TRANSCRIPT

IDN PDP Working Group 1 Call

28 February 2012

Attendees:

Jaap Akkerhuis, Expert on Standardisation
Lyman Chapin, Technical Community
Chris Disspain, .au (Chair)
Avri Doria, GNSO
Manal Ismail, GAC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC
Minjung Park, .kr
Vaggelis Segredakis, .gr

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordström

Apologies:

Hiro Hotta, .jp

Bart Boswinkel:	Let me just get started, so -- because this is -- most of this is -- let me explain what I've done. I've posted, say, the progress report from November 2010 again. It's been stable, and I've included some new observations, which we need to revisit. So I just want to run through quickly what we've done until now and then stop where I've included some additional questions language, and that's for further discussion between now and probably the next face-to-face meeting.
Chris Disspain:	That's fine, but there's not a huge amount of point in having a discussion about it on this call.
Bart Boswinkel:	No, I just want to flag it.
Chris Disspain:	No, I understand that, and that's fine. But if we're dealing with Jaap as an observer and Avri as an observer, and we don't have any ccs on the call, then there's not -- no offense to Jaap or Avri, but there's not a lot to be gained by spending a huge amount of time running through it.
Bart Boswinkel:	Oh, I know. We can do it very quickly. Manal, I see she's in the room --

Chris Disspain:	Who?
(multiple speakers)	
Bart Boswinkel:	Minal.
Chris Disspain:	Hmm, okay.
Bart Boswinkel:	Let me just get started, and I'll stop where necessary.
Chris Disspain:	Go ahead.
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay, so this is, again, a recapping of what we've done, progress to date that -- I'll update this as well as we go on overarching principles --
Chris Disspain:	Which document are you looking at -- the overall overview or the selection criteria?
Bart Boswinkel:	Selection criteria.
Chris Disspain:	Thank you, okay, go ahead.
Bart Boswinkel:	Say, the overriding principles -- if it's -- yes -- if they were good principles they still should remain the same. And I checked, and all of them seem to be still valid. So -- no changes there. Scroll down -- agreed criteria. So there is no changes in this bit. Meaningful representation is still the same -- meaningful representation of the name must be in a designated language of the directory. Based on the discussions in, say, the study group on the use of country names, it appears that the term "designated language" is appropriate. Not using official language is that we had an extensive discussion on this one already in this working group, and it's been validated again in the study group, so no changes there.

A short name -- that's all similar. One string per designated language -- that is probably still a very valid criteria, and note that the variant discussion is still not concluded. So, as we agreed, we push ahead. It must be meet -- abide to all technical criteria, and probably that's a separate discussion with the technical people on the working group. Whether these second GO (ph) criteria are still valid, because there is a reference to a RFC, but that was at drop stage at the time. So that's a separate discussion.

Now we get into the changes and issues of the date, and that's to do with the confusing the similarity. |
Chris Disspain:	So that's Decision I.
Bart Boswinkel:	Sorry?
Chris Disspain:	Decision H and Decision I.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. H is still the confusingly similarity with any combination of two letter -- ASCII call letters that is A through Zed. Maybe that can be improved, and the question is whether they should be formulated as strongly as it is and also in the context of Decision I. And maybe, Chris, you want to take this on where we are right now?
Chris Disspain:	Yes. So -- yes, I will. So -- you'll know that we've had, in the fast track, there have been some issues with applications that have been deemed to be

confusingly similar with existing ASCII two-letter codes, and there are three specific ones. One is the Greek application for Epsilon Lambda, which the panel found was confusingly similar with a number of different two-letter codes -- EA being, perhaps, the main one. There is the Bulgarian application, which, on the face of it, looks very similar to BR, which is, of course, Brazil. And there is also the European Union -- there was a European Union application for two names, two strings. One being Epsilon Upsilon in Greek and the other one being --

(chime)

