IDN phase, and then it's got an ASCII phase.

Patrick Jones: Well, my attempt was to have this definition of character not just be an IDN definition but a...

Marilyn Cade: Right, right. And I thought that was kind of how...

Patrick Jones: I think it's being pushed back and forth a little bit...

Man: It's been pushed back and forth a lot. And...

Marilyn Cade: Well, maybe that this (fact) needs to happen publicly so that the IDN guys aren't feeling - aren't, you know, feeling that this, I mean, I certainly I recognize the importance of being really clear and this is a great description of character as it relates to the purpose of the discussing IDN.

Man: And the alternative idea, which is not necessarily good alternative - I'll throw it out there will be to have a paragraph that - for the purpose of them discussing everything other than IBM or something more of a - it is a letter, a number or a letter, a digit, or a symbol?

Marilyn Cade: I would have thought that character would start out with a very high level, a very generic statement that said, for the purposes of discussing of - to the purposes of discussing the DNS, a character may be a digit, a letter or a symbol.

Man: I guess the only problem with that is, ICANN excludes IDN...

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no wait, let me go on.

Man: ...with IDN symbols, which I don't...

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no let me go on. So that would be the opening description of character. And then it would say for the purpose of discussing IDN, blah, blah, blah and keep - structure it in here.

But we'll also have a balance of recognizing the roughly 100 million plus ASCII sooner and I don't this, but, you know, but why don't we try and, Patrick, I'm happy to post to the full group that this is the status report that a large part on our report is about ASCII treatment.

Do you want - would it be helpful for me to post to the list so that Cary and Tina can see the concerns are great?

Man: You know what, why don't I try to pick this up and if you want to view that, that's fine. But perhaps it can be dealt with pretty easily and you don't have to spend a lot of time on it.

Marilyn Cade: I don't want to spend any time on it. I'll just list and say, earlier I had suggested that we needed an overall definition very, very broad that here it's been termed character encompasses. And then there's specific treatment in ASCII and specific treatment in IDN.

Man: That's fine.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: All right. Thanks Greg.

Greg Ruth: Thank you Marilyn. I think if we - I think there's - any problem with the examples that I've used?

Marilyn Cade: Problem or question might be? You mean the Chinese word for alcoholic beverage?

Man: Is there any problem with the examples that have been used so far?

Man: I don't think so.

I think they're good. My (unintelligible).

Man: I posted to the subgroup list, some additional examples that came from William Tan.

Marilyn Cade: I saw those.

Man: And those are existing registrations in (.Biz). I would like to add those to the IDN section just as additional examples. And if there's any problem with that, anybody say so; otherwise, I'm going to put those in as well.

Marilyn Cade: Well, those are good - that those go in this section. These are just labels, this isn't about where they're registered, right?

Man: No, this is just as examples of IDN as second level name.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And then you would just put the other examples in the IDN section.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Is that right?

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Man: I'm also updating the IDN section to include the relevant references to the (GAAP) principles and the IDN working group sections that we mentioned last week. I was a bit (slopped) at the end of the week to get this done, so it's my apologies for not turning in a completed section.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, we're in awe. But I have a question for you. It's a generic question to all of us, we tend to use the term - the phrase consultations occurred with and then we list people and so the reader will know who they are. Should we maybe be thinking that we have a - annex to our report Greg, which lists the experts and gives their title?

Greg Ruth: I think that's a good idea and that kind of goes the least part way to satisfying I'd be of more informally one of the Chuck/Liz concerns that, you know, the - you know, that we have some identification of who the experts are and their credentials.

Marilyn Cade: Right, because - and so maybe what we could do is have the annex have their name, their title/affiliation and their CV.

Greg Ruth: Right. If there are some pre-existing, you know, (squid) that's been used to describe all or most of this people in some other, you know, related context, we can just hopefully list that from someone.

Marilyn Cade: But I was just noticing Michael Edison and I heard that Tina Dam is but lots of other readers might not or Cary Carp.

Anyway, that's just my...

Man: Why can't we put that in the - just improve the consultation with expert section or the summary of relevant information sources with the expert and a title?

Man: I think that's great. I think also that saves us from (mocking) with template, so...

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry, where?

I didn't understand where?

Man: In the - on consultation with experts...

Man: Either put it there or in the summary of relevant information sources with experts consulted with them...

Man: So either on...

Marilyn Cade: I say, I don't see a heading called summary of relevant...

Man: Bottom of Page 8.

Marilyn Cade: To Page 8, sorry.

Man: It's within each section.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, putting on each section.

Man: And it's already in - each section has consultation with experts and summary - information sources.

Marilyn Cade: It does right. So just repeat it. If they say, okay - okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...in the relevant section.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Now, if we want we can leave it out of subsequent ones - the mentioned ones; but that's an editing issue.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Man: ...good place for that and we avoid having to create a side (car) to this existing template.

Marilyn Cade: So Patrick, on Page 9, which has recommendation to symbols. And it's ASCII character treatment in the DNS - ASCII character (achievement).

Patrick Jones: Right.

Marilyn Cade: So recommendation is about - well, I guess I'm - Recommendation 1 says that it's about the definition of character. But it doesn't say that it's about the definition of character in IBM. And then Recommendation 2 says symbols.

