

Reserved Names (RN) Working Group Teleconference

1 March 2007

18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Reserved Names (RN) Working Group teleconference on 1 March 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

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

The audio recording is available at:

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/rn-wg-20070301.mp3>

On page

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

Attendance:

Working Group members

Chuck Gomes - Chair

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Alistair Dixon - CBUC

Neal Blair - CBUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Victoria McEvedy - NCUC

Jon Nevett - Registrars

Tim Ruiz - Registrars

Seth Jacoby - Registrars

Dan Dougherty - IPC

Tamara Reznik - IPC

Greg Shatan - IPC

Mike Palage - Registries constituency

Edmon Chung - Registries constituency

Avri Doria - Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO Council

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

Invited IDN experts:

Cary Karp

Ram Mohan

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Tim Denton - Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat

Absent excused:

Caroline Greer - Registries

Coordinator: I'd like to advise everyone that the conference is being recorded. If you do have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Chuck Gomes: And remember please, as we start the meeting, that it's also being transcribed, so it's important that you identify yourself when you speak, so that the transcribers can put down who's talking. Sometimes, I can pick it up from contacts, sometimes, not. But last week, I want to compliment, everybody did a really nice job with that and that really helps.

For anyone who's using a speaker phone, that's fine, and I recognize the convenience of that when you're listening, but it is helpful if you use either headphones or the handset when you're speaking. It'll come through clear.

I want to welcome Victoria. And, Victoria, tell me how - tell us all how you pronounce your last name, so I don't mess it up.

Victoria McEvedy: Sure. No one gets it right without some assistance. It's McEvedy.

Chuck Gomes: McEvedy. Okay, McEvedy.

And correct me if I pile it up in the future.

Victoria McEvedy: No problem.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And welcome. And you're in London, is that right?

Victoria McEvedy: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Well, thank you for joining us representing the NCUC. I appreciate that very much.

Any - there seem several suggestions on the agenda. Are there any other comments on the agenda? Is it okay as is? Any changes suggested? Any more changes?

Okay. Then, the next thing I want to talk about is the status of missing interest statements. And by the way, Victoria, thank you for being so prompt in submitting yours as a new member.

Edmund Chang has submitted an interest statement. Now, I have requested a little bit more information from Edmund on his interest statement although I think it's fine for him to participate today.

And then, Sophia Bekele, who is represent - a liaison for the IDN Working Group, has not submitted one. And so I assume that should be forthcoming because the questions she asked in that regard have been answered by both me and by Ram, who's the chair of the IDN Working Group that she is liaison from.

Still no word on the GAC liaison. So, what I'm going to do now - and again, before we talk with our experts this morning, keep in mind, as I think I have on the list, that we have Minjung Park, who is a liaison from the ccNSO. And Minjung, because of the terrible hour in Korea when we hold this meeting, is not able to join our call.

But, please, take advantage of her with regard to liaison with the ccNSO in particular with issues like two-character domain names and then the others where you think the ccNSO might be able to be helpful there. And her e-mail address is contained on the contact list, and I just sent out a new version of that. I think it was yesterday but within the day for all I know.

And Sophia, of course, is liaison to the IDN Working Group. Of course, today, we're going to be able to talk with the chair of that group.

Okay. I want to jump right in to the expert consultation with Ram Mohan and Cary Karp. Ram, as I think all of you know, is the chair of the IDN Work - the GNSO IDN Working Group. He's also a member of the President's IDN Committee, in fact, so as Cary Karp, who's with us, too. They're both members of that committee. They are both members of the IDN Guidelines Group. Both of them have been very active in IDN on the technical and policy side for years.

So - and now, Tina has not able to make it today because of travel. She is actually probably on a plane right now. And if she was in it like 3:00 in the morning or something, so she sent her apologies but will try to participate via e-mail if she can following this meeting.

So, now, let's get right to and, hopefully, everybody had a chance to look at the questions that I put together. I didn't see any new ones from anybody else after I sent that to the list, but I do want to encourage those of you who have questions related to the Reserved Name category that you're working on in your subgroup. Certainly, feel free to ask questions today.

The general question - let me start off with the general questions. In cases where IDN versions of reserved names should be reserved, okay, and keep in mind that all - and each of the report should talk about whether there's need to - whether there's a recommendation to reserve IDN versions of a name - category of names you're considering.

In those cases, should the reserved names include the ASCII-compatible ACE form, which is the A form, and the latest draft that was put out and the local script form Unicode or what is called the U form.

And I don't know which one of you guys want to jump in first. Ram and Cary but whoever does, feel free.

Ram Mohan: Cary, do you want to lead.

Cary Karp: I can lead.

I would like to ask you some clarification first, Chuck. When you speak of the IDN version of a non-IDN name, how are you dealing with translated equivalence to a pre-existing label that don't require the use of Unicode characters to correct display? Is that a separate issue?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we're going to get to that a little bit more later on, but it is good you bring that up. And in fact, why don't you, for the sake of the Working Group, explain what you're getting at there. I think that would be helpful for those...

Cary Karp: Okay. I'm getting at the following and that is, as we provide localized equivalence to existing labels or introduce new labels in languages that there are no relationships to English whatsoever, we're not necessarily entering the round of IDN. There are any numbers of languages that are written using undecorated Latin characters, and therefore, would be regarded as ASCII names, but they're not English. And we can easily seize some TLD labels that are displayed using ASCII characters evocative of or explicitly associated with English vocabulary correlating to another ASCII sequence that is a translated version of that label. So, the internationalization of the main space is not the same thing as the deployment of IDN. So, the need for non-ASCII Unicode characters is an issue, which is subordinate to what I believe your primary concern is.

Is that what you want me to say, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's helpful. And we are. You're correct. Obviously, the reserved names category, as your version I know you're with in the current registry agreement because you have one of those, you know, does relate strictly to ASCII, and one of our tasks, of course, is, okay,

what should the reserved names list include with regard to IDN names, both of the top level and lower level. So, we'll be looking at specific categories as we go through.

Anybody have any questions for Cary and what he just said?

Ram, you want to add anything there?

Ram Mohan: Chuck, I was just going to wait for the response to that before I add something there. I think what Cary points out is an important clarification to the larger question. And, perhaps, your working group would be well-advised to not only restrict it's analysis to the U form and the A form but to really look at, you know, what is considered and equivalent of a name that is deserving of reservation.

Chuck Gomes: Could you give us an example of that? Do you have an equivalent?

Ram Mohan: Well, so at the - this is back to what Cary was saying, there are a number of names where you do not require a character set, a specific Unicode character set to represent it. In recent mind, an example that immediately pops up is "Voyage," V-O-Y-A-G-E. It's a French word, and it does not require any accented characters or anything special. It can be written just normally in - using normal Latin script that the (unintelligible) I looks identical to regular English language domain name or a TLD label called Voyage.

Chuck Gomes: What would be the implications of that for reserved names?

Ram Mohan: What the - I guess what I'm recommending is the following that - there are two things here. One is to think about not only the Unicode form

versus the ASCII form, but to consider - if I view it a little bit more of a continuum that you can have a name that is in the ASCII form, if you will, that have another ASCII form that is an exact connotation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Cary Karp: There is one maybe you can read to this concrete. I'm now going to take this to what I regard is an absolutely inapplicable extreme. But nonetheless, it takes one of the endpoints of what you might (dump aiming board). And that is to the extent that a Reserved Name is the dictionary word or is clearly evocative of a dictionary word in some language. That same word or abbreviation with similar evocative connotation in every other language that you're considering has to be included.

So, if we're taking Voyage, the French word Voyage will appear in any French-Thai, French-Chinese, French-English, French-German, French-Japanese dictionary. Whatever it is on the other side of that definition needs similar reservation. So, at some point, you might want to consider a list of languages that are going to enjoy whatever reserve protection you think is reasonable.

But obviously, I don't - it goes out saying that that would be an enormously intricate task, you know, itself. The political and cultural and everything else sensitivity that would attach to it makes it almost be to consider much less undertake. But if there's a kind of thing that would be necessary if you are really going to afford equitable protection to the holders of lexemic, to use the fancy term, name in all of the languages that are figuring in this discussion.

Chuck Gomes: So, Cary, what you're talking about there was to have - it would a very intricate task, then, if we came up with the list of controversial name maybe even geographical names and then try to reserve all of the comparable ones in various scripts.

Cary Karp: Yeah, I'm not suggesting that this...

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, Cary. Go ahead.

Cary Karp: I'm not suggesting that this is doable. But again, it is the extreme at the other end of some continuum to use (VAM's) term that you have to find some comfortable position on.

Woman: Yeah, you have to take all continuum terms.

Ram Mohan: Just to clarify, I'd want to be careful about using comparable as a term, Chuck, because I don't think it's a precisely defined term. In this area, the more precision you have, the better it's going to be. And I would - the working group especially within internationalization, 1314 respective the social cultural component is going to be inescapable when you're looking at reserved names.

And one argument just to play the other side of it, one argument that I have heard some folks use, which I'm actually a little sympathetic to, is C-O-L-O-R and C-O-L-O-U-R are considered two separate domain names in the - you know, not at the top level but at the second level. And therefore, a case could be made that should there be something similar at the top level of the domain name system. Similar distinctions opt to be made.

