

TRANSCRIPT

IDN PDP Working Group Call

13 June 2012

Kristina Nordström: From the ccNSO we have Gihan Dias, Hiro Hotta, Vaggelis Segredakis, Chris Disspain and special guest Giovanni Seppia. From ALAC we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. From GNSO we have Lyman Chapin -- oh, sorry, from the Technical Community. And expert on standardization, Jaap Akkerhuis. From Staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom and Naela Sarras.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. And so you're aware -- so everybody knows, this is recorded. But, there will be a transcript available as well for those who have not joined.

Okay. That's the administrative stuff and I'll -- probably this sounds better. Let me take you -- I will not run through the whole document right now. Let me just explain what we've been doing since the -- since a couple of weeks I sent out the confusingly similarity report.

What we've done is updated the policy document as it was to include more process descriptions and the confusingly similarity. I'll just explain, without going through the major changes, but I'll explain where they are. So, it's the introduction itself. I think we clarified this in section three of the document. Now, we've included some open questions; in fact, two. One of them is on the applicability or, if it's still valid, the Lemman (ph) RFC, so -- but that's a question, so that's on the technical criteria. And another question is whether or not to include single-character IDNs as recommended by the JIG, because that's still a pending issue we haven't discussed. So, these are the open questions.

The second major change is on the standard for confusingly similarity and I'll scroll through that part in a minute.

The third one is we made explicit the placeholder for variants as discussed in previous meetings.

Then, in the processes, I've -- or we've included a lot of procedures and processes, a combination from the Fast Track process here as described in the IDNC Working Group with the -- and in the implementation plan and have updated it to reflect some of the experiences over time. The major ones are -- I think we've clarified that the delegation or redelegation of ccTLDs is not part of this overall policy. So, that is according to its own policy and its own processes and procedures, because there appears to be some confusion with the community about this.

A second bit, and I will go there in a minute as well once we've singled out our focus on the confusingly similarity, is we've described the validation processes in more detail; so, in the sense of both the staff and in the independent review. And we've explicitly now included in the overall policy the change withdrawal and termination of the request, which was in the implementation plan, but also included an administrative closure of processes because at some times you just need to close a request.

And finally, in Section 5, so that's the end in the Miscellaneous, we included the verification of the implementation plan just to make explicit that the implementation plan has to go through with -- again, through the ccNSO and the transitional arrangement, so moving from the Fast Track process rules into the overall policy.

So, these are the major changes in this updated document. Are there any questions on this particular before we zoom in into the first major change, that's the confusingly similarity?

No? Then I'll go to confusingly similarity. So, better don't look at the screen because -- that's in Section 3 under Criteria if you're not here and that's on page nine, Confusingly Similarity of IDN ccTLD Strings. And it starts with -- so, Chris, do you want me to read it out and do you want to take the discussion from here on this bit?

Chris Disspain: Sure, Bart, if you want me to. I mean, I'm happy to do that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Hang on a second. I just need to adjust the volume here.

So, page nine of the document -- is it Section I, I think, is Confusingly Similarity of IDN ccTLD Strings. And there is a proposed change or addition, which is highlighted, I think, on the document. It certainly is on mine.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it is.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. And it refers specifically to -- it says, "Confusingly similar strings or two different strings of Unicode characters whose appearance in common fonts in small size for the typical screen resolutions is sufficiently close so that it is probable that a reasonable Internet user who

is unfamiliar with the script would perceive the strings to be the same or confuse one for the other."

That is an addition to the previous version of the document. And as the footnote says, it's based on Unicode Technical Report 36, Section 2, Digital Security Issues. It is an attempt, I think, Bart, it would be fair to say, wouldn't it, an attempt to provide some more guidance, some more color and depth to the -- to what we think is confusingly similar.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. It's -- and it'd say -- it should capture -- that was the attempt, I think, and that's pretty -- and I think very important. It should capture both the -- say the discussion we had until now in this small group regarding confusingly similarity. And so, on the one hand side, the concerns that Lyman expressed on that we need to safeguard and ensure the stability and security and, on the other hand side, some of the concerns from -- and that's one of the reasons why we have Giovanni on the call and Vaggelis, and some of the concerns about clarifying it to the community what is actually meant.

