Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference

8 March 2007

18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 8 March 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

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

The audio recording is available at:

http://gnso-audio.icann.org/RN-wg-20070308.mp3

is posted on page:

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

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Dan Dougherty - IPC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Jon Nevett - Registrars constituency

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Edmon Chung - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council IDN
wg Liaison

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Coordinator: Passcode is RN. Customer is ICANN. Leader of the call is Miss Glen
                 Desaintgery. Call is scheduled Thursday, March 08, 2007 at 6:00 p.m.
                 (unintelligible). Caller ID is 3715414.

Chuck Gomes: …having technical problems in my email and Web access. So I…

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by.

                 At this time, I'd like to remind all parties, today's conference call is
                 being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this
                 time.

                 At this time, I would like turn our conference over to Mr. Chuck Gomes.
                 Sir, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

                 Okay. Welcome everybody. I cannot get my email open on my laptop
                 and I can't see much on my trail with some of the attachments that
                 were sent in the last few minutes, so I apologize for that. But let's go
                 ahead and get started. Everybody heard the announcement on the
                 recording. Remember it's being transcribed, and please identify

yourself for the transcription so that the transcribers know who you are. If you're using a speakerphone, remember to use the handset when you're speaking.

I made two changes in the agenda. I want to make sure everybody is okay with those. I moved the third-level names reserved first and then the single character and two character names second in the agenda. Any problems with that? Okay.

What I - and we really need to get through all of the reports, so that gives us about 15 minutes each I think, plus hopefully a little extra time at the end.

The - just very briefly talk about any changes you made in your report, but what we really want you to do is go over your (star) recommendations and indicate whether there's rough consensus or whether there's not, and then we'll talk about the (star) recommendations as the full group.

Any questions or comments on that? Okay.

(Greg), you're on for the names reserved to third level.

(Greg):   Yes. The only change that will be made in this version of the report is there were two. One is a more complete description of our discussion with experts which are limited to representatives of .name and .pro, going into some of the, you know, initial security and logistical/technical concerns, primarily kind of security concerns that led to reservations at the third level and just reducing our recommendations to a table format which still needs a bit of a work.

And I guess, Chuck, you opened up kind of a question of whether we should be making recommendations which regard to IDN, our reservations at the third level.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Did my question there make sense?

(Greg): I think so. I guess the question is whether, you know, these names that are all, you know, in Arabic - or, you know, English character, whatever you want to call it, most of our alphabet, whether we need to kind of - they should be translated into other characters.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And we're not necessarily talking about Name and Pro so much as if they are new TLDs that register names at the third level, and they decide to do, you know, offer IDN names at the third level, then what recommendations would we make in regard to that.

Should any of the reserve names in ASCI at the third level be - also be reserved at the, you know, at the third level in IDN versions, and probably the same principles will apply there assuming we agree to them as a working group as apply elsewhere.

For example, you know, one of the points recommended by (Rom) and (Keri) was that you don't try to reserve IDN versions of acronyms or abbreviations because it gets terribly complicated and with the huge chore, but as cases come up, they could be dealt with on a case by case basis.

So I mean, is that a reasonable approach to the IDN issue?

(Greg):   I think that it is. I think that if - looking back at the initial issues of
                 security and other things which are really echoing at these changes at
                 the second level, you could follow on a case by case basis, presume
                 that there's not going to be an IDN version of dub-dub-dub, dub-dub-
                 dub will be dub-dub-dub.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

(Greg):   So you don't need to worry about that. The same thing with something
                 like DIR or directory which is prohibited. That doesn't need to be
                 translated unless they're going to change the way -- technically, the
                 way their…

Chuck Gomes: Right.

(Greg):   …TLD works.

Chuck Gomes: Now, the second issue that I think I brought up in my email was that it
                 looks like in this case, the table that I - for showing recommendations
                 really doesn't work very well because really we're just talking about
                 third level in this particular case.

                 And other things will fall out in other categories I believe. So it may not
                 make sense to use the table in this case, and I think in this case only,
                 at least that's my thinking so far. What do you think on that?

(Greg):   I think that makes sense. I guess it also raises the question whether all
                 the other tables should deal with reservations at the third level as the
                 draft table I think did.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I don't think we lose anything by that.

(Greg): Definite to make sure then whatever being said is kind of consistent.

Chuck Gomes: Consistent, exactly. Yeah. Absolutely right.

So, would you please go over your recommendations? Unfortunately I can't pull them up right now because I can't get into my email except on my (Trio) and it wouldn't help much on the (Trio). So, would you please read your recommendation?

(Greg): Sure. One moment here while I turn…

Chuck Gomes: And tell me too, are they - never mind. Go ahead, just read them.

(Greg): Sure. Our recommendation in short is we do not recommend any change in the treatment of prohibited third-level labels and patterns of names staying with the registry which are two of the three kinds of reserve names at the third level.

The ICANN and nIANA reserve names with third level should be treated or should be harmonized with the recommendations regarding those names (unintelligible).

So if we're recommending…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Greg): …no change there, same thing at the third level.

Chuck Gomes: And so the requirements for any new TLD that would register names to the third level would be treated the same way that it is today.

(Greg): Right. One open question I guess is that their .name and .pro chose slightly different lists of prohibited labels at the third level. I think that would again be kind of registry specific.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

(Greg): For instance, genealogy was a prohibited label for .name for obvious reasons, not for .pro, for similarly obvious reasons.

Chuck Gomes: So it doesn't sound like we're necessarily setting a policy for which names here. This will be - are you recommending then that this would be contracts - I mean specific to the particular business that's operating TLD.

(Greg): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Probably you want to state that…

(Greg): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: …and then you also need to add language in for the IDN.

(Greg): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Does that cover you recommendations?

(Greg): It does.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Let's open it up for discussion.

Anybody have any questions or comments on the recommendations for third level?

Mike Palage: I guess - this is Mike Palage. (Greg), good job and I appreciate the qualifying language regarding the ICANN and nIANA names regarding a harmonization. I think that is a - I think that addresses my concerns regarding any final discussion of that issue at the second level.

(Greg):   Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else?

Tim Denson: This is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Denson: I just - it was interesting that in the consultation with (unintelligible) says that there was no - someone was able to give any context, document, details, et cetera to why the names were selected, the class of .name restrictions, why it's more narrow than .pro for other names that had been rejected.

So I don't have a huge issue with the recommendations. It seems that perhaps, you know, there could be some stipulation that maybe that be reviewed or, you know, are these restrictions really necessary. There doesn't seem to be any justifications for it (unintelligible) can come up with.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. At least they couldn't remember or whatever. And now of course for gTLDs going forward, there will be a comment - are you suggesting, Tim, maybe that in the case of new TLDs that we recommend that some explanation or justification of - for observing the names be stated in the application?

Tim Denson: Yeah, yeah, exactly. And we just don't assume that, you know, it used to copy what has been done in the past necessarily.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh. And, (Greg), how do you respond to that?

(Greg):   I think that makes sense. I mean I think there is an issue with the lack of documentation and just taking them on somewhat on their honor that these, you know, make sense, that http.name - or .name shouldn't be allowed as the third level for either technical or security reasons.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Greg):   So I think it should be documented and probably should also follow the same logic that was initially set up, so this doesn't become, you know, some back door for premium names at the third level.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody have any comments on that?

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Avri.

Avri Doria: I don't know that I'm against this change but it sounds to me like it is a radical change (unintelligible) as opposed to leaving it to registry, it's now basically saying that the registry has to find a set of reasons to why they're doing it and then (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last part.

Avri Doria: And then we go further and we're saying, and these reasons need to be good reasons and that good reasons include stability and security, et cetera.

So I'm not saying I'm against it, but it does sound to me like we sort of drifted to a radically different as opposed to it being sort of up to the registry, n Now we're saying, well, it's up to review by ICANN and there needs to be a set of criteria to determine when a reason is a good reason.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. No, I didn't hear the last part. Actually let me rephrase that.

I didn't think Tim said that they need to say anymore than, here's our justification for doing this.

Avri Doria: Right. That's right, that's all he said. But in the response, the response basically then took that extra step because otherwise an explanation - and that has originally been a question on my mind.

(Greg):   I got you.

Avri Doria: So any explanations, well, I kind of felt like it because they kind of looked like cool names to reserve would be an explanation.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. (Greg), was that your intent?

(Greg):   No -- quite the opposite. I think if we look what that .name and .pro did in fact do in their list of prohibit labels at the third level, they took, you know, short narrow lists that, you know, were not intended, you know, seemed to be intended entirely for, you know, kind of security and stability concerns, and that's all they did.

I think that we kind of - in the absence of it, of, you know, definitive documentations, I think we have to go from the evidence and presume that that's the reasoning behind these choices and why they're broken out as a particular category or prohibited labels which go back into the registry agreement and see how it defines what the prohibited labels are and get a little bit more flavor on that and see if there is a - I'm not familiar with the registry agreement to say whether it kind of speaks to how these names whether there are some existing standards by which these names were chosen. I think I would like to look back and see there.

I just wouldn't want to see somebody coming up with suddenly, you know, 3,000 prohibited labels at the third level which would be inconsistent. That I think would be a radical departure from what we currently have with .name and .pro which have only their directory email, http mail, MX followed by 0 to 100, NS followed by 0 to 100 (unintelligible) and dub-dub-dub followed by number from 0 to 100, and then genealogy for .name and (CACCA) certificate GRP Pro, Registry Pro, verifying and verifications for .pro, and verify and verification, you know, relate to the business model for .pro which, you know, verifies the people are in fact registered professionals.

So there's, you know, specific reasons - business model reasons and stability reasons that seem to play into that. In the absence of a document I think we need to try to maintain, you know, the spirit of consistency with this, so that this doesn't become a huge loophole where registry is (unintelligible) thousands of men.

Chuck Gomes: So let me clarify though. Are we just suggesting…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Are we just suggesting that if a new TLD is (unintelligible) the third level and they have some reserve names there that they provide their rationale for those names, is that what he recommendation is?