While I'm a little sympathetic to it, my concern has to do with the confusion that I believe will inevitably occur between somebody not knowing C-O-L-O-R and C-O-L-O-U-R as being two completely different terms, because the C-O-L-O-R--C-O-L-O-U-R differentiation is, technically speaking and to a computer and from a Unicode and a code point perspective, they are two completely separate terms, but to layperson, they are exactly the same thing.

And I think you will find that exact same issue will hit you much more frequently in the IDN area.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, good point. Now, let's go back to the question I asked. So, in cases - and as we go through the questions today, we'll decide which cases may apply, but in cases where we do decide to recommend a reservation of a term in its IDN script equivalence, should we reserve both - should we show the reservation list both in A form and U form like a recommendation that Tina made for - in some of the language with regard to the tag names.

You follow me? In other words, if we're going to have a Reserved Name list, let's say we decide to reserve Web, obviously, we're not going to do that, but let's say we decide to reserve the term Web and we decide that it should also be reserved in various IDN versions, should we - should our list of reserved names then show the ASCII compatible form of Web in various scripts as well as the Unicode or local form?

Cary Karp: Could I comment on that?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Cary.

Cary Karp: Okay, there are two comments. First, you probably should tighten up your terminology, use the term Unicode form. The local display form may not be in Unicode, and it is completely external to the IDN process. So, we ended the IDN realm once we've turned a local representation of a character that the user has typed into its Unicode code point. Practically, they'll be the same thing, but in the internal representation, they'll be different. And in fact, there are some conversation issues there. It's not necessary. It will not invariably as smoothly - as smooth as I say.

But nonetheless, we're talking about the Unicode representation of an IDN. That's what the users expect to see on the screen. And then, we're talking about the ASCII compatible equivalent of it, which is what actually stored on the DNS, and these things are absolutely equivalent to each other. But, if you wish to communicate a name in some medium that ensures that the recipient of that communication will know what is being referred to, then I would suggest that you want to have both forms as a label there.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Yeah. And that's consistent with what Tina said. And that's the question - are you concur with that from?

Cary Karp: I concur with that with one amendment, which is do not say both versions but instead to say all versions because...

Ram Mohan: Both representation of the name. It's one name represented in two forms.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure I understood your comment, Ram. What do you mean, all versions? So - and we're creating this list of IDN reserved names. What I understood Cary to say and answer the question was, yes, we should show the A form and the U form. And you said, all forms.

Woman: The U form is the third form based upon what Cary just said.

Cary Karp: An IDN can be expressed in two ways, either as an extend dash, dash sequence of ASCII characters or as Unicode string. And since we've decided that we're only talking about the Unicode's way of IDN, the question is, is there any need to communicate both of these, and I think everybody has an agreement that they are.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. And so, Ram, back to your...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...there. Could you clarify what you meant by show all forms?

Ram Mohan: Actually, Cary clarified it immediately after my statement, which is both forms of a given name. So, in other words, what I was getting at was, a name represented all certain way in the ASCII form, its equivalent in the Unicode form should be also communicated as a pair. But I was saying, really, the other semantic meaning I was implying was that that name is possible is also represented in other ASCII forms, and in each ASCII form that is represented is equivalent to Unicode form should also go along.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, very good. And the ASCII form would be clear from the existing reserved names list, or in the case of, if some are added to that some new ones. Okay, I think that makes sense.

Now, I want to make sure that people...

Avri Doria: Can other people ask clarifying questions?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I kind of understood and I've gotten confused.

So, when you say, equivalent - I got two questions. When you say, equivalent ASCII form, are you talking about synonyms? And then, the other question I have, I thought there were actually three representations being talked about, the A, the U and what appears like on a screen to the native viewer.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...that the appearance on the screen and the U were not necessarily the same.

Ram Mohan: Well, in my view, the appearance on the screen and the U must have a one-to-one correlation because the U is what is going to be supported. So, let me give you an example. In India, they use - for Hindi, they use the ISCII script, which is not recognized in Unicode, and therefore, does not have an equivalent representation.

On the screen in India, you may be able to see a character represented using ISCII but that - that is I-S-C-I-I and we don't care about that. We only care about the Unicode representation of that script.

Avri Doria: Okay. The Unicode representation is still one that one could look at for visual confusability.

Cary Karp: If you want to talk about confusability, the local representation, as Ram is describing it, and the Unicode representation are the ones that are going to be spitting images with each other...

Avri Doria: Okay, fine.

Cary Karp: ...but in their internal representation, they're not the same thing.

Avri Doria: Okay, fine.

Chuck Gomes: I think that answers your question, right, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, that answered my question. So, it is only the two forms.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ram Mohan: It is only the two forms. And what was the first part of your question?

Avri Doria: First question, when you were talking about other ASCII representations, so in other words, if you have - and I didn't quite understand what that meant. Was that synonym for the word in an

ASCII or was that because I assume that there was only one ACE compatible, I mean, ACE representation for you or there are several?

Ram Mohan: Let me try to illustrate. In a hypothetical case, it is possible that some organization has decided that they are applying for a new TLD, and that TLD, they apply for it with three equivalent names or forms. So, I don't know - I cannot think of an example off the top of my head. But in that case...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...synonym, so.

Ram Mohan: I don't know. It could be synonyms, it could be something that is constitutionally or legally required, you know, and therefore, they may not be exactly synonyms but they may be considered to be equivalent. And really, what I was saying was, I don't know enough geopolitics to comment in a universal way on it. But I do know that the possibility exists that...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Ram Mohan: ...you may have multiple representations of a given name even in ASCII.

Avri Doria: So in other words, an example might be - I'm just trying to get my head, I'm sorry. If one country had several national scripts and their name for the country would have a different theme, would have a different U name in each of those three scripts, then you would also

need these three ACEs equivalent to three A names equivalent of those names.

Ram Mohan: Yeah. That's a pretty good example, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: That - good questions, Avri.

And I want to make a suggestion. I know that a lot of you are going to be a little bit overwhelmed by the IDN discussion. Hang in there. We're going to get - when we get to the specific reserved name categories shortly, I think some of this will become more clear. And keep in mind that you can always get clarification after this meeting as well.

What I want to do next is go to the second general question and then we'll get to the specific categories. Are there any guidelines that we could follow regarding when to reserve IDN versions of ASCII reserved names and when it doesn't make sense? For example, does it make sense to reserve IDN versions of abbreviations and acronyms? As you know, we have a lot of those. Or would that have to be handled on a case-by-case basis depending on the script?

Ram Mohan: Cary, let me lead that with an answer and to jump in.

My suggestion is that, in these cases, you are best referring to a local authority, language authority or some sort of a constitutional body. I think it's a slippery slope to try and make global policy for what is the effectively local issue. Again, just to give an example, .org in India, one of the scripts that is used popularly in India is called Tamil -- T-A-M-I-L

-- and in that script, org is spelled out exactly O-R-G in the local language. However, com is not spelled out as com. And we would not know that unless we went and talk to a local language authority there.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Okay. Cary, would you like to add anything there?

Cary Karp: No, I don't think so. I mean, the thing that I imagine that's been discussed that's significant in this group is that, domain names, despite the fact that they're called names aren't supposed to be names, they have certain coincidental word-like and name-like properties. But they're only supposed to be mnemonically convenient off the numeric sequences that then provide some convenience for some users.

And when we end up in a situation where we're talking about what can either be read as meaningless off of a numeric string or as some form of truncated or clip or abbreviated or acronym version of something that has clear meaning and they even do regardless by somebody has earned eligible property. You're just courting an unendable discussion about what needs to be covered and what doesn't need to be covered. No matter what you do, there's always going to be something that's on the outside that should be on the inside and vice versa. So, the essence of DNS is extraordinarily not amenable to the kinds of things we're talking about right now, including the IDN stuff.

Ram Mohan: Cary, my - I'm sorry, Chuck, my - this is Ram. My formulation would be, in all cases, the exemption of abbreviation for the reservation for the abbreviation should be referred to local language authorities or local - or appropriately selected local expertise unless clear exceptions exist. So, something that generally sweeps this particular issue to the local people I think is the right thing to do. And if you really want to

have a caveat, put one caveat that says, unless there's a query established exception.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good.

Let's move on into the specific categories, so that the various (subjects) of our total working group can get some direction in terms of their recommendations that they need to consider. And as you already know, we're looking at top level, we're looking at second level, which is for the most - second level is covered in ASCII but we need to cite whether the second level - whether we recommend the second level reservation should include the A and U forms of various names as well, and then, of course, a few cases where third level will apply.

So, let's start off with the first category, which is, Labels Reserved at All Levels, and there two categories of names there. The first category is, ICANN-related Name, and those are aso, gnso, icann, internic and ccnso. Now, as to the (CAP 3.0 - 4.0) Agreement, as Cary well know, that still have DNSO and CSO. We don't need to focus on those. But for this category of names, what do you two recommend with regard to IDN should - can versions of this even be represented in IDN in some scripts? If so, should they be reserved? What is your thinking on that?