Patrick Jones: Well, it's because definition of character should be character across the board not...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, I got it.

Man: The half level definition is...

Marilyn Cade: And so that's saying (very impossible) and then I go to Recommendation 2, and I see that here it says only ASCII characters are permitted, I think I actually wrote the story early long time ago, I mean it was edited.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So, the scope to this technology experts and we said there would not be support making changes to allow with the list of symbols and one or two character name names at any level.

Patrick Jones: That's not going to change, but I'm going to change...

Marilyn Cade: Right. And then we have the reference to the consultation with experts.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And the summary of relevant information sources from...

Patrick Jones: So here's what I have as some new information.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: I have an RFP 952, but I need to add here...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: ...and I need to clarify that this restriction on symbols over the DNS comes from the host name convention.

Marilyn Cade: Right, I was reading that today, yes.

Patrick Jones: And this means that domain names can only be letters A through Z, digits 0 through 9 and the hyphen.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Patrick Jones: And that is the convention for why their symbols are not allowed.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

We've referenced before that it'd be really good to have that. And then that should probably - shouldn't that go in the background?

Patrick Jones: That goes in the background. And it also is - I need to go back up to Page 2 and change symbols and not according to DNS to either clarifying sentence that should go there and I haven't - it's almost finished, but I need to put that in that section.

Marilyn Cade: Okay great. And then - so then we go into Recommendation 3. And that's the IDN...

Man: The second - now, and before we go on to Recommendation 3, I just have one question about the recommendation on symbols - that first sentence that only ASCII characters are permitted in the DNS. There are ASCII characters other than A to Z, 0 through 9 and the hyphen.

Marilyn Cade: In that and the DNS.

Greg Ruth: Right, I know. But I'm stating, I guess, the way I read this originally or maybe I'm just being (dense) is that maybe you need to say only certain ASCII characters are permitted in the DNS.

Marilyn Cade: It's something - what you mean by that Greg and...

Greg Ruth: Well, I guess I - when I look at this initially and quickly, I would - I thought, then maybe we're trying to say that all ASCII characters are submitted in the DNS. I know that's not the case, so...

Man: Could you do it another way, which would be to say only the following ASCII characters at present?

Man: Right.

Man: That would be okay.

Marilyn Cade: What is the reference to at present Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Well, because - and I guess we're examining whether there should be any (edit)...

Marilyn Cade: Well - oh, but - that this is related to ASCII, which we don't have the ability to change.

Alistair Dixon: No, true. But we - that's true. But we, I mean, it seems to me that here we are - well, I mean that's some misunderstanding. Here we are talking about IDN have - here is other symbols and characters and you know, that's - well I thought it was...

Woman: Right. He's really cutting out - sorry.

Alistair Dixon: Okay, sorry. It just seems that may - we should be limiting it to the current situation. And I mean, if we're making a reference to an RFC then I think we should refer to that RFC.

Marilyn Cade: So you were thinking at present?

Avri Doria: Hi this is Avri. I just want to let you know, I got delayed and I just joined.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: It's exciting, Avri, we're talking about (RFCs).

Avri Doria: That's what made me speak up, as opposed to just sitting here quietly.

Marilyn Cade: So Alistair, it'd be something like at present, based on the current (RFC), based on the - current (RFC), blah, blah, blah.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Man: Yes, a related point is that symbols are in fact ASCII characters. Then certain symbols are such as an asterisk or percentage sign.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Yeah and these are pretty specific about things, the LDH ASCII.

Man: Right. You know, that's what I'm - maybe it's right, the letter did at hyphen ASCII, maybe that's what we just need to do. Put in the letter, did it in hyphen ASCII characters are the only one et cetera.

Man: Yes that's the clarification that I am going to add.

Marilyn Cade: Oh good, okay, so we can wait for you to do that.

Man: ...great. Okay, that's all I wanted to say, just to...

Man: And I wanted to - on this call today, make sure that everyone was fine with that.

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Fine with that, but I'm going to - yes, but I'm going to raise another point. I'm not sure that actually did consult with McFadden and (Delevan) on this topic.

Right, I'm looking at the transcripts and looking at my notes, we actually skipped symbols.

Man: And I have (Dave) another look of the transcript Marilyn and my recollection was that we did actually briefly discuss this.

Marilyn Cade: Very, very, very briefly (Oscar). And we didn't - they made a conforming statement.

Man: Exactly.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, I - so okay, I know I'm okay with referencing it. But all they did was just acknowledge the statements that we made.

Man: That's - I would say - nothing further to say about it, I think that's all we need.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I just - you know, I just don't wanted people to be surprised if they come back and said we didn't talked about that, we just acknowledged, okay, okay...

Man: I thought we asked the questions over them and they said, yeah, that seems fine to us.

Marilyn Cade: That's what I mean, but they just - they just acknowledged the previous work we've done. I'm fine with that, I just don't - I just - they're not

looking for us. And so Patrick, where you're going to add one more RFC, you're going to make a change.

Patrick Jones: Okay, it's going down in RFC, edit the language so that it is technically accurate.

Marilyn Cade: Yup.

Patrick Jones: And then also add the language that Alistair mentioned.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: Great. I think and most this other comment, we can move on to Recommendation 3, single and two character IDN, both at the top and second level.

Man: Okay.