Chris Disspain: So, I guess we need to take questions now, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Chris Disspain: But we don't seem to have any questions (inaudible) --.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Bart, can I comment something?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Vaggelis, of course.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Although I'm quite okay with the addition of these four lines in the document, I would pretty much prefer if we added somewhere there that the Unicode characters that are about to be checked against each other are PVALID in RFC 5892. Because otherwise, we are checking against things that are not in the protocol and they are not something that we should check against because we don't know how the software is interpreting it or how the software is (inaudible) it.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe -- Vaggelis, one question. Isn't that captured in the -- so if you scroll upstairs in the technical requirements?

Vaggelis Segredakis: Yes. But, although in the technical requirements, we say that the string should be selected to be PVALID against RFC 5892. The string that is actually being checked is not the same; is not necessarily the same. It might be letters which are not allowed in the protocol.

Bart Boswinkel: So, yeah, I don't mind adding it, it's only is what is the best place to do it. Is it either in --?

Vaggelis Segredakis: After Unicode characters --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: I would add a comma and say PVALID in RFC 5892.

Bart Boswinkel: PVALID?

Vaggelis Segredakis: PVALID. It's six letters. PVALID.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, in RFC --.

Chris Disspain: Might be helpful -- might be helpful, Vaggelis, if you just send a note to the list, just to confirm that --.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Information and then we can get it sorted out.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Yes, of course. Of course.

Chris Disspain: Thank you.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay.

Lyman Chapin: This is Lyman. It's -- at the moment, the deliberation that's going on in the IAB and the IATF community would make me a little hesitant to explicitly call that out, except by reference to an RFC, because it's possible that things that are not strictly PVALID according to 5492 or -- I'm not sure I got that right -- might be acceptable in an IDNTLD string. I'd certainly want to check that before I just added that clause to the statement.

Bart Boswinkel: Of course. That's a good suggestion, Lyman, so you can check it against the technical --.

Lyman Chapin: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Finding.

Lyman Chapin: I understand what you're trying to do and I agree that it's -- that we need to be careful in how we specify it. But, I'm not certain that these IDN strings will be limited exclusively to strings that are PVALID under those rules. There may be other strings that contain characters that would be acceptable and I would just want to go back and check and make very certain that we weren't sort of restricting the range further than we need to.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay. So, I understand the proposal and you can reply to that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And I see Jaap's hand up as well.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. I mean, I would not specify exactly PVALID because the whole RFC actually is an algorithm how to get to the -- how to get -- how to validate a

proper character and then has big examples. And people might say when it's not in the example, it's not PVALID, but you never know whether it will be PVALID in future or new characters might pop up. I mean, I would be very careful how to refer to the RFC so there's no confusion.

Lyman Chapin: I found the -- Bart, I found the text that currently describes the way in which the DNS stability evaluations will deal with this. It reads, "The IDNA derived property of every character in an IDN label must be protocol valid (PVALID) or contextual rule required (Context J or Context O). A string that contains one or more characters with the property Context J or Context O must be appropriate for the script and associated languages according to unambiguous contextual rules provided by the applicant."

That's in the procedure spec that's going to be used for evaluating IDN new gTLD applications. And I understand and fully support the desire to have harmony between the way in which we're evaluating IDN ccTLDs and the IDN new gTLDs.

Bart Boswinkel: Is that publicly available, Lyman?

Lyman Chapin: It is, yes. I'll make -- I'll find the reference to the place where it's published and send it to you and you can then forward it to the list.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So -- thank you, that will be great. Because going downwards -- before we start -- I'd first close the discussion on this bit because this is more about -- it's in-between the proposal we have to come to a methodology and the standard itself, but I'll explain later on.

Are there any other issues, questions relating to the updated standard as included in this section? No?

So, one of the things that we were proposing, and it is included in this section of the -- yes, here we are, in this section of the comments itself, so it's not part of the policy, is that what we're suggesting is that, as part of the implementation plan, the methodology to assess and the more specific criteria are included and pre-published before the overall policy is becoming effective or becoming operational. Is that a way forward that the working group agrees to? Because it's -- while the experience I think the community had and everybody had with the Fast Track process is this perception of not knowing what is happening with, say, the reviews.

Okay. Then I think that's clear. So, going back to Vaggelis' point, whether to include it in the standard itself or whether we're going to include it in the implementation plan, that's the next step. Because we have made some provisions here and it's -- I will go back -- when I scroll forward all of you will see it, is that the standard, the methodology for review has to develop once we pass the overall policy. And I think this is -- that's more an operational, technical implementation phase than anything else.

So, you're suggesting, Vaggelis, as long as we capture, it could be included in the methodology as well. Is that fine or --?