(Greg): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Greg): And I think also that it should be - I also do think it needs to be a limited list we need to figure exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we have to be careful if we're going there, and I think that's what Avri's concern is. Keep in mind, there will be a comment period. So if it's not limited, you know, that in a new gTLD process that's nearing completion, there will be a public comment period and so forth, so there will be opportunity to deal with that.

But as soon as you start putting in language like you're talking about, I think Avri is right, you're starting in, okay, what criteria are we going to

apply, what, you know, we're going down a path I think that is personally I think we don't want to go.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. I'd like to get in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Tim's next and then Marilyn.

Mike Palage: And then Palage (unintelligible) Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Denson: Just to clarify, you know, one of the things I didn't want to see - I wouldn't want to see happen is that because, you know, http or email is currently reserved at the third level in some cases, that that necessarily becomes a standard that new gTLD down the road (unintelligible) well, you know, these naturally have to be reserved because of security concerns. I don't think that's necessarily true.

                 As far as premium names are concerned, I'm not worried about it. I mean it's up to the business model of the registry and I think it makes perfect sense for them to have hundreds if not thousands of names that they reserved for premium allocation at a later date, and that's (unintelligible) at the registry.

                 (Unintelligible) because certain labels were reserved by existing registry that they have to be reserved going forward.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Got you.

                 Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I wanted to just flag something that I wanted us to come back to, Chuck, that I think is a standard question. And it's a couple of things.

I hear some competing views, and I think it's important to do what you just did which is always identify really whether it's a view that's driven by our individual perspective or something that has the more global interest in mind.

So when we are talking about reserve categories, in writing the statement of work, we took care to note that we're looking to identify whether to keep things on reserve, and if they can be unreserved, what the process is to unreserve them, whether it's just notice, et cetera.

So that's a couple of points to think about.

But another point that keeps coming back to me is when a name is prohibited to -- and I think we need to reach a consensus on this at some point, Chuck.

When a name is prohibited, does that mean to all of us that the registry doesn't have the option of later at any time they choose de-restricting it and allocating it, versus it's on reserve and there is a named process by which it can be unreserved and allocated, process described.

(Greg):   Well, of course we have several different categories that kind of overlap the things you're saying already.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But I'm thinking as we go through our recommendations, we need to sort recommendations into clear categories so people don't get

confused a name is prohibited, oh well, that registry actually thought those were - they could release them later for premium names. So the categories need to be really clear when we make our recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mike.

Mike Palage: Thank you, (Chuck).

Again, I think this goes back to the issues we talked about I think on the call yesterday as well as some of the stuff I had raised in the first called out. What are the definitions of reserve?

Based upon what we've talked about, I tend to find myself more aligned with the comments raised by Tim and Avri regarding the particular language, although I do think (Greg) does raise some valid points.

Perhaps -- I mean this is just something that I just jotted down and would just like to throw out there for consideration. While recognizing the rights of registry to reserve names for a variety of technical security and/or business reasons, registry operator should provide some reasonable documentation for the basis of these reservations.

So again I just throw that out there for consideration by the group to see if that potentially addresses the concerns.

The first, again, to reiterate (Tim's) point, if there isn't any basis, there's an incredible danger for these names to just perpetuate themselves

and, you know, 10 years down the line, people would be like scratching their heads, well, why were these names reserved?

And we've seen that exactly in connection with nIANA and ICANN names. Nobody knows where that documentation is. So I think it is important that we sort of create some record.

But as Tim and Avri said, I don't think we want to begin to impose artificial limits, because again, we don't know what particular business models may be on the horizon (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: No, I have concern about one word you…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …and that's reasonable.

Mike Palage: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: As soon as you throw that word in, then I think we're back to Avri's point.

Mike Palage: Okay. Some documents - friendly amendment taking. Let's strike it. That's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mike Palage: I'm not married to that word though.

Chuck Gomes: Is anybody opposed to a recommendation like that?

Marilyn Cade: I'm not sure that -- it's Marilyn -- I'm not sure that I am or not. I'm going to have to see it in writing, and I don't think we should approve a recommendation that we haven't all seen in writing.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me tell you what my approach on this, Marilyn, is to get a general sense today and then ask (Greg) to, you know, revise the recommendations and send them to the list and see if there are any problems with it.

Man: But Mike is online, maybe he could just…

((Crosstalk))

Mike Palage: I'm doing that…

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) right now then.

Mike Palage: Great.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …repeat it, with the friendly amendment, because I'm not clear in my mind what it says at the moment.

Woman: And let me just say that if Mike could type it in, we could go on and maybe come back to it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's fine. Unfortunately I won't be able to see it so you'll have to read it to me because I haven't solved my technical problem here in the hotel, so.

Mike Palage: Okay. Here - let me - the wording that I'm proposing right now would appear in between the first - it would be the sentence in between the two sentences that (Greg) has provided right now.

So, after the first sentence, we do not recommend any change in the treatment of prohibited third-level labels and pattern of names same with the registry.

New insertion. While recognizing the rights of registries to reserve names for a variety of technical security and/or business reasons, the registry operators should provide some documentation for the basis of this reservations.

Final sentence as it currently stands, the ICANN and nIANA reserve names, the third level should be harmonized with the recommendations regarding those names at the second level.

Chuck Gomes: Now it's still - just for time sake and the fact is that (Greg) is going to have to read…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …draft the recommendations anyway to deal wit the IDN issue, my - and that's not going to happen on this call…

Mike Palage: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: …because he has to leave, probably already had to leave.

(Greg):   I'm still here, just barely.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, thanks.

So, are there any concerns from the oral reading of that right now, understanding that (Greg) is going to re-distribute this and (Michael) send that language to the list? Okay?

The overall approach on the recommendations here, any big concerns there or any objections to where we're going, again, understanding that (Brad) and (Dan) will re-submit this so that everybody can see it in writing.

Okay. Very good.

Then I think we can go on to the next category which is single and two character labels, and I think that Patrick is going to present that one. And I'm sorry guys, I could not pull up the latest documents that was sent because of the problem I'm having, so.

Patrick Jones: Okay. Well, I can give a quick update on what was included in the document that I sent to the list this morning. The changes were pretty minor but should be put in.

What I added was more background on two characteristics at the top level and two characteristics at the second level which is basically a

reference to the (Life 02) report with a cut and paste from the (Life 02) report recommendations at the very end of the document.

And then the other addition was a (star) recommendation in 3.4 under single letters and numbers at the second level, is now an (04), and I could read that very briefly and then turn it over to discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, in fact, why don't you go through all of the recommendations again…

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: …because I do want everybody to be clear.

And people, if you've got the document that was sent out this morning, please pull it up. You'll be in better shape than me if you can do that. So, go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And let's talk about each category separately as quickly as we can. So I encourage people to be - certainly make your comments but make them as concise as possible.

Patrick Jones: 3.1 is symbols and the subgroup recommends that current practice be maintained so that no symbol other than the hyphen and the dot be considered for use at any level.

Chuck Gomes: And I would suggest a minor rewording of that, that the hyphen and dot are the only - can be used in a domain name. The dot is really not part of a level.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: If you know what I'm saying. You can word it however you want, but just a minor tweak to the wording there.

Woman: Hi. Chuck, would you just say that again. Because I agree with you but I just wanted…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Again, I apologize for not having the - in fact, I may have an old version up, let me try that. Well, I won't take the time.

The - what I'm saying is to say that a dot can't be used in any level. Dots aren't used at any level. They're used as separators which they say in their - you guys say that in your report.

Woman: Yeah. But we probably ought to say it that way. We probably should say that in the recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: That's what I'm suggesting.

Woman: Yeah, that the dot can be used but only as a separator.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

The way it was worded, it just sounded like the dot can be used at any level and that's not literally correct, so.

Okay? We don't need to spend a lot of time on that. That's just a minor thing.

Patrick Jones: Okay. The next one is single letter…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Hold on a second. Are there any problems with that recommendation? Any questions, comments?

Avri Doria: Quick question.

By problems you mean…

Chuck Gomes: I mean…

Avri Doria: …agreement with it or problems understanding it?

Chuck Gomes: Agreement.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well, I won't be agreeing to it.

Chuck Gomes: And why is that?

Avri Doria: Because I still - I know that we don't have a text in there that says, "Because technically it's not feasible." I would - don't believe that not all symbols are necessarily problematic and that until we have a clear technical viewpoint on that. So I have no problem with them being reserved until such time as they're technically cleared or some such wording like that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, so in the future, if the DNS was changed to…

Avri Doria: Well, at the moment - okay, one can quote the DNS so that they never work, and that may indeed happen, and I'll argue that in a different venue.

                But at the moment, if - okay, if they don't work, then obviously no one is going to assign them another -- if the code (unintelligible). But if it's just a prohibition by practice because of the technical concerns, I want to make sure that the technical concerns are real. I don't see any other reasons to not allow them other than DNS technical concerns, so that…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm not a DNS expert, but my understanding is that DNS will only accept - and it could be the way it was quoted, but the reality of the matter, that's the way it's quoted, only accepts ASCII characters…

Avri Doria: I understand that…

Chuck Gomes: …and the dash. So I'm not understanding.

Avri Doria: Well, first of all, okay, we're first of all dealing in both ASCII and IDN, correct? So in IDN, a…

Chuck Gomes: But…

Avri Doria: …symbol would be reflected different…

Chuck Gomes: Hold on. In the DNS, we're only dealing with ASCII characters and the dash. There's no…

Avri Doria: I understand.

Chuck Gomes: …local language characters, as you know, in the DNS.

Avri Doria: I believe - yes, I understand. And I believe that as people move on to updated protocols, they may or may not include them at the moment. But basically we make policy decisions based upon technical speculation and then we make technical hard-coding based on policy.

                And so this one is, to me, a problematic not in the technopolitical realm of, is it technology, is it policy, is it hard-coded policy, is there really a technical issue?

                And as the protocols are indeed being looked at at the moment within the ITF, if we go with a policy that says they'll never be used, then there's no reason for the technologist to ever look at the issue of whether they are technologically feasible, and…

Chuck Gomes: I'm not aware of that DNS protocol being looked at. Is it?