Chris Disspain:	Hi, who is there?
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Hello, this is Vaggelis. Sorry, I was a little bit delayed.
Chris Disspain:	Hi, Vagellis, how are you?
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Fine, how are you?
Chris Disspain:	Don't worry, you're fine. You've joined at the perfect time, because we're just discussing -- Bart was taking us through the summary policy document, which, if you're in the Adobe room, should be up on the screen for you.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Thank you.
Chris Disspain:	And we're talking about Decision I, which is the string confusion with other TLDs. And I was just explaining that issues have arisen with the Greek application -- the Bulgarian application and the European Union application. And in the case of the European Union applications one was that an EU equivalent in Greek and the other was for an EU equivalent in Cyrillic.
	So -- what's been happening in the background is that Bart and I, together with Patrick and Vaggelis and Lyman and, latterly, Steve Crocker (ph) have been trying to figure out a way through all of this. And in very simple terms, there's a sort of general acceptance that the finding of the variance or the confusingly similar panel in respect to the Bulgarian application is probably correct in the sense that to most people it does seem to be confusing.
	But there is some question over whether the finding in respect to the Greek application for Epsilon Lambda is, in fact, confusing or not. And there are also some issues that were written in respect to the European Union application.
	We put to the ccNSO in -- where were we, Bart?
Bart Boswinkel:	Dakar.
Chris Disspain:	Dakar, thank you. In Dakar, a guideline to instruct the confusingly similar panel that where a name is confusingly similar with itself, it shouldn't be a problem. So in the case of, for example, the Bulgarian application -- sorry -- the European Union application for an EU equivalent in Cyrillic, it was clear that that was confusingly similar with EU in ASCII, and we said that we thought that that was fine and there doesn't seem to be any problem with that.
	But that hasn't solved the larger problem, and the larger problem is that the panel is taking an extremely conservative approach to confusing similarity, and that is driven by the guidelines that they were given by Tina in the blog that she issued to deal with confusing similarity.
	And we're trying to solve that problem, and we've worked very hard to try and solve that problem and have come to the conclusion that rather than messing

about trying to solve the problem in the fast track, the easiest way to try and deal with it is to just move forwards with the full-blown IDN policy, which we're hoping we can get approved relatively quickly. And to include in that policy, a definition of confusing similarity that comes from the document that Dennis Jennings, VIP -- what does that stand for? The --

Bart Boswinkel: Variant Issues Project.

Chris Disspain: The Variant -- thank you very much -- Issues Project -- has come up with in respect to confusingly similar, and that is in this document in a box inserted in Decision I, and it said in this context, "visibly" confusable refers to two different strings of Unicode characters whose appearance in common fonts, in small sizes, at typical screen resolutions is sufficiently close that people easily mistake one for the other.

Now, this is a -- this would be a change to the current methodology that the panel is using -- the current methodology that the panel is using is to start from the principal that everything is confusing. And then ask the question as to whether the current application sufficiently deals with the principle that everything is confusing in order to make it not confusing. And it doesn't provide any guidelines, really, at all to tell the panel how sensible or how much common sense they should use in making that decision.

And we think that the definition used by the VIP, the Variant Issues Project, is actually quite helpful, because it narrows the area of confusion to being common fonts. So it's confusingly similar in a font that is used by a small group of people in the outer regions of Sweden, and that is not the common font. But it's Helvetica or Calibri or et cetera -- that is a common font in smaller sizes, because when you go to upper case, the characters can tend to look completely different from the way that they look in lower case. And, of course, generally speaking, domain names are written in lower case.

And the typical screen resolutions because, again, if you use very large screen resolutions you're going to end up with the same problem is sufficiently close that people easily mistake one for the other.

So, in a nutshell, what we are proposing is to proceed with the IDN PDP -- did someone just join the call?

Minjung Park: (inaudible) Minjung Park.

Chris Disspain: Sorry?

Bart Boswinkel: Minjung.

Kristina Nordström: Minjung Park.

Chris Disspain: Oh, okay.

Kristina Nordström: And Manal is on her way, too.

Chris Disspain: Okay, no problem. So -- what I was saying was we think that we can proceed with making some changes to the current documentation for the full-blown IDN PDP. We can insert this definition of visibly confusable. We can put in a placeholder to allow for the fact that the Variant Issues Project is still ongoing and, therefore, the final understanding of what we do about variants isn't ready yet, and it may well be some time before it is. But we could hopefully find ourselves in the position where in Costa Rica or fairly soon afterwards this working group puts forward its recommendations for the full IDN policy, which

would then be adopted by the ccNSO and would effectively mean that the fast track is at an end and that all new applications or existing applications are dealt with under the terms of the new full-blown policy.

I hope that makes sense. I am conscious that it's a fair bit to take in, and I'm happy to discuss the details with anybody who wants to ask questions.

Somebody else just joined the call. Is that you, Manal?

Kristina Nordström: It should be Manal.

Chris Disspain: Is that you Manal?

Manal Ismail: Yes, yes, I'm on the call now.

Chris Disspain: How are you?

Manal Ismail: I'm fine.