Cary Karp: Do you want to tell him or should I?

Ram Mohan: I'm happy to take a swing at it, Cary.

I think this is quite an unachievable task for any group to do much less of volunteer group to do. Unless there is some clearer description of each of these expansions in the local language that is then

abbreviated, I think you have a real problem because GNSO represented in French may have nothing to do with the actual name of your organization converted in French.

So, my recommendation is, do not bother reserving this, but instead, to see if there would be an equivalent and to reserve them at that time. It's a little controversial recommendation but it seems meaningless to reserve GNSO when GNSO means nothing.

Cary Karp: There is I think probably a profitable way to avoid some of the intricacy in this, and that is, our literal sequences that appear in URLs all the time that are regarded as protocol elements, HTTP, for example. Probably, ought not to be a candidate for representation in other script. It can - it's easily enough to be done without, in fact, in many application contexts, but nonetheless, if you regard this IANA-, ICANN-specific sequences more as protocol elements than as what - as was not to be called initialism. That's what they are in that kind of reference. You'll be kind of say, GNSO is a concept in the Internet pure of things and it is not an English term, it is not translatable into something else than the GNSO, G-N-S-O, designates some thing. And it's not a word. It's a protocol.

Ram Mohan: I can live with that, Cary.

Cary Karp: Yeah.

Ram Mohan: I can certainly live with that. I think that provides an elegant way out of the controversy here. If you look at GNSO, ICANN, et cetera, merely as initialism and dual way with any semantic representation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's helpful.

Ram Mohan: Oh, yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm sorry, it's Mike Rodenbaugh. I'm not really clear on what that meant.

Ram Mohan: That means that I-C-A-N-N, Mike - this is Ram. I-C-A-N-N is strip of meaning and it - what we merely say is, I-C-A-N-N is an important term, and therefore, shall be reserved.

Cary Karp: ICANN is a token or an alphanumeric - well, an alpha-token of...

Mike Rodenbaugh: How about trademark? Does that work? I mean, that's...

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: If you want to move this in the direction of being insolubly complex, sure. If you want to replace the complexity, probably not.

(Marilyn): Cary - Ram, I have a - Chuck, I have a question for either Ram or Cary.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Michael Palage: This is Mike Palage. If I can get in the queue...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. I better make a list, huh?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, this is Tim. I (found) you knew I joined the call.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, thank you, Tim. Okay.

(Marilyn): It's (Marilyn). And thank you so much. This has been very helpful. But I have a follow on question to the reference to HTTP, HTML both of which are a string of letters which you have particular relevance and in e-mail routing or address and I guess I should say. Would you go back to that example and talk a little bit more about that? Because it sounds like what you are saying is and I'd like to phrase token, Cary, it's sort of does this string of letters - it has meaning and - to it because of its technical use or I guess that would be the right phrase?

Cary Karp: Yup.

Ram Mohan: So, although HTML has an actual expansion, it is kind of meaning something more than that, and therefore, HTML in its form as it is - just as it stands will be reserved in other areas regardless of how it's converted into French or converted into Arabic.

(Marilyn): And...

Cary Karp: Hold on a second there. Ram, I want to make sure we're clear on what you just said. So, HTML should be - we reserve it today in ASCII. If I understood you correctly and I may not, you're saying that there's no need to reserve IDN versions of it, whatever those might be.

Ram Mohan: That's not what I said it off. I'm glad you asked.

Cary Karp: Oh, that's why I asked because I want to make sure.

Ram Mohan: Actually, what I'm saying is that, the IDN version of HTML, you're going to get incredibly caught up in what is the IDN version, what is the appropriate translation. And in many languages around the world, a technical glossary is yet to be composed that has an equivalent of HTTP or HTML as an example or .com as an example.

So, in those cases, what we're saying is HTML, for instance, what we're saying is, just take HTML and consider it just initialism, do not bother about what it actually mean. We just say, HTML is an important term, and therefore, is reserved as it exists. It's reserved in the local languages.

Cary, do you want...

Chuck Gomes: Hold on just a second, Cary, but, Ram, you said, reserved in the local languages. What did you mean by that? HTML in its ASCII form is reserved?

Ram Mohan: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Not any - because it's too complicated to get the IDN versions, right?

Ram Mohan: Exactly. It's an almost impossible job to get all the IDN versions of HTML in all the language in the world. I think it's a general principle, again, trying to reduce the complexity of it.

If you would need to invent a sequence of non-ASCII characters to represent something that is well-known in its ASCII form, who are you

...serving? If you would have to get what the Arabic sequence of equivalent to HTML is, nobody is likely to thank you. If, however, some community does come forward and say, in fact, in our - with this frame of reference, there are translated equivalent to these things, and we will appreciate your - someplace in the list. That would be quite different.

But have you been contacted by any such community? I mean, to the best of my knowledge - or why don't I do it in my own experience? The International Council of Museums, ICOM, has 140 national committees using all sorts of scripts and languages, and with two exceptions, of which I'm aware, every single one of them uses the ICOM acronym in its Latin form.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Edmund Chang: This is Edmund. May I offer a suggest - I guess...

Chuck Gomes: Hold on, Edmund.

Edmund Chang: ...example...

Chuck Gomes: I'll add you to the queue, okay?

And let me go - (Marilyn), now, did your question get answered?

(Marilyn)?

Cary Karp: We can't possibly have overwhelmed her.

Ram Mohan: She's probably speaking at a muted phone.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, she's probably. Well, let's go back to my - I want to go back to Mike Rodenbaugh. Did your question get answered?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think so. I mean, I think the answer was, we're trying to find an elegant and simple solution and weren't all out the one we've invented forever. But, yes, I think it...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay. And then, Mike Palage, I think you were next.

Michael Palage: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Chuck. Mike Palage here.

I just wanted to, I guess, share the concerns that I thought I heard both Cary and Ram articulating about the potential of expanding reservations, if you will, outside of tokens or string identifiers. You know, this is something that I think I've tried to articulate not within the context of IDN but just the - if you will be existing ASCII reservation of these strings and designations within the existing TLDs.

And the one thing I would point out to you, Mike, where you and ICANN may, in fact - Mike Rodenbaugh, where ICANN and you maybe similarly situated is, in that list of words there -- the aso, icann, iana -- ICANN does actually have trademark registrations for ICANN and IANA.

So, you know, again, I'm not - one of the reasons that I've been very concerned about ICANN/IANA seeking this reservation is I don't want them to, if you will, be creating generous rights or protections that other parties might not be entitled to. So, I guess that's, if you will, my

concerns. And I think Ram and Cary were - am I saying what you would said that there is danger if we begin to extend this outside of just technical protocols to potentially marks or trademarks trading and other things?

Ram Mohan: Yeah, I guess I would say that if you identify something as initials or as a combination of characters that is important stated as such and then hold on to them and reserve them, don't try to translate them because I think inevitably, you'll get into trouble.

Chuck Gomes: And actually, Ram, then that gets - that's kind of what I was trying to get at, and obviously, they did do a very good job up in that general question. Are there some guidelines that we could follow? And I think you just gave one, and that is, don't try to translate acronyms or abbreviations that have very specific meaning in a technical context or whatever.

Ram Mohan: If you wanted to do that and I'm not up to justify the opposite, you do not want to do that, but if you wanted to, what you would need to do is translate the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers said in some other language, and then a local translation of that that corresponds to initialism or acronym in the (angle) of frame of reference.

I mean, it's close and appropriate to make the assumption that the notion of abbreviation, as we are using it, is applicable. It's not.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Ram Mohan: So, again, there is a name that is abbreviated, truncated, clipped, whatever - there a whole bunch of the ways to doing this if approached from the Anglified perspective. And what we would need to do is translate the extensive term and then figure out what the local equivalent to our notion of acronymization might be. But the thing we'd also need to do is ask that local community if they themselves use the English name of it token for this or if they have some local abbreviated form. And only in the presence of explicit knowledge do you guys have a real problem. And I think you're assuming that this will be a frequent case, and I'm suggesting that it will be infrequent one.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Thank you. You know, you guys have been very helpful on this. I think it gives us the direction we need here.

Edmund, you wanted to add something.

Edmund Chang: Oh, I'm just going to give a sort of example outside of the use of some English acronyms. For example, FISA is one example where the F-I-S-A doesn't correspond to an English sort of name, but that a French one I believe or partly French, but basically, it's not English. It's actually even in English that we would give FISA and that sort of would transfer for like acronyms like ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. So, hopefully, we're clear enough on this. And anybody - now, Timothy Denton, you obviously are the lead on this particular category. Are you okay on what you heard so far?

Timothy Denton: Yes and no. Yes, I get this answer that it was on Mohan's word. Unless there's a clear description of local languages, you'd be inviting us very great deal of trouble to do this. And the overall impression, again,

forgive me as I do not heard it correctly, is that you shouldn't bother reserving until you find local equivalent, and this is a rather immense task. So, that was - I'm sorry, that's my high level takeaway. If I failed to get some details, I confess I have.

Chuck Gomes: No, I think you have, and I'd be glad to, you know, assist on this. I'm sure both Ram and Cary, if you need more clarification, would be able to provide at the e-mail on one on one.

