

Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference

25 April 2007

18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 25 April 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://gns0-audio.icann.org/rn-wg-20070425.mp3>

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

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes - Working Group Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Ray Fassett - Registries constituency

Edmond Chung - Registries constituency

Caroline Greer - Registries constituency

Michael Palage - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Consultant - absent apologies

Glen de Saint G ery - Secretariat

Absent apologies:

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council IDN

wg Liaison

Chuck Gomes: And look at it one more time; the dub-dub-dub, whois, and nic, one for review by everybody.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, are there going to be any more modifications for the template?

Chuck Gomes: I don't plan on it. Now, understand that because of the differences in some of the categories like for example single, double letter, and stuff like that, you should keep the basic format the same but you may have to organizing it to fit your - the needs of a particular subgroup.

Now, I say that but if there needs to be because the template doesn't adequately met needs, we can certainly talk about that.

Patrick Jones: Okay. Because it's been giving me some headaches to try to take what I did earlier on - over the weekend and put it into the new template you send around.

Chuck Gomes: Where are the problems, Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Well, so far, I guess, it's because there's so many recommendations that are going to be coming out into the subgroup.

Coordinator: Excuse me; Caroline Greer has joined.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Welcome, Caroline.

Caroline Greer: Hello.

Patrick Jones: I'm just finding it hard to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, Patrick, what I would suggest there and maybe we should about that one, everybody's on the call but - now, the recommendations are going on the table, right?

Patrick Jones: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So that shouldn't be a problem, should it?

Patrick Jones: Those are abbreviated recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: No, that's changed. The new template does not - should not say abbreviated.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's the full recommendation - yeah, I understand completely, that's why I redid the template -- one of the reasons why I redid the template.

Coordinator: Excuse me; Avri Doria has joined.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Hi.

Chuck Gomes: This is your...

Patrick Jones: Let's just talk about that thing.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Avri, is this your second or your third teleconference today?

Avri Doria: Third.

Chuck Gomes: Third; okay.

Avri Doria: One was not ICANN. So...

Chuck Gomes: Right. Okay.

Avri Doria: My third ICANN phone call - teleconferences and I had one other one.
But there was a time - had find time to get my Pilates class in.

Chuck Gomes: Good. I actually between conference calls got in a little exercising
myself. I didn't do Pilates, my wife does Pilates.

Avri Doria: I'm just learning it; it's fun.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. She does it pretty regularly. Yeah.

Avri Doria: Have been doing it for a couple of weeks.

Chuck Gomes: Anyway, so, I guess, what I will do is send out that dub-dub-dub report to the group because I think I just finished it. Let's see.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Hello.

Chuck Gomes: Hello.

Avri Doria: Just checking; (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah because I'm sending a message off.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I was just waiting for a few more people to join.

Avri Doria: No problem.

Chuck Gomes: I'm just clicking right now, sending out a second - what is very close to completion. I think it should be complete unless people find something else in it; the dub-dub-dub, nic, and whois report. I just finished revising it under the new format and for total group review.

So, okay, so, let's see and maybe I ought to get my contact list up here since - Glen is going to be a little bit late because she is going from the

ICANN office over to her hotel to participate on this call. So she'll be joining us shortly.

So I'll get my contact list up and we can just kind of move. In fact, I've got - I don't even need that, I guess, because I have my - let's take a look here, I have (Neil), myself, Patrick, - oh, Glen, you're on?

Glen de Saint Géry: I'm on but I'm not yet in the hotel.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: So I'm on my - so I'm (unintelligible) my PC.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, got you.

And then Caroline, and Avri.

Alistair, you're on?

Alistair Dixon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome.

And (Ray) is on?

So we'll hang just a few more minutes to see if we have anybody else that's going to join. I'm sure we will.

Marilyn (unintelligible).

Sorry; I got the other line ringing.

I'll just watch this list here to see what happens. Probably, I think, I pretty full agenda because today we really want to spend as much time as possible talking about where each subgroup is going and how much of our two hours we use will depend on how much time we take on each of those and I would like to spend as much as is helpful.

Everyone should have received a new template for the subgroup reports and Liz has - it includes input from Liz on that and so make sure you use that one. With that, I also sent close to final version of the tag names report. Patrick and others helped me on some examples there that I - that's not in there yet. But I highlighted that part in yellow so that you'd know where that will be inserted.

And then I just a few minutes ago, you may not even received it yet, sent what, I think, is a final report for nic, whois, and dub-dub-dub. So those reports, by the way, the tag names and the one I just mentioned are not something that we're going to go over in the agenda today but hopefully everybody can review them within the next week so that if you do have any comments, you can send them to the list so that those - we could be basically done with those.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I just joined.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. I see your name on my list here. Welcome.

Greg Shatan: And I was told that we have not yet asked for the recording to begin.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct. So do you want to say something before I do?

Greg Shatan: No. I just wanted to note that.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry; just being (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: No, I have nothing to offer here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. Well, we'll wait maybe one more minute and then we'll get going here.

Greg Shatan: Of our group, this is the third call in three days. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well, this is my second two-hour call today. I didn't have one yesterday but I did have a call like this on Monday for different reasons. Avri is on her third teleconference today as I understand it.

Greg Shatan: Well, since she's on two subcommittees plus...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And so, anyway, okay, well, let's go ahead and get started. I think, others will probably join us but I don't want to waste people's time.

I did send out earlier today a slightly revised agenda. Nothing really major but in that revised agenda I highlighted the changes so that you would be able to easily see where I suggested some changes.

Okay, operator, it's okay to start the recording.

Coordinator: Thank you.

At this time, I would like to inform all parties that the call is now being recorded.

You may go ahead, sir.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

And remember, it's being transcribed as well so remember to identify yourself when you talk and if you're using a speakerphone, remember to use the handset when you're doing that to make it easier for everybody to hear.

Any changes to the agenda or any addition, questions, anything?

Marilyn Cade: I just want you to know that I joined. It's Marilyn Cade.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marilyn. I appreciate you let me know because I'm not looking at my thing right at the moment. I'm looking at the agenda instead and I have so many files open on my laptop that it's - I have to switch around several places, so.

Okay, and agenda's okay. Remember always if you have any updates to - statement of interest to send those to the list.

I want to next talk about the meeting next week; the May 3rd meeting. As you recall from last week's meeting, I will not be able to chair that one. In fact, I won't even be able to participate because I will be in a live board meeting that I'm a part of and can't change.

So Marilyn has kindly volunteered to fill in the role as Chair. The primary objective in that meeting will be as follows and you can see it on the agenda if you have it in front of you.

To review the recommendations under consideration by each subgroup. You may not be totally finalized by then but you should be getting pretty close, enough to at least give the full group an idea. Enough so that you can get feedback from the full working group next week and thereby see what final tweaks you need to make to your recommendation because we will only have one week after that to not only finalize the subgroup reports but then to finalize our working group report and get it approved on the 10th.

So, again, as I said in an email, please don't think that you can just keep working until the 10th; that's not quite true. In fact, my suggestion and we can talk about this but my suggestion is that the subgroup report should be done not later than the 8th and distributed to the full list so people have a couple of days to review them and even provide feedback via email before our meeting because in our final meeting, that's it.

We've got to, you know, approve the final recommendations and give Liz everything she needs to be able to not only finish our working group - the full working group report which will include all the subgroup reports but also then she's going to shortly after that incorporate our recommendations into the new TLD report. And as you can tell by looking at the template that it's - the template is kind of designed with that purpose in mind.

Any questions on that?

Now, Marilyn, I'm available just for you and I - you know, you requested that you and I talk maybe after this meeting and that should work fine for me. In fact, if you'll email me a good time after this call, I can be pretty flexible. And I do have - I don't have too many conflicts I can't adjust tomorrow.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So if you can send me a time I can give you a call, or if you want to call me, whatever works best, just let me know.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, good.

Chuck Gomes: And you and I can talk further.

Marilyn Cade: Sure. And just then we can get the agenda agreed before you - so that's out for people and people have...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I won't have that probably by - well, I probably will have - could have that by tomorrow. I don't know that I'll - I might get it done today. We'll see. Because it's - I think, it's pretty clear what needs to be one next week and that's what I was talking about at a high level but I'll - and you'll see that it'll kind of pattern what we do today.

Marilyn Cade: Good.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Marilyn Cade: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Anything else on the meeting next week? Again, let me - I'll say this later too but thanks for all of the hard work going on. I try to watch some of it but I can't watch everything or participate in every call. But I'm really pleased with what I see going on. You guys are really working hard and thanks, especially to the Chairs who are taking the leadership role there.

Caroline Greer: Chuck, it's Caroline here.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Caroline Greer: And just to jump in and say that the inter-meeting is actually taking place next week and I'm not sure what my schedule be like and it may effect some of the other members of the group as well and there maybe a reduced participation because of us.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I understand. If you're impacted that way, please make sure that when you do have spare time that you contribute via the list because again we only have one week after the 3rd to finish everything. So it's going to be really important if you do have to miss next week's call, like me, you know, keep your subgroup informed of where you're at on things, respond as quickly as possibly and that'll make it a lot easier on the Chairs and the rest of us as we wrap up this 30-day extension.

Thanks for brining that up, Caroline.

Okay, the next thing and this is an addition to the agenda that I sent out - that I added today. I was - on of the things that the council suggested we have and Liz has been - wasn't in our working group report first time around, was some sort of a definition of reserve names.

And in my own interpretation of that, and I welcome comments on that, I don't think there were so much looking for a formal definition of reserve names as they were a - you know, make sure that everyone understands what the focus is of the reserve names working group and, of course, by the (unintelligible), some of the categories that we dealt with first time around.