Avri Doria: At various levels, yes, constantly. But…

Chuck Gomes: This particular issue?

Avri Doria: No, not this particular issue. Not at the moment.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Because there's a policy that says no.

Chuck Gomes: Where is that policy, within the ITF?

Avri Doria: No, within ICANN. And we have a policy and a technological
                 assumption feeding each other.

Chuck Gomes: Where is the policy within ICANN?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Man: My understanding was RSC (unintelligible) talks about the
                 requirements for domain names to start (unintelligible)…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Man: …include (unintelligible) and numbers and the (unintelligible). That was
                 my understanding.

Avri Doria: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: So that's an RSC…

Avri Doria: Right.

Chuck Gomes: …not an ICANN policy.

Woman: Right.

Avri Doria: Right. The ICANN policy build on that, correct. What I'm saying is the technical foundation of that RSC prohibition is not necessary.

So I'm not recommending that we pay anything here other than the catch phrase, you know, of unless technology, at some point, allows it…

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So, that - is that a friendly amendment?

Avri Doria: It's accepted as such.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: And that's all I'm saying…

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's helpful, Avri.

Avri Doria: …policy into technology.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: And leave it open for technology to be innovative to…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay. I got you. Okay. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I'm not going to impose the friendly amendment, but I am going to say that it's going to have to say and then the issue can be reconsidered, because just because a change happens, it doesn't mean…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right. Okay. Are you okay with that, Avri?

Avri Doria: Your friendly amendment of the friendly amendment?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right. We won't be too formal, but, yes.

                And Patrick, and Alistair, I don't know if Neal is on.

Neal Blair: I'm on.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Do any of you have a problem with that?

Man: No problem.

Alistair Dixon: That sounds fine to me. I mean, I was concerned that, you know, we didn't have a lot of information about this particular…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

Alistair Dixon: …so I think Avri's amendment (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody else in the entire group that have a problem with that, or with it? So we can assume what's the rewording and, again, these will need to be sent to the full list, just the recommendations, you don't have to necessarily have to send your whole report to make it easy on people just to show them the rewording that would be helpful and will make it fairly simple for people to look at those and review them. So, I'm going to assume that that one is okay.

Patrick, go ahead.

Patrick Jones: Okay. I picked up Avri and Marilyn's friendly amendments and I'll put them into - update it for all recommendations that I sent back to the list.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Patrick Jones: The next one is single letter and number TLDs. And we have two (unintelligible) recommendations. Alt one is we recommend that single letters and numbers be allowed at the top level. Alt two is we recommend that single letters and numbers be reserved at the top level.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: I'll go on to…

Chuck Gomes: No, don't go on, sorry.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let's nail each one down if we can. Let's open it up for discussion.

Man: …in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody else? Okay, Mike.

Mike Palage: Thanks. As I said yesterday, I think -- what is it -- Alistair gave a good discussion on the difference between these two proposals, and I believe he had said he was actually leaning towards ultimate proposal one.

I also expressed support for alternate one's wording yesterday on the call, although in an effort to potentially bridge the concerns with alt two, I proposed the following friendly amendment after we recommend that single letters and numbers should be allowed at the top level unless prior to the commitment of the next TLD round by ICANN.

There are valid documented reasons from the technical community against the allocation of such strings. I'll send that actually to the list right now, I forgot to do that yesterday, my apologies.

But I think that unless we can come up with some technical reason not to allocate these strings, I think it would probably be in our best interest to move forward with the allocation of these strings.

Tim Denson: This is Tim, I'd like to be in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Tim, you go ahead. I want to get in the queue, too. So, I'll put myself in the queue. Who was that? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I'd like to be in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Edmon Chung: Edmon as well.

Chuck Gomes: Edmon as well, okay. Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Denson: Yeah, I guess all I have is more of a question because I don't see IDN being considered here. But certainly, I think it says letters and numbers, is that intentional and staying away from the term character?

               So, is that - would be considered separate because, certainly in some languages, especially those like, you know, Chinese, Japanese, or a concept or - can certainly be representative with a single Japanese character or Chinese character. Was that given any thought or that…

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, can I respond to that or…

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: I mean, yes, we did have some discussion of this in the group. And I guess, in view was that whatever we do with single characters for ASCII, we should follow some consistent treatment for IDN. So, if we're going to have single characters to ASCII, we should have single characters for IDN.

I mean - and I agree that the IDN issue actually - single characters in some language as word not just symbols. I mean, there are some single characters in, for example, English of a word. They seem to be fairly generic for the word. But - so, that was one point.

I guess the other point was, we did have some discussion about confusingly similar records. You've got issues like omicron, this is O, this is zero. So, you would need to find a way to deal with those sorts of issues, and so you've had - could only have an omicron or an O or a zero, not all three. That was, well, at least my thinking. But I don't…

Chuck Gomes: By the way, if I could jump in there, Alistair, the -- and you're aware of this I think, the new TLD process, might cover that issue because of the confusingly similar issues. So, for example, if O was registered and somebody wanted to register zero, I suspect that that would be viewed as confusingly similar.

Alistair Dixon: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: You'd be right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: You'd be right, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry to interrupt you, but I just wanted to throw that in…

Alistair Dixon: No, that's right.

Yeah, yeah. No, that's right. I think it was the question of, I mean, I guess the confuse - I certainly agree with it. It's just a question of IDN versus ASCII, which gets preference?

And I think the answer is effectively who (unintelligible) probably.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Okay.

Tim Denson: This is Tim.

I guess I would support out one and have - I think probably (Mike's) modification to that or edit to that as well…

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Tim Denson: …good idea.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Is that - Tim, on yours? Are you finished?

Tim Denson: Yes, I'm done.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. I don't want to jump in before now.

The comment I wanted to add is something I thought of, I think last night, sometime yesterday, that doing it in the case of single character names at the top level, has there been any thought given to allocation?

And what I'm asking is, should the same allocation method that's being outlined in the new TLD recommendations from TDP 05 apply to single-character names just like it does every other one?

I think that's an issue that needs to be explored a little bit because of what I believe would be huge value and interest in single character names.

Mike Palage: This is Mike, Chuck.

I'd actually, in my paper prior to Amsterdam, actually, talk about potential dual allocation of names where one would go through one track and potentially auctioning off another class of domain name. So, myself, I think that is something potentially worth exploring and something that I, myself, have written upon previously.

The only question that I would raise here is, I think what we're talking about is whether something should or not be reserved. The allocation of these names I think is, perhaps, somewhat outside of our scope. I would agree with that.

Okay, so as I said, you know, hopefully, this is something that could be discussed in the PDP with regard to, if you will, the allocation if there's a tie or something that is unique because you are right, there are a limited number of single-letter domain names that are available.

So, again, I agree with your point, something I previously written on, I support it, I just questioned the appropriateness of us referencing that within…

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't think it's inappropriate to references, Mike. What I - but I do because I think that it would be appropriate for us to make a recommendation to this fact that we - assuming the group supports this.

I'm not suggesting one way or another that we recommend that these names would be - not be reserved at the top level pending, you know, more work on the issue of allocation, for example.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I speak to that?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: If you're talking to the same topic, that's fine.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Mike, did you want to say something…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …referring to the queue testing and…

Chuck Gomes: No, well, I'm holding on the queue a minute while we talk about the issue that I just brought up if that's okay.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Can I be on the queue on this?

Man: Oh, sure.

Man: It seems like you - it's a good topic, Chuck. So, I guess what happens is when we talk a little later on about the allocation for how a registry does it, and it's my opinion that VeriSign, as a registry, should have flexibility to decide how it wants to go about allocating the names. That's my position on that topic.

                If you will - mapping that back to how one would go about allocating it…

Chuck Gomes: You're talking about the second level there.

Man: The second level, yeah. Now, with regards to allocating at the top level, I don't believe it's appropriate for this group to talk about - there should be no reference of allocation.

                What we are talking about is, should it or should it not be reserved? And this is something I think Marilyn has articulated before in the past about what we're looking at, and I just really - I just have strong reservations about us talking about any type of allocation mechanisms regarding these names just like I've articulated in some of the groups and talked about, you know, protecting the rights of others. There needs to be clear demarcation lines between what is and is not within our…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, but we have a responsibility to make recommendations regarding further work. And I think that includes, if we believe, so that, you know, we recommend that further work to be done regarding

allocation. It's not in our statement or work, but this is one of our recommendations for follow on work and regard to this.

But, anyway, let's go on. With Avri next or…

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, I have a point of order.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: You opened a new topic, so I prefer you take a queue on that topic or go back to the original queue…

Chuck Gomes: That's what I was working on the queue on that topic, Marilyn. And was that you next or Avri?

Avri Doria: Oh, I think I was, but…

Chuck Gomes: I thought so, too.

Avri Doria: …I'll defer to Marilyn…

Marilyn Cade: No, I just want to know which topic we're talking about.

Chuck Gomes: We're talking about the topics that I raised, so that we can be, you know, not come back to it after several other topics.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Then, I would like to be in the queue on that. But I'm also in the other queue as well.

Chuck Gomes: I have you in the other queue. Let me get this queue. I think I've got Avri, I've got Marilyn, I've got…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …who else in this queue?

Alistair Dixon: Alistair.

Chuck Gomes: That's right. Sorry, Alistair, I forgot you. You may have been out earlier but anyway. Okay. So, Avri, it's your turn.

Avri Doria: Yup. Okay. And just on this queue and the other one, I strongly support on any of this single letter. I know we're only talking about the top-level domain, but I will time my remarks at a second-level domain also when we get there is that all of these are precious commodity because there's a very limited number and that I think it is right to not reserve them.

However, I do think that they should be subject to special allocation methods not to be determined by us, future work. And that - and this is my own opinion. I don't know if it belongs in this but in the next conversation and that those before the public interests at whatever levels this single level are controlled. So, at first level, certainly. At second, probably.