Man: I hope people would have the chance to read and there's some comment - and it's not...

Man: Again, as I mentioned previously, I'm going to add the sections that were mentioned last week from the IDN outcomes report and the GAAP principles on new gTLDs.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And Patrick, I think it would be helpful on the second paragraph where it now reads as examples single and two character IDNs currently existed second and third level domain names just to add in both country codes, in ccTLDs and in gTLD.

Patrick Jones: Let me capture that right now in both...

Marilyn Cade: ccTLDs...

Patrick Jones: ccTLD...

Marilyn Cade: ...and gTLDs.

Patrick Jones: ...and gTLDs, yes that's correct.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Patrick Jones: Is everyone pretty much in agreement with these recommendations that we really can't restrict across the board single and two characters in IDN?

Man: I guess, I'm not quite understanding why they shouldn't be restricted. (Unintelligible). It seems like a rather bold statement. It'll be nice to say the same thing about ASCII characters too. I don't know, (the string) should be analyzed and it should all be so granule.

Avri Doria: Isn't because single characters and double characters within IDN first of all don't have the technical limitation of shortness. And second of all, can be complete words or even sentences.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Is that...

Man: That's correct.

Avri Doria: That's really two reasons. One, technically they're not the same, even though we say two characters because they're all X and dash, dash, a bunch of group.

And then second, if it's Korean, for example, the one that I know a little of, if it's Korean one symbol, you know, is composed of three characters and can be all alert.

Marilyn Cade: So...

Man: And that's fine...

Marilyn Cade: ...and actually, I think it would be very, very helpful. Given that we have lay people reading this besides experts. It could be really helpful to have three sentences that captures who - what Avri just said

Man: Well, we've actually done that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Now, it says in some scripts such as Chinese, Japanese and Korean, single and two characters frequently translate into words, concepts or phrases.

Man: Right. And just the other side of that is the technical explanation that...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: Yes, you don't need...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...behind that, for, you know, what the DNS sees is not a word, it sees...

Man: So for DNS...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: You know, Patrick a footnote or a parenthetical...

Patrick Jones: No, that's a good recommendation on and I want to add that in.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Can I just add a slight caveat about it. Because there are both IDNs that are very similar to (SG) at least...

Man: Uh-huh.

Man: ...so - but Omnicrom will look like ours.

Man: And that is the other problem with some scripts particularly Cyrillic or other scripts that are very close to Latin characters. We're going to have a problem if we recommend the list of those characters.

Marilyn Cade: And actually, there's something in the document that the recommendation that Neal drafted. And again I spend sometime talking about this weekend that's very relevant to that.

And that is - it may not be a purely technical issue but it is a user type of confusion issue.

Man: Exactly. And then it seems to me that every recommendation needs to reflect - I mean, I think it's a drift on this and should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

Marilyn Cade: But - yeah.

Man: But then when you actually - specifically reference - make sure you're out of confusion.

Marilyn Cade: But what about Alistair, what about say, because and then get that example, we - you could also say for example, blah, blah, blah, then therefore, requested script should be analyzed in a case-by-case basis.

Avri Doria: Right. What you - might even be able to go further and just sort of like, I mean, we already have the basic notion of confusingly similar notice, exchanges in a little and goes on confusingly similar with a two-letter ASCII.

Another is because there's any number of them whether it's an extended ASCII and Cyrillic or whatever.

Woman: Right.

Woman: And what we're basically seeing as a group, they are confusingly similar with LDH ASCII to letter, names.

Woman: So, even if the names doesn't exist?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, so for instance, hey Neal, can I read ahead for a minute?

Neal Blair: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: So for instance, in Neal's Recommendation 7, there's a paragraph that he (looks) opposing to going to background section and it says, that any further considerations regarding how numbers and letters may be mistaken for each other by a user - appearance and then he gives two examples which is typing lower case L and upper case O - sorry, lower - yeah, lower case L and upper case O, which could look like 10 but it's not. And so the machine may not be confused but the typist may be confused.

Man: Except, I don't think the DNS recognizes the upper and lower case.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, you know, I wanted to ask you about that because I was reading RFC 1035 again, because I was bored or assigned to that job. So we can come back to see whether that's a problem but I was - but here, obviously thinking about as threatened that could go into - in between the first 10 and so the second 10 that captures this concept. And points out why the - they need to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

Man: Yeah, I mean that's a lot - I think I would (stay) here.

Man: Why don't we, you know, circulate some language to the subgroup list?

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: And we can trade back and forth.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Okay.

Man: Do we need to say anything about distinguishing IDN which close to resemble? Let the Latin character set versus IDNs that don't?

Marilyn Cade: That was...

Man: Because I'm not sure that a case-by-case basis does necessarily, you know, as true for Cyrillic or even some - there are some that are even closer than Cyrillic.

Man: But here's a good way to look at it for the new gTLD process. Let's forget about second level name that for new gTLDs, we're going to be reviewing his applications on a case-by-case basis anyway. But by reviewing them, closely based on the script that comes in, then issues of confusing similarity can be dealt with at that level.

Avri Doria: They can be Patrick, but we need to have some sort of principles that the staff can rely on, they can turn to.

Patrick Jones: You get to second level, you know, case-by-case just, you know, I'm not that it would be workably done, every registrar, every registry would be looking at, you know, thousands of...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I don't think it...