So I sent that around on this past Friday; it's not very long. Hopefully, everybody had a chance to look at that. But I did want to provide opportunity for feedback on that right now and if there is none, we can - Liz and I can use that then to incorporate into the full working group report.

Are there any - I can go through it briefly if people want me to. I don't want to do that unless it's of value.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, could you - it's Marilyn. I actually am not online and it is important - I think, we had previously discussed the idea - some ideas about it. Maybe you could just go through it very quickly.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It's short enough that, I think, what I'll is read it because it's just one, you know, one page; a little bit less than a page. And I title it Definition of Reserve names but I confess that it's not really a formal

definition but I do believe that it satisfies what was requested by the council.

It goes as follows.

For the purpose of developing recommendations that are readily useable in the GNSO, new gTLD, PDP report, and in response to direction received from the GNSO council in Lisbon, the reserve name working group focused attention in its final recommendations only on reserve name requirements that apply to all new gTLDs for which clear requirements could be defined.

Depending on the specific reserve name category, as well as the type, ASCII or IDN, the reserve name requirements recommended may apply on any one or more of the following levels as indicated.

Number 1, at the top level regarding gTLD string restrictions.

Number 2, at the second level as contractual conditions.

And Number 3, at the third level as contractual conditions for any new gTLDs that offer domain registrations at the third level.

Now let me stop; that's the first paragraph. And let me stop and see if there are any questions or comments on that.

Marilyn Cade: I do have a question.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

I don't want to get into a big philosophical discussion but did the council indicate whether they ere thinking that the reserve name definition might be applied to the time of renewal of existing gTLD?

Chuck Gomes: That was not discussed.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Then I'm not questioning the language and I just want to clarify that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, good. Okay, thanks.

Anybody else on the first paragraph?

Okay, then it goes on.

Therefore, the final RN working group reserve name recommendations fall under the following categories: ICANN IANA names; single and two-character names including the use of symbols, tag names; nic, whois, and dub-dub-dub; and then the final category is gTLD names at the second level or third level if applicable.

Now, let me continue on that one.

In its work, the RN working group also focused on the following categories if names: Geographical and geopolitical names; specific names reserved by particular gTLD registries of the second and third level; and controversial names.

In the case of the second category, that's the specific names for gTLD registries, the list of registry-specific names were unique to particular gTLD registries than to all gTLDs and thus did not set the focus of the group.

In the case of geographical, geopolitical names and controversial names, it was very difficult if not impossible to define clear reservation requirements that could be applied to for all new gTLDs. At the same time, the work completed by the group seems to be very applicable to the process developed as part of the new gTLD, PDP. So recommendations are included in this report for consideration as part of those processes.

And that's the end of the statement.

Any questions or comments?

Hopefully, that's consistent with what we've talked about so far during this extended time.

Okay?

All right, now, if I don't hear anything via email on this and some of you may want to look at the hard copy if you hadn't already done so by tomorrow, I'll probably assume that this is fine and Liz and I can incorporate it into the final report.

Okay, back to the agenda then. All right, now, the reason I put that where I did in the agenda today is as I was doing - as you know, I have some tasks of dealing with several of the categories that we did and

form a subgroup for and as indicated early on this call, I sent out today a near final version of the tag names report and a - what I believe is a final version of the nic, whois, dub-dub-dub report.

Another task I have is to deal with symbols. As I was trying to do this in the format of the template, I was having trouble because I don't think it really fits the focus. The symbol is a fine recommendation, I have no problem with it. But I'm not sure it really it's the focus of our task with regards to our reserve name category because obviously we're not talking about reserve names, we're talking about use of symbols in names, really whatever names you're talking about.

So I wanted us to spend a few minutes talking about that and see if I'm wrong on that and I maybe. But it's my opinion that that particular recommendation would probably fall down as - in a different category rather than recommendations for reserve names for new TLDs.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to question that but declare an interest. I advised a famous and well-known grand holder that uses a symbol in their name...

Chuck Gomes: I wonder who that is.

Marilyn Cade: They're called AT&T. And I have question because, you know, symbols today and ASCII names other than the dash are not allowed. So I'm just asking the question but I need to be clear that I have an interest,

potentially I have a client that has an interest in the treatment of symbols.

Why - the very strong advice that we got from the technical community was that symbols need to stay on reserve.

Chuck Gomes: I fully support that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So that's what I wasn't - so you're not questioning the actual recommendation?

Chuck Gomes: Not - one (unintelligible). I think the recommendation is sound. I'm just not seeing it into the recommendations with regards to reserve name.

Marilyn Cade: Where would it fit?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we can - our report is going to be in three categories including some like other reserve name that are no really - we're not really working on now but we can out it in that category and say that the group does make this recommendation even though it does not literally fit into the reserve name focus.

I'm not saying we leave it out of the report.

Marilyn Cade: You know, I'm not - I don't - you know, this maybe something that you and I if no one else is particularly interested and ought to spend some time thinking about and even talking about online because I'm not yet in agreement and it may just be because I don't understand how a different treatment would ensure that symbols stay on reserve which, I think, is what the technical committee is very concerned happen.

Avri Doria: Hi. Can I speak?

Chuck Gomes: Please, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I would tend for one will leave it out because there's technical reasons for why those characters would not be allowed but I don't think it necessarily fits in to the logic of reserve names of names which for some reason aren't being given.

So, I mean, they're basically finding some - just not allow the characters at a much lower level. So...

Chuck Gomes: And that's where I was struggling, Avri.

Avri Doria: Right. It seems to me that there's a technical, you know, assumption that these are not useful and that the system will not accept them and at the end of it, that they're not actually reserve names which are things that are technically possible but not to be done. They're setting the system up so that they're not even technically possible.

Alistair Dixon: Can I join the queue, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Alistair.

Were you finished, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Did anybody else want to join the queue?

Edmon Chung: Edmon.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Go ahead, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Chuck, I think, we're talking about two types of issues here. I mean, symbols are potentially a reserve name. It's sort of one or two characters or possibly more characters at the top level. But then there's also the question of whether they should be allowed to actually within a name such as AT&T.

And so, I think, it seems to me that there are actually specific reserve name issues with symbols because you could have just symbol name.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, right.

Alistair Dixon: And there's that possibility. But also, they are an issue if they're within a name. And it seems to me that certainly the single and two character groups would (unintelligible) symbols just because they would potentially buy that (A) name or parts of the name or for those particular types of domain.

But there is potentially - they also could be part of the name for longer (lease), domain names as well.

Chuck Gomes: Right, which really isn't our task but I do understand your point with regard to - especially like single character names, it could fit to say that, you know, the recommendation could fit in the single or two

character name which is where you guys had it before. We singled it out because it was done and everything.

I don't think it works as a separate subgroup report. I don't have anything to put in that, right, except for the recommendation and a couple other things. I went through the previous single second - two-character name report and there's just very little on that other than the recommendation. And I'm fully supportive of the recommendation. As I've already said, I just had struggled in terms of how to handle it.

Now one option and I haven't forgotten you, Edmon, you're next. One option would be to again make it part of the single, two-character name subgroup report and I'm not opposed to that, okay?

Alistair Dixon: I don't think it's specific to single and two-character names. I mean, you could have (exclamation mark), (exclamation mark), (exclamation mark) as a name.

Chuck Gomes: Understand and it applies like you already said in other ways to more than single or two-character name.

But that's not our task to deal with what can be included in a domain name. Our task is reserve name.

Alistair Dixon: Right. I was just sort of - I guess, the point I was making was - I mean, in that conclusion - a conclusion with respect to single and two-character name in terms of symbols, I think, applies to longer length name that are at least symbol (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: It does. It does. It's just that's just not our part of our statement of work.

Alistair Dixon: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. Would you put me back in the queue because - in drafting on the statement of work, I think, I probably have a different view than you do on that.

Chuck Gomes: All right, Edmon's next.

Edmon Chung: I think as to leave it out for a few reasons and in terms of leaving it out but I'm not saying it's completely leaving it out. But maybe we can have some sort of a blanket statement about just general compliance with (RFCs) or general compliance with technical standards.

And other - the item that - if we talk about symbols and there are many other types of names that are essentially reserved. For example, names that start with a hyphen or names that end with a hyphen. Potentially, they can be entered actually into (DDNS) but it's just technical standard sort of reservation that we don't allow it.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Edmon Chung: So they're not that much different, you know. They are a little bit different but if we talk about it, then we might as well talk about names that start and end with hyphen as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Sure. I'm just going to go back to the original purpose of our - doing this work. We call it the reserve name working group. We were trying to work from what is prohibited by contract and what's prohibited by (RFC) and what's prohibited by an appendix that list reserve name.

It seems to me in order to be responsive to the intent and this - the treatment of symbols was on the original appendix, if you remember.

Chuck Gomes: On what appendix?

Marilyn Cade: The Appendix 6, I think, it is that had single character symbol.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so.

Marilyn Cade: I thought symbols, Chuck, was treated as a character so there's numbers, digits - there's digits, letters, and symbol.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me let Patrick jump in on this as soon as I'm down with this.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Because he's been working on that as you know.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not aware of any reference to symbols or even a definition of what character means in Appendix 6.

Marilyn Cade: No, no. I don't think there is a definition in Appendix 6. I just said, I think, we started out thinking that we need to make some sort of

disposition of all of the things that were on Appendix 6. So my questions is more - one of the things I thought we wanted to do ultimately was have a simple, easy, go to place for new applicants so that they knew what was allowed and what wasn't allowed an move past the prohibited categories.

So if we watch the solution to providing information other than saying, "Here's a list of applicable (RFCs), go read them for yourself."