But I definitely, strongly agree with reserve for subjects, special allocation method. And I don't know if that's an amendment to one of them or is that the third alternative.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Okay, great. That was clear.

                Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

                I have a comment about this discussion. I believe - and I was not on
                that part of the call, so some of you who were need to refresh my
                memory, I haven't seen the transcript. I had tried to contact Ram to
                verify what his expression was.

                I understood that Ram raised some concerns about single letters at the
                top level because that needs to be verified. I also know from reading
                John Clemson's post that he certainly has concerns about single
                letters at the top level. If not, also at the second level.

                I had talked briefly to (Crocker) and to (Delavan). Both of them
                expressed initial concerns about releasing this at the top level.

                So, I'm not persuaded that there is not going to be some strong
                technical opposition to releasing at the top level. That's an open
                question for me.

                I will say that, if they - if determined, there are no technical issues or
                other justifications not to release them that I would tend to support
                other comments similar to those that Avri has made about there would
                need to be future work, there would need to be a special allocation
                process, there should be a public benefit aspect to the allocation.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: I was just going to say, Chuck, that we did actually discussed allocation of these sorts of TLD in the Los Angeles meeting. And certainly, I mean, my view is these are the sorts of TLDs that would leave themselves to an auction-type process, although I'm aware, of course, of the concerns I think that we raised in that discussion that, you know, basically that it just means that (unintelligible). Certainly that was what was discussed in Los Angles as far - especially with reference to these particular TLDs.

There may be, as far as IDNs are concerned though, there could be - it might be possible to establish rights to a particular IDN, I don't know, but certainly in terms of ASCII, I think these sorts TLDs will leave themselves more to an auction-type process.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Anybody else in this little sub-queue that we have regarding the issue I raised?

Okay. Then we're back in the main queue. And I think that brings up Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just going to go ask the question I was going to ask before.

And I received the message, Chuck, that you, yourself, did not comment or respond. I missed the conversation where I heard that

Ram raised questions about allocation of single letters that the top level.

Chuck Gomes: Now the reason I didn't respond because I was trying to remember, Marilyn, and I didn't succeed.

The - I don't recall. Does anybody - we may have to go back and look at the transcript or listen to the MP3 or ask, even quicker, ask Ram.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. And I had called him and told him we would send him further follow-ups.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Marilyn Cade: But I was expecting to see the transcript. But we can - but in any case, I would just say, and I don't think it would be responsible of us whatever amendments are made to the recommendation, not to note that there has not - there has been indication of concerns from at least one reputable technical resource, and those have not been thoroughly examined (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Tim Denson: This is Tim.

I think…

Chuck Gomes: Is this on the same topic that Marilyn is raising?

Tim Denson: Yeah, yeah, I was just going to say I think Cary Karp had some input into that as well.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Tim Denson: And - but I think what Mike was proposing as far as amendment can cover that, doesn't it?

Chuck Gomes: That's - I think so.

Marilyn Cade: I - you see, I don't think it does, because what Mike says, unless you technical guys -- pardon me, Mike -- but in reading it, here's how I read it, unless you technical guys get yourself organized and come forward with the whole flood of documentation, we're going ahead anyway. That just kind of doesn't play well with the technical community.

                I think we might - you know, the point is we do need to undertake verifying that they're not technical concerns in order for ICANN to legitimately move ahead with saying these are not going to be highly controversial and disputed names.

Chuck Gomes: Well, what would happen is…

Tim Denson: This is Tim. Can I get in the queue again on that?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Go ahead, Mike, and then…

Mike Palage: Tim could go first.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Tim.

Tim Denson: I don't disagree, Marilyn. I just think that, right now what we have are some, you know, what I consider to be more, you know, just commentary that we've received over the phone or whatever because there's nothing really, you know, technical or documented about what the exact problems.

Even John Clemson's note to the group was really pretty weak and, you know, technical information that actually backed up his arguments.

So I just think that's the kind of thing that we need to look for. And I don't think it's out of line to expect that that could be produced. If it can't, then I prefer - not that it should be considered. It sounds like it could be, but then we should expect that it is.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Mike.

Mike Palage: Thanks.

Really just echoing what Tim had said there, I think we need to sit there and distinguish between commentary versus actually clear documented technical reasons, setting forth the oppositions.

You know, if we are going to sit there and deny allocation of these, I think there needs to be a record established. And this goes back to what I think we were talking about in (Greg's).

When we do something, there needs to be documentation, there needs to be a foundation upon which the legitimacy of our actions can be based, not mere commentary or anecdotes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, can I join the…

Chuck Gomes: On the same topic? Okay.

Alistair Dixon: On this topic.

Sophia Bekele: Can I join too? Sophia here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And, Chuck, can I sign off? And - because I've got to go to another call and I think probably Patrick can convey and Neal and Alistair the discussions that have taken place in the group.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marilyn. Sorry we didn't get done with this before you left. And I'm sorry in more ways than one because we're way behind in our agenda.

                 Okay. Go ahead, Alistair, you were on, right?

Alistair Dixon: Just follow-up, okay. Thanks, Chuck.

                 I just - I guess I would certainly have sympathy with (Mike's) proposed recommendation. But I do think that we - it would be desirable to explore this topic further before it's convinced by the council.

I do think we should actually be doing outreach to see if we can dig it in sort of robust technical documentation around this particular issue. I mean, I just don't think we have yet - either had a sort of a particular discussion around whether there are in particular technical issues and this, you know, it hasn't been a concentrated, robust discussion on this particular issue. And what (unintelligible) and I think that would be very desirable before we (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Yes, Chuck, a question first perhaps. Are we talking - I can't help when you mentioned Ram or Cary, is this relative to IDN issues on this level?

Chuck Gomes: Well…

Sophia Bekele: …because…

Chuck Gomes: Marilyn's point was is that, she thought that Ram had made some statements with regard the single-character issue regarding IDN. So, yes, and…

Sophia Bekele: Well, yeah. I think it's already documented as well. I think you refer to that kind of language as an example even it has meaning for each, you know, character. So, he suggested advising with the language community on this.

And I think the whole working group view of that single character as well at the top level and the third level. Second level was on commenting the status quo and not changed anything, and it has to be the top level especially very sensitive.

And, you know, the Chinese character, for example, as we're looking at this second-level ASCII characters, many of Chinese languages are two characters.

So, we're thinking of reserving that. It's sort of like, you know, shutting out the whole community. That was also an example given in the third level as well. So, there is no reservation that is recommended on this all three levels.

Chuck Gomes: On the single character.

Sophia Bekele: The single character.

Chuck Gomes: And then, we're talking about two things. There are single-character ASCII and single-character IDN.

Sophia Bekele: Single-character IDN.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

Sophia Bekele: …level…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Sophia Bekele: …and top level and the third level, right?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay. And, Patrick, you may want to - you guys can pursue that however you see fit in that regard.

I think Edmon was - we're back in the main queue. Edmon, you're up.

Edmon Chung: It's actually similar topic. I want to go back to - I want to talk about the IDN and we will go back to (Tim's) comment. And I'm not sure why letter is used rather than (unintelligible) and whether that has any significance.

I hear that, you know, the intent is to - we look forward for the recommendation to be valid for both ASCII and IDN, but this seems very confusing.

And also, the difference between number, ASCII letter and IDN character and single letter in all cases is significantly different in my mind, especially, for example, number, you know, that that clearly has some technical issues there.

And single ASCII letter and then single IDN character also present in very different challenges. So, as Sophia mentioned, I think single-character IDN is, to some degree, almost bordering desirable especially for languages like Chinese.

So, I'm not sure whether we should somehow separate them at least explicitly state that, you know, even if the general alternatives are the same to explicitly split them into three areas.

Chuck Gomes: And I suspect that we would encounter some problems if we made recommendations that single characters at whatever level should be unreserved in ASCII but defer a decision on IDNs because that may given advantage to the ASCII - people that use the ASCII rather than those who use IDN. Is my thinking on there…

Edmon Chung: Are we talking about, first, about TLD right now or…

Chuck Gomes: I said any level.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: In other words, if we remove the reservation of single characters and ASCII at either the top or the second or the third level and we didn't do it at the same time, our recommendations for IDN that we put that off for further research with that given advantage to those people in the world who use ASCII characters. I don't know. I'm not sure I even know the answer to that.

Man: Chuck, can I join the queue on this particular…

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Edmon Chung: (Unintelligible)…

Chuck Gomes: Yes go ahead, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: …begins - I think it's not just between ASCII and IDN, though. I mean, if you get in to the discussion about technical issue, I believe the response would be quite significantly different between single ASCII letter and single number.

Chuck Gomes: I got that. Yeah.

Edmon Chung: So since we are likely going to invoke that, I don't - I think it's important to separate them into three areas because we are likely going to get three very different assets, some technical …

Chuck Gomes: Now, what should be separated in the three different areas -- letter, number, and character?

Edmon Chung: IDN character. Right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Denson: This is Tim. I have a comment on that or I can get in the queue…

Chuck Gomes: I think Alistair did too. So let's - Tim, you're after Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, my - firstly - I mean I have several comments about those.

Firstly, one of the concerns about single characters (unintelligible) letters or numbers were concerned around mistyping and the potential (unintelligible) et cetera.

And I guess one of the things that, it would seem to me that if you're going to - if a single character concern raises concerns in the ASCII, why wouldn't it raise similar concerns in an IDN world in terms of mistyping.

It seems to me that I mean I think it's an important point that actually certainly in the IDN world, and particularly with (unintelligible) Chinese, a single character, you know, single characters are words and it would seem to me that in some ways it could be argued that you are actually

imposing different roles on the IDN world versus the SD world if you're not allowing single characters in IDN.

You know, the example I can think of is, well, my pronunciation is actually pretty bad, but (Jing) for example which is I understand in Chinese (was the city). If you basically see (unintelligible) character, IDNs (unintelligible) would roll out words like that.

And I think it just seems to me that I think it would be preferable to at least (unintelligible) characters in IDNs, and if you are allowing single characters in IDN, I think that also you should also allow single characters and ASCII because it would - I mean because basically the concerns about single characters at least from the passing point of view which seems to be the same to me.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, good. Okay, some good points. Okay.