Patrick Jones: ...more of domain names, but the top level obviously is a whole, you know, process into which one more step can be worth into. But generally speaking registration is, you know, a 30-second.

Marilyn Cade: So the second level, I don't think it can be doubled. But my question at the top level is, is this a - our strategy, I think there's Avri, is this an issue of a controversial?

How does this get resolved both as opposed to domain names that was confusingly similar to an ASCII string, but the ASCII string, it's easy to think of one that might look confusingly similar to .Com, but let's say I propose to one that is confusingly similar to an ASCII string but the ASCII string is now (fit).

Avri Doria: Yeah, I don't think it's controversial because it's a variant of confusingly similar, but I've been worried about that myself is the ASCII look-alikes that aren't LDHs. And I haven't quite known how to approach it.

Man: I see that.

Avri Doria: But it doesn't look like an issue.

Man: And it's my understanding and, correct me if I'm wrong, but technically that's not an issue because underlying the, you know, the Cyrillic - is something that doesn't look anything like the ASCII (pay pal).

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: To the user, it's indistinguishable.

Avri Doria: Right. It's in that set that other class, so that's the - that the user, yes, there's nothing technically wrong with it.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: To create anything that looks ASCII even though it's not. But also, is that all because it looks confusing when you type it. But what keyboard are you typing it with.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: So that, are you typing it with, you know, that the basic ASCII keyboard or are you typing it with an extended ASCII keyboard. That I can type those, you know, on my machine, so - and typing one is not the others so, that's a whole class of names that I think both in the IDN group, which I was in, I don't think we really covered...

Man: When...

Avri Doria: ...and I don't think we've covered here is the LDH look-alike.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And maybe we could (say) that.

Avri Doria: And I...

Marilyn Cade: Is it thinking about it and I don't understand exactly the right way to handle them yet.

Man: It isn't just an LDH look-alike issues, Avri, because - isn't - wouldn't it be a problem with confusing similarity between possibly some other scripts rather than...

Avri Doria: Yes. You can have that confusingly similar between (Jewish) and Hebrew.

Man: Exactly.

Woman: Right.

Man: Or Bulgarian and Cyrillic and so on.

Man: And there's also - and other Indian scripts used the same character.

Avri Doria: Right. So we do have that; but - and then we haven't really gotten into that issue and I've never even been sure whether we need to. But it tickles at the back of my mind.

Man: Maybe it - the further work - it may be high-hanging fruit at this point not for a lack of agreement but for lack of...

Woman: Understanding.

Man: ...idea as to what the recommendation could be.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: Just, you know...

Man: Well, it seems to me the recommendation is basically practical. It's just - because it's just analyzing them on a case-by-case basis and if there's a demonstration of, you know, over a problem of confusion well then that might be ground for rejection of the proposed string.

Man: So I think at the top level that's workable at the second level, again, I go back...

Woman: So I...

Man: I don't think it's workable to analyze anything on a case-by-case basis.

Man: Oh sure...

Marilyn Cade: We're not - I thought this is only at the top level and we're reading this now, then I see - you know, I think maybe these needs to read instead request the strings at the top level should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. I don't think it's visible to do with them at the second level.

Avri Doria: Right, and the ones that I was thinking of the subgroup that before us because this two letter top level?

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: Seems easy to deal with. And I don't that we've already basically cut off and said the ASCII two level is reserved. Yeah, that LDH ASCII level is reserved.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: So by extension. Anything that looks like one of those...

Marilyn Cade: Is reserved.

Avri Doria: Should just be considered reserved. And that was the simple case that I was...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: ...gleaming at sort of thing, I think that one can be handled. The larger case is a different issue.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Man: Well, the idea behind the recommendation was really - because we know that when the application process opens will get applications for and we potentially could get applications for single and two character IDNs that actually mean a word or phrase like, you know, a .Tokyo or .Beijing in Japanese or Chinese characters.

Avri Doria: Uh-huh.

Right, and those should be okay.

Man: Right.

Avri Doria: At least in my opinion, those should be okay, but one that looks like .AR even though it's not LDH, shouldn't be.

Marilyn Cade: Well actually - and actually Avri, when we say those should be okay, let's say we got one for - so I'll use Tokyo.

Let's say we got one for Tokyo. Okay - may fall in to a different category, it may be...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: ...geodetic and geopolitical.

Avri Doria: Yes. And that's another issue that we didn't look at that I was talking to Liz about in the background is we're all dealing with second single issues at the moment.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And supposed...

Avri Doria: And that the compound is yet another story when something is like falls into two or three of the categories then which we'll have (primacy).

Marilyn Cade: And or what's the progression?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Then that's a more complex issue than any of our single compartmentalized groups.

Marilyn Cade: Yup.

Man: But there is another issue that is I think probably just single character specific. And that is if you got, say, (application) for (R) and (Omnicro), and perhaps I don't know - Cyrillic equivalent as well quite likely, the two gets priority.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm sorry, you have to say that again, I didn't hear you.

Man: Oh sorry. So there's another issue, it seems to me that it is just a single character specific issue.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: And that is if you got an application for all - for Omnicro and if there are other IDN equivalents I can't remember this as Cyrillic - probably is. That the question is who get priority for that if you're a three (applications) for all work character that looks the same.