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. I understand that. That's a good point.

Patrick, could I ask you to jump in here and share your thoughts in this regard because I know you've been working lots of hours as part of your - the subgroup one, single and two character and probably others in the subgroup as well with regard to this whole issue of character in particular now as it relates to symbol.

Patrick Jones: Symbols are not in Appendix 6 or in the registry agreement appendices. I think, where it comes in is from an (RFC) and unfortunately, I don't have it in front of me right now. But, I think, since it comes from the same place that the reservation of example comes from, that we probably should find a way to include it and I don't have a problem with putting it back into the single and two character section because we pretty much already dealt with it but leave it to everybody else to decide if that's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I'm okay with that alternative, by the way. I don't think it works as a separate report. But I'm okay with doing that. And - let me ask first of all, ask Greg and other members of the single and two-

character subgroup, is there - are any of you opposed to that approach?

Greg Shatan: It was originally there, wasn't it?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it was. It was.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We pulled it out because of the way things happen. We don't need to worry too much about why that happened or how but anybody oppose to that in the subgroup?

Then let me open it up to everybody on the call. Was anybody opposed to that approach and, Avri, in your case, you had a minority statement in that regard already and that would remain a part of that as I understand it.

Nobody oppose to that?

Then - and Greg, you're okay with that?

Greg Shatan: I am fine with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Let's do that so if you guys then would just kind of make sure that's in your final report as a separate category and let's handle it that way and I'm okay with that.

All right.

Mike Palage, thanks or joining us.

Mike Palage: No problem.

Chuck Gomes: I see you're on.

Now, let me get back over to - have the agenda in front of me.

Thanks for the discussion on that. That was helpful and it solved the problem that I ran into yesterday that's why I added it.

So, now, I said this for those who were on the call early. I did send out this morning, my time anyway, this morning, a revised template for subgroup reports. Please use that one. It has some instructions at the beginning to try and help you.

I think it's pretty clear. You're going to be able to cut and paste from the old report. I didn't include that in the instructions but I'm sure everybody understands that like the background information and so forth.

With regard to the rationale for your recommendations, we need to do a little bit more than what was done per role. If you look at the two examples of reports that I sent our today, the tag names and the nic, whois, and dub-dub-dub, you'll see that I added some paragraph in those sections because we really hadn't given enough rationale for all the recommendations.

In cases like the single and two-character where you have so many categories, be creative in terms of - so that it meets your needs with regard to how you give the rationale. You can create subsections or something. If you need my support on that, I doubt you will, but if you do, I'll be glad to help.

But follow the format of the template, keeping fonts the same and everything and that will make it much easier for Liz when she pools all these things together into a full working group report and then ultimately into the new TLD report.

Any questions on that?

Okay, then let's get to our main agenda item today and that's to take a look at the subgroup report.

Avri Doria: I was in mute and I had one comment. But it takes so long to unmute.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I'm sorry, Avri. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And it's just one.

I am one of those who does not use Microsoft Word at all. I use Open Office and there's a very strong list of do not do this, do not do that, do no change anything. I just wanted to list an apology upfront that being an Open Office user, I cannot guarantee that I will follow and then I won't in some way change something in the document.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Is that possible that someone else...

((Foreign Language Spoken))

Chuck Gomes: Is it possible that someone in your working group could do the basic document - final document preparation?

Avri Doria: I wasn't planning on it. I was thinking that I was stocky for that basically.

Chuck Gomes: Why don't you check...

Avri Doria: But also I sort of believe that, you know, I mean, I think, it's all nice that we have these templates and it's nice that we should do our utmost to make it as uniform and consistent as possible. But I just wanted to sort of indicate that it isn't the case that there won't be some (massaging).

Chuck Gomes: Well, I...

Avri Doria: And it's just - the first page of it, it's so commanding that - and so absolute that I felt it's necessary to say, "Well, maybe. I'll do my best but, you know."

Chuck Gomes: Well, I would appreciate it if you would see if somebody else could do it who's a Microsoft user.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: If that's not possible, we'll have to deal with it. But let me tell you that that last week of our regular reserve name work was just horrendous for some us...

Avri Doria: In which case, I may say something...

Chuck Gomes: ...to try and pool things together.

Avri Doria: ...about us committing to proprietary software that people would have to buy and I'll suggest that everyone should be using Open Office and not Microsoft more than anything.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, All right. But anyway, one of the primary reasons is to make it real easy to pool things together in the last - what it's going to amount to us, I think, the last two days and that's going to be quite a challenge so anything you can do to facilitate, that would be appreciated.

Avri Doria: Of course. One more try.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

All right, let's go to the subgroup updates and the first thing I want to do is go over and I'll come back on each of these as for each subgroup but you have it in your agenda there, Item 8A is update should include the following.

So - and we'll go through this and I'll guide you through them too. But we want to make sure that we understand what expert consultation has been initiated, to whom when it was initiated, deadlines for responses, et cetera.

We want to know whether the GAC principles have been referenced as applicable in the subgroup report. And I understand you haven't finished your subgroup report but these are - Marilyn, this is what I was

saying is next week's exercise is going to be similar, these same things because of the things that we don't want to lose track off.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And then have IDN working group principles been referenced and addressed as applicable. We need a summary of the recommendations that are under consideration. You should be able to do that pretty completely next week. Today, do as much as you can, okay, because the sooner the group is able to give you feedback, the sooner we can work together on that.

The goal of course is when we get down to that, to May 10th, that hopefully we've already really had enough input from the full working group that no major changes have to be made because each subgroup will have received feedback from the full group progressively leading up to that point in time.

And then I'd like to know how close your subgroup is in reaching rough consensus on recommendations. Areas where there are rough consensus, areas where there are disagreements. Don't need a lot of detail there but just give us a flavor for where we're at and maybe where the whole group can help.

Woman: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Woman: Do you have a proposed definition for rough consensus or do you think it's unanimity?

Chuck Gomes: Well, no, I don't think unanimity.

Woman: So my second questions is, we had accommodated individual statements or minority statements. The term minority statements mean one thing in one place that we will continue to accommodate...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, we will. In fact, you'll see in the new template that that's addressed in there. Okay?

Woman: All right.

Chuck Gomes: So that's in there. So that will be the same but basically, thank you as a group to reach a position that most if not everybody will support. If you can't do that and you come to a position where there are some minority statements, that's okay and I'm sure there will be cases where that's true.

But just like we said in our statement of work, Marilyn, that you and I worked on, that's the goal. It's not going to be achievable all the time and certainly not for our group here as well. But, again, alerting the full group where you think there are going to be areas of disagreement will be helpful for us so we can get feedback from the broader group in sessions like these and one you're going to Chair next week.

Even more important next week because we need to be - have a reasonably good feel after the meeting next week that we're going in a directions that the full working group supports even though final approval won't occur until the 10th.

And then, any input from the full working group we want today not only to have a summary from the working group share and others in the subgroups, excuse me, but also we want to have opportunities today for people who aren't part of that group to share their thoughts so that again you have that input early in the process instead at the end.

Not that we have to, you know, spend huge amounts of times on that but any thoughts people have that might help the working group. Now is the time to give them and even more so next week.

Now, any questions on what we're looking for updates for each subgroup or any additions maybe I didn't cover enough.

Then, I don't think - let me look real quick at my meeting things. So we don't have the Chair for - (Mike Rotenberg) is apparently not on the call. Did he - if someone else does made it on ICANN IANA names or should we move to another category?

Man: Edmon is also listed as...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, he's on there. Edmon, are you prepared to deal with that one?

Edmon Chung: Not quite actually. I didn't see any activity there. Is it just between myself and (Mike)?

Chuck Gomes: It's just you and (Mike). So...

Edmon Chung: Okay, I'll - if he doesn't start the discussion, I'll get the discussion...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Right, I appreciate that.

Edmon Chung: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And it's important that we understand if we get down to the end and we haven't really made any progress there that our recommendation per the council's guidance is going to be status quo with a recommendation for additional work. So as long as everybody understands that in all cases, okay?

All right, then let's go Greg to single and two-character reserve names.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg and I'll start and I'm sure that my subgroup members will chime in where necessary to amplify, clarify, modify, and correct.

We have - going through your framework for updating, we've had a very fruitful time so far. On Monday, we had an expert consultation via conference call with two experts -- two technical experts -- (Steve Delevan) and (Mark McFadden). And we have - Marilyn has provided a first draft summary which (Mike Rotenberg) is reviving of the expert consultation or the results from that meeting.

Like one of the important things to take away from that - for our subcommittee for our working group and for consideration of this and this may affect some other groups as well is we can't look at what happens or what's reserved in a - at a TLD level and at the second level in the abstract. It really needs to be viewed in combination.

In other words, depending upon what is happening or what is reserved or allowed at the top level certain thing maybe possible to second level and if other things are prohibited or reserved at the first level, different things maybe possible at the second level. In other words, certain combinations between first top and second level may cause problems even if one would be okay if not in combination.

Woman: Greg, could you give an example because I...

Greg Shatan: Sure. And we did find examples are always very fruitful in talking about this.

For instance, a single letter, second level domain would not cause issues as long as the top level domain was not a single letter. If the top level domain was a single letter, it is likely that single letters at the second level would cause a problem, a technical problem with certain applications of software. So that would affect our recommendation with regard to single letters at the second level.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I know that's said in the notes that Marilyn prepared too. So that's - I have a really good realization.

(Ray): This is (Ray). I have a real quick question on that.

So you're saying that in single characters, TLD.TLD could cause a technical problem?

Greg Shatan: If you're saying A.A?

(Ray): Right.