Tim.

Tim Denson: Yes. I guess my comment is kind of similar to Alistair there, that I kind of agree with him that perhaps, you know, there's a difference between letter and number in IDN, if we're talking about allowing single characters.

But when we get to - if we're going to recommend that we don't allow single characters for some technical reasons, then it gets much more complicated because those technical reasons aren't going to apply across all languages and scripts.

You know, they certainly might be valid within romanized scripts or whatever, but when you're talking about, you know, Chinese, Japanese or others, you know, Hebrew, they certainly wouldn't apply.

So I think when - if we - if the recommendation is that they're not allowed for some technical reasons, then it gets much more complicated and there's many more separate issues besides just letter, number, IDN, gets in the letter number and the various scripts that are in languages that are involved in IDN.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Now, Edmon, a question for you in this regard. Does it make sense to talk about number? Does that have the same complications that letter versus character would have with regard to IDN?

Edmon Chung: Well, number is clearly a problem and it's almost clearly a technical problem. For example, the issue with IP addresses. I think that comes to mind immediately and will be one of the clear issues against allowing single number TLDs.

And a single letter ASCII letter TLD would be less of a concern if the - the mistype issue obviously is one of them, but, you know, I don't - I'm not completely convinced with that either.

But anyway - and when you move to IDN, it's completely different. I mean…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So the same thing applies to us.

Does it - would it make sense to break this category down further into single ASCII letter and single ASCII number and single IDN character?

Woman: Sounds good.

Edmon Chung: That would be my I guess suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's good. That's what I thought you're saying. I just want to clarify.

Edmon Chung: In terms of title, I'm not sure what exactly titles say, probably exactly the - because - particularly -- because right now the title says single letter and that…

Chuck Gomes: So we could say - would alpha character makes more sense? In some of the RFCs they say alpha number and that's where I'm coming from. Would that be better than letter -- alpha character?

Edmon Chung: I think it would be best…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …alpha character would be maybe would be very precise?

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. Can I get it?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, jump in Patrick.

Patrick Jones: I think all this discussion is really great and it demonstrates that more work is needed in this particular area and that we should probably pick these suggestions, break down the category, and submit additional information to the list, but we may want to move on to some of the…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I was getting ready to do that. Yes.

One other thought I had in that regard is that, you know, it seems to me that there may be a difference between second level and top level and that when we get to the point, and I don't think we're going to get to it in our final report this time, is where we're making recommendations on second level and first and top with regard to single character names, that it might not be a bad idea to release the reservation requirement to second level before you do it at the first level just so that we have some learning, but that's just another consideration that I'm throwing out, we don't really need to debate that right now.

Yes, I think you're right, Patrick, that this category - this subcategory I think were okay, and the first one was assembled, but this first subcategory here definitely needs more work.

And I think that that's what the recommendation should be and we should get some guidelines as to what that work needs - at least identify some of the topics that need to be pursued further, the things that we've talked about in this time right now.

Okay. What's the next subcategory?

Patrick Jones: Next is two-letter TLD.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Patrick Jones: Two letters at the top level.

We have two recommendations. Alt one is we recommend that two-letter TLDs be allowed provided that measures to avoid…

Chuck Gomes: And you're talking about ASCII two-letter right now, correct?

Patrick Jones: ASCII two-letter TLDs, that they be allowed provided measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes are implemented and that a standardized approach should be used which ensures consultation with appropriate parties including the ccNSO and the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency, and where technical issues are identified (unintelligible) our steps.

Chuck Gomes: What would the ISO agency have to do with this?

Patrick Jones: This is where we have a - where I have a problem with this recommendation, is that - and you'll see it in all two. The ISO 3166 list is currently used for allocation of country codes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I'm aware of the list. You said without consultation with that organization. So I understand consulting with the ccTLDs, but the list is, you know, there, and of course it changes infrequently, but it changes. But what good would it do to consult with the ISO organization?

Patrick Jones: Yes. And I'm honestly not sure either this was, you know, the language that…

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I'm just asking because I'm curious. There may very well be a good reason for that.

Man: I think the concern was…

Chuck Gomes: Sorry?

Man: In regard to this recommendation, it's pretty clear what they're going to say. I don't think it would be any surprise.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's what I was thinking too. Alistair, go ahead.

Alistair Dixon: Well, I think the idea to talk to ISO was simply that they were the ones holding the list of, you know, of two-letter names. And so that's the reason to talk to them.

                   But, yes, I mean whether they would be - I mean they're not the ones deciding what are the relevant two-letter names.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So, okay, we don't need to belabor that, I don't think, but that's good - Patrick, go ahead.

Patrick Jones: Alt two is we recommend that the current practice of allowing two-letter name, two-letter, that we should ASCII names at the top level only for ccTLDs remain at this time.

The subgroup has been encouraged not to consider removing the restriction on two-letter ASCII names at the top level. IANA has based its allocation of two-letter names at the top level on the ISO 3166 list. There is a risk of collision between in the interim allocations and ISO 3156 assignment which may be desired in the future.

Alistair Dixon: Yes, I think because that one is probably the politically easier one.

Patrick Jones: And this alt two follows the recommendations that are in the GAPP principles that were published in April '05.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now what the discussion or comment on this one?

Mike Palage: (Palage) join the queue?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Mike. Anybody else?

Alistair Dixon: Alistair, I'll go in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Denson: Tim get in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Tim.

Mike Palage: Chuck, as you know, I resisted the reservations of the IANA ICANN
                  names.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Mike Palage: However, under those circumstances where ICANN I don't think has
                  been able to come forward with a valid reason. I think in connection
                  with the reservation of the two-letter ASCII characters at the top level, I
                  do think there is a valid reason particularly regarding, if you will, future
                  countries.

                  As you say, the list does change infrequently, but if it does, I think that
                  is important to preserve that. So on this one, notwithstanding my
                  reservations and comments in connection with other subgroups, I
                  would propose - I would be in favor al two at this time but would like to
                  listen to other people.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

                  Okay. Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: Yes. I (unintelligible) just elaborated it on the discussion.

                  I would consider truly the TLD to be very, very high (unintelligible) and
                  for the political reasons. But I mean I just - the perspective I had was
                  that while there are political reasons for maintaining two-letter names -
                  reservation of two-letter names…

Chuck Gomes: At the top level we're talking about, right.

Alistair Dixon: At the top level only. I guess - on policy terms, it seems to me there were more questions. And I in particular, you know, we are talking about, as you say, very occasional additions of countries. And unless the country only has two letters, there are originally options for you know, for a country label.

So I guess, well, there may be options (unintelligible) but certainly in some countries I would think there are options. And so I guess from my point of view, I think there may be benefits and we're to examine whether there would be an approach that would allow countries to continue to obtain new labels that are created, but at the same time deal with basically trademark (unintelligible) for example, they also have legitimate - may have legitimate claims two-letter.

Chuck Gomes: So would you say favor alt one or alt two or more work?

Alistair Dixon: I would favor more work.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, okay.

Alistair Dixon: Yes. That would be my preference.

I mean - I think to be realistic, I think probably alt two is the realistic recommendation. But I do think this is something that could be explored more.

I guess the other point that I thought about this one was that there was also - and the principals I guess addressed this, is that with respect to country name, and we agreed, you know, a sort of discussion on geographical names, but it seemed to me that the need to have two-

letter TLDs may reserve of countries may diminish if you're going to provide a country name. And equally, the (unintelligible) IDNs may also diminish the need for two-letter TLDs and ASCII for all countries.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I've got you, and Avri. I think Tim is next.

Tim Denson: Yes. Thanks, Chuck.

I guess I would support alt two primarily, you know, I hate to say this, but it's for political reasons. And I think possibly for, you know, stability reasons perhaps, to some extent just that - so there isn't confusion to, you know, amongst users as to, you know, what they're actually accessing, although that's been diminished quite a bit now anyway with, you know, vanity - the vanity approach of some of this ccTLDs like .TV or .WS.

But again I guess for political reasons I think at this point I would support alt two, although the second level would be completely different story.

Chuck Gomes: Now before I go to Avri, Patrick, clarification question here. Now you guys didn't make an IDN recommendation with regard to this, did you?

Patrick Jones: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that needs to be done as well. And we get into the abbreviation acronym type thing I think that Cary and Ram mentioned. So that's an issue there with regard to the IDN recommendation there.

Okay, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, hi.

I definitely support alt two. One of the things I like about it is the, at this time, one of the things I believe is that we have sort of an either/or. I think having set aside for ISO 3166 the two characters for countries so that there's a safe country identification method is a good thing and should be maintained.

I think I touched some significant - part of what…

Chuck Gomes: Did we lose you or did I get lost?

Man: I think we just lost Avri.

Man: I think we lost Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, hold on. I'm going to…

Man: We're still here, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, and it sounds like I'm still here too. I was just checking myself.

Now, does anybody else on the call…

Avri Doria: Well, sorry. I'm back.

Chuck Gomes: Oh you're back. Go ahead, Avri. I was just killing time.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you.

So I attach some significance to what was said earlier, is that there's almost either/or situation. If the demand becomes very strong that we have to open up reservations for a country name in many different characters and many different languages, then I think that there's a tradeoff between (unintelligible) saying, two-letter, ISO, and opening up the whole rest of the range. So that's why I attach a lot of importance to at this time.

Mike Palage: Chuck, this is Mike, if I could just…

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead.

Mike Palage: …a 30-second comment after listening to the fellow members.

Again I still am supportive of alt two as I think most other members are. The only qualification, perhaps, when we have two-letter ASCII names, perhaps we might want to say two-letter ASCII letter-only names. And the reason I say this is let's just suppose…

Chuck Gomes: Say that again. I missed part of it. Two-letter what?

Mike Palage: Two-letter ASCII letter-only names.

So what happens is let's just suppose O2 provider sort of wants to have .O2 or .A1. If we go with, if you will, a letter number approach, there is no potential for collusion.