Marilyn Cade: Is it - doesn't that should govern by the same rule in around but, all those that look the same have to deal with each other and come into that.

Woman: Yeah, you know, we did propose that and we have to go back and look at the full PDP report that - of course they may not be all in the same round but then they would run into the previous...

Woman: Right.

Woman: ...the previous history.

Woman: Right, then you run into the previous rule. But if they're in the same round and they all look alike, then that may just be something where we need a footnote recommendation in the PDP process itself. Because we're going on similar and similar is visual as well as any other but we'd certainly had visual similarity covered.

Man: I mean, the IDN working group would say, and the IDN should get rid of them.

But I think I can't remember what - I think...

But then of course, you've got - if you've got two .IDN (competing) - so yeah.

Woman: Yeah. I would believe that one.

Man: Yeah.

Woman: Well, I mean because, you know...

Man: But I think it will come up.

Woman: Right. And I think that's going to the same conflict resolution process so, you know. And I can't imagine, I mean, it might happen. But I can't imagine that we would give IDN, I already - perhaps it would happen in the first ground, but I can't see it happen in the general rule.

Man: Yeah.

Woman: Well. But let me just raise a different question.

There are other things that we have to overcome like is there a trademark and is there some other conflict that has to be overcome.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: And so all of that performs a series of tests or things that have been taken into account by evaluators.

Woman: Yes.

But there's a much more complex question once you start putting all these things together...

Woman: (Yeah)

Woman: ...than what we have been dealing with in our there on the separate compartments.

Woman: Okay.

So we could probably read along or Greg will never get to his meeting in Chicago that he's there to attend.

Man: And I've got another meeting in about - actually about half an hour unfortunately that I do have to go after we jump off in about half an hour.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: So Greg, do you want to review this. Do you want to skip to reviewing the two documents that were submitted by Neal and by me and then see what else is there time for?

Greg Ruth: So why don't we do that, and if people can turn to that email that would be good?

Woman: I might congratulate Neal on being able to find his way back to Utah. It's just much faster than I thought he could.

Man: I just had - I just followed this on.

Woman: He told me he was flying so I missed it and understood and told everybody he wasn't going to be on the call.

Woman: Unless I can do with my frequent trips to Europe Avri.

Woman: Uh-huh. Yeah.

Woman: So we'll just walk through the 6 and 7.

Man: This with 6?

Woman: Six.

Woman: Okay. Six.

It'd be good if I could find it. Here it is.

Single and two digits as the top level I felt like I cheated and that's the easy assignment.

Recommended numbers is not database at the top level as single or two-digit. I put in the word or other because basically the technical guy said, "No digits at the top level."

Do we need to verify that?

Woman: I think that's pretty much they said that we can't have a numerical top level.

Woman: Right.

In order to avoid potential confusion with IP addresses and the...

Man: No. Not numerical but top level or digital at the top level.

Woman: Right. Right. Thanks.

Man: Okay, the same. Yeah, I'm sorry.

Woman: Yeah.

Man: I was thinking symbol.

Woman: Right, right, right.

Then see later recommendation was supposed to allow rotation of numbers at the second and third levels including single numbers, right?

Man: Right.

Woman: So that's addressed elsewhere. Then the rationale is allocation of numbers at both the top level and the second level and maybe it's out in confusion with IP addresses. The numbers are already allocated at second level Legacy TLDs. No numbers at the top level.

We have the risk of conflict interactions with potential numbers of the second level. But if we have them at the TLD level we have conflicts at the second level where it's much more difficult to actually enforce the restrictions.

And then it's also Legacy software that hopefully interprets if certain numbers such as 00 are admitted.

So we've got both DNS, but we also have a Legacy software.

And then I just said that we've had previous discussions about that concerns about conflict sites with IP addresses we reviewed (relevant RFCs), we held an interactive consultation, with (Steve Delevan), and Mark McFadden, here's the link to the transcript.

And then I'm suggesting that the experts review this recommendation and concur with it and email the recommendation 6 and 7 to Steve and Mark today just because I thought they ought to sign off on it until when we needed a quick turnaround.

So then I provided our references and I reference the relevant (GAAP) principles that I could identify.

Man: The only - I just had one comment Marilyn which was just I did not in an email to the group. Just that basically (Delevan) had - if there were - as there was a ban on - we would have numbers at the top level as there was a ban on numbers below this.

But then, he knows that there would be a problem with enforcement.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Which I think you sort of see it, but...

Woman: Right.

Man: ...that was just one sort of - just one night. But I don't think it changes your recommendation.

Man: And also sends to our existing numbers of second level.

Man: Yeah. But I mean, I guess, the option would be to allow numbers at the top level - no other and for those...

Woman: Yeah but...

Man: ...for those domains.

Woman: Yeah. But you know, Alistair, then you'd have to go to a heavily-sponsored and moderated. And I know you're familiar with the fact that Internet - moderates certain second level.

Man: Yeah. Yeah. It would be possible but it's just...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Right. Just for others on the call. So in that - the name has - has a number of second levels that are moderated.

So you know, let's take as an example .(GIK) is not moderated but (.CO), that's moderated. And so I have to prove I'm a company in order to get a third level.