Vaggelis Segredakis: I was texting the (inaudible) and I (inaudible). Sorry about that. Can you please tell me again?

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at the methodology, this is -- we're talking about the standard itself. What you were suggesting, could that be included in the methodology?

Vaggelis Segredakis: In page 10, let's say?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Don't know.

Bart Boswinkel: Well, we talk -- so, you've got the standard but then there is the review methodology as well, to which Lyman just referred, and that's more the how the panel will look at the string. And once -- if that is publicly available, then the applicant would know what is happening. And I think that was one of the -- that's one of the things that was not clear from the implementation plan.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Of course, it would be helpful and it certainly is a major issue for the applicant to know in advance what is going to happen with a string. However, I would much more prefer it in the highlighted text in page nine.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Vaggelis Segredakis: I (inaudible) to read Lyman's text, the text that Lyman referred to, because I'm really not familiar with it.

Bart Boswinkel: No, but as Lyman said, I'll forward it to the list and then if you can forward what you had suggested to the list as well then we'll have it available in Prague.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Of course.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Okay. Let's -- I want to move forward now, Chris, to the changes in the processes, again --.

Chris Disspain: You (inaudible), Bart. You go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, okay. We are at -- I have to check. Otherwise, I drive you mad. I think I scroll --.

Chris Disspain: Well, you've always done that, so there's no --.

Bart Boswinkel: It's on page 17. Yes, it starts on page 17. So, I'll scroll down to page 17. Here we are.

In -- so, on the first part, what we've done is to provide a general description of the technical and string confusion review; again, just to clarify for base again on the experiences. In -- what we've -- are suggesting, first of all to the group, of course, is I think the -- one the one hand side you've got the technical panel and on the second -- or the technical review and then you have the confusingly similarity review. And this in future will be done at least by two independents, independent review panels.

And secondly, and that's probably -- and that was part of the discussion; this came back under the review of the Fast Track process -- is to have a -- what is currently called the technical or the confusingly similarity review. And then, only under specific circumstances have a final validation review. Again, this is in order to -- yeah, to try to balance all the interests involved, as we said above.

Chris, do you want again to take this from here and explain a bit more of the background?

Chris Disspain: In respect to the additional reviews, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Yeah? Well, it's simply that we think that, in discussion with community generally, we think that the -- there needs to be a technical review and there's no question about that. And we've talked at length to the technical community about the possibility of some kind of appeals mechanism in respect to that. And perfectly -- legitimately, the response has been that it undermines the -- if you've going to review it on a technical basis, then it undermines the validity of the original technical review and that's perfectly understandable. So, the concept is to put in place a second level review that can be called on by the applicant, but it's based on slightly different criteria built around perception.

Now, it needs to be said, does it not, Bart, that at this stage we're still working on gathering the necessary information to see if this is feasible?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yeah. And this again -- I have to --.

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible.)

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Do you want to explain what we're doing?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. But first, at least again say that the current -- the proposal will be -- and this is captured in the document as well, that the current -- or the proposed panel will use the criteria and a similar approach as currently the DNS Stability Panel Review; again, to safeguard as much as possible the -- within -- acknowledging there will be some -- or minimizing the risks of string confusion, etc.

The second step, and this is based on the discussions we had in Costa Rica, and thanks to Giovanni, is that we think that there is a valid point and that's one of the changes in the -- we proposed in the standard itself, that the second panel should more look into the perception of written characters. There is a whole field of research, etc., in how people across scripts perceive written characters and whether they are considered confusingly similar or not and say what the suggestion is. And we still need to do the research, or more in-depth research, and include -- and that's why we suggested as well that the methodology needs to be involved, but this should be, more or less, the role of the second panel.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Exactly. So, I'm not sure whether (inaudible) can answer that, Bart, but whether we'd best just go in -- go to discussion on it if people want to.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I think -- yeah. This is the proposal, so any questions, criticism, etc., please go ahead.

Lyman Chapin: Hi, Bart. It's Lyman.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Lyman.

Lyman Chapin: Hi. First, it's good, but we should point out that separating the technical review of the string from the confusing similarity --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Lyman Chapin: Review, that's our -- that's a feature of the new gTLD program as its set up right now. So, that's a good way to have it. We've already taken the step in the new gTLD reviews of separating those into two different places with two different independent panels. So, that -- I certainly have no objection to that at all.

I think it's probably going to be obvious to the people on this call, yourself included, that I see the addition of a second level review that's extended review as a relatively transparent way to get around the decision of the first panel; which could, of course, obviously take into account all of the concerns about confusing similarity and new research and so forth that you just mentioned.