And, (Marilyn), I'm going to apologize right now. We're not going to get to single and character names before you have to leave. I apologize for that. But a way of avoiding it, I don't think.

Avri Doria: Chuck, this is Avri. Can I...

Man: I agree. Thanks, Chuck.

Avri Doria: Can I put one footnote on the one we just left? It'll be quick.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Avri Doria: Some organizations, but I don't know how many of these will apply to, formally list their names in both English and, for example, French abbreviation, not that we have the UN on this, but so we probably should make a footnote that one has to be careful. And if they list themselves under two abbreviations then we may need to take that into account.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think one of the ways we're going to - I think it was Ram, it could have been Cary, that made the suggestion that, you know, if

there maybe some cases where a local community communicates with ICANN, with the GNSO, whatever and as we go, there could be exceptions made and reservations of some IDN things if it's really applicable, but those should be done on an exception basis it's sounds like instead of to trying to do this on a general basis, which would be probably impossible.

Okay. Let's go on, then, to the IANA-related names, and, you know, that's afrinic, apnic, arin, example, gtd-servers, iab, iana, iana-servers, iesg, ietf, irtf, istf, lacnic, latnic, rfc-editor, ripe, and root-servers. Now, one of those at least is quite different than the rest based on our previous discussion. And that is example.

So, let's talk about that one first then see what you recommend in that regard, Cary and Ram.

Ram Mohan: Let me just - a lot of very brief respond. In the cases of the initials, the prior guideline that you suggested will hold. In the case of the word that has semantic meaning, you know, itself, "example", I think it is reasonable to expect that that word will be similarly used in other TLDs and another representation.

If I recall right, one of the reasons why "example" was originally reserved was because it was used as illustration of Whois, et cetera, and it's probably worthwhile to make that really a policy and to say that that word, "example", shall be what continues to go forward as, you know, as an name used for illustrative purposes, for example, in listing Whois Data.

Chuck Gomes: And it could be used - I think it's also - one of the reasons in the - it was also - that it was I think used for testing and so forth. So, you have...

Ram Mohan: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...you've been using. And so, what you're suggesting is that it probably would be good to recommend that U and A versions of "example" and other scripts be reserved.

Ram Mohan: But as a language, as in this case, this is one of the rare circumstances where we do need to talk about language. If you have some need to have looked in a dictionary, an authoritative dictionary of every language that's ever figure in the RDN discussion. Here's the word to look up.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, good. Okay. And then, now, Ram, I think you said, then, that all of the others, which are, for the most part, acronyms I guess gTLD-servers and rfc-editor and root-servers and iana-servers are a little bit different. But the discussion we just had would apply to those other ones. Is that correct?

Ram Mohan: That's correct. And even things like rfc-editor and iana-servers, root-servers, I would suggest that you treat them as initialism or acronym.

Edmund Chang: There's another little detail on this, what actually might be interesting to discuss with - well, actually, Ram probably is going to speak about it authoritatively. The RSDs are deliberately kept free of 8 bit characters, and for us to take any terms that are a part of the vocabulary, in which the RSD formulation is declared and decide that we're going to 8 bit to

(defy) them, that might be another situation where we can expect to be thanked.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay.

Ram Mohan: I agree. I think swift punishment will follow.

Man: Ram, I would like to just - you to clarify what you mean by when, say, you speak of things like rfc-editor to treat them as acronyms. Can you untuck that concept for me?

Ram Mohan: What I'm saying is, in the prior discussion, we had discussed a number of terms, for example, I-C-A-N-N...

Man: Uh-huh.

Ram Mohan: ...being treated as initialism and not expanded into its English form and then converted to a local language form and then reinitialize it.

Man: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, of course. So, just keep it as...

Ram Mohan: Right, exactly. Yeah. Definitely. Okay?

Chuck Gomes: Good. That was - any other questions or comments on that category?

Okay. Let's move on to Additional Second-Level Reservations, and let's talk about all single-character labels. Which one of the two of you would like to start off on that one?

Ram Mohan: Can I start by asking a question simply?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Cary Karp: John Klensin prepared a rather lengthy discussion of the issues that are attached to the use of single-character labels on both the top and second level that Liz Williams posted to the GNSO Council List, which is a public (unintelligible), in the middle of January. Have you taken note of that or...

Chuck Gomes: We have, Cary.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But for this discussion, I don't really want to go into the issues there. I'd really like to focus on, you know, if single-character labels are reserved as they are today in ASCII regardless of the level that they're at, okay, are, you know, should any IDN versions of single characters be reserved as well? Does that even make sense?

Cary Karp: If we are talking about (in variable) parallel representation of the U and the A labels, which count as the single character? Which one do you count?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well, I understand. Why don't you explain that to the rest...

Ram Mohan: Cary, I would count to the normal user out there if they look at a single character in their local language, they would think of that a single character, and they wouldn't have the foggiest idea to translate into xn dash, dash something or the other. So, to me, that would - I view that

from the lens of a layperson, the average Internet user, a single character is exactly what it looks like to the human eye.

I would like to, perhaps, ask Chuck for a clarification. When you say, single character, that concept doesn't exactly translate across all of the world's languages. So, I'm wondering whether, in fact, what we are talking about is the alphabet that is used to represent a given language, each individual alphabet be reserved and numerals be reserved. Is that what you're really driving at?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And so - and you just made a very important point in that - into the statement that single character doesn't translate in languages. So, could I conclude from that, then, that the - it doesn't really make sense in those languages to reserve whatever might be a single character.

And then, my followup question would be, okay, and the languages where single character does have meaning should, for example, if we reserved a, you know, the letter W, okay, should the corresponding character in other languages be reserved as well?

(Cary Karp): You are making an assumption about global translatability that also has no...

Chuck Gomes: I understand.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Palage: Can I just make a little bit contextual statement on that, Chuck? I mean, just going back to the original reason, you know, why single

letters were reserved in the first place for forward extensibility of the name space. I'm just curious...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Michael Palage: ...the IDN context is that, you know, translates it over the IDN context. It does not because, obviously, in the DNS, the Punycode string is much longer than a single character to render the Unicode single character.

((Crosstalk))

Ram Mohan: I think the problem is that while in the DNS, the Punycode is - this is Ram. While the Punycode is longer to the user of that term, they don't see - they cannot expect them to see it in Punycode. We can expect them to see it as a single character.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct. And that's what I'm going to say, Ram. So, Mike, what would happen is, the - for example, let's just use Y, okay, of interest to you, okay? You're right, you know, in other scripts that it would not look like a single character but certainly not in the DNS. But when it's at application level, it would.

Does that make sense?

Michael Palage: At the application level or at the visual level to a user?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I think we're talking the same thing there.

Michael Palage: And again, I think the reasons for reserving them are technical reasons due to interface with applications.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Hold on a second. I don't want to talk about whether we should reserve them or not that...

Michael Palage: Yeah, I agree. I agree. I agree.

Chuck Gomes: That's not the subject here. The subject here is, if it's decided to reserve them, what actions, if any, should we take with regard to IDN? So, that's what we're trying to get a handle on.

Michael Palage: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: Now, back to what we are talking about. Ram and Cary, let me, you know. Can you comment a little bit further on this? Are we going down a path that's, in some cases, doable, in other cases, not, like the languages - that single character doesn't have any meaning?

Cary Karp: Oh, let me (unintelligible) the question here. Do you think you can give the reluctance here without libeling - without making yourself vulnerable to a charge of cultural bias that we are doing something for the languages that we understand but not for the others? Are we decided to do something that we realize can't be done in all languages? So, do things on behalf of the global community that will serve that community, but if you ended up being selected on a way that can be repressive this random or discriminatory, you might want to think twice.

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh. Okay, good. Okay.

Ram, you want to add anything?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, this is Tim, if I can get in the queue...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Tim.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'd like to get in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Avri. I've got you down. So, Tim is first. Anybody else?

Sophia Bekele: Sophia.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: I have my statement of interest.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. You submit it and I take it.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay.

Okay, Tim, go ahead.

Timothy Denton: I'm just having trouble understanding what - why the length of the label makes more of an issue. I mean, if we're saying that a label at the second level can be one to X number of characters and then these other reservations, you know, especially these other reservations apply, while we're singling out single-letter names, I mean, even two

letters, I mean, a two-letter, you know, present that being completely reserved to simply because of the ISO 3166.

But in a general sense, you know, a label can be one to X number of characters but these reservations apply. So, why a single character pulls more of an issue?

Cary Karp: Can I just clarify? I don't think it's figured into the discussion this far that may provide some perspective in all of this.

Chuck Gomes: Please do, Cary.

Cary Karp: Okay. It's actually - I would regard it as a genuine security issue. And that is, we are talking about situations where users have to be protected from being deliberately confused using as one of the protector devices ensuring that script are not mixed in a single label.

There are some writing systems, some languages do use multiple scripts and they need to be accommodated. But in any situation where the normal writing practice applied to a language doesn't require the use of more than one script. We are - we got guidelines, we're going to try to make into the protocol, an absolute string that you can only have one script in a label.