So you could go to heavy moderation and I don't know that heavy is the right word. You can go to moderation and say the (registry.10) agrees that there is no first come, first serve.

All applicants have to be reviewed and we're going to not allow any numbers so they could actually just black out the registration of numbers or anything that looks like the numbers.

Man: Yes. So it is an option that I guess - I mean, but we wouldn't recommend it at this stage Marilyn. Is that your thinking?

Marilyn Cade: I just tried to draft but I read in the (RFCs) and but I heard the experts say I do notice that I - the Type O it's an RFC and not an RRC.

And I think the number is 1035, not 1535.

Man: The (RFC) they were referring to in that the call was 1535.

Woman: Good. Good.

Man: But with that said, I don't think 1535 was an issue because the (OSTEP) report on (.names) proposals spent a lot of time reviewing (RFC) 1535 and...

Woman: And it supported numbers at the second level.

Man: Yes.

Woman: But not at the first level.

Man: If the address number is at the first level.

Woman: Right. Correct.

Are there any other references that people can probably include it?

Man: I can't think of one.

Anybody else?

Man: Which is the one that - I mean, isn't in the relevant one with the (RFC) that requires just (OD) generally.

Woman: Yeah, that's 1035.

Man: Oh that's (inside).

Woman: It's (10 to 13) or (RFC) 1035.

Woman: Oh. So that should be included.

Man: I think so. Yeah.

Woman: Yeah. Okay...

And are you okay with the (GAK) principle, 1.4? Reserving operational stability to liability security in global interoperability? And to that fix of the selection process to ensure as blah, blah, blah, blah?

Woman: By the way, on the 1035, what we're really talking is Standard 13 because it's been updated many times; and that sort of confusing. I'm not quite sure.

Woman: So Avri, thank you. I get so confused on finding the latest update.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...the (RFC) editor searching tool is the best one for that.

Woman: I'm sorry?

Woman: Anyhow, we should probably take that one offline in terms of aligning references.

Woman: Okay. Okay.

So that's six.

No major objections to - in adding 1035?

Is anyone suggesting a change to the recommendation.

Man: I don't think so.

Marilyn Cade: Does anyone want to submit a minority report?

Man: It's a good movie.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: (Everybody good with) Recommendation 6? Recommendation 7,
single letter, single digit combination.

Neal Blair: Okay. This is Neal.

The only caveat that I had and it wasn't clear to me from our
conference with the expert is the sequencing and hopefully they can
get a response to that pretty soon.

But does anyone else get a clear view of whether the order of the
numbers or sequencing was important? I remember they're matching it
but I don't know if this is in reference to this.

Marilyn Cade: And I wouldn't capture it in my notes.

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And they talk about it with the dash.

But any way, with that caveat with that one possible caveat, it appears that one letter and one number combinations are allowable and each case will be reviewed and the only real obvious cases I can think of is the confusion of the part of their view of the user with a small L and a 1 and a 0, you know, and O.

But you know, that should be picked up you know, rather easily.

Man: I should clarify that and I mention that earlier that there's no distinction between upper case and lower case.

Man: Right.

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no, no. Perhaps there's no distinction in machine code, there is a distinction on the part of the (typos) that they're...

Man: Yeah, it's just the (typos); so only the (typos). So it's not really a technical thing as much as it is (that's there).

Man: The confusion...

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So let me just ask the question here.

So if I saw something written as 333.1O, it's written. And I like I get, you know, I emailed something or I get something in the post, and I typed 333.10, so don't (hit it). It's a user confusion. It's not a machine confusion.

Man: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: And so if that happens that the user would just get a no return I think.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...a different domain.

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Man: ...might result.

Marilyn Cade: It might...

Man: You know, this gets into - you know, it talks to us or maybe it doesn't get into but it kind of gets near to some of the type of (glutting trips)...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: ...that you draw people to PayPal where the L is actually a 1.

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Is that reflected clearly in the wording? I mean, is there a clause here that that could make that a little more clear than it's clearly a user - because - you know, what obviously be covered, you know, when they applied, I mean, anything that's obviously confusing.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well this is assuming that someone doesn't object to such an application on a - for reasons that it's confusing.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But, you know, when we say someone doesn't object to the application, who are we expecting to object? There is no one who's designated to speak for users.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: Are we expecting the (AR) - and Avri had actually asked the question separately that's very relevant.

So who would object?

Let's say that I proposed to this.

It's a lower L and upper case O. And you know, the answer is well, the machine doesn't read it differently, you know, but the user does.

And this gets approved and it creates all sorts of consumer confusion and potential prog problems.

Man: Is there anyway in the application process that I guess technical experts could have some kind of input that an application such as this one is just a bad idea?

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm just asking a question not...?

Man: Well, it's not really a technical issue.

Marilyn Cade: Right. It's not a technical issue. It's a policy issue. Because it isn't a technical problem. It's a policy problem.

Man: But this problem is not specific to - combination...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well, I mean, there are other I guess that - well (they're homogenous).

But it just seems to me, I thought in the PDP '05, one requirement was the - that this basically proposals will only be accepted where misses have been taken to avoid confusion.

So there was some...

Man: Okay, that's good.

Man: ...opposing to - such proposals, such as...

((Crosstalk))

Man: You can always...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...a user can always confuse a small L with a one.