And I think that potentially may address it. Because what we're looking to do is make sure the different countries have added to the ISO list, that they will be able to sort of, you know, have that option available to them.

In the case of an O2 or an A2 and A1 or something like that, that is not going to be, you know, that is not going to be an allocation I doubt the ISO group is going to do because traditionally it has been letter only.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I agree with that, but you still have the confusability issue just by appearance, you know, the zero and the O, the 1 and the L. So you have that issue as well.

Mike Palage: But that's interesting thought I think.

Chuck Gomes: Well - go ahead, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: We did actually address that. There was actually a recommendation into the combination just following this particular -- yeah, points. But I mean I think your wording (unintelligible) does help clarify what we're talking about here.

Sophia Bekele: Chuck, may I make a comment just quickly?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Sophia. Go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: Yes. I was just wondering, one other question actually, why don't we just say a two-letter country code label, you know, just to isolate the ASCII, because in the second level that's what we're talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: There may be new two-letter, if I'm understanding correctly, there could be a new country form, there probably will be new countries formed in the future that will request a new code. And so that's I think one of the reasons, if I'm understanding your point correctly.

Sophia Bekele: Because that's the unknown.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. You know, ISO would probably add to its list, more than likely will add to its list in the future. And so at the least, at the second level, if you allow two-character names to be registered except for the ISO list as it is today, you can just about bet that all of those will be registered and so they wouldn't be available for the - for ISO to use.

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I mean two characters are very much in demand, right?

Sophia Bekele: Sure. Okay. Well, that was a suggestion…

Chuck Gomes: No, good suggestion, but I think that's the - I was just trying to point out one other thing we need to be aware of. And if I was the ISO organization, that's the case where I would have concerns.

Sophia Bekele: Okay. And the other point I was trying to make is - regarding on the IDN, just to express the views of the people, because it says on the report that I sent you as well, generally, the second level I think is the same thing I referred earlier, it's impossible, you know, to make reservations, it's going to affect a lot of the language community. And I think Ram and Cary perhaps have mentioned that at that time…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, they did, yeah.

Sophia Bekele: So, that is, you know, to leave it open and not to make any reservation.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Sophia Bekele: At the third level, the same thing as well.

Chuck Gomes: As the second. Yeah, that makes sense.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay.

All right. So that one - let's see now, I was going to ask this question -- is there anybody besides Alistair who thinks that more work is needed on this one?

Man: Mike's basically in favor of alt one, Mike Rodenbaugh.

Chuck Gomes: Oh he's in favor of alt one which was opening it up.

Man: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So we've got one person in favor alt one, we've got one person in favor of more work, everybody else that spoke, and I realize a lot of you have not spoken, is there anybody else on the call who would favor alt one or more work?

Dan Halloran: Well, I would check. This is Dan, but alt one.

Chuck Gomes: Alt one? Okay.

Patrick, I'm guessing that this one has -- I'm the one who was talking three -- but we're trying to get rough consensus. It seems to me, and then I'll let people on the call say if they disagree with my conclusion here, but it seems to me that, at least for our reports that's due on the 16th, we probably ought to recommend more work on this one.

Does anybody disagree with that?

We're at a point where we're going to have to, you know, cut bait on some of these at least for this iteration of our work. Keep in mind we may have an additional 30 days. So I'll talk about that later.

Man: Okay. Let me just add that we - within our subgroup, we discussed this pretty heavily, and in between the strong recommendation that we received from (unintelligible) and ccNSO, the GAAP principles and conveyed this email from (Ayena), and there's pretty strong support outside of this working group for alt two. So, just take that into consideration as well.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I mean, that's a very good point. And the working group --
because of three people's position on this differing, we could decide as
a working group to go with alt two and then allow the three people
either jointly or separately to - I mean, they would be allowed to submit
their minority position on this.

Do people in the group think that's a better approach?

Tim Denton: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Denton: Tim Denton.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Tim Denton: Yes. I mean, from what I heard, just listening to this and given the
kinds of concerns from other community, I think we would be wise to
not to upset them and that we have - they have expressed themselves
in the clearest possible terms. And that's what I want to say.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Anybody else want to comment?

Alistair Dixon: I mean, Chuck, it's Alistair here. I obviously think alt one is buying a
fight that isn't going through with (unintelligible) three.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I would agree with you on that one. That's a fight we're not going
to win I think.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah. I mean - so I guess - I mean I would I think probably be certainly heavy for your suggested approach, although I think there may be possibly a way through this, although I can't see it at the moment.

I mean, I think, you know, realistically, alt two is the recommendation that I, for example, could be the board. And, you know, concerning alt one, I think, you know, and certainly there are issues there, and I think there's - I mean perhaps this work we might be able to find a solution, but I think it's not obvious at the moment.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

So, does anybody object to us then putting forward as a working group recommendation, not unanimous obviously, our working group recommendation that is alt two and there will be minority opinion included below the recommendation?

Anybody opposed to that?

Mike Palage: Chuck, with regard to alt two, are we going to say that it's ASCII letter-only or we're just going to have a flat-out prohibition on alt two letter ASCII names?

Alistair Dixon: It's letter-only, Mike, that's what our recommendation wording actually have…

Mike Palage: Okay, two-letter…

Alistair Dixon: …two-letter name.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So then, are we recommending that letter-number combinations not be reserved?

Man: That's separate recommendation.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's 3.3 below.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's 3.3, I'm sorry. Again, keep in mind, I don't have them in front of me because…

Alistair Dixon: And it is ASCII only, we're not talking about IDN here, just ASCII.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, thanks.

Man: Alistair, thank you, and that reinforces my support for alt two as well, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right.

                Well, let's go on to the next subcategory.

Patrick Jones: The next one is combination, one letter and one number and two number TLD and it says…

Chuck Gomes: And this is at top level?

Patrick Jones: At the top level -- are the subject of further work by the subgroup and outreach to experts. This area needs further study including discussion with technical experts before any recommendation is made.

Chuck Gomes: Any problems with that recommendation?

Okay, if we put that one forward.

Okay. Next category.

Patrick Jones: The next category has several option. This is single letters and numbers at the second level. Starts out, we recommend that single letters and numbers be released at the second level in future TLDs and that those currently reserved in existing TLD should be released.

Methods for allocating release names were discussed by the subgroup. It says three alternative recommendations are presented, but we actually added a fourth alternative this morning.

Chuck Gomes: And those alternatives would be for consideration of a - possibly a future group to work on that, right, since that's really not in our statement of work. Is that correct?

Patrick Jones: Yeah, I think that's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Right…

Patrick Jones: Alistair, do you want to add to that or…

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, I think that that's great. I mean certainly I wasn't aware that allocation was actually part of that statement of work. I thought that…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And again Mike and I disagreed on this, Mike Palage, but I think it's okay for us to mention allocation. I don't think it's our task to come up with allocation method and in fact, I think it's much more efficient to form a totally new group. I also don't think that that would be appropriate for us to do on our 30-day extension if we're given one of those.

So, any other comments on that?

Avri Doria: Yes, can I make…

Alistair Dixon: Can I just make one more comment as well, Chuck…

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, I'll turn in Avri.

Alistair Dixon: I mean, I agree with you. I think this particular allocation will be involved and possibly for discussion. So I think it's (unintelligible) to have a different group working on this.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think it's just a friendly amendment that I think people would agree with because of all the alts, is that we recommend that they should be released, but I would add, subject to the development of a new allocation method, you know, a separate allocation method, and

then, you know, 0.2 possibilities presented in this group but we recommend that, you know, a new process be created by the council to look into this.

So - but I think that should be released subject to the development of or agreement on, you know, on new allocation method and not just release period.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any problems with that amendment? It sounds okay to me. Is that okay with you, Alistair and Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Avri, can you send that to me…

Chuck Gomes: And Neal, is that okay?

Man: Yeah. I'm fine with it, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, can you send…

Avri Doria: I can send some wording, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

Okay.

Alistair Dixon: Just know, Chuck, that I think some of the options may actually be existing allocation as well as new ones, so.

Chuck Gomes: Run that by me again.

Alistair Dixon: Some of the - I mean Avri included the word new allocation, it's about, for example, alt three I think is an existing allocation method.

Chuck Gomes: Oh yeah, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, I'll word it to not exclude something that already exists.

Chuck Gomes: In other words, you could probably just leave out the word new, and in other words it could be an existing one or a new one.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: But just aside on the allocation method, that would be like.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right, right.

Okay. Anything else on this one?

Tim Denton: This is Tim. I would like to comment.

Chuck Gomes: Tim.

Tim Denton: So, in my understanding, we're going to take out the allocation suggestions. And that would be my preference. I agree with Avri's rewording except that I would prefer that we don't include suggested allocation number.

Avri Doria: Can I?

Chuck Gomes: So you're - well, let me - go ahead, Avri, jump in.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I was going to recommend in the wording that below are some options that have been put forward, but the discussion shouldn't be limited to these options and I leave it go with that. But since people did suggest them, I didn't see a harm in including them as examples of possible methods.

Chuck Gomes: Well, what do you think about that, Tim?

Tim Denson: I guess I'm - I just don't want to get any impression that we are - that working group is supporting any one allocation method over another.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Of course, if we show just for our options, it certainly doesn't seem like we're doing that.

(John):   This is (John)…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Denson: There might be many other options and, you know, are we taking the risk of closing the door on possibly other ideas?

Chuck Gomes: I think you're right, we should make sure that the language is clear that other options should be explored.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Also some UN-type ambiguous (unintelligible) if appropriate language and see if it works.

(John): I'd like to agree with -- this (John) -- I'd like to agree with Tim that we do not list any (fault) on this in any methods of allocation. I think it could create some confusion and it could send the wrong message.

If we're not the group looking at allocation methods, then we shouldn't be suggesting any allocation methods, and leave it to whatever group would be suggesting such methods.

Chuck Gomes: Now the reason I kind of leaned, although I'm not - I don't feel really strongly about this towards, you know, including those, was basically I think it's helpful to give some direction with regard to, you know, what work we think needs to be done. But I'm not sure that that's critical that we list those either.