Greg): A.A could cause a problem A.com would not cause a technical problem but A.A or A.X is likely to cause a technical problem.

(Ray): Okay.

Greg Shatan: Whereas .A would not cause a problem unless if there was a single letter - second level domain in that domain.

(Ray): Okay, I only mentioned because I know the RSTEP recently concluded that TLD.TLD does not cause a technical issue but I don't know if they looked at it from the direction of single character TLD dot single character TLD that I don't know.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Now, Greg, I think if I understood that the notes from Marilyn correctly that like a 1.1 have some possible problems as well.

Greg Shatan: Yes, digits even and not limited to single digit combinations at both levels...

Chuck Gomes: That's right.

Greg Shatan: ...were also likely to cause problems because certain software would attempt to identify it as an IP address and not a domain name.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask question on the last thing you said (unintelligible)?

When the RSTEP was looking into that manual, I'll go and check it myself, were they looking at it based on (RFC 1535) issues or was that something else that prompted that? Because one of the things we had talked about was, this was possible a (1535) hold over and therefore needed more investigation. But I'm wondering whether that's what the RSTEP was looking at that time.

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick...

Chuck Gomes: (Ray), I - oh, you're going to - I was going to say, Patrick also whois very closely involved in the RSTEP process is welcome to comment on this.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Patrick Jones: The answer is yes.

Avri Doria: So it was specifically the (1535) problem, okay.

Patrick Jones: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I'm going to have to go back and look at that and see whether - because that might change the analysis we had somewhat because - good, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And, by the way guys, I want everybody to feel free to participate on this because whether you're in the subgroup or not because this is the

kind of thing that helps the working group in terms of reaching their final recommendations and so forth, okay?

Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

And we are also in a process of lining up IDN experts, as well as the old IDN issues in our (bailiwick).

Chuck Gomes: Who were you thinking out there?

Greg Shatan: I have - we're still --I have no name in front of me.

Woman: But it was the usual suspects.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Usual suspects, okay. I know those usual suspects pretty well.

Woman: I think we had - Greg, we have previously talked about (Carey), (Tina) and Ram, I think.

Greg Shatan: Yes, that's right, Ram Mohan.

Woman: That's usual suspects.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. I just was curious, okay.

Greg Shatan: Yes, no unusual suspects although...

Chuck Gomes: There are a few of those around too.

Greg Shatan: ...that might be fun.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: We will be your referencing GAC principles in the subgroup report and IDN recommendations addressing those as applicable.

Chuck Gomes: And keep in mind and I won't repeat this for everyone in the subgroups. But keep in mind that it doesn't mean that we have to follow every GAC principle. I'm not suggesting we shouldn't and it doesn't mean that we have to follow every recommendation by the IDN subgroups committee or working group. But we should at least address the issues and if we don't, provide some rationales to why we didn't.

Okay, go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

A summary of recommendations under consideration.

Well first, we are going to provide a working definition of character so that our recommendations around single and two-character names can be put into a context or at least to define context. We'll start to single and two-character IDNs, I think, that's still under work. Under work is still underway on that.

Single ASCII letters at the top level domain, as mentioned before, our recommendation is that these and it could be released at the top if there is appropriate methodology either technically or by enforcement that single letters could be prohibited at the second level or reserved completely at the second level in such a top level domain.

Chuck Gomes: So let me pursue that a little bit further and if you going to get to it, just let me know.

Greg Shatan: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: So if I'm speeding up too far.

It sounds like you'd go either way there. You could allow it at the top level provided their restrictions at the second level. It could be done the other way as well, right? Disallowed at the top level and allowed at the second level. Is my thinking correct there?

Greg Shatan: Yes, absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: It's either or so if we get to - as we get to the recommendation a single letter at the second level, note there could be technical problems in releasing those in single letter TLD.

Chuck Gomes: So you could actually have a first come first serve. If the second level occurred first then the top level is restricted or vice versa.

Greg Shatan: Right although I presume that one would establish a top level.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Through the registry.

Chuck Gomes: I agree.

Greg Shatan: Yeah. I haven't yet found a way to reserve or register a domain name in a domain that doesn't exist yet but I'm sure somebody will find...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...and find a way to make money out of it.

Anyway, so where there single letters we need to - at the second level we do need to see how that will resolve.

Single ASCII letters and numbers at the second level, again we find that there, you know, don't agree. We would recommend releasing those subject to or at least in TLDs of more than one character, but indicating that there could be technical issues if there is a single character TLD.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: For single and two-character ASCII numbers .11 or .1 or .19 at the top level, our recommendation is to continue the reserve status.

Chuck Gomes: And that's because of the - is that related to IT numbers?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay?

Greg Shatan: For two ASCII letter-number combinations .1M or .M1, for instance, at the top level, there's still some more work. We need to clarify with our technical experts whether it matters, whether the digit comes first or second and whether the rule - whether one would cause a technical issue and the other one may not.

Chuck Gomes: Good, okay.

Greg Shatan: For two ASCII letters at the top while there are still some continued discussion in the group at this point, the rough consensus subject for half to at least a minority view would be to maintain the reservation based on the ISO 3166 list which generates ccTLDs and so the country code is established by ISO.

Chuck Gomes: Now, do you mean by that, that it would only be reserved for the ISO 3166-1 list or with all two-letter name to be reserved?

Greg Shatan: I think we need to further clarify that within the group. Although I think there is at least some support maybe even most support for a complete reservation because new countries are introduced and then they don't have to, you know, worry about the issue how do you undo a gTLD that is a two-letter, let's say, .XY and then all of a sudden (Zigisthan) comes to exist and they should be assign .XY or does one - we may need to consult, God forbid, with ISO since country codes aren't necessarily, you know, absolute in a sense that there is not only

one possible country code for country and some of the country codes are not as intuitive as others already.

And therefore, even if .XY was already a gTLD, perhaps something else could be found for this mythical (Zigisthan) if it becomes an actual country.

Chuck Gomes: And we know what the GAC wants and what the ccTLD community wants in this regard, that's pretty clear. So we obviously want to be sensitive to the political reality there. But if just need a contact with ISO, and I don't know that she is the best person or not. But I think she'll be one who's responsive because she's been so heavily involved in the DNSO and DNSO in the past. And that's (Elizabeth Pordano) who's now doing work for the...

Woman: All right, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So I just throw that out as a person who probably you could - if nothing else she would get you in touch with the right people and probably be more responsive than just somebody who didn't know us.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Patrick Jones: Chuck, can I get in the queue on this?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. Jump in.

Patrick Jones: I'm not really sure we need to do that. I am pretty sure that some - what the working group did before Lisbon that this category was pretty much completed. And then our recommendation hasn't changed any.

Chuck Gomes: If that's the case I think you're absolutely right, Patrick, and I'm perfectly comfortable with that. I just wanted to throw that in case - it's up to the working where they decide they need to do anything there or not.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, I want balance not reopening Pandora's Box with - just making sure that the working s a whole was happy or least the subgroup is kind of happy with the process by which we maintain that as well, so just being kind of liberal guy that I am.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Greg Shatan: Finally, we have two ASCII letters and numbers at the second level. And our rough consensus recommendation at this point will be to allow registries to release them provides they are measures to avoid confusion with existing ccTLDs. So for instance EU.com, you know, could be an issue.

So this is any combination...

Chuck Gomes: How about the ccTLDs do it all the time?

Greg Shatan: Right.

Well, we only recommend that there be measures to avoid confusion nothing more prohibitive than that.

Chuck Gomes: Greg, with regard to IDN, the IDN issues that you're going to be dealing with and I understand that you've got a lot of work to do there. I

encourage the working group to keep in mind several of the IDN working group recommendations. One of them and I don't have - oh I may have them in front of me but somewhere on my laptop.

But anyway, you know, obviously the IDN working was really concerned about giving an advantage to ASCII TLDs over IDN TLDs. So keep that in mind as well as some of the recommendations that weren't necessarily strongly supportive but had some support also had to do with whether or not ASCII TLDs could be introduced before IDN.

And again, if you do that, you have to - you know, measures should be taken so that it doesn't give the ASCII people the advantage and so forth.

I just throw this out not for discussion right now but it's important because of the issues you guys are going to be dealing with both ASCII and IDN single character, two-character and you may not even relate to IDN in that way. But keep those recommendations in mind when you're doing your deliberation.

Does that make sense?

Greg Shatan: If you could just clarify a little bit more of how...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, without - let's see...

Greg Shatan: Without boring too many people.

Chuck Gomes: I'm trying to think, yeah. Well...

Greg Shatan: How the ASCII would have an advantage over the IDN?

Chuck Gomes: For example and this may not be a good example for your group but let's say that single character ASCII names were allowed at the top level. But we decided to wait on single character whatever that means for IDN or IDN in some scripts or whatever.

Then the ASCII - somebody could propose a single character ASCII sublevel domain a corresponding equivalent in some IDN script would essentially be blocked because that's going to create probably confusion later on. Now, that may not be a good example for you because you may recommend something totally different for IDN single characters.

But all I'm saying is, there aren't really many recommendations and they're pretty brief in the IDN work - (yearly) report. There's probably two or three and if you would like me to specifically highlight those for you, just send me an email and I will do that.

Greg Shatan: That would be very helpful.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. I'll write myself a note so I don't forget, okay?

Greg Shatan: Yeah, I'll write you a note as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. That would be great.

Greg Shatan: So that covers our draft recommendations as we're looking at them at this point.