And it goes back to a statement that's currently in the draft that essentially says that, even if there's a situation in which there is a threat to the security or stability of the DNS, that other considerations, such as whether a community really, really wants that string can essentially override that. And from a technical community standpoint, that's simply a non-starter. Every Internet draft, IAB statement going back to February, everything that's come out has reinforced the -- what's in the most recent Internet draft, the Lemman draft, is referred to as the principle of conservatism, which is don't do something that might break the Internet until you are absolutely certain that it won't.

And I've made this point before. I think that we should not be writing into our specs at this stage in the game provisions for essentially overriding concerns about security and stability on the basis that there's a user community that has a really strong desire to use a particular idea and string and that somehow that should be considered to be equal to, or a balance to, concerns about security and stability. I just -- there's no way I can wrap my brain around that as a good way to proceed. But, again, that's the technical community perspective and I understand from our previous conversations that there are other concerns at work. So, I'll just register that objection and let you proceed.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Lyman, is this in reference to the section on, say -- just to be clear on it, is that in reference to the section on Section I, I think, on confusingly similarity where there is -- where we mentioned the interest needs to be balanced?

Lyman Chapin: I think that's the place. It was on the screen --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Lyman Chapin: A moment ago and I -- you scrolled down. I don't have the --.

Bart Boswinkel: No, but it's -- then I know -- I'll have a look at it and I'll note the objection there because that's -- I think it's only fair.

Lyman Chapin: Yeah. I'll just --.

Unidentified Participant: Hi, Bart. It's -- sorry.

Lyman Chapin: From -- if you look at the draft on the DNSO and code point principles, the principle that I'm talking about is, "The route phone is by definition the one DNSO that must be shared by everybody."

Bart Boswinkel: Yep.

Lyman Chapin: "Therefore, any decision to permit a code point in the route phone should be as conservative as practicable. Doubts should always be resolved in favor of rejecting a code point for inclusion rather than in favor of including it in order to minimize risk."

Chris Disspain: Yep. Sure. I think -- I mean, we need to make a note of it. I think we don't have a problem with that.

Bart Boswinkel: No, no, absolutely not. No, but it's -- that's why we have these conversations, in order to see -- because this is still a draft, if -- whether to improve it and if there is areas to -- for improvement or is there some objection.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Yeah.

Giovanni Seppia: Hi, Bart, it's Giovanni.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Giovanni.

Giovanni Seppia: Can I say something?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Giovanni Seppia: Hi. I fully subscribe what Lyman has just said. And I think that I have went through this monumental document that Bart kindly drafted and I think that what Lyman said should be also contextualized to the IDN Fast Track process in the sense that I think at the time it was launched, I think some challenges were a bit underestimated. And the point that the changes with these two working groups, IDN/PDP working groups, the changes that we are trying to introduce are to better frame the entire process.

And also, would like to understand and also highlight the point that, basically, it is true that we have a technical community and the technical community so far has made statements and evaluations about confusingly similarities. What I would like to point out is that there's a scientific community, Real Scientifica (ph), which is nothing less than the technical community, that they've made studies since the '50s about confusingly similarities. And I think that the changes would -- that we are now talking about, those changes, they would like to take into account this scientific aspect, too.

So, I don't think the intention is to override or to hamper the security of anything, but just to take into consideration something that could even, let's say, add something extra to the entire ICANN framework for IDN ccTLDs in the sense that there could be a more scientific background of certain evaluations, instead of like it happened for the T1, and very public about that instead of receiving a paper that say that a certain thing is rejected following a subjective assessment. And I think "subjective assessment" is a stronger -- is a strong word in the sense that it cannot be accepted, especially when you can have a scientific background.

So, I would say that, again, there's no intention -- this is what I see -- to override anything, there's just intention to refine the process.

Lyman Chapin: Yeah. This is Lyman. I agree with you. What I don't understand is why that intelligence or that additional level of scientific understanding of the issue, why that should not be part of the first review. Why should that only be part of the second review? That sounds to me like something that very much ought to be taken into account by the group that does the first review.

Chris Disspain: Which would mean, Lyman, that we would have to form some kind of hybrid panel, which I have understood was as fairly challenging exercise.

Lyman Chapin: Why a hybrid --

Chris Disspain: Well --.

Lyman Chapin: This sounds like information and understanding of issues and so forth that ought to be incorporated in the work of any panel that's looking at the issue of confusing similarity. It just seems like due diligence. I don't know why you would not do it the first time around.