If all you have is one character in a label, that protection evaporates. And there are numerous scripts that contain characters that look like Os. There are numerous scripts that contain characters that look like Ls. These things have already been registered, so for somebody to acquire 1 of the 26 ASCII single-letter sTLDs would put them in a

situation of as great vulnerability with this kind of abuse as can be conceived.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Cary.

Man: It's not a matter of somebody who acquires an ASCII would be the abuser, which I think is...

Cary Karp: It would be the automatic (abusee). But after a half a dozen scripts that look like O in .com and goodness how many in cc.

Chuck Gomes: So, I think you're saying that if O or .o is registered, then the owner of .o's users would be confused by the existing O similarities that have already been registered as IDN?

Cary Karp: They would be immediately vulnerable. If someone who already has those other Os is just waiting for the real O to become available, then whoever acquires the real O will be (er) to exactly the kinds of things that were breaking our backs trying to protect users, otherwise, from. So, there's nothing (unintelligible) about on the one hand saying, one script, one label, and also saying, why can't we have a single character string.

Ram Mohan: And, Chuck, may I add to this?

Chuck Gomes: Please, Ram. Go ahead.

Ram Mohan: In some languages, just taking the example of O, there is no lowercase representation of it, but there is an uppercase representation of it, and

they - to the normal user, they look different but they are actually the same, and you would run that issue as well.

Chuck Gomes: Now...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Just give Tim with a follow-up. Do we have that issue now with certain scripts where, you know, there are several - I mean, I just wondered two, but, you know, perhaps, 90% of the script has characters that are look the same as characters in another script.

Cary Karp: Yes. And that's why the IDN guidelines that were revised last year recommend against script mixing for - to resolve precisely that issue.

((Crosstalk))

Man: But, I mean, you could create one just easily without script mixing as you could for a single letter.

Cary Karp: No, because in the DNS, lowercase and uppercase are the same.

Man: So, if I have OOO.com in ASCII, I'm not moving away at risk of OOO we got something from IDN?

Ram Mohan: I don't think I understand the question. The way I'm looking at it is - this is Ram. The way I'm looking at it is, OOO written, say, in the Latin script, you would want to make sure that OOO in Cyrillic, as an example, or in some other script or in this equivalent, that equivalent is actually (blocked) from registration or is tied to this registration

because they looked confused, visually confusing. And I don't understand how that correlates to uppercase or lowercase, which was really my clarification.

Chuck Gomes: One thing I want to remind everybody that the new gTLD Group working on the PDP is dealing with the issue of confusingly similar. So, it's not our task to deal with that in this. It's okay that it comes up, okay? But keep in mind that that's not part of our work task in terms of dealing with confusingly similar so a very important issue and a tough one, okay?

But right now, we need to be able to refine our recommendations with regard to reserved names, and we don't need to go down that path.

Tim, are you okay? Do you still (unintelligible)?

Timothy Denton: Not entirely but I think it's (okay).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And maybe we can talk more of it offline and you can also talk to these guys, you know, via e-mail or whatever.

Avri, I think - and somebody else wanted in the queue. Who was that?

(Alistair): (Alistair).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, (Alistair). Avri is next then Sophia and then (Alistair).

Avri Doria: Okay, hi. Thanks.

Okay. I'm glad you brought up about the confusability rules sort of trumping all this and making some of the stuff that came up just recently not as much an issue. One of the things that I was thinking of is that in terms of what Cary have said about the prejudice of in some things we got in alphabet, and therefore, we say, you can't use it.

And the other one is that, you probably could define it as simply anything that can be defined with a single representation. In other words, there are the code points and there are those. And so, anything that can be defined as a single code point whether it is a letter from an alphabet or it is a specific symbol of some sort from a picture - pictorially represented language, they would be equivalent at that translated level. So, if you wanted to reserve those, now, I'm not actually in favor of reserving them. So - but I just wanted to point out that I think, technically, one could do it if one did it based upon, you know, the code point.

On the other thing of the...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...again, a confusion between something that looks like O in a different script and O in ASCII, again, then I think we're falling in the confusability issue, and once one of them has it, then, you know, the next IDN - I mean, the next TLD wouldn't be able to get it because something that looks like that already had it, and that will - would apply there.

Chuck Gomes: And I want to come back to that one. But before I do, Ram or Cary, do you want to comment on the single code point reservation issue?

Ram Mohan: I would like - this is Ram. I would like to comment on it very quickly. I was cringing when I heard it because I think it works well in certain languages, but in other languages, it's actually impossible to represent even a given alphabet, a single letter of the alphabet with only one code point. And so, in that case, I think we would have a problem.

So, I think that is overconstraining. That definition overconstrains the issue, and it kind of assumes that we actually have a global expertise in many languages. I know for sure that I'm ignorant about most language in the world.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Now, by the way, and, Avri, I want to come back to your second point now and go back to Cary's statement about cultural bias. Now, I apologize, some of you aren't going to like what I'm going to say next, and I'm not advocating one position or another, but I think it's an issue that we need to consider.

If, for example, the requirement for reserving single-character labels was removed and opened up and we had a new round of gTLDs or ASCII before IDN, I think we would be creating some cultural bias. In other words, I think and the Working Group can talk about this later, but I think if, for example, we - there was not a reservation for single-character names in an ASCII round if the ASCII round happened before IDNs were ready, then we would be giving the advantage to those in the ASCII world over those in the IDN world, and I suspect that would be problematic.

Man: But, Chuck, isn't that exactly what we're doing regardless of the number of characters in the TLD?

Avri Doria: Right.

Chuck Gomes: I supposed that's interesting point. I supposed that's true. Yes.

Man: Yeah, like those American lawyers.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Yeah.

Timothy Denton: Chuck, this is Tim.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Tim, were you trying to get in the queue again?

Timothy Denton: I think (Alistair) has something...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. We're going to - Avri, you're done, right? Sophia was next. Did - Tim, did you want back in the queue?

Timothy Denton: Yes, please back in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay. Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Yes, Chuck. I guess I'm not sure if I can post my own opinion because I'm in liaison to...

Chuck Gomes: No, feel free.

Sophia Bekele: Is it free? Okay. Good. We're clarifying that.

The only thing I wanted to, perhaps, caution is on the single-character reservation and I think there are two voices here that what I see is that it's going to get real complex on the translations, again, and I was just wondering if we can feel what - if we should stick to a uniform policy for both the single character and listen to the inputs from the - or leave the confusability, visually confusability issue, which is one of the issues here on the single character as well to the groups that are working on it, so...

Chuck Gomes: That's what I was suggesting, Sophia.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. But having a uniform policy, you know, for both a single character and the other one, so then we would avoid trying to dissect every, you know, every reserved name for every character if we don't apply a uniform policy.

Chuck Gomes: What kind of a uniform policy are you thinking of? I'm not exactly following you.

Sophia Bekele: Well, I guess what I'm trying to say is, we're coming up to the single character, you know, if we're going to reserve the old, you know, and then translate it into the different scripts. We don't know the implication of that. So, we're struggling with that.

And then, the other policy we're trying to have is on names that are, you know, more than single characters, right? So, the uniform policy being why don't we have the same policy on both?

Chuck Gomes: On single characters and other names?

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. I mean, why are we treating them differently when it comes to the, you know, IDN...

Chuck Gomes: Well, here's one reason. Okay? Single characters are now reserved.

Sophia Bekele: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Multiple character names, in general, are not. So, that's one reason why we're - the primary reason we're focusing on those.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah, but the implication is the same, right? In terms of translation. That's what we're saying. The implication is the same given that it's reserved or not.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure that I agree with that. Ram or Cary, you want to comment? Are the implications the same for single characters as they are for multiple character names?

Cary Karp: To the extent that we're talking about the mixed script concept that is applicable when there are more than one character, it is by definition not - there's only one character and I think it's a very important principle. So - and at least on that level is a clear distinction.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. But, technically, right, Cary? Not...

Cary Karp: Oh, in terms of the user vulnerability. Technically, on absolute technical level, all labels in the DNS are stored in ASCII form and a single displayed Unicode character is a minimum of six ASCII characters in its encoded form. So, on an absolute technical level, this is a non-issue.

If the issue is protecting the users of the Internet from a rigid abuse that can be avoided then we probably should spend more time talking about it.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. What I'm saying, it's not that we're not talking about it. How is this one different from the non-reserved one?

Cary Karp: Oh, if what you mean that there should be two sets of policies depending on the extent to which a name is reserved, I agree with you.

Now, I mean, we're talking about basic principles of what opt to appear in the name space regardless of what any given string that might appear on the name space might have additional attributes.

Sophia Bekele: So, do you agree that, you know, we can have - the implication is the same; therefore, we should stick to similar policy in terms of the outcome?

Chuck Gomes: If what you're suggesting, Sophia, that since there aren't reserved names for multiple characters that there shouldn't be for single characters, that would be the same policy.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Okay. And I follow you. Okay.