Chuck Gomes: Now how close are you - well, let me back up a step first and, Marilyn, I'll include this in next week agenda because it's going to be important.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: You already did it in your discussion, Greg, some of the comments you made I was very pleased to hear. But any cases where you can use examples to illustrate what you're talking about was, you know, was really strongly encouraged in Lisbon so just like you did when Marilyn asked the question and you provided some example, the more you can do that the better.

And with regard to the template that you're using, I think, the examples can go right as part of their - in the recommendation box in the table that's what I'm going to do in the case of tag names.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, we considered the same thing on our call and adding a column to the recommendation summaries table with a column work example.

Chuck Gomes: Be careful about changing the table.

Greg Shatan: Okay, I'll reconsider that.

Chuck Gomes: Because - rather use a bit, you know, just put more text in the (sell) I think. The reason I'm saying that is then we want them - Liz really because of her short window is going to need to do a lot of cut and past thing.

And if there are some change to what you see there, that format is the format that is going to be in the new TLD report.

Greg Shatan: Okay, then we can just add text to the sell...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, exactly.

Greg Shatan: ...in the column reserve name category.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct. And if for some reason that becomes too difficult, let's talk about it, email or whatever and get Liz involved and make sure that if we do do anything different we have her concurrence before we do that.

Greg Shatan: I don't think that would be too difficult.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: We have exceptional people in our committee.

Patrick Jones: I've already started doing that so I think we're in good shape.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I figured before because you and I have been exchanging messages with Liz ans so forth.

Okay, good.

Greg Shatan: Well, Patrick is keeping us on a straight and narrow terms of both content and process.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I appreciate that, Patrick.

The - now, how close is your subgroup in reaching rough consensus whatever that means, let's not to go back there, okay, on the various recommendations which ones are you fairly close on, which ones are the most challenging?

Greg Shatan: I think we're close on nearly all of them. I think the IDN wants us because if that portion is lagging a little bit as we've paid attention to the ASCII section more and had our technical experts dealing primarily of the ASCII issues that one's come along further.

I would say really on every other one of them, you know, subject to kind of, you know, honoring the process and making sure that even our minority view holders, you know, feel, you know, satisfied with the process.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: I think we're really very close.

Chuck Gomes: No, are there any major areas of disagreement?

Greg Shatan: I don't think so I think there are, you know, some discussion around the all but closed issue of cc or two letter-number combinations or the two ASCII letters at the top.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Greg Shatan: But I would even call that open because if I do, I'll get (stomped).

Chuck Gomes: You don't want to get (stomped)?

Greg Shatan: No, and rightly so. And so really it's only the IDN area. So at this point I don't see, you know, and subject to the correction from my subcommittee members based on our call yesterday I think we're very close and a lot of work left early as processed rather than discussion or (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: I have a question.

Alistair Dixon: I have a comment too.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right.

Marilyn and then Alistair.

Marilyn Cade: Sure and then I may follow after him because my first question is and I'm sorry I was away for just a moment.

We did have a question that I think we (hadn't) resolved but just need to verify didn't we about the order of the dash? And I didn't - I don't - but I'm not saying there's a disagreement I just didn't know if we had mentioned that.

Greg Shatan: That's correct, Marilyn. We did - and considering the - at least at the second level, you know, we're - we really need to consider the hyphen isn't an allowed character or the dash isn't an allowed character and

consider that as well in combinations of letters and numbers at the second level.

Chuck Gomes: Except that the - in the first and last character position.

Marilyn Cade: Well, that's...

Greg Shatan: Well, there's only one or two and it's characters that's always going to be in the first or last.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So that's why we needed to just - I think it's worth just mentioning because Chuck is on and Edmon is on. The examples that I thought we talked about was at the top level dash - letter dash, digit dash, dash letter dash digit and there is some - there's an (RFC) that does prohibit the placement of the dash, does it not?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I can't tell you what (RFC) it is but Edmon referred to the concept earlier.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And that is is that you can't have a dash in the first or the last position of a domain name.

Avri Doria: While we're going - this is Avri. When we're going through the discussion, we acknowledged the first position, we weren't positive in fact we we're acting as if the last position as possible so it may just be going back to that (RFC) and confirming that both first and last position are problematic in which case, I think, it comes at most point.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right.

Avri Doria: I think in our discussion we got half way there because we all knew that first position was a problem, I don't think any of us were aware that last position was a problem but that's easy to check if it's...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, good.

Greg Shatan: And that was pretty much in that.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm not an (RFC) expert but I know that that's a principle we've been using within Verisign since as long as I've been involved.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah and I thought I remembered it as well but we were - as Avri said, we were - we begin to engage in circular (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. All right.

Mike Palage: Chuck, this is Mike. I actually have to leave for - to catch a plane in about five minutes. If I could just get in the queue after Avri on this issue?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, in fact because I - would it be okay, Greg, if we jump to geographic and comeback and I've got Marilyn in the queue, Alistair in the queue. Marilyn and Alistair are you okay with that? Greg, are you okay with that?

Greg Shatan: I'm fine.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Alistair Dixon: Absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, then let's jump in Mike to geographic and that's the same things we won't have as much time if you got to get up in five minutes but let's go for it.

Mike Palage: Okay, basically just give us an update; as you were aware we finished our list of, if you will questions, that have been sent out to experts.

Where we, if you will, now are trying to tackle is to take the previous recommendations, sync them up with the GAC final draft principles and prepare a report; that should be done I would say by the end of the week so we should have it in the template by then.

Right now I don't see any shift within the group to potentially deviate from the original recommendations which does create a potential inconsistency with the draft GAC principles that talked about assigning - providing governments rising gross in connection with their names.

So part of that we will have to do is explain, if you will, acknowledged what they have said and potentially state why we think there should be a different outcome as opposed to the recommendation.

Now, consistent with that we've actually asked the GAC to explain their differences because governments in other (fora) have taken, if you will, opposite positions. So, you know, we're not going to try to explain those differences, we'll ask the GAC if they could perhaps explain it but we will just look at what has been stated in different (fora) and put forth our reasoning for what we feel is the best way.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now, Mike, what about the IDN area? How are you dealing with that?

Mike Palage: I have not even - with IDN, I'll have to go back and look that is we've primarily been focused on ASCII most of our work.

Chuck Gomes: Maybe that whatever you're recommending works variety into but make sure you give that some thought and investigation there to make sure because we have to cover that area as well.

Mike Palage: Okay. So that's it and if I can just - I do have one question for Greg and his group here on the single letters and that's where I was originally trying to get in.

Chuck Gomes: Just before you ask that question let's make sure that we see if anybody got any questions or input on geographic.

Marilyn Cade: I do but I know Mike has limited...

Mike Palage: Go ahead, Marilyn, shoot.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn speaking.

I may end up filing a - and I'll try to talk to you offline, Mike, when you have time. I know you end up filing a minority statement Chuck for - on - I'm not on that subgroup but on the issue of geographic names but I'll talk to Mike ahead of time.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Mike Palage: And put it this way, that's actually - I actually maybe filing a minority reporting in connection with the single top level domain so I guess there you go.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds fair.

Mike Palage: Sounds very fair. And as I said, Marilyn, if I can I guess my question really just...

Marilyn Cade: (Greg's) (cheering) the single letter.

Mike Palage: Correct and I'm just saying I'm looking at his recommendation that say that the single setters could - should continue to be reserved so I'm not saying...

Chuck Gomes: No, Mike, one other thing and I'm going to say this, I won't repeat this for all the working groups but for next week's meeting that Marilyn is chairing and it's on a Thursday, okay?

Please send to the list by at least the end of the day, Wednesday, a list of - the little table from the template that has where you're at on your recommendation so everybody can have that in front of them for the same - similar type discussion that's going to occur next week.

Does that make sense?

Okay, that'll greatly facilitate us because - and then the group can go through and we can see overall where there - you know, where tweaks are needed or where maybe the full group is not going in the same

direction as the subgroup, whatever things we need to know so that that last week of work we can zero in on those things and make sure we're finished.

Okay? And that applies to everyone of the subgroup so, Edmon, if you would make sure that (Mike) knows that as well, I'd appreciate that. And I'll try and I'll send something out in that regard too.

Anything else on geographic and geopolitical?

Okay, Mike, then because you're up to get off, I'll jump you in the queue with regard to single and two character and let you go ahead of Marilyn Cade and Alistair Dixon.

Mike Palage: Thanks, I appreciate that.

Greg, here is my question. In point - bullet point 30 in Marilyn's draft summary report, she talks about there being potential stability issues with single letter top level domains and she or the notes talked about how those TLD that had - were larger than three letters had some issues.

I guess my question is knowing what we know today, would we have used that back in 2000 to deny TLDs greater than three letters from being added to the route because what I'm struggling with here is the way the recommendations with single letters go is it's almost like well, there needs to be more work and I do have concerns about the, you know, if you will, enhancing the infrastructure of developing countries as being a prerequisite.

Because I don't - in this recommendation it doesn't say who has to pay for that improvement whether it's the registry operator, whether it's ICANN, whether it's somebody else. And I just look at these types of things as potentially impeding innovation and instead of doing what ICANN has done putting out statements to say, "Listen, here is a list of TLDs and please design your applications to take this into account." I think that's important and just one other data point that I did want to bring is at the application level, right? There have been problems even with TLDs that are three letters.

You know, I've discussed with Jeff Neuman there are some software applications that when you try to order things they do not acknowledge if you will .biz as a legitimate extension, they only look to com, .org and other things.

So I just think that the recommendation with regard to single letters at the top level is - I have some reservations and as I said I will try the document and just as Marilyn is going to document here issues, I will try to document them as well to you and perhaps to your subcommittee so that we do have the potential to resolve them and then if not I'll just try to file a minority report.