Chris Disspain: Well, I think that's a good point. We should take that -- Bart, we should take that and --.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible) for us to do that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And I got the -- Vaggelis first and then Jaap. Vaggelis?

Vaggelis Segredakis: Yes. Yes, Bart. First of all, I must say that I agree with Giovanni. It is very interesting to see that there are -- there has been some work in confusability in areas different than DNS. And it should be somehow incorporated in the way the review panel is reviewing the decisions of the first panel, which is mostly DNS oriented. So, that's a comment for that.

And then, I have to add two more comments on two pages that you scrolled down from. Is now the time to do that?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah. Go ahead.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Yeah? If you go to page 15 of the document --.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll scroll up for those --.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Just a minute.

Vaggelis Segredakis: A little bit more.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay. Alright. At the last paragraph, which says classification of input, that --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: ICANN should develop. The very last statement is -- it says that, "This classification must also take into account that significantly interested parties should agree that the selected (inaudible) is the appropriate one and that other stakeholders have some voice in selecting the manager." I don't understand that.

Bart Boswinkel: No, this is -- sorry, this is a quotation from -- thank you for pointing this out. This was the adjustment of the significantly interested parties for this process and, as explained, this should change --.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: To string. Thank you very much.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Thank you for that. And in page 18, -- and I must ask you to go down again.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah

Vaggelis Segredakis: Alright. The second bullet of the page, which is --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: A little bit up -- a little bit more. Okay, now we have it. "In order to ensure consistency of interpretation across the IDN ccTLD election process and new gTLD process, ICANN has suggested to appoint the same panel for the two processes is a standard for (inaudible) and criteria to determine confusability similarly -- the confusingly similarity are the same."

Now, there I have a problem because I know that there are 1,900 applications for gTLDs. And if we say that you must have the same panel or we suggest you have the same panel, then for ccTLD you'll have to wait for three years.

Chris Disspain: So, Vaggelis, that's accepted, but we have a huge issue here which we need to deal with, which is it is inconceivable that you could have two separate panels judging the same criteria with such a high level of non-scientific, if you like, judgment. We will end up with a series of precedents being set across two different panels for the gTLDs and ccTLDs that will effectively cause us to end up being wrapped up in litigation forever.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay. (Inaudible.)

Chris Disspain: People will claim that Panel A is finding as a precedent that indicates that Panel B's findings are wrong.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay. Then, let's --.

Chris Disspain: It's almost impossible for us to deal with it on the basis of two separate panels, I would argue.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Alright. This objection is noted, but my question then is should the ccTLD enjoy some kind of faster track than the gTLDs? Because most of the --.

Chris Disspain: Well, that's an interesting and separate question.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Right.

Chris Disspain: But, I -- but a valid one, nonetheless. But, I would -- purely from a legal point of view, when I'm wearing my lawyer's hat, it is just massively unwise to have a circumstance where we have two totally different independent panels sitting on the same issue. In circumstances where you don't have a binary calculation, you have a -- at least to some extent, the subjective view.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Alright. So (Inaudible) --.

Chris Disspain: I'm not saying that what we have is necessarily a solution (inaudible) --.

Vaggelis Segredakis: But, is it possible for the ccTLDs to have some kind of more speedy way of checking them, because they usually are of necessity to a much bigger audience, maybe.

Chris Disspain: Possibly.

Vaggelis Segredakis: We could put that in quotes.

Chris Disspain: Possible. Let's note that and see if we can find a way --.

Bart Boswinkel: And I'll include that as -- Vaggelis, could you send me a note on that? Say, I've captured this one on the -- but, your concern on, say, the -- with the two panels?

Vaggelis Segredakis: Okay. Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Noted because then we -- so, I'll include that as a note as well.

Yeah, you -- sorry. Vaggelis, you have any more comments or questions?

Vaggelis Segredakis: Maybe later.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Jaap.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I've got a technical question. Lyman, I mean, I noticed that -- did -- the Lyman draft has been expired --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Jaap Akkerhuis: In April. And I'm not sure whether it will continue. What I do know is that this actually -- in preparation in the IAB have a follow-up on this draft. And I'm not sure whether it's published or not, but that might be better. Yeah. So, I'll send you the details and --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, please. Yes, please. That's -- if --. Sorry?

Jaap Akkerhuis: It's always best for them to refer to drafts, especially when they are expired, but --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah.