So we got a - anybody - does anybody feel really strongly that those four ideas need to be in here?

Avri Doria: I kind of - this is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: I kind of think it's (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mike Palage: This is Palage, if I can…

Tim Denson: It's Tim, I'd like to get in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I got…

Alistair Dixon: I'd like to get in the queue please.

Chuck Gomes: Let's see, it was Palage and then - and who was it, Alistair?

Tim Denson: Tim…

Chuck Gomes: Tim again?

Tim Denson: Yeah.

Alistair Dixon: Tim is before me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Tim and then Alistair, okay.

Man: And then…

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else?

Okay, Mike?

Mike Palage: Thank you, Chuck.

Based upon my earlier comments about any reference to our future allocations, based upon the dialogue that we had so far, I would not be opposed to a reference for, you know, referring allocation to a future work group. So that is something through the discussion here that I would be open to. So you had said that we were in opposition…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Mike Palage: I think I…

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, I appreciate you clarifying that. You know, I just want to make sure, I didn't want to just totally…

Mike Palage: Not a problem.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mike Palage: However, what I am concerned with is based upon the arguments that I think Tim and (John) have articulated, I do think it's a potential slippery slope that we start down and when we begin to, if you will, provide and enumerate, even if it's not a definitive list, but a list of allocation methods, I think it's just potential mission (unintelligible).

And while I respect Avri's ability to come up with brilliant language that commits to nothing, I really just - I do have concerns about why they should be included in the first place.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Okay, Tim?

Tim Denson: Yeah, again, just to clarify, I don't have an issue either with suggesting that work needs to be done on allocation method. I (unintelligible) we shouldn't include any suggestions for a number of reasons. One is because, one thing, it's not part of our statement of work.

And two, regardless of how ambiguous we try to make this language, when we present this report, we have these, you know, these four very specific allocation methods in the report and imply, at least in my mind that, you know, that the work group somehow discussed this, and we think these are four good ideas.

And that just isn't the case. I mean, if we're going to include them, then I think we need to, as a group, you know, discuss, and we think this is a good one to include on that. And since we're not going to go down that road, I would…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Denson: …you know, oppose then be included at all.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

And Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: I guess my view is that opposing some of the other speakers. I mean certainly the group itself did have quite a discussion on this point. And I would - although I think both - I mean both Mike and Marilyn on the call, I'm sure that both of them would want to have those options included in any consideration of allocation of the name.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So it's kind of got a split position - let me try and recommend a compromise. What if we were to just simply make a statement that in the process of doing our work several ideas were discussed and the working group will be glad to refer those to any group that works on this?

(John): I - this is (John). I would be comfortable with - I would not be comfortable with that listing, and with that, even with that…

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm not - (John), I wasn't suggesting listing them.

(John): Okay, say that again…

Chuck Gomes: I was suggesting that instead of -- I probably didn't make it clear -- instead of listing them, we just add a statement that said the subgroup that worked on this did discuss some alternatives and if whatever group that's formed to work on this would like to have those, they would be happy to provide it.

(John): I'd be comfortable with that, sorry. Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it's okay.

Alistair Dixon: That will be okay with me too, Chuck.

Man: That would be okay with me too, Chuck.

Mike Palage: That would be okay with me as well, Chuck -- Palage here.

Man: I could live with it, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Did you get that, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: I did.

Avri Doria: I'll include it in the suggested language I'm about to send Patrick…

Patrick Jones: That's perfect. I was just going to ask that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri, appreciate that.

                What's next, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: The next and last category…

Chuck Gomes: Oh that was a good word in there, the last.

Patrick Jones: …and number, and this is two-letter ASCII number at the second level, the recommendation is the existing gTLD registry agreement provides for a method of potential release a few character ASCII names at the second level.

                In addition, two-letter and/or number ASCII strings at the second level may be released through the process for new registry services which provides - which involve - process-involves analysis of any technical or security concerns and provides opportunity for public input.

                Technical issues related to the release of two-letter and/or number strings have been previously addressed by the (unintelligible) set forth on GNRs proposed registry service.

                (GAC) has previously noted the WIPO2 report statement that, and this is in quotes, "If ISO 3166 (alpha 2) country code elements are to be registered as domain names in the gTLDs, it is recommended that this

be done in a manner that minimizes the potential for confusion with ccTLDs.

We recommend that registries may propose release of two-letter and/or number strings at the second level provided that measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes are implemented.

A standardized approach should be used which ensures consultation with appropriate parties including the ccNSO and ISO where - and where technical issues are identified R-step.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any discussion?

Any - now, so you guys reached rough consensus on this one?

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: We - I think we did reach consensus, yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, consensus. Yeah, sorry. Good. And so it was total consensus, okay. Nothing rough about it.

Okay, the - so, it does - is anybody in the - on the call here opposed to that recommendation? Okay.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, yeah, Patrick, do you want to clarify the recommendation?

Patrick Jones: It's 3.5 two-letter and number ASCII strings at the second level.

And the recommendation was to maintain the existing method of release, but - and also the final processes available.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Avri, is that okay?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Okay, very good.

Now, keep in mind that you guys - one big omission in your recommendations is the IDN issue. So that needs to be added to your recommendations, and we'll probably have to still consider those.

Alistair Dixon: Yeah, Chuck, I think we basically run out of time.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I know.

Alistair Dixon: Certainly I think - I think (unintelligible) we've had discussion on that, I think there is probably a view that certainly two-character ID could be released.

Chuck Gomes: Well, wait a second. That seems to be contrary to what - oh, two-character in the - two-character IDN - two IDN characters could be released.

Patrick Jones: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: But we probably ought to have something in there that with regard to, you know, Unicode versions of, excuse me, trying to come up with IDN equivalents or transliterations of two character names is an overly complicated task and a road we shouldn't go, and I'm going back to the recommendations by Cary and Ram regarding the complications involved there.

Does that make sense?

Alistair Dixon: We will - then we will have to do further work on that issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and that one probably is fairly simple if we accept the advise of the experts that we received.

Patrick Jones: Yeah, I think -- and this Patrick -- probably after the call with Ram and Cary, we didn't have time to distill down their comments and do anything.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: So that's something that we will need to do.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sure that they would, either one, probably would be willing to assist you two if you need a little more assistance on that.

Patrick Jones: That would be greatly appreciated.

Chuck Gomes: And of course, your office is fairly close to Tina, she might be helpful there too now that she's back in the States.

Patrick Jones: Just for a short period of time.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, is that right? Okay.

Sophia Bekele: Chuck, can I just something to that…

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Sophia, go ahead.

Sophia Bekele: …section. I mean I suppose the purpose of that report that I submitted for the group is a compilation of all the comments made by the working group as well as the experts, right?

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Sophia Bekele: So I would suggest maybe, you know, something for that report to work with Cary, make sense out of it altogether and provide the input.

Chuck Gomes: Provide what input?

Sophia Bekele: Provide input for the recommendations that you need on the IDN.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, input from who?

Sophia Bekele: Well, I'm trying to understand the process of how you will include the input of the IDN working group.

Chuck Gomes: Well, okay I explained that to you in an email today. What we're going to do is we're going to - once we get our report final, okay, we're going to send it to the IDN Working Group, okay, and ask for their feedback.

Sophia Bekele: So it is after this - the process?

Chuck Gomes: It may be. And we may have to submit it to the counsel and say, this report is submitted because we had a deadline. Please understand that we haven't received the feedback from the IDN Working Group yet.

Sophia Bekele): Oh…

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Sophia Bekele: I just wanted to express that, you know, all the views where there so far. And I do not know how you were planning to compile that, you know, because I guess I set like all the works that I have put in there, and probably not being considered in a way that, you know, because they'll set and I'm bringing the views of the group and we're going to skip that and make your own recommendations when they go back…

Chuck Gomes: Well, okay. I'm sure…

((Crosstalk))

Alistair Dixon: Can I respond to that?

Sophia Bekele: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You want to finish, Sophia?

Sophia Bekele: No, no, I'm done. Maybe there's a lack of understanding of how the whole process works.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alistair?

Alistair Dixon: I think we would certainly want to consider Sophia's report in relation to those characters. So, I mean, Sophia, that would definitely be in an import into our subgroup's recommendations are on IDN.

Sophia Bekele: Sure, Alistair. I was just suggesting you can take that report and to download, you know, with Cary and Ram and go over it so if there's a difference between the views, it could be filtered out before it goes on the final report versus doing it the other way around. That was just my thinking, but…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And in fact, both ways I think there are good ways to do it.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, either way is fine as long as…

Chuck Gomes: No, no. Again, I think both. I mean, the working - the subgroup is going to look at your report and then we're still going to have to produce a report by a week from tomorrow and deliver it.

So if we're not able to get IDN working group feedback before we do that, the feedback would still be important. And we would qualify our submission without understanding.

Sophia Bekele: Okay, that is fine. I just want to make sure that it's done one way or the other.

Chuck Gomes: I think it's going to be done both ways.

Sophia Bekele: All right.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, this is Patrick. Can I just…

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: Just so we haven't had time to look at that, and if Sophia has already drafted something with some suggested language on IDNs, you know, two-character IDNs at the second level, I'd love to see the language, and our subgroup can talk about it and probably even include it.

Chuck Gomes: She sent several things to the list, I think it was today -- it could've been yesterday. The - and one of them was kind of a summary of I think the working group's positions and one of them was her personal views, is that right, Sophia, with regard to each of the - each - every category of reserve names.

Sophia Bekele: No, no. My personal views are not there at all. It is all the working group view. You know, it's dot matrix.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, that's good. I wasn't clear on that.

Sophia Bekele: No, no, no. It's purely the working group's view and it included the expert's view, what you guys called expert with Cary and Ram.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I did say some things from that, yeah.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, yeah. The second column is their view. And then the fourth column which is the last one is titled Working Group -- IDN Working Group View.

So those are the comments by the IDN Working Group. So there is a reconciliation or agreements to be made there. Or when you are drafting your recommendations, you can see which - which ones you go by.