Chuck Gomes: You know, Mike, some of the concern that you're talking about related to applications that haven't been updated in years and I'm not talking about major applications but it might be in an ISP software whatever and - or some little player software that just hasn't updated their software in years and therefore there's an impact on them first things like this, is that part of what you're talking about?

Mike Palage: I think so. I'm just worried just seen what the new TLDs both the new three letters in 2000 as well as those that were in excess of three. The problems that they encountered - there were problems but just because there were problems does not mean that under the standard since they could have called "stability issues," this standard applied back in 2000 if we knew what we knew today could have potentially been used to prevent them from being added to the route.

So I think instead of saying they should continue to be reserved is maybe perhaps ICANN should try one out and part of the - allowing someone to try one out should be what is your proposal to increase education to develop infrastructure.

Marilyn Cade: Mike?

Mike Palage: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Can I refer to over to 46 to 50? I think that actually addresses the point you're raising.

Mike Palage: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: What do you mean by 46 or 50?

Marilyn Cade: Oh, sorry just on that document, the paragraph that are numbered 46 to 50.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: But the point is, this is Avri, that was a discussion that is ongoing as his broken application software efficient with then - to prevent something as that's an open discussion that we had both with the experts and among ourselves.

Mike Palage: And as I said, Marilyn, I appreciate that document, it was very helpful since I wasn't able to participate in the call. I was just able to just glance through that while Greg was doing his report.

And as I said I think that work at this group and - is really excellent and I appreciate it. It was just as I said some of the - whether appearing in the recommendation as opposed to what appears down in 46 and 50 I guess trying to sort of sync them up that I guess that's my concern that those that appear in 46 and 50 actually should somehow be some more incorporated back up into the top.

So, listen, I have to run I am now late, thank you, Chuck, for allowing me to queue jump and I apologize to Alistair and to Avri.

Chuck Gomes: And to Marilyn, okay. Well, thanks Mike.

Okay and now we're back in the queue for single and two character and, Marilyn, I think you are next.

Do you still want to be in the queue, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I thought Alistair was next.

Chuck Gomes: I had him down - I had you down before him. Did you already get your comments in?

Marilyn Cade: No, my comment about single letter I still wanted to make. Mike kind of actually pointed people to one of the issues - I don't think - I think at some point Chuck and I think we should do it with you in the chair is we ought to talk about what the full reserve name working group proposes on prioritization that is low-hanging fruit versus need a ladder to reach the fruit versus need an extension ladder to reach the fruit.

And, you know, if there is further work to be done on an - in a number of areas what does the working group think priority is when they put forward their recommendation into the full task force report?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And it maybe that - that maybe difficult I think it's okay for us to attempt that or see whether we can have enough time to pull that off in terms of providing priorities to the additional work that we may recommend, we can certainly try.

Okay?

Now, Alistair.

Alistair Dixon: Thanks, Chuck.

I just wanted to raise an issue it was sort of a comment in terms of approach. It seemed to me that was - on particularly single letters at the top level that potentially possibly numbers as well is that on one side of your approach maybe simpler but if an approach was taken we - it was specific condition in relation to release all particular types of TLD.

So for example single letter you could - and my example would be you could perhaps only release a single character or a single letter TLD if there was a prohibition on single characters at the second level.

I guess, yeah, the question I was really raising is are we sort of - should we be taking a one size fits all approach and say there should be reserved and there are no issues or - I'm sorry this shouldn't be reserved, there are no issues or this should be reserved because there are issues.

Or should we really take an approach, "Well, here are some issues but here are the ways you can solve those issues."

Chuck Gomes: Well, my own person response to that and I'm just one member of this group, okay? And the fact that I'm chair doesn't give me anymore voice than anybody else, okay?

But I like what you said in the latter part I think that's more sensible approach. The bottom line is you can always find issue which is about anything. Okay?

Alistair Dixon: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: If we can - if the issues can be mitigated in reasonable ways and not even in imperfect ways then it might be okay to go to another same direction and that I guess is somewhat related to what Mike is saying you can be so restrictive in terms of what you allow that there's no innovation and it's very cumbersome or you can find some middle ground where there some reasonableness and I personally lean towards the latter.

Marilyn Cade: Chuck, it's Marilyn. I want to be back in the queue and say something about the - it occurs to be very often though and I know we're in the reserved name working group but it occurs to me very often that we are spending a huge amount of time on whether or not names that are presently on reserve are going to be able to be proposed by someone as a top level string.

I hope ultimately that there are a lot more interesting names and that we know we all go back to the idea that the process is going to be about the introduction of not just names that are previously on reserve.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh. Agreed, yeah.

Alistair, were you finished?

Alistair Dixon: I think so. I guess, yes. But just what I was trying to sort of suggest is it seems to me that there also potentially solutions to some of these problems that are not one size fits all and I guess that does come as the cause of complication.

And for example if you were going to say prohibit single character names at the second level if you're going to permit on the top level, you know, that's just about a single character TLD.

Then, you know, that might be fine to those TLDs but for everything else you can take a different approach and that may make enforcement difficult, that might, you know, might have other consequences. You know, I just - yeah, so I just (unintelligible) as it is the potential solution but it maybe be a complicated solution.

Chuck Gomes: From a totally pragmatic point of view especially considering the technical community whatever that means, let's you define however you want, is it less realistic that there's going to be a lot of problems with opening up single letters at the second level, then there will be if they're opened up at the top level?

Marilyn Cade: So, let me see if I understand this, are you asking will the technical community who may have a view about this?

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: Will they think there are more problems at the top level than the second level or vise versa?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I can only speak to the technical folks I've spoken to both formally and informally who at this point seem to think there is a greater problem at the top level.

Chuck Gomes: And you're probably way ahead of me in terms of what my thinking is there, Marilyn, but what I'm getting at is, you know, we could go for the tougher one, okay, and then let's get shut down or we could be pragmatic and go for the more realistic one.

Woman: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not telling the working group...

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...which way to go. I'm just saying...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Could I comment on what Marilyn said?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, sure, sure Avri.

Greg Shatan: And this is Greg. I'd like to be in the queue as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Avri and Greg.

Marilyn Cade: And, Chuck, I just want to offer a clarification and I can do that after that, well, I'm going to ask is a question or because I put it in the original set of questions and I've tried to - I think it's in the original statement of work and that is, you know, let's say you continue a reservation for now, what is the process at which you would revisit a reservation and what is the - what would trigger the revisiting of a reservation?

Chuck Gomes: Right, right.

Okay, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I guess, I got a different impression, maybe Marilyn has been talking to different technical folks than I've been talking too, the impression I got was that the problem or just that were no problems at

either the single - I mean for the single and either top or second that the problem case is when they're both single letter.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: And that that whether one or other is a problem, is equal because it's only if the other one is and so at that point, it's the (1535) problem that we were talking about before that we need to confirm and if there is the (1535), then there is possibly a policy constraint that if you're single at one, you're not at the other but that is equal.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

And by the way, I'm just really strongly impressed with the work you guys are doing, so great work.

Greg?

Greg Shatan: I guess my only comment would be that, well, I think there is, you know, as so far indicated less of an issue with regard to single letters at the second level than there is single letters at the top level. That's certainly related primarily to the relative nature of the issue between the two and not - and I'm not quite as convinced to some that there are significant issues at the top level based on what we referred from our technical experts and it may not be a binary choices to which one we recommend although I think that, you know, given essentially the lack of significant problems or the lack of any thought of the significant problem with single letters at the second level, you know, would certainly lead one if one had to make an either or decision to go

towards single letters at the second level and not towards single letters at the top.

Marilyn Cade: You know, and I should probably clarify, Chuck, when I say that I think there going to be technical community concerns, I - my conversations have not been limited to only being a technical problem.

I think there are some other concerns that had been raised by some other parties about the allocation of single letters in particular at the top level that maybe a small P policy question that our technical - the two folks we consulted, the technical experts, we're not trying to address that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Now let me ask you guys and we're going to need to move on here pretty soon but let me ask anybody from the committee and, Greg, you can start if you want but I'm curious whether do you think it's going to be realistic to actually come up with the firm recommendation and with regard to single character - single letters or it's more likely that you're going to end up - there's still going to be some work needed after our working group?

Greg Shatan: I don't want prejudice the work of the working group since we are still discussing this. However I think that for single letters at the second level, I don't think we're going to have much of a problem coming up with the recommendation.

I think that for single letters at the top, there's going to be a little bit more of a process again, because what I mentioned at the beginning

which is that single letters at the top, you know, are more likely - relatively more likely to cause a technical issue if there are single letters allowed at the second level and relatively less likely to cause a technical issue if there aren't single letters allowed at the second level unless that disallowance can be enforce.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Okay, good. Well, we probably ought to move on, that's not critical that we answer that question. It was mostly curiosity on my part. Again, I compliment the - everybody on this working group with the tremendous work you're putting in to this and it's very, very impressive.

Okay, let's move on then to gTLD names at the second level

(Ray)?

(Ray): I'm here.

Chuck Gomes: You're on.

(Ray): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And you know the structure we're following start out with expert consultation and move on down the list.

(Ray): Right, right.

And it's important to appreciate for this particular reserve name category, we are relying on this technical expert opinion provided by

RSTEP but there's not the utmost concern to TLD.TLD because if there was, then this would obviously be automatically continued as a reserve name category.

So, understanding that, we, the subgroup has had two calls in the few days, Edmon, Patrick, and myself; today was also broached on the registry constituency call regarding the fact that the subgroup has reached what we considered to be a preliminary recommendation and now have feedback from the registry constituency members for example on the preliminary recommendation; that should be going out to the constituency today hopefully yet, if not tomorrow for sure.