Chris Disspain: Good. I'm not going to go back and explain what I just explained in the last 10 minutes, so my apologies for that.

Bart Boswinkel: Great.

Chris Disspain: Bart, over to you -- or back to you, rather.

Bart Boswinkel: Is what I'll do is I'll summarize the two criteria, because in the next -- I'll send it to the e-mail group -- or to the working group, say "This is what we discussed and what we propose."

Chris Disspain: Okay, so let's be clear where we are. We've got -- yes, I think that's fine. So we've got this call right now, and on this call we don't have any cc representation. We've got Minal from the GAC; we've got Avri from -- I guess, Avri, I'm not sure what hat you're wearing -- GNSO or ALAC, one or the other; we've got Cheryl --

Avri Doria: GNSO.

Chris Disspain: GNSO. We've got Cheryl wearing her ALAC liaison hat; we've got Jaap, who is a sort of independent observer from the technical community; and we've got me and Bart and Kristina. So --

Kristina Nordström: And we have Minjung, too.

Chris Disspain: I apologize, I apologize. So what we do not have is a quorum or, for that matter, enough cc representation to actually do anything. But -- Bart, if you can put an e-mail together explaining our intentions in respect to pushing this PDP forward to finalization with the addition of the visibly confused -- I'm sorry, Vaggelis is on the call, too. I humbly apologize. With the addition of this visibly confusable definition -- do we have a scheduled session on this in Costa Rica?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we do.

Chris Disspain: When is that?

Bart Boswinkel: So this is with regard to the overall criteria.

Chris Disspain: And when is that?

Bart Boswinkel: This is on Tuesday afternoon, late in the afternoon.

Chris Disspain:	Well, I'm fairly sure that I'll be able to do that. So that's good.
Bart Boswinkel:	Otherwise -- and we'll see what happens. This is one of the discussion points for the list, so I'll make a separate e-mail for this one. Let me take you through, seeing there are no further changes in this document. The only question I had for myself -- so this is Decision G -- is just a change of position with regard to the technical criteria. I'll do that in a separate e-mail as well. Kristina, would you change the documents, please?
Kristina Nordstrom:	Yes.
Bart Boswinkel:	So we're now in the other document, Chris -- the overall process for the selection.
Chris Disspain:	Okay.
Bart Boswinkel:	Little change with one exception -- two exceptions, actually. It has to do with -- there we are -- required endorsement support for selected string. What I propose is some of you may be aware of it -- there is a ccNSO framework of interpretation working group, and it came up with a definition of the significantly interested parties. This includes government and other parties, and it is an interpretation of RFC5091 and the GAC principals. And that will be proposed for a delegation - redelegation of ccTLDs.

As some of you will recall, the whole IDN fast track and the overall policy is more or less based upon the, say, delegation, redelegation processes for ccTLDs. And so what I suggest, and this is the first change, is start to include language from the framework of interpretation because it provides clarity, which was unclear under the, say, the fast track itself -- what is the role of the significant -- the interested parties? What type of documentation, et cetera. So that's one change. Any questions on this one? |
Chris Disspain:	Well, I have a question about it, which is -- I accept what you're saying, but until such time as the decisions -- sorry -- as the recommendations of the framework of interpretation working group adopted, are we not jumping the gun slightly to put those in? I mean, it's clear, isn't it, that the IDN -- sorry -- it's likely, isn't it, that the IDN PDP will be adopted prior to that?
Bart Boswinkel:	Hopefully, yes.
Chris Disspain:	So wouldn't we be better to say that the policy should be enhanced by any decisions made in respect to the framework of interpretation rather than actually being specific about it?
Bart Boswinkel:	That's an alternative as well. But --
Chris Disspain:	I'm just slightly concerned that we don't jump the gun and start inserting in one policy, specifically, in respect to IDNs, the series of requirements in respect to delegation, which haven't yet been adopted in respect to delegations in ASCII or -- ?
Bart Boswinkel:	I've changed that -- it's very easily changed because this was just -- I've inserted it so everybody is aware this is happening, and this was, as you may recall, one of the -- that say I started these fast track review. This was one of the concerns that it was unclear what the role is of, say, the local Internet community; how it should be defined, et cetera.

Chris Disspain:	Yes, bluntly, the concern was that there were applications for IDNs under the fast track from government-sponsored registries that had no evidence at all of any local Internet community buy-in or significantly interested party buy-ins. And the Board was concerned that that wasn't provided, on the one hand. But on the other hand, acknowledged that in the particular jurisdictions that the fast track applications were made in. For many of those, the concept of even going out to the public or going out to local Internet community for endorsement was just something that they didn't even feature in their way of looking at these things.