Sophia Bekele: Okay. And the other one I was trying to say, the guideline I think, Chuck, you say that developing the guidelines for that reserved name in general. I think this would be a good idea even for the whole discussion that we would have. We have to take that guideline for all reserved names and run it by the IDN Working Group that we, you know, we are having every week and see everybody's opinion and induction and suggest an input of, you know, the guidelines that could be because, you know, most of us are saying, we don't have that - the linguistic implication in here, so it would be a good idea to develop a guideline, in my opinion, like you suggested early for the...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Sophia Bekele: ...reserved names.

Chuck Gomes: And of course, that's one of the reasons why we have the experts on, but it's my intent to ask you and Ram both to communicate. In fact, I hope you will communicate even the discussions we're having today to the IDN Working Group. Unfortunately, both Working Groups are expected to finish their tasks before (unintelligible), which means there's going to be very little window, and, you know, probably not time for feedback to be incorporated in our final report. That doesn't mean that feedback can't be provided to the GNSO Council as it takes action on the reports. But, yeah, absolutely, that's fine. In fact, that's what I'm planning.

Sophia Bekele: Yeah. Just a guideline, a formal one put on paper. I think that would be help - that would help you and...

Chuck Gomes: What we'll present, then, as our final report and, in particular, ask them to take a look at the recommendations with regard as it relate to IDN.

Sophia Bekele: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Sophia Bekele: No problem. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: (Alistair).

(Alistair): Thanks, Chuck.

I have a question - or comment. It's sort of (unintelligible) the point you made earlier that it sort of concerns about cultural imperialism of (unintelligible) of a character type. It seems - my understanding is that, in some script, a single character is actually a word and the script I can think of is it was Chinese character. If you think of something like Beijing, that's two characters. So, you could potentially have a character - a single character Bei where it actually might make sense to have it as a TLD. I mean, my understanding is that means, not.

I mean, and - but - and so, I guess the question in my mind is, well, if you're going to have a policy for all single characters, it may actually not make sense when it comes to IDN. So, for example, if we continue the policy on reservation of single characters for ASCII, that may actually not make sense for some IDN script for some language scripts, sorry, as opposed to IDN.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think that's what Ram and Cary were saying, correct?

(Alistair): Well, what about the English words A and I? True.

So, it seems to me there's not a simple answer in short.

Chuck Gomes: Let's make sure what - I want to make sure what's the question.

(Alistair): Well, the question is, I mean, the question is, I don't - I mean, is it - does it make sense if we say there are technical reasons towards a single character in ASCII? It seems to me that that may not automatically flow through to IDN. So, it may actually be...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Alistair): ...acceptable to have single-character labels in IDN.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And let's not get into whether we believe there are technical reasons, but what that - Cary or Ram, do you want to respond to that forgetting the issue of whether or not there are technical reasons for reserving them?

I mean, is it possible that the - that if there is some reason for not doing them in single ASCII characters for, you know, that it may not be the same case in IDN versions?

Cary Karp: It's kind of a hard question to answer. Yes, there are things that we would regard. We Anglified would regard as single characters on a screen that - to someone who that means that - whom that mean something would not be perceived to the single character, and it might

also require several Unicode code points representation. So, here, we actually do get into some semantic fun and games in defining what a single character is.

But can I ask, yet, another question that's intended, hopefully, to reduce the complexity of this discussion, and that's, does anyone on this call actually believe that we can expect to see single-character TLD label whatever the definition is?

Man: Yes...

Edmund Chang: This is Edmund...

Man: ...I think it's quite possible.

Edmund Chang: ...I think it's possible, yeah.

Cary Karp: Okay. Then, we do have this last roll of the stuff. We haven't seen them on the second level. We sanctioned yet, so.

Ram Mohan: Well, they've been out there as IDN...

((Crosstalk))

Cary Karp: On regards to the second level manifestation of single-display characters is a non-issue. I mean, the second level main phase is literally (extend).

Man: Yeah.

Cary Karp: Yeah. But there are still formal constraints on the appearance - in the ASCII, Ram. It's actually one of the situations where the ASCII will certainly is not the favored one.

Chuck Gomes: Now, Ram - excuse me, Cary, so if I can translate what you just said, I think you're saying that the single character issue is much simpler on the second level than it is on the top level. Is that correct?

Cary Karp: I tend to harbor this simplistic belief that the further away from the root you get, the more breathing space you have.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. I just want to make sure I interpreted it right. I think that's helpful information.

Okay. (Alistair), did - I don't know if that answered your question...

(Alistair): Thank you. No, I think I'm fine with that. Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Tim, you wanted to get back in the queue?

Edmund Chang: Edmund...

Timothy Denton: Yeah, Chuck. But I think the conversation displays it. It kind of answered my question or concern. I just wanted to clarify what we were - now, we weren't assuming that the arguments that we've been discussing or the concerns we've been discussing about single letters, single characters at the top level necessarily meant the same policy...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Timothy Denton: ...we need to apply at the second level.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I think that was...

Timothy Denton: And I think that's been answered.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think that was a real good point to clarify.

Okay, Edmund.

Edmund Chang: One thing about reserved names and a couple of words. Does it include people from I guess applying for a single-letter TLD even if we say it's reserved? They just have to justify it, right? Is that correct understanding or are we saying, once it's reserved, it's never, you know, I mean, it's completely - I can't submit the application and it won't be considered at all?

Chuck Gomes: Any - if the council would recommend and the board would adapt a policy with regard to new introduction and new gTLDs that excluded single-character top level domains, then somebody could apply it, well, to say, I wanted to spend the money, but they'd be thrown out very quickly.

Edmund Chang: But we're talking about reserved names in that sense or are we talking about...

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Edmund Chang: ...you know, that reserved - if you have to...

Chuck Gomes: Keep...

Edmund Chang: ...justify it.

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind that reserved names at the top level kind of have a little different meaning in the sense that what we're really saying is, these names are not allowed for top level domains right now. That doesn't mean it couldn't change in the future. But that's a little bit different than saying, .asia can't register second level names that are single character or any TLD for that matter.

Edmund Chang: And I understand. So, we are talking about almost like prohibiting in the top level.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Edmund Chang: Well, I guess in that case, then, it does not make sense to prohibit it for IDN, then, that if it is the case where with a reserved, you'd need additional justification, then I would say, no - it's good to extend this policy to IDN.

Chuck Gomes: Extend what policy?

Edmund Chang: No character...

Chuck Gomes: Oh...

Edmund Chang: ...well, I mean...

Chuck Gomes: ...to have a reservation at the top level, you mean, of single characters?

Edmund Chang: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Okay. Got you.

All right. Let's move on because we're quickly running out of time. We need to get through this.

Now, I'm going to try and simplify this next one. I want to see if Cary and Ram agree with me. For two-character labels, and folks, we're not going to get in to ccTLD issues in this call, the - but it seems to me there are abbreviations and our argument for the IANA and ICANN names apply the same way. Is that a correct conclusion? Cary and Ram.

Cary Karp: I'm not 100% sure. I know which situation to answer. Can you state the question once again, please?

Chuck Gomes: Well, okay, I - Cary, and I didn't make this very clear. I moved on to another category of reserved names, and that...

Cary Karp: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: ...the two-character labels. Okay?

Cary Karp: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: And I guess they're not always abbreviations but - or maybe my question as I do this, but what is your thinking with regard to IDN implications of two-character labels?

Go ahead, Cary.

Cary Karp: Okay. To the extent that we're talking about non-ASCII characters, display characters, I think we're okay. The constraint on the two labels - two-letter labels is that they are in potential conflict with the freedom of the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency to add new two-letter code, and we probably are not in the position where we can override that. But that list is avowedly ASCII and ASCII only. And unless they're willing to open it up for the appearance of Unicode characters, which as I understand ain't going to happen. I see no reason why two non-ASCII character labels can't be made available.

Chuck Gomes: What if the country code registry, so, end up having their IDN versions of their country code top level domain, would that be a problem, then?

Cary Karp: Well, there's a potential nag here. If what we're talking about is some localized equivalent to the cc label, that's fine. If we're talking about transliterating or translating 3166 code, then I suspect the 3166 Maintenance Agency is going to want to have a word in the discussion.

So, ever since the operator can figure out a reasonable argument for being given a local label designating the thing that the cc abbreviation abbreviates that designates more power to him, I would have thought.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Ram. Do have anything to add here? Are you still with us? Did we lose Ram?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I haven't been able to look over at my list because we're moving along here.

Cary Karp: I will be quite certain that Ram has an opinion on this, and I wouldn't bet any money that it's going to be the same with mine.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay. Well, hopefully, we'll get Ram back here.

So, Cary, what - I mean, any suggestions about how to proceed with this category regarding IDNs? You're saying that they might be okay in non-ASCII characters, so we maybe don't need to extend it to non-ASCII names.

Cary Karp: Well, let's make it conditional. If what I - if my basic assumption is true that the reason why two-character ASCII labels are restricted is to avoid potential conflict with coming ISO 3166 letter code. If those codes are ASCII and ASCII only then there is no reason to extend the constraint on the number of characters external to the ASCII realm.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Cary Karp: And you noticed how many types in that sense.

Chuck Gomes: I did.

Cary Karp: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And I couldn't cite that. But we're having this recorded. So, anybody in the Working Group has a question or comments here? Hopefully, the group that's working on those will at least have some...