Marilyn Cade: So Alistair what you're saying is such - but paragraph in the discussion background what you think that the principles of PDP '05 will resolve it because an evaluation would show that this would be confusing to the user.

Man: Yes. I don't see this as any different to what (Ruth has) frequently discussed in the PDP '05 for it about variations on (.COM).

Marilyn Cade: So...

Man: I think you're right.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So this paragraph should just go into the background and we should just go and look at the principles and see if in fact what sounds like one of the principles would address this.

Man: Yeah. I mean, I would reference. I mean, I think we need to just have a look at the nice draft as the PDP '05 document that I think it does a great...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: Yeah that makes a lot of sense.

Marilyn Cade: And then all we need to do is just put it in the background, section.

Avri Doria: I'm not sure.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Peggy), does that sound okay?

Man: It sounds good to me. I'd be interested to hear what Avri's got.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I was just, I mean, I'd have to go back to that too. But I'm still not sure that the PDP process has the confusing against something that doesn't yet exist.

Marilyn Cade: Oh.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...we certainly have the confusing against the existing.

Man: Isn't that kind of a first come, first serve that the first one isn't confusing? Is it the only one and the other one...?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...only measured by being confusing against...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...if they passed one allow to come through that's preventing PayPal to come through.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...PayPal doesn't exist.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: If PayPal never existed...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Man: ...and PayPal one...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Then it will be okay. Yeah.

Man: ...defined, so that could be the next great business model.

Woman: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That sort.

I guess - in one issue there I guess to whether you have...

Marilyn Cade: But - hey Greg...

Man: That exist one TLD...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah Greg, maybe...

Man: ...in another TLD.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Maybe the issue for us is the fact that since numbers are not recommended at the top level, this is confusingly similar to numbers and numbers are prohibited.

((Crosstalk))

Man: All right.

Marilyn Cade: Can I just ask are the any other digits besides L and O? 1 and O?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I mean, one and O, is the other digit...?

Man: Five can look like an S.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry?

Man: Five can look like an S.

Marilyn Cade: I thought about five. Yeah. Uh-huh.

Man: And there's IDN issues.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But I think in issues that I think addressed in the IDN section.

Avri Doria: Yeah and it's possible that all of these things fall under other categories that the PayPal One gets subjected to - on trademark issue that...

Marilyn Cade: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: ...that Tokyo is spelled with a zero.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Avri Doria: That gets bumped on a geographic. And that if it doesn't pick on any of the other issues, that's not an issue.

Marilyn Cade: But this is an issue, Avri, if numbers are not allowed and this is confusingly (similar) to numbers.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: This is a category where we have a company that has a grasp and actual interest in applying as soon as the (round) opens. I don't know if any of you thought in (wisdom) and also I think they were (in South Harlow). The company is interested in bidding for (.4U).

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. Dot...?

Man: (Dot - .4U).

Man: (Dot 4U).

Man: The number 4 and the letter U.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

I'm sorry. I'm confused. What is that confusingly similar to?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Man: It's not - I don't think - confusing similarity...

Marilyn Cade: It's an example of -- yes, sorry, sorry and I got it. I got it. I got it. Okay.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry to make it into something that's -- okay. All right.

Man: I don't think we want to use that as one of our examples.

Marilyn Cade: No.

Man: A company that's expressed an interest. But that is a real world example of one that's waiting.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right. Right.

And frankly, I've used 2K as an example because I thought it might be a real example.

But you know, I don't see any problem with something that's not confusing. I just see a problem with something that's confusing.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Marilyn Cade: So I don't see for you to say...

Man: And it's not a technical problem either. It's just - I think we just need to make note of it.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. No, no.

Man: And move on.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. So can we propose - let's just go in the background discussion and then move on.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Sounds good.

Man: Agreed.

Marilyn Cade: Do we need to note that we could also say for example the number 5 is easily confused with the letter S and just make that a factual statement?

Man: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I don't know. I was just asking.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (That's harmless).

Alistair Dixon: Then the other one is Number 2, you can - they confuse with - for us depending on (where) you come from.

Woman: So we could just include those additional examples and move on.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Good. Okay.

And the rationale?

Woman: It's a technical problem to user problem.

Man: (Good).

Woman: And then what about expert consultation?

Man: It seemed totally clear that they can have - there were no problems per se, you know, except that - which we mentioned. And again, I'm unclear as to the sequence that it was a big deal with the dash and it could be a deal with this.

Woman: So we can ask them that.

Man: Yeah, we already have that.

Woman: Yup.

Man: So we're waiting for an answer.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Are there other (RFPs)? (Bob) have mentioned a few others but I haven't a chance to look at them.

So we can really (get) an answer?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah.

There are other (RSCPs) - sometimes since I looked at them.

Woman: Any other changes?

Man: I think not. But obviously, - thing to say, you know?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Now is the time.

Woman: I know you're running out of time.

Man: Yes, I have about 3 minutes unfortunately.

Woman: What do you want to do in those minutes?

Man: Good question. Well I think we need to - for those who haven't supplied their input and we need to. And that's primarily me and who else?

Woman: Is it...?

Man: Avri? Avri, did you have any assignments that you're supposed to bring in today?

Avri Doria: I don't think so.

Woman: Avri was writing single letters and digits at the second level...