The best example I can give you is that United Arab Emirates where the response was, well, but the prince says that this is what we should have and, therefore, this is what we should have, and that's how we work. Which is a perfectly valid response. It might not necessarily fit with everyone's model, but it certainly fits with their model. That's how the concern arise, wasn't it? |
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, I accept this, but it also was made clear, say, by some of the applicants themselves that, say, the process itself wasn't clearly defined (audio break) criteria.
Chris Disspain:	And I agree with that. I mean, that's true. I mean, Manal raised that point on a number of occasions. And that's absolutely true. My concern is simply that we don't, as I said, I don't want us to be jumping the gun here.
Bart Boswinkel:	I'll amend it, but this was just to raise awareness of this is happening.
Chris Disspain:	No, I think that's absolutely fine.
Bart Boswinkel:	To say there is already this note. Yes? And if you look carefully, and this is what I'll do over the next couple of days -- I will start inserting language from the fast track process as well and update it, and we'll send it to the group.

Now, the second main issue is -- deals with a decision point found in these documents, review for potentials in confusion of -- there are two main issues here. One is how they should relate to the confusingly similarity process for the new gTLDs. If there should be a relation. That's one question I have, say, from maintaining these documents.

And the second one, and this became clear, as well, from the reviews and from the discussions Chris refers to is -- whether there is a need to include the possibility to suit clarification or petition against finding of a DNS stability panel.

Under the fast track process, it is not possible. And I say some people and especially, for instance, by (inaudible) and others with some experience of the fast track process consider this a lack in the process itself. |
Chris Disspain:	As opposed to an ALAC.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Ha-ha.
Chris Disspain:	Ha-ha. Okay, but there are two points there. The first one is in respect to -- and you've got it here in this document, Decision 10 -- how should review of potential string confusion -- how should this relate to confusing similarity in the gTLD process?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes.

Chris Disspain:	The current situation, as I understand it, is that we could, if we're not careful, end up with one, let us say, with a different panel dealing with the same issue in the gTLD process to our panel in the ccTLD process, which, frankly, is a recipe for disaster because you could end up with a situation where a panel in the ccTLD process finds that something is confusingly similar but the different panel in the gTLD process finds there is not. And that's ludicrous, and I have had a conversation with Elise Garrick (ph) who agrees with me that that is ludicrous, and it is on the agenda for discussion with the new gTLD team in Costa Rica to ensure that, effectively -- or try to ensure that the same group of people, the same panel, is dealing with the same topics or the same decisions, whether it be an application for a new gTLD or an application for an IDN ccTLD because otherwise it becomes a nonsense.

So we need to flag that it's not an issue for our policy document, but it's a logistic issue that we need to sort out. |
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, and similar, say, adding to this is whether there has to be the same criteria. Currently, they do, but if we start changing it based on the experience, yes, you could have the same panel dealing with two criteria, and will (inaudible) a mess as well.
Chris Disspain:	Well, I agree, but I think the Variant Issues Project basically trumps everything. I mean, if the Variant Issues Project says this is how you should look at confusing similarity, and there is general acceptance of that, then that seems to me to trump pretty much everything else, because they need to look at that, anyway, and we have to work through that.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Yes, but if I may say something --
Chris Disspain:	Yes, Vaggelis.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Actually, the VIP (inaudible) have come to a definite conclusion how it should deal with the visual similarities, especially in Greek and Latin and Cyrillic.
Chris Disspain:	But they do have a definition of that?
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Mm-hmm, I think so.
Chris Disspain:	They do have a proposed definition, which is what we're proposing to include in our documentation, which is the thing about commonly used fonts in -- and standard resolution.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	I think that's a very good resolution.
Chris Disspain:	Yes. It makes sense to me -- it makes sense to both that I've spoken to about it, and I think it would be -- whether it solves the Greek problem or not is a different issue. It may or it may not, but the point is that just from a sort of over-arching viewpoint, it makes sense. And so, therefore, it's something I think we should adopt.

Oh, someone said the (inaudible) is to wait again and not finalize the idea in PDP and wait for more information from the VIP, the Variant Issues Project. But, frankly, we really do need to tie the fast track up as quickly as we can and get on with the full-blown policy because that's safer and much easier (telephone rings).