(Alistair): Chuck, can I be added to the queue?

Chuck Gomes: You can jump right in, (Alistair).

(Alistair): I mean, it seems to me that, actually, some IDN - it would actually nice to see allow two-character labels at the top label from the user's point of view. I mean, the example I gave earlier, Beijing, would be a good example I thought as a two-character term in Chinese. So - and as far as I know, it doesn't have any 3166 caught in the problem.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Alistair): So, my - some presumption would be - should be allowed unless there are issues.

Cary Karp: Can I comment directly on that, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely.

Cary Karp: Okay. One of the things that may be underway is that some cc operators are, in fact, trying to get the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency to consider the addition of two-character designations from non-ASCII script from other scripts. And if they do that, if they succeed, then all of a sudden, the two-character constraint does extend beyond ASCII.

Chuck Gomes: Well, unless there - the corresponding IDN versions are full country names or something like that.

Cary Karp: I would assume that a country's incept would be in a localized designation of that country according to local custom and practice rather than a performance isn't going to be a two-character representation because that's what 3166 happen to be.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So, I wonder if this is one that it would be wise to wait on until we have more information.

Avri Doria: Can I speak? This is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I actually tend to be very much in favor of the first thing you suggested, which is that, you know, we treat them in as abbreviations, and therefore, not worry about them outside of ASCII. I don't think there's any way we can project what might happen if I, so, decided to extend and come up with another set of designation in other scripts. And if we try to guess the number of things that we might have to block off because of what might happen, I think it'd be way too much. So, I think that your first notion of it which is these are abbreviations and their reserved at that a two and beyond that, no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you.

Moving right along, let's go to Second-Level Reservations for Registry Operations, which is simply nic, whois, and www. I think that's done. I mean, that's - Cary, you agree with that? And, (Glenn), let me know if

you see Ram getting back on. I'm finding - I don't have time to flip over to that.

Coordinator: I'll do that.

Cary Karp: (Glenn), when is this call scheduled to end?

Chuck Gomes: In 28 minutes.

Cary Karp: Oh, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Sorry. And we - you should see the agenda we have after you guys leave, which probably most of us going to be postponed. I don't know.

But, Cary, do you agree that, I mean, nic, whois, and www, there's no use going down a path of getting IDN person to those.

Cary Karp: But these things are protocol elements.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Cary Karp: Yeah. And a protocol element is not a word.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Okay. So, I don't think - and somebody correct me if you think I'm wrong but we probably don't need to spend any time on this one, so.

Okay. Let's go on to the - I'm sorry, I'm trying to write myself a note here.

Okay, going down, then, to Geographic and Geopolitical. Now, we're not going to talk - I supposed that if there's any reservation of geographic and geopolitical names, and I don't know whether that will be ever or not, that, certainly, the IDN version of those in the official languages scripts of whether a country is involved should probably be reserved as well. I'll throw that out to you, first of all, Cary, and then see if anybody in the group has comments or questions.

Cary Karp: Okay. Once you have this specific question that I'm being asked to answer?

Chuck Gomes: Well, some agreements, as you know, have reservations regarding - name reservations regarding geographic and geopolitical...

Cary Karp: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...names. And you know that the GAC is, of course...

Cary Karp: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomes: ...for that. The question is, if there are reservations of name in ASCII, the geographic and geopolitical name, is it reasonable to assume that, then, the - at least in the script for which a particular country - that a particular country uses officially, they should be reserved if the A and U form should be reserved as well?

Cary Karp: I would actually invert that to the extent that there is any justification for any such reservation. I would have thought that the local

representations are the ones that are deserving of the greater protection.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a clarification question, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Avri Doria: Cary, does that mean, for example, if we're reserving the ccTLD, they would, for example, would have all the IDN versions of...

Cary Karp: The ccs don't have - the ccs have codes that's political. Those are not names of countries. They may or may not be abbreviations of the English names and countries. So, at this point, that - a segment of the name space that hasn't been populated. And that's geopolitical entities wishing to have TLD labels for themselves. And I would suspect that the most valuable such designation is the one that has the most meaning locally, and that would be up to the community to decide how much beyond that they would like to be protected rather than somehow flattening the names of all the countries and govern them in the world into an ASCII space and then trying to work backwards from there into the local environment.

Avri Doria: Uh-huh.

Cary Karp: I would suspect that this is going to be one of the issues that the GAC CNSO Working Group is likely to focus an attention on, and we might want to refer to their initial thinking before proceeding very much here.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. The - so, back to my question - I understand what you said, Cary, that you think that the local representation is more important than the ASCII. It could be, though, that we end up just like in some agreements today that there are some reservation requirements with regard to the ASCII for those and any in the future that might happen. It seems like it makes sense that the A and U versions of the ASCII should also be reserved. Is that a reasonable...

Cary Karp: By definition, there is no U version of an ASCII anything.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. I meant, the A version.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I comment?

Chuck Gomes: Well, the - I mean, Germany or - is...

Cary Karp: Okay, okay. Then, we have an example of something that's going to the IDN. The local designation to Germany is org/land. It doesn't require any decorative Latin characters. And if the government of Germany, in addition to its cc label .ge feels need for an extensive representation of its name, org/land is likely to be it, I mean, the ge is better used for abbreviation of it. I think actually the ge is blessed almost by being an abbreviation of the local name of the country rather than an Anglify - the English name of the country.

So, the real issue here is not so much what names opt to be permitted, but is the notion of their being two national domains in parallel operations. .ge is the German national domain, .org/land as the German national domain. Is that attainable concept, you know, itself?

But again, I suspect these are prime issues for, yet, to ccNSO consideration.

But if you have - I supposed what you're saying is that, if we are going to protect a name, both in its Anglified, ASCII-fied representation and what we would assume to be the prime local representation if that local representation requires the use of non-ASCII characters, sure, we're going to need to reserve the U label.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And that answers my question.

Cary Karp: Yeah. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. Okay.

Good. Any other questions on this one?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask a quick question?

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: And basically, the question I want to sort of ask is, I understand that we need to wait until we've talked, but I don't know if I understand why we want to anticipate their request in terms of adding more names, basically, taking names out of the gTLD basket and putting them into the ccTLD basket without having had to negotiate that first.

And so, for us to do it unilaterally seems to me, I mean, the decision remains somewhat in the band about the country's name in the

national script, but I don't know that we want to actually decide that in advance of having to.

Chuck Gomes: Well, and of course, our recommendations can approach that exactly like you're saying. So, what we recommend is entirely up to us as a Working Group, so we can actually work a recommendation to accomplish I think what you just said.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Edmund Chang: This is Edmund. Can I...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Edmund.

Edmund Chang: It's actually for the - at least for the second level, the newer contracts that have wording that says, you know, geographical names and all related official languages as well. So, I just want to bring that up to your attention to that - use for the second level of that anticipated already.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Now, because our time is so short, the remaining categories are Names Reserved at the Third Level, Other Names Reserved at the Second Level, which are a bunch of different reservation lists by five or six registries, and then Controversial Names.

So, what I want to do to cover those, and in particular, calling on the people that are working on those categories, have the principles that we've talked about and the input we've received from Cary and Ram

giving you sufficient guidance for you to deal with IDN and your recommendations and reports or are there other specific questions that you would like to ask.

Timothy Denton: Yes, it's Tim Denton here.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Tim.

Timothy Denton: Ram, in relation to ICANN...

Chuck Gomes: I don't know that Ram is still on.

Timothy Denton: Oh, okay. Cary, in relation to ICANN and IANA reserved names, the exception of "example," what, in simple terms, was your recommendation or advice?

Cary Karp: We regard them as integral designators approaching no translations.

Chuck Gomes: Just like your first category, Tim, ICANN names.

Timothy Denton: Without translation, it's just whatever the...

Chuck Gomes: We're not worrying about (Semantic) meaning.

Cary Karp: If you want to get punched in the nose, give the rfc-editor a name and another language.

Timothy Denton: I don't want to fight with the IETF. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Oh, it's fun to fight with the IETF.

Timothy Denton: Oh, Jesus. You never see that (unintelligible) the idea. Okay. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Avri has, I think.

Okay. Any other - anybody else have questions for Cary?

Man: Thank you, Cary.

Timothy Denton: This is Tim...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, thank you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I have one more question if you don't mind. Cary, you mentioned that the general proposition...

Chuck Gomes: Is this Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, I'm sorry. It's Mike Rodenbaugh. That the farther you get away from the root, essentially, the safer you are. I'm just wondering if you can give us a quick description on the technical reason, what were the differences between the top level and the second level, for example...

Cary Karp: There's actually a theological component to the reasoning. And that is, because the essence of the - one of the essentialities of the DNS is this point of administrative delegation. There is no mechanism that makes it possible to propagate policies through all levels of any zone.

And even if there was such a mechanism, there's no reasonable way to release it unless there was some TLD that provided unique name service for all names in it, but there was the single zone as it were. So, because there's no where that I can know what's going on the fourth level and even less possible you'll be knowing what's going on - goes on the fifth level.