And what we're focusing in on in terms of the recommendation right now is...

Chuck Gomes: Hold on before you go there (Ray).

(Ray): Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Last week we talked about reaching out to some non-registry users as well.

(Ray): Right.

Chuck Gomes: Has anything happened in that regard?

(Ray): Well, first I think we need to get our hands around the - what the recommendation is and that is going to be support from the registry constituency members for the recommendation of subgroup and once

we have that in hand, then we want to take it out farther. I know we're under a bit of a time constraint.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it may not work in fact if you wait for that especially if you're waiting for feedback from registries even though it may not be the most desirable, you may need to them in parallel.

(Ray): Right, but the subgroup has taken the position as well that the primary affected parties with this particular reserve name category are the registry operators.

Chuck Gomes: Understand that but would that prevent you from sending some fillers out to some other, you know, groups like the ALAC or something to see if, you know, they see a point of confusion or whatever the issue maybe. I just don't want us to forget some suggestions that were made last week.

(Ray): Right.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...with to all the constituencies plus the (ALAC)?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, sure, sure.

(Ray): Yeah. Right, right we do see validity in that and this was specifically discussed amongst the subgroup. We just think it might be premature to go out before we have something we feel can actually be a recommendation given our time constraints.

Marilyn Cade: (Ray), it's Marilyn.

Can I just give you the other side of that and ask you to take in consideration. Alistair is on the call from the DC as well as (Neil) and myself, we can't turn it around overnight from a constituency. We at least be to give them a heads up.

(Ray): Uh-huh.

Marilyn Cade: And tell them that something is coming in order to involve the membership.

(Ray): Right, and once that they keep in mind to and we were definitely sensitive to that but one thing to keep in mind is that this particular category does not hold a lot of the issues that exist in the - in some of the other categories.

So, I thought it might be worthwhile just to share now what we are focusing on...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

(Ray): ...in the recommendation to kind of give flavor of where we're at. And what we're focusing in on is right now the contractual condition requires approval by ICANN if a registry operator wants to release a gTLD string at the second level.

And what we're focusing on is that it's really not proper or we feel as a recommendation that it's probably not a good idea for ICANN to be in that position of approving that instead it makes more sense as a

recommendation to have a situation where ICANN is simply being notified that a gTLD string is being unreserved at the second level.

So, it's really a minor nuance going, taking ICANN, our position of approval to our position of simply being notified under certain conditions of beyond unreserving of a gTLD at the second level.

Chuck Gomes: But couldn't you propose that as a - propose your draft recommendation acknowledging that it's not even subgroup hasn't totally finalized it and send that out just for comment to the six constituencies in the ALAC and ask them if they can give you some feedback in week if there's any big issues with that or concerns and ask them to be specific.

I mean what are you really lose by that?

(Ray): I think it would be stronger. It might be stronger. And I'm thinking out loud...

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm sure it would be stronger, (Ray). I'm not arguing with that but a week from now, it's too late. I mean it's just reality that we're dealing with. And I think it's better to do it with some chance of getting responses than to delay it for perfect circumstances and not get the responses back in time.

Marilyn Cade: You know, I'll just support that because where I think it's like to cause more debate when the council is looking at the final report because are people are going to feel they haven't participated in reviewing this within their constituency ahead of time.

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick.

I guess I have a question.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Patrick Jones: Not speaking in on behalf of, you know, as a member of the subgroup but just generally, is the reasoning to send this out to the different supporting organizations just so everyone feels like they have chance to be included in the consideration of this or is it really because we feel like, you know, there are other parties impacted by this particular contractual provision?

Chuck Gomes: I think the latter one's, the stronger one, but the reality in that is, is that Marilyn's point is right, is if that - if there has been some betting of some of these things but we're really not doing that in a lot of the others either because there so much work to be done so, we could argue that point. But it will be easier to get these things through if in fact we've solicited some input and listened to input that we get from other places.

Again, you know, Patrick, I say that the primary reason is to find out they really care whether it really has impact to other people besides registries. I for one for some of registry as you know, I'm a member of the registry, the - you know, I think that the primary impact to registries but I do agree that there's possible impact to other users and just giving them a chance to identify, they may all come back and say, "It's not a big issue for us," it would be nice to know that.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: All right, (Ray), what else you get?

(Ray): I'm thinking about all that.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. I know how your mind works.

(Ray): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: You and I have gone back and forth in lots of these things.

(Ray): Right, right, right.

GAC principles for example, we definitely are citing the recommendation obviously to avoid user confusion with any such release of gTLD names at second level...

Chuck Gomes: And you refer to the GAC principle or GAC principles when you do that, right?

(Ray): Right, that's right.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: How about IDN?

(Ray): Yeah, IDN, well, there are not IDN right now at the top level so it's difficult to, you know, address that particular one and another one was there was no IDN reserved at the second level because there are none at the top level.

Chuck Gomes: Could they be going forward?

(Ray): We feel that IDN falls within the same parameters as ASCII. So, whatever recommendation works for ASCII can work for IDN.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let's think about some example because one of the things and this is before you joined the working group but we, you know, we did the consultation with the - with I think (Tina) and Ram on the phone and then (Carry) participated in some other exchanges and so forth.

But one of the points made with regard to ICANN and IANA and dub-dub-dub, nic, and whois is it - you know, we shouldn't go down a path of trying to translate or transliterate acronyms or abbreviations or, you know, special terms like whois because they may not be possible in some scripts. At the same time there are maybe some examples let's take dot museum for example where it's actual a word and it's a lit bit different case.

So, I'm not sure it's as simple as just concluding that whatever works for ASCII works for IDN. That certainly doesn't seem to be the case with ICANN/IANA names with dub-dub-dub, nic, and whois and based on the expert consultation and you may want to look at the consultation note that the dub-dub-dub when I sent out today, there are some comments there but you can look back in some other of the original subgroup reports or the main report to get some of that information.

I think some of those issues are related to - I mean like for example jobs is another one that you're involve with in terms of is it, you know, depending on what your recommendation is, should that same

recommendation apply that an IDN translation or of the dot job should work, I'm not asking you to answer to that.

(Ray): No, no but let me try to answer that. Actually I think and Patrick and Edmon can chip in. I don't think we're looking at translations. If the IDN exists at the top level and the question becomes can the registry operator unreserve that IDN at the second level. It - I don't think we're going down the path of translations.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

I'm just - all I'm doing is...

((Crosstalk))

(Ray): Right, I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So that - make sure that we're as complete as possible in the subgroup.

(Ray): Right, right. I appreciate that, the comment.

Edmon, did you want to...

((Crosstalk))

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I think that's the thinking from my side as well. Until it is an actually a gTLD, we won't - it won't be a gTLD related reservation,

right. So, it has to be delegated into the route and then that's within the scope of the discussion for this particular subgroup.

So, with that view I mean, the IDN will be a separate item and would pretty much apply. And in the cases of translation that you mentioned, you know, those were taken care of with other items like confusable.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: Just to add to that and this is Patrick. The contractual language for the new agreement has a link to an IANA page, this is dynamic so as new TLDs are added to the route, they appear on that IANA list.

And, you know, as IDNs are added in the future, they will also be added to that list so that would be the list that the reservation requirement is based on.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Patrick Jones: It wouldn't be on translation but that as Edmon said it would be part of the confusability issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Anything else on this category by anybody in the working group?

Okay, let's go on to controversial names.

Avri Doria: Okay.

On controversial names, trying to get it together here. I've got so many windows open also.

Chuck Gomes: And me too.

Avri Doria: Okay, on controversial names, one of the things I have taken your off - your template and started to fill it in.

We had one meeting. We've got another one scheduled for next week before the meeting of the third though at the same day. We went through - we have not consulted with any experts yet. So there is going to be at least an email consultation with the usual suspects in IDN.

We reviewed the GAC principle with regards to controversial names came up with at least one issue specifically that and that the current recommendation speak about non-consensus issue brought up by an advisory committee.

And so - and not - we're wondering what happens if an advisory committee or a few governments within the GAC have a dispute - have an issue.

Now, within the GAC principles, we talk about - they talk about expresses formal concerns and that the board should deal with them. But if we're putting together a dispute resolution, we need to take into account the possibility that those things should be dealt with earlier in the process and not have to wait for the board.

So that's one consideration that needs to be dealt with. That brought up another issue when thinking about that one which was - and this is

in the dispute resolution process on how are disputes by non-ICANN bodies to be dealt with. And that's an open issue that needs to be discussed some more. We've haven't gotten anywhere on that one yet basically just brought it up as an issues that needs to be dealt with.

In terms of the dispute resolution process, I believe that Marilyn and Tamara are working on our first draft of it that the group will then discuss on email and such.

By the way, I am in the process of putting both all of these notes and the template within Google docs so that other members as a group can in realtime either use email or the Google mechanism for that.

We use the Google mechanism I think to good advantage in the whois. And since it's one that nobody has to install anything for, they decided to go with it.

We did not see any necessity to do any specifically consultation with the GAC at this point. I think that I'm not sure but that - the issues we'll cover adequately; they gave us clues on how to interpret. We did talk about the fact that if any issues did come up that needed clarification, the approach we might take is to contact, you know, one or two of the GAC (unintelligible) for example, you know, the chair of the group or something that basically gets their view point on an interpretation if that's needed.

The dispute name list which is something that we need to look is something that would be a byproduct of the dispute process and that's being looked at. As I said, the dispute process is going to be looked at and that would include all of that.

Now, incorporating any relevant comments from the IDN working group as people probably saw mine and this was my personal comment not the group comment, basically looked into - my comment was that's automatically dealt with at a higher level than these controversial names than the dispute process.