Bart, in respect to the (telephone rings) -- (inaudible) mechanism -- |
| Bart Boswinkel: | Yes? |

Chris Disspain:	Do you think we could (telephone rings) get away with --
Bart Boswinkel:	Someone calling. I have to wait.
Chris Disspain:	(telephone rings) Okay.
Bart Boswinkel:	It's always my daughter. She always calls at --
Chris Disspain:	Of course, it is.

(telephone rings)

That's fine. Is that being actually at Bart's house, as we speak.

Bart Boswinkel:	Actually, she hung up.
Chris Disspain:	Good! Excellent news. On the repeals mechanism, do you think it's feasible for us to say in the policy that we are considering the possibility of a review mechanism for decisions of the confusing similarity panel, and that that can be dealt with in a separate document in a separate policy? Or otherwise it's going to be three or four or five months before we get that sorted out, in my view.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. Of course, you can say, but what you gain by it is that you can leave it as a matter of implementation as well. That you say, as a high-level principle, that you -- it needs -- that it is advised to include it.
Chris Disspain:	Yes, the problem is if we leave it to implementation, we're going to end up in the same -- we could end up in the same mess we're in now because we don't have any control over implementation.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, that's the reason for -- that's always the trade-off. That's why we haven't pushed the decisions on sub-processes. It's somewhere between implementation and policy.
Chris Disspain:	Well, what about if we -- all right, what about if we said -- what about if we sign up on the IDN policy, and say in the policy that the ccNSO believes that there should be a review mechanism to allow applicants to have decisions of the variant -- sorry -- the decisions of the confusing similarity panel were reviewed, and that the IDN PDP working group should remain constituted to work closely with staff on the implementation of that policy.
Bart Boswinkel:	You could divide it up but -- again, probably --
Chris Disspain:	Hang on, hang on, Bart. Vaggelis?
Vaggelis Segredakis:	If I can say something -- I think that the last paragraph in Decision 10, (inaudible) the fast track process blah blah blah paragraph -- it's necessary, of course, but it should say something because as it is in there, it says that there were some problems, and that's all. We should say something like there were some problems, and we are proposing this one -- this thing to happen as a solution.
Chris Disspain:	Yes, but I agree with you, Vaggelis. The question is how much detail we need to go into. If we try and write -- if we try to write the review panel into this particular policy, my guess is that that will take us at least three months.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Okay, so if we want to move the document forward, then we should take it outside, like you said.

Chris Disspain:	Exactly. If we write there should be a review mechanism and the working group should continue to exist in order to work with staff to come up with an implementation plan, which would be subject to the approval of the ccNSO, then I think we can sign off on the policy more quickly and have the review mechanism in place as soon as it's ready rather than delaying signing up on the policy. That's kind of the way forward, I think. As long as we're not giving it to staff to do on their own, I think we still maintain enough control over it to ensure that we end up with something that we're comfortable with.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Chris, Avri's got a hand up in the room (inaudible).
(multiple speakers)	
Chris Disspain:	Avri, I'm not in the room, so I apologize --
Avri Doria:	I just put it up, so -- but thank you it's Avri. I think the last part from the observer recommendation point of view -- I think the last part of what you said and the ccNSO gets to approve it is critical to this. We've tried before in other environments, yes, we'll leave the implementation open, and then work with the staff and hope that that all comes out right, and that path I advise against. So making it that it absolutely must be agreed by you all after that, it will possibly make it work. No one I know has tried that one yet. That's at least a possibility. And, you know, thanks.
Chris Disspain:	Thanks, Avri. I think that's right, and as I say, I think the alternative is that we delay again, and I'm just not comfortable doing that. We need to push this forward so that it's set in stone rather than -- the policy, rather, is set in stone rather than writing on the fast track.

But you and I can work on some words over the next few days to finalize, don't you think? |
Bart Boswinkel:	I think the main point is it's clear that there should be included some language about it. That's why I've included it for this discussion and, again, I'll summarize this and send it to the e-mail list.
Chris Disspain:	Okay. Now, Bart, if we're going to have a full-blown session with the ccNSO on Tuesday afternoon in Costa Rica, what do you think the chances are of having this working group meet beforehand. Is that feasible?
Bart Boswinkel:	I can always say it's not a question -- Kristina, do you think we still have room to do it? Kristina is scheduling the meetings.
Kristina Nordström:	Sorry, can you repeat -- do we still have room for what?
Bart Boswinkel:	To meet before Tuesday as a working group -- so an additional meeting.
Kristina Nordström:	Oh, well, I have to look into that (inaudible).
Chris Disspain:	Kristina, the -- it would be fantastic if we could. It could be Sunday or even Monday. I can provide, assuming that I have a suite, which I think I probably do, but I'm not 100 percent certain, but assuming I do, I can provide the venue without us needing to book a room.
Kristina Nordström:	Yes, because that wouldn't be possible for me to do at this point.
Chris Disspain:	Why don't you assume, for the moment. So can I ask you to do me a favor -- can you send a note to Diane copying me and copy Bart and say that Chris would like to have a meeting of the IDN PDP working group at some time on Sunday or