Man: Or was that Alistair?

Woman: Yeah. I know I thought I'd backed out because I was - I'd like to be writing in another group.

Man: Avri very skillfully backed out.

Woman: So who's doing that? We've got...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Greg?

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: I (interpret this). I thought in the email - Avri. But then that changed.

Woman: It did say Avri. But...

Man: They asked for directions and it appears I was incorrect. So we need a volunteer.

Woman: Oops.

Woman: Oops. This is the topic at the single letters and digits at second level.

I'm joking. Let me find the report.

Woman: Pretty much.

Woman: Hold on.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: I mean, I don't mind having another look at (unintelligible).

Woman: Could you Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Sure.

Woman: It's pretty much (dead) I think.

Alistair Dixon: That was my impression last time. So I'll have another look.

Man: If you send just another note (unintelligible) required emails as that would be good to (closure at all).

And that would leave me as the only one hanging out.

And I will try to get to that - maybe tonight is possible. But maybe after a cocktail party.

Alistair Dixon: But what is my (timeframe) for my email?

Man: Well, I think - well, certainly by Thursday we want to have that (unintelligible) working groups calling on Thursday, we want to know.

Alistair Dixon: Okay.

Man: ... and understand. And I guess, you know?

If you think there is going to be more work required, then you know, it will be good to have it circulated before Thursday and sign off.

Woman: You are actually -- Greg, you have a deadline of Wednesday to know what your report is going to be on (the chart) that's on Page...

Alistair Dixon: I do it by Wednesday. So (unintelligible) my timeframe. That should be fine.

Woman: Just so you know Greg. Right. You need to just update anything on the chart on - 6 and 7.

Man: By Wednesday.

Woman: Yeah. So because that's what we're going to start with on the recommendations.

But you know, to Alistair and I'm just looking at this, single letter and digits second level, it says (release) - find development of suitable allocation framework. Examples includes (a.com)...

So I think Greg you're - remember that the expert say that there's an interaction (unintelligible) between single letters at the top level and the second level.

Man: Right we have an interaction we see there.

Woman: And that's not...

Alistair Dixon: Well, yes. That probably the solution would be not to allow release to second level if four domains that have single letters at the top level.

Man: Right.

Alistair Dixon: That all the others will find.

Woman: But you need to - the other thing the expert said is there's an (unintelligible) of the issues.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Woman: That's the second level.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well I think that, you know, technically there's the issue whether that - that was going to be easier to screen for technically or the LDH to ask you that not to allow that you have a single letter TLD your software should just kick out any single letter attempt.

Alistair Dixon: Surely we could do what, you know, have been done for others and just put a blanket (registration) on both characters for those TLDs.

Woman: But you need to go back and look. Alistair, you need to look at those technical experts...

Alistair Dixon: I'll have it over here. I'll have a look.

Woman: Yeah. Which is - they think that study needs to be done in any case.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah. Yup.

Woman: And Mark is pretty explicit on some ideas on - I put it in my notes that Mark want - distract you but you can go look at it.

Man: Right.

Woman: (Mark) suggested there might even be a model for your study.

Alistair Dixon: Okay. (Sounds okay).

Man: Okay. I'll just turn into a pumpkin in about 30 seconds. So then by Wednesday we'll have a chart updated (unintelligible) look at that, I'll circulate that and see if anybody else has any comments on that.

We'll also get Alistair's no further work needed or an alternative email. Alistair (unintelligible) mine on Wednesday as well.

Woman: Cutting it very close that means the subgroup may - you maybe going into this with the idea that your subgroup hasn't had a chance to debate it. So you may...

Man: I'll try on that. Yeah, I'll try to do it by tomorrow.

Woman: ...I'm just saying you may need the schedule of the subgroup call.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's what I was going to ask. Do we need to schedule another call between now and Thursday?

Woman: You're not going to get it between now and Thursday. I don't think.

Man: I think after Thursday, we don't need another call.

Woman: You may.

Man: Yeah. I'm not surprised. I mean I think we will. We need a wrap up call after the full group call on Thursday.

Man: Friday or Monday?

Woman: I can't do Friday. I can do Monday.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Either one is fine.

Woman: But what's...

Alistair Dixon: Sunday would be my preference but...

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: ...Friday - is fine.

Woman: What the date Monday? What is the date?

Man: Monday, May 7.

Woman: Okay. I'm still on the country. I can do Monday.

Man: Do we want to try for 1:30 again on Monday?

Woman: 1:30 to 4:30? Yes.

Man: Yup.

Woman: That's probably good Greg.

Man: Yes. But - shot since the Tuesday the 8th is the...

Woman: Right.

Man: ...(drop dead) day.

Woman: Right. Okay.

So can we just get - can you make sure Glen schedules that?

Woman: I'm sure. Yeah that's fine. I'm also going to (unintelligible) recording in an hour.

Woman: Fabulous.

Man: Great. Thank you.

Well thank you all. And I thank you for your hard work so far and we're getting very (cold).

Woman: Thanks to Patrick.

Man: Absolutely Patrick. If all of us were 1/10 as diligent in productive review, we would be done already.

Man: Well I had a help from Tina. So you guys...

Man: All right. (Unintelligible) delegating and (unintelligible) other resources as well.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Goodbye all.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END