However, in thinking about it afterwards, deal - a personal to a opinion but or a personal question that I've now sent to the group is looking at controversial names and disturbingly similar or confusingly similar is what happens when you have something that is either on the disputed list or potentially on the disputed list.

But you're not using the word that would be there. But for example just using the brand FCUK, now that is confusingly similar perhaps for some people disturbingly similar for other is that something that by extension of the - the similarity rule one needs to worry about when talking about controversy.

Because I mean we've seen quite a movement in terms of people using something that puts you in mind of something controversial was added. And that's just an issue that I just sort of brought up and I'm throwing it up to the group so that other people can think about it too.

So this is basically me disagreeing with me who's said first no issue here and then all of the sudden going but wait a second.

So that's - let me see if there's anything - they were basically in our meeting.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg; I just like to get into the queue.

Avri Doria: Okay. Should I...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. If you want to jump in right now?

Greg Shatan: Okay. Just, I guess, I was to say with regard to say.

Chuck Gomes: No, if that's okay with Avri, it's okay to me.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Yeah. With regard to the FCUK is dot com, you know, raises another issue or - that's a trademark.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Greg Shatan: And it's actually - and it is a domain (result) so.

Avri Doria: Right. I know that that one is a trademark. And so that becomes actually an interesting multiple issue in terms of we'll hear somebody as prevented from having a trademark because it's confusingly similar as something that's controversial. And that's the whole issue that we haven't gotten into.

Greg Shatan: And I would, you know, also be concerned about the term confusingly similar since that's the term of art in a trademark world and, you know, involves a particular set of analytics.

Marilyn Cade: The guy, yeah. But -and I want to jump in as well.

I thought Avri and Chuck and everyone else here should spot me on this. I thought that actually there's a different process to deal with trademark conflicts.

Chuck Gomes: That's my understanding.

Greg Shatan: Right. I guess my point here is that we have something here which even if it weren't a trademark, you know, may or may not be similar.

And on top of that, you know, if we have a trademark that could be considered a controversial name, it's kind of getting double whammied and I would note that while the US trademarks will all prohibits offensive - I'm not sure exact - I can't say it exactly the standard that they use that they prohibit the registration of offensive terms. But FCUK is in fact registered.

So, you know...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: ... we - whatever our test is, we have to watch out that we somehow having to come even more conservative than we should be or there's at least a possibility here for somebody who has a very elevated sense of the controversial to shut things down in more broadly than need be.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: So there's a slippery slope problem here.

Avri Doria: Well I think the whole controversial - I mean I think that that's part of the whole controversial name issue is that it starts on that slippery slope. And we've got to be very careful.

I think basically having this course to think about it about the IDN. And I think it is an important thing for us to consider outside of these separate groups that we haven't really gotten to is in many cases, we may have several categories at the same time.

And as we could have something that is a trademark and as controversial, we could have something that's controversial and geographic and two letters to three and another word.

So - I mean that was just an issue that's forcing me to think about the IDN issue and the confusingly similar basically brought us. But indeed, I agree. I mean I tend to be a minimalist in terms of - and this is personally I tend to be a minimalist in terms of exclusion of controversy.

Greg Shatan: Right. I guess I would also kind of pick up the banner - phone banner of Victoria McEvedy perhaps.

Avri Doria: Right.

Greg Shatan: And I'd be concerned about, you know, freedom of expression issues here and the fact that, you know, tolerating unpopular or expression is very much a part of the basis of certain countries and very much antithetical to the social institutions of other countries.

So it's kind of a question who's controversy are we going to worry about. I mean for instance I've been here checking (dirtydue.com) is - it resolves; I'm not particularly happy about that. (Fuck.com) also resolves.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: I mean how far are we going to go and saying that the, you know, it should be kind of a PG world of domain name.

Avri Doria: And that's one of the ones that I think expresses that in that other issues that was brought up into who have - I'll use the word standing though I'm sure that there's a proper definition that I'm not quite good enough to use. Who has standing other than advisory committee in the dispute process and that's something that has yet to be dealt with.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I think we mentioned that in that yes, exactly and what's the standard.

Avri Doria: Right. And those are things that we don't need to deal with.

Greg Shatan: Right, I think to paraphrase (Voltaire), I might come out with the minority statement and maybe - it won't be the minority statement that I disapprove of the domain that you wish to register but I will defend your - to death your right to register.

Avri Doria: Yeah. If it's a minority, I'm obviously with you on that personally.

So I don't know where we're at on consensus but we've definitely been very agreeable on our conversations. We've had one. We have not had a lot on the net yet. And I guess there's only a week and plus to go but we've got ways to go yet.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Avri - and I know you're still work in IDNs and even doing some consultations still on that but so if there was a controversial word in name - controversial name in ASCII, would the corresponding controversial name be - would it also be controversial in another script if it was translatable and vice versa.

I'm not asking you to answer that. I'm throwing that out just as I'm sure that you've all ready thought of...

Avri Doria: Right. Well, one of the - yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...issues with IDNs.

Avri Doria: One of the things that we did bring up is how do you - in the dispute resolution process, how do you deal with the language/cultural communities that IDN brings to all of this?

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: And that sounds something that that's being thought about and investigated.

Chuck Gomes: Does anyone else in the full working group have - or one of the group, working group, subgroup members as well have anything to ask to add in this regard?

Marilyn Cade: Well I'm just - what Tamara and I are doing is we're looking at the RSTEP process and examining it for learning as a possible approach to drafting a process.

So if there are - but if other people have other ideas about what we should look at, I know we would welcome hearing that.

Chuck Gomes: Or they'll send them your way, right?

Marilyn Cade: Send them our way.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Avri Doria: If there was sort of a presumption that, you know, the RSTEP process is something that ICANN knows, it's a well thought process. And so it does seem to make sense that I need - just be a process that we come up with should look at that as a model to build on.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Avri Doria: It wouldn't be asking the RSETP process to handle it, it would be a parallel problem.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Oh, I would love that.

Avri Doria: I knew you would. It's been a friend a long time and that might end that friendship.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, now, let me remind, okay so chairs in particular but all the working group members should be aware of this. Not later than Wednesday of next week, in other words a week from today, submit to the RN list the table of your recommendations as close to final as it can be. They don't have to be totally final but as close as you can.

If you have a couple of choices you're looking at, put both choices in there for right now. That will greatly facilitate a similar discussion like we've had today next Wednesday except a lot further along than where we're at today.

And the goal will be to get maximum feedback from the full working group so that as you do your final touches to your report and in particular your recommendations, you have a good sense of the full working group is going to support those and we won't have any surprises in the last couple of days.

Any questions on that?

Okay. We're down to the last two or three minutes and let me give you a very quick update on action items for Liz and I.

As, you know, I sent out - we made a decision on assembles - in reserve names. That's going to be part of the single-two character.

Tag names. I sent out a very near final version of that. Please try and review that in the next seven days and send out any comments or not. We'll probably just assume that it's okay if we don't hear any comments on that or concerns. We don't want to spend a lot of time on those things that are pretty well done.

The main place in this report lie tag names and nic, whois, and dub-dub-dub to look at is the rationale part Item 2 at the very end. The rationale part is - I know and this is where I added some verbiage make sure what I added is okay there.

So both of those have been sent out. I need examples still that are being provided to me as some IDN examples for the tag names report.

Third level names. I still have that one to work on. I probably will work on that this afternoon and tomorrow and other names at the second level, the same thing. Those are things that aren't going to be part of our - the main recommendations part but a separate part of the report.

We've taken care of the definition of reserve names and the - Liz has organized the basic - total working group report as specified there in Agenda Item 9-B2 and that we'll be adding to that in terms of - I mean filling in information on that.

Subgroups. You're incorporating the GAC principles in the new TLD recommendation as applicable. And Liz did send off a message to the SFUK regarding security and stability issues of our previous recommendation.

And then Annex that Philip Shepherd had recommended be created having an alphabetical list of all reserved name, well, that's something that we can pull together at least for those that are list of names towards the end there.

And report format. You've got the template. Any questions on that, please remember to let me know or let Liz know or both of us.

Any special needs for any of the subgroups?

Okay. The - it would be helpful if you can by Tuesday, May 1, and that's a holiday in Europe so, you know, a little slippage in that when we get it. If you'd like a format check on your - the status, even however incomplete it is of the subgroup reports, send them to Liz or me and (when we have to do it), I won't be as quite as able to that next week. But I will have some access and be able to be online quite a bit next week.

The actions items for next week, I think we've covered those. Obviously, consider the feedback you received today in your subgroup were try and be as close to final recommendation as you can by next Wednesday and get those to the list for total group feedback next Wednesday. And be ready to describe - you know, again, the agenda next week will be very much like what we did today.

And follow the same format for updates from each subgroup. And I'll probably get that agenda out at the latest tomorrow. But it shouldn't be any surprise because you're - other than a few little tweaks, it's going to be what we went through today except we should be able to do it even more finely next week. We need to be able to do it more finely next week. And Liz and I will continue to incorporate stuff that's completed into the main report.

Again, as I send out these reports on things that we didn't form a subgroup for, make sure you take a look at them quickly, see if there's

any problems, let us know so that we can finalize those without taking a lot of time of live meeting as we go through that.

The - okay, I think that's it. Is there anything else?

My compliments again to fantastic work going on. I - you know, what you guys are doing is really what makes this work and so, my thanks and sincere compliments in that regard. And I will be in touch and Liz next week even though I won't be able to participate in the meeting.

Have a good day.

Greg Shatan: Bye, Chuck, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Marilyn Cade: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END