At some point, I have to turn off my concern or I don't sleep at night. So, working backwards from that, if I can make note that thinking about this makes no suspense thinking about the fourth level, I can think about the third level. I need to think even more about the second level and my business is thinking about the top level.

Chuck Gomes: Does that help, Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Not tremendously but I'd like to take that offline, Cary. Maybe you and I can...

Cary Karp: Okay. I labeled my initial statement as its simplicity to believe, and if you expect massive objective supporting argumentation for it...

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, no, no...

Cary Karp: ...and as long as it's...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Not massive. Really, just a brief statement of a technical principle would help me to understand...

Cary Karp: Okay. The non-propagatability of policies down to three, that's the basic of the belief.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that makes sense. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody else have a question for Cary?

Timothy Denton: This is Tim.

I just want to thank Cary and, Ram, if you're still listening. I thought it is variable principle. I think it's kind of good.

Cary Karp: Okay, great. Anytime. You're welcome.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Cary.

Cary Karp: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Your release.

Cary Karp: Okay. Thanks. Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

All right. Well, folks, we've got - you know, we're obviously not going to cover our agendas today. But let me tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to skip back, skip pass the reports to cover some things that we all need to be aware of and then talk about how we're going to get

done. I don't - I think the time today was critical for all of us in our report, so I have no problems with the time we spent.

But I want to skip to the timeline in the agenda. We have two scheduled meetings left -- next Thursday, March 8, and Thursday, March 15. In essence, next week, the reports have to be mostly done, 95% done, probably, because we really need, next week, to discuss the recommendations as a group for each of the report and to, you know, see where we got agreement, see where we haven't, so that we can modify that. We have to, on March 15, basically, approve what's going into our final report. So, we can't wait until then to do very much work.

Now, come back to other options for maybe adding a meeting, we'll talk about that in a minute. The deadline, first, to approve the report is March 15. I supposed we could have another meeting on the 16th and submit it that same day. But it's due on the 16th of March. That's the group's final report.

I am - I have already started working on a template and some of the background information so forth of that report, so I'm less concern about actually finalizing the final report than I am about getting the individual reports finalized and Working Group agreement on what our recommendations are. So that going to be our high priority next Thursday. But there's quite a bit we need to do before we can get to that point.

The second thing I wanted to talk about, you know, depending on how much progress we make between now and the 15th of March, you

know, I want to make sure that we have maximum participation on the meeting on the 15th of March.

Right now, it's scheduled for the same time as this meeting, but it will have to end at the end of two hours because there's a GNSO Council Meeting right after that. So, if people think we need more time than two hours, we can move it up an hour and try that. Any thoughts on that?

(Patrick): Chuck, this is (Patrick).

Can I suggest something?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

(Patrick): Would it be possible to have a call between those two days?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm going to come back...

((Crosstalk))

(Patrick): ...Monday the 12th or the 13th...

Chuck Gomes: I'm actually going to come back to that, (Patrick).

(Patrick): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I just kind of wanted to see - people to see kind of the end and then we'll come back to that, so. But, yes, I do want to talk about that.

Now, for - as far as action items, assuming we had gotten through the reports, you know, we're going to have to really be very close to finish product, and they need to be distributed by Wednesday for every one of the groups. It'd be nice if any of them can be submitted sooner. I've submitted the one for the Tag Names. It's probably very close. If not, you know, we took the final format. It's one of the things we were going to talk about today.

But it would be very helpful if we could have gone through each of the reports at least briefly today before our meeting next Thursday, because I really - next Thursday, we really need to be focusing on, primarily, the recommendations, maybe a little bit of time on role if there's any disagreement in role, but the primary thing where we're going to have some controversy, especially in some of the topics, is with regard to the recommendations. They will need to move from straw recommendations into recommendations of the Working Group. And so, that'll probably take our whole call next Thursday.

So now, back to (Patrick's) suggestion, is there - I'm assuming that very few people could continue this call longer. Is that a fault assumption? I mean, is...

(Avri Doria): I can't. I can't.

Chuck Gomes: And so, there are two already.

Man: I couldn't either, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: So, we're seeing - and that doesn't surprise me plus - and I'm asking a lot to go more than two hours, so. So, you kind of lose effectiveness when you make them too long.

So, it seems to me like (Patrick) suggested that we really could use another meeting between now and next Thursday. And so, the question is, this time seems to work about as well as any time, correct me if I'm wrong on that, it doesn't fit everybody's schedule as we know, but it is there - and, (Glenn), if you would help us out in terms of conflicting meetings. Can you tell us - if you can probably look up the master calendar quicker than I can, what - on tomorrow, on Monday through Wednesday next week, what conflicting meetings are there on the GNSO master calendar?

(Glenn): One opening would be next Monday. I'll tell you why. Because we usually have a Whois score, and there are normal Whois score, so that would be quite free, Monday afternoon or Monday...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that would be at the same time?

(Glenn): At the same time I think would work, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Is that beyond...

(Glenn): If it would work for everybody.

Chuck Gomes: I understand that. We'll talk about that in a minute. Is...

(Glenn): And then, we've got a conflicting call on Tuesday. We are not really at the same time, but there is an IDN call on Tuesday, which is much earlier this call. Wednesday will probably be a possibility, too.

Chuck Gomes: And obviously, it'd be better if we can do it sooner rather than later because...

(Glenn): Yes, exactly.

Chuck Gomes: ...we have a little bit of time in between our meetings.

(Glenn): If you'd like, what about putting it on Tuesday at the same time.

Chuck Gomes: Well, you said, Mon...

(Glenn): Oh, no, no, sorry. There is a call at that time already.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and what about tomorrow?

(Glenn): Tomorrow is Friday.

Chuck Gomes: But then, we're working in the people's weekend, so...

(Glenn): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Glenn): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Are there any conflicts tomorrow?

(Glenn): There are non conflicts tomorrow, but Friday, at this time, is a bad time.

Chuck Gomes: It's a bad time? Because...

(Glenn): Yes. I don't think you're going to get - it's not a good time for calls.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So, let's talk about Monday as a group. Is there anybody that can't make this - a call this time on Monday?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, it's Tim.

I'll be in Washington DC at a conference. Obviously, there must be some way I could make this call. It's just that it would be, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Timothy Denton: ...or it can be in another day.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay. Got it.

Other people, who else cannot - has conflicts on Monday at this time?

((Crosstalk))

(John): Chuck, it's (John). I have a conflict.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody else?

So, it sounds like - I suspected any time and day we take we're going to have some conflicts, especially since it wasn't free schedule. But I'm going to - you know, unless I hear more objections. Let's go ahead and schedule a call for Monday, same time, and be the same call-in information. And then, we will finish today's agenda to, hopefully, give the various groups enough time to be able to have a couple of days and before meeting on Thursday.

In the meantime, keep plugging away because it's a short - it's just one week until we really need to have the reports, really 95% complete. If not, a little bit more other than final recommendations. And by next Thursday again, we need everybody to at least have your straw recommendations done.

Now, if you can't reach consensus in your subgroup then please provide alternative recommendations for the full group to consider. Okay? Preferably, we'd like to see things as a group as rich raft consensus in, and then we'll go from there. That doesn't mean we still wouldn't look at alternatives, but that's what I'd like you to shoot for.

Are there any questions on that?

Timothy Denton: Chuck, this is Tim. We're planning on two hours again on Monday, then.

Chuck Gomes: I think we'll meet it, Tim. I'll do my best and make it free, but I think by the time we go through all of the reports - and keep in mind, we're going to do very brief updates, look at the roll and worry about our straw recommendations, talk about what needs to be done in the reports to get them near final, and I don't know if any of you had a

chance to look at the single and two-character name. They obviously got some new things, new information today to add to their work, but the report is looking really good.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Cameron): May I just ask - this is (Cameron). Can I just ask that we do maybe the reports in their first order of normal, and so that some of the reports that usually (unintelligible) can get?

Chuck Gomes: You know, I did that once, reversed them because of reports getting short. I can certainly do that again. I don't have any problems with that although I think I would like, unless there's objections in the group, to reveal what the low-hanging fruit because I think there's a couple at least that we can knock off. Okay? But after that, sure, I'd be more than happy to do that. Okay. I did that once already.

(Cameron): I do remember.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

(Cameron): I do remember that you did. I just want to make sure all that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. You know, it's good - it's a good point. It's a good point.

So, well...

Man: I'm sorry, Chuck. Do you (talk) for everybody to try to get complete straw recommendations in by Monday or...

Chuck Gomes: No. By next Thursday, we need to have those done.

Man: Okay. Good. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, what we're going to do, hopefully, most of you, if not, all of you, have already done what we needed for the meeting on Monday. We're going to finish the agenda. We're going to go through every one of the reports and see where we are - what needs to be done before Thursday, but I'm telling you that - keep in mind, we need the plan to have your straw recommendations done by your subgroup by Thursday.

Man: Right. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

And to the extent possible, if they can be sent - your reports can be sent to the list, you know, into the day, Wednesday, that would help for those who at least get up early and - or different Time Zones could maybe take a glance at them, that's helpful.

Okay? Any other questions?

Thanks everybody. Talk to you on Monday.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END