So I'm just thinking, this report is probably more important before than after you draft your recommendations and then send it back to the working group. So…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think that's understood, yeah.

Sophia Bekele: My views are not there because I'm not…

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so what's in this - in each of the tables, the changes you made, it would have - or any changes you made which aren't clear because you - didn't use a tracking function, but they're not long enough that it would matter, I don't think. So the - those are the working group's position.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. All the - the fourth column is the working group additions.

I mean, the only contribution that Ram and Cary made was on the first day when you asked those questions to them. And so that's already reflected on as an experts group and then after that I took that and gave it to the working group and so they provided their input and I put that on that on the fourth column.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Sophia Bekele: A certain document is just to assist you if you were going to do the recommendations. These are perhaps the way to consolidate the views of the working group, toward the recommendation. So, I mean if the second document is just to format it according to your standards.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Sophia Bekele: Dot matrix was just a collection of views of everyone. So…

Chuck Gomes: Right, okay. Thank you.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, no problem.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Well, let's see, what time is it? Okay, I'd like to go to tag names. That report is - everybody has had that for a couple of days, several days, look at the recommendations there, the - they are - had to find them first of all.

Here we go, okay, we did add the - I think it was Avri that pointed out that on the top level for tag names ASCII that we made sure that the current requirements extended to the top level made clear on that. And

so, the top level for IDN - and by the way, and all of this we said no additional work, and I say, we - Patrick and I, right?

In the IDN levels we said, it was non-applicable. Sophia has raised an issue that she thinks that the basically the two hyphen should be reserved anywhere in the string.

And that would have to be qualified a little bit because she can't (unintelligible) at the beginning or the end. But the - that's the - and then - so the changes in the recommendations are fairly minor.

Sophia has raised this other issue, the - as far as I'm aware -- and Patrick, you can comment on this -- the technical community has never documented any concern with regard to reserving the string else - the two hyphens anywhere else, in the domain name, is that correct?

Sophia Bekele: I could talk about that. I mean I sent you an email, Chuck, and I say you can drop it. It was just a recommendation. It's to avoid sloppy programming that could be anticipated in the future. And so I mean it's a precaution, it's sort of a preventative measures…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Sophia Bekele: …you know, we don't take a risk, that's all.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. That's understood. And I appreciate the time you spent on those emails.

The - one of the things as I was thinking about that, and I didn't have time to respond an email, but is that I think we're talking about

programming at the browser level for the most part where I think talking about the browser manufacturers being pretty good on their quality control.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, but we're not - my concern was not the browser manufacturers which are right now currently the IDN aware, as they say, and we're talking about millions of other applications, accounting applications, developed, you know, globally, to, you know, with all these hyperlinks to, you know, to get you from one place to another.

So those are the applications I was talking about and those to become IDN aware and, you know, it could take 10 years or maybe five years, I don't know, but those are the programming that we were trying to avoid, not necessarily the already tested and proven browser level.

Chuck Gomes: Well, if - does IDN Working Group take a position on this?

Sophia Bekele: Well, yeah, they - obviously, it's - I've sent it out and there were bunch of different opinions on it. So, if you want to go over it again, Patrick, you can ask again what if people want to make a consensus on it.

But, it's just - this is again, it's not - doesn't present a risk immediately but - and it will. If simple grammar does not, you know, does not, you know, identify the (XN) at the beginning, somehow, it's areas at programming are - there's a potential to quote confusion and, you know, when it get translated at the IDN level - at the visual level, so, that's what we're saying and this (proving) and all that was supposed to be following that analogy.

Chuck Gomes: Patrick, you want to add anything?

Patrick Jones: I really don't have anything to add to that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and - personally, I'm not convinced that it's worth the impact that would have on the…

Sophia Bekele: There's no immediate impact, that's why I suggested that…

Chuck Gomes: Well, there's an impact in the case of the registries. If they have to implement code that would reserve not only this - that the (ACE) prefix at the beginning but reserve double hyphen - not allowed double hyphens anywhere in a name, so there is an impact there and…

Sophia Bekele: That's okay, Chuck, I just sent you an e-mail to say drop it. It's more of a user (unintelligible) usually what's…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I can't see my e-mail, I'm sorry, because I can't get on, that's been handicapped throughout this call so, I'm sorry, I didn't see that.

All right, is there any problems - is this report ready to go? Anybody have an objection to this reports being finalized?

Patrick Jones: Oh, just been (unintelligible), so we are drafting that particular item.

Chuck Gomes: It was never added.

Patrick Jones: Okay, all right.

Chuck Gomes: And we were discussing whether it should be added.

Sophia Bekele: (Unintelligible) or not.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay?

All right, tag names and (unintelligible) and our time is just about up. So let's - I really didn't want to have to schedule another meeting but I don't know how we can avoid it.

We still have the ICANN - that's ICANN. ICANN and IANA related names, other names reserved at the second level, controversial names and geographic and geopolitical names to cover. Let's see, I got a use of my (unintelligible) and to look up my calendar, seems I can't see it on my laptop here. The…

And let me go over the Monday on my calendar…

Patrick Jones: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes?

Patrick Jones: And then - and just in case there's - if you feel it appropriate, then we could put in the HTTP, HTTPS and HTML back into the ICANN and IANA names that I have been considered there.

Chuck Gomes: That's probably an appropriate place for that, so…

Patrick Jones: Then I'll do that and I get them out of (nic),who, and www.whois. And - okay, so we can send it to them all at one place at one time.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and that probably a good idea based on what you and I talked about this morning.

Patrick Jones: That's fine. And that's (unintelligible)…

Chuck Gomes: The - and it fits there and for just everybody else in the call. And because www, nic and whois or are for registry operational uses, that probably wouldn't apply to the HTTP et cetera.

So - and we may not even do anything with those but it - because it came up, it's the only reason we're considering them at (unintelligible) I saw your - before I lost e-mail contact there, I did your message on that regard and I thought it was - just had a lot of value.

The - can we schedule a meeting for Monday? I apologize. I don't know how to avoid it. And I don't think we wasted time today.

Marilyn Cade: At the 18 (UTC) of the last Monday?

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me?

Marilyn Cade: What's the time you're thinking of, the 18 (UTC) as the last Monday?

Chuck Gomes: What do people prefer. That's pretty early for Alistair I know.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, yeah, that's right.

Chuck Gomes: We can do it the same time as today. It's okay, I'll just check my calendar. I can do it either at - now, we have daylights - yeah, so

Daylight Saving's Time is Sunday for us but yeah, and we can do it whichever time people like. Let me look all account for that there.

Glen, could you - what's the time of the meeting on the 15th? We moved it up. And I think we moved it to 1600 (UTC) is that correct? Are you there Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: That's what I showed at (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. And anybody can look it up I guess, so it's 1600. So we could do with at 1700 or 1800 UTC. Today's meeting - well, and again, it's before Daylight Saving's Time in the US, but it was - it would be the same preferences by people?

Man: I prefer - if we could, I prefer the same time with today.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: So what's that affects that 1800 UTC is this?

Chuck Gomes: I…

Woman: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: I think so. Does that work for everybody?

Man: And that…

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry, this Glen, can I just push in that 1800 UTC is going to be one hour before the (unintelligible) for meeting.

Woman: On the 12th we're talking about.

Glen Desaintgery: Oh sorry, sorry, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. We're talking about adding another meeting Glen, on Monday.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I'm sorry too. But…

Mike Palage: Chuck, this is Mike. That the current - this time as today's call would work best from the (unintelligible)…

Woman: What if you (want) there or later for you?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That - is that okay Mike?

Mike Palage: Yeah. And it's - the afternoon is better than the morning.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

All right, if there are no objections, we will talk again on Monday, and we will cover the - we will first cover the recommendations on the four reports that we didn't get to.

I think it's four, is it four or five? Anyway, and then, we will comeback as we have time to the additional, you know, that modified recommendations that we talked about today.

Now, a quick question for you, did anybody have a chance to look at the drafts report, final report for the whole working group and is there any input in - regarding that?

Tim Denson: Chuck, this is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Denson: You've just - going back to the schedule, I'm going to be traveling on Monday, so I would not likely be able to joined the call on that one time, and most as after what 3pm Pacific Time.

Chuck Gomes: But it's just really late for some people.

Tim Denson: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Denson: So, that - and if Avri can join perhaps she'd belong to (kind a) cover the controversial names and then we can - and we haven't (unintelligible) changes can be (worked) to the recommendation, yet so we'll try to get that done before that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Avri, are you okay with that?

Avri Doria: I miss which meeting, I didn't - I…

Chuck Gomes: The One Monday.

Avri Doria: The One Monday, I'll definitely be at the One Monday.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so Tim we'll need your - you to take the lead on that because he'll be traveling.

Avri Doria: Okay great.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Anybody else - any comments on the - and if you have a - I understand you probably haven't had any chance to look at it but, unfortunately, we're going to have to actually finalize it next week. So if you can look at that between now and Monday, I will try and see if any - there's any major changes.

I understand that we're going to have to add more tables for the single and two character thing, that's not a hard thing to do, but - and that fits on the way it would - I set it up anyway so, Tim Denton?

Tim Denton: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: You can - I'll accept the changes on the tag names. It's basically done, so, if you want to do editorial check on that one, you're welcome to.

Tim Denton: Okay. And I'll have a - I'm going to retrieve your thing over the draft or first report and see if you would have any comments.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Denton: But that's (unintelligible) in me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right, so, okay, and - so I guess we're - we better call it quits for today because I - if you guys are like me, you'll probably pretty well burned out anyway. So, we'll meet again on Monday.

                Anybody have anything else?

Tim Denton: Monday, same time as today?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and now, that if Canada on Daylight Saving's Time?

Tim Denton: By the same time with you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so it'll be - actually be an hour later start time for us on Daylight Saving's Time.

Tim Denton: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, in the US and Canada, okay.

Woman: Okay, (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: All right everybody, thanks a lot for the hard work.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: I'll talk to you later. Have a good weekend.

Man: Bye.

END