	Monday -- whatever -- and he's not sure whether he actually has a suite booked or not. If he does, could you confirm that?
Kristina Nordström:	Yes, I can confirm the note.
Chris Disspain:	She can confirm that, and if she does confirm it, then there's not that many of us. I wonder if it's reasonably comfortable, we'll be able to have a meeting. It's not going to be a particularly long meeting. And then as soon as I've gotten me schedule, which will be in the next day or so, I'll be able to tell you when it can be done.
Kristina Nordström:	Okay. It will probably be Sunday morning or Monday morning around 9. Which would you prefer?
Chris Disspain:	I don't know yet, to be honest. Let me -- let me -- actually, you know what? Let me talk to Diane. I've got to speak to Diane tomorrow morning, anyway. So let me do it all. I'll fix it, and I'll get back to you both.
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay.
Chris Disspain:	It will be easier that way.
Kristina Nordström:	So from 10:00 Sunday and Monday will be very busy, so if it can be before that, that's great.
Chris Disspain:	Yes, but I mean we'll just -- we'll fit it in when we need to fit it in. I understand. We don't need support, we just need to get as many of the CCs in the room as possible, so that we can push this forward. I don't want to be talking to this document in the CC NSO meeting on Tuesday without having some time with the working group beforehand. Okay?
Kristina Nordström:	Do you still want the working group meeting on Thursday, or do you want to replace it?
(multiple speakers)	
Kristina Nordström:	Sorry?
Bart Boswinkel:	We can always cancel it. Just leave it as it is.
Kristina Nordström:	Okay.
Chris Disspain:	Okay. So, Bart, you and I need to work on an e-mail to go out to the working group in the next few days, yes?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes.
Chris Disspain:	Okay, well, I'll be in Brussels on Thursday afternoon, your time.
Bart Boswinkel:	Oh, that's nice.
Chris Disspain:	I'm not sure, but I'm not sure I'd go that far, but anyway.
Bart Boswinkel:	The weather (inaudible).
Chris Disspain:	From about 10:00 Thursday morning, your time, I'll be on London and on the train. So we can talk then and get something sorted out, all right?
Bart Boswinkel:	Very well.

Chris Disspain:	Okay.
Bart Boswinkel:	And what I'll do is I'll fill in the day, because there are a lot of blanks over the next couple of days. I'll complete this document and send it out to the -- as a full document and then summarize what e-mails -- the points for discussion.
Chris Disspain:	Well, yes, but sending it out as it is without an explanation is not going to be very helpful.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, I know.
Chris Disspain:	So let's do an e-mail -- at least do an e-mail explaining it.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes.
Chris Disspain:	Okay.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Can I ask for a clarification (inaudible). Is it possible? Bart, where you say Decision 1 in confusion with other TLDs, in this context, visually confusable first are two different things of Unicode characters in common fonts in small sizes. These small sizes is like small characters or is it size -- like size?
Bart Boswinkel:	We need to check with the Variant Issue Project, and I think you were part of it.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Yes.
Bart Boswinkel:	So you --
Chris Disspain:	What does that mean, Vaggelis? It's their wording.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Sorry?
Chris Disspain:	It's a Variant Issue Project's wording.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Oh, okay.
Chris Disspain:	So if you could go back and get clarification, I would be quite comfortable to say in lower case.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	In lower case, okay.
Chris Disspain:	That's not what it currently says.
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Yes. Okay, I'll clarify that.
Chris Disspain:	If you can go back and clarify that. But personally I would be quite comfortable to say "in lower case."
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Okay.
(multiple speakers)	
Vaggelis Segredakis:	Mm-hmm, I know. Thank you.
Chris Disspain:	Okay. Are we done, Bart?
Bart Boswinkel:	I'm done.

Chris Disspain: Well, congratulations.

Bart Boswinkel: So are you.

Chris Disspain: I think so.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you all and see you online.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Chris Disspain: Any other questions or comments? Cool. Thanks, everybody.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Safe travels.

Unidentified Speaker: Bye.