Jaap Akkerhuis: The IAB is preparing something.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. As you may have noted, it's a -- in the technical criteria, this was one of the two questions that was open, whether it's still valid or not. So - - but, I'm not sure, so -- because it was suggested at a time by Patrick to include it as a reference. But, if there is -- if it's superseded, then please - - yeah, please send your comments.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I'll do that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

Vaggelis, you still have your hand up. Do you still have a question or a comment?

Vaggelis Segredakis: Sorry for that. I'll take the hand down.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. I heard Lyman?

Lyman Chapin: Yes. I -- about a half hour ago, at the beginning of the call, I sent a note to (inaudible) asking him what the status of that document was, so we may know before the call is over.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. No, but at least, say, the intention was -- and probably all noted, the intention is to include such a reference just to make sure that the technical criteria on that -- and I know Patrick suggested it, but I'm not sure about the status. So, that was one of the questions for Patrick and for other people involved in the technical community.

So, any other questions relating to this specific topic on the processes for validation?

No? Then I think I do have one more point for discussion and I need to scroll back. There is still an open question as well that is with regard to the number of characters. I'm almost there. Come on.

As some of you may know, one of the recommendations of the Joint ccNSO/GNSO/IDN Working Group was to -- was its recommendation to include also IDN strings of one character. And I know that this is still pending, the question is whether or not to include the reference or whether or not to, say, allow one character IDN ccTLDs.

Chris Disspain: As part of this policy?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: No. I mean, I (inaudible) --.

Unidentified Participant: That's right.

Chris Disspain: I'll tell you why no, if you'd like.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Because, unless you're going to make a -- unless we're going to make a distinction between scripts that are -- I forget the correct term to graphic scripts, to Japanese, Korean, Chinese, etc., as opposed to alphabetic scripts, specifically Greek and Cyrillic, then we are in grave danger of causing huge confusion and problems. We would need, in my view, to discuss single character ASCII in order to allow single character IDNs, unless we limit them to a different type of script. And if we do that, that's fine, but we need to go through a whole process of discussing how we're going to do that and that's going to slow down the process significantly, in my opinion.

Bart Boswinkel: So, what I could do is include a reference that we -- that the working group is aware of this discussion, but this discussion is still ongoing and say as soon as -- as we did, put in place a placeholder.

Chris Disspain: I'm happy to do that, but I can tell you that the Board won't -- the ICANN Board won't, at this stage, agree to single character IDNs across all scripts. It's too much of a stretch. And we would need to take a serious look at the type of script and the effect that that would have.

Bart Boswinkel: So, this is a point of further clarification in the future, as with the placeholder for barriers.

Chris Disspain: It's effectively providing the ability to register. Just to take an example, dot-epsilon, which would block dot-e, which in the same way that dot-e would block dot-epsilon. And that's just --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Without serious policy development not acceptable.

Bart Boswinkel: No. But, on the other hand, say you do have -- and I don't see this as an issue as a -- under the IDN ccTLD selection process, it still needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of a country or territory.

Chris Disspain: Sure, I accept that. But, even -- it doesn't change the fact that the (inaudible) of actually opening up and allowing single characters is still allowing single characters. And there's a huge -- we can have a huge debate about what is a character.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: And are we referring to Unicode characters, are we referring to character in the script and so on and so forth.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. It's fine. So, I'll put it in a placeholder.

Anybody else on this topic, because it was one of the open questions?

Gihan Dias: This is Gihan. I believe the (inaudible) there is some evidence that there is come country (inaudible) somewhere which has a single character name in some scripts. And we have no evidence whatsoever for that at this point and so, until you have some evidence for that, that we don't really worry about it for ccTLDs.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Then I'll just put it --.

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible.)

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry?

Chris Disspain: That's a very valid point, Gihan. No, he's -- it's actually -- that's a very valid point.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. So, I'll include a reference there as well to that point and say that it will be revisited in time.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, okay. That's all I had on my list. What I'll do is I'll include, say, if -- the comments you have made and the suggestions by e-mail. I'll include it in an updated version and I'll send it prior to Prague. So, hopefully, the working group could finalize it on Thursday because then we have something to really send to the public and -- for public comments, because that still needs to happen.

Chris Disspain: That's the goal, Bart, is to have -- to sign off on the panel meeting -- sorry, the working group meeting on Thursday in Prague?

Bart Boswinkel: Yep.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Bart, can I add a very last comment?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, of course, Vaggelis.

Vaggelis Segredakis: On page 23 on the review (inaudible) for the selection of (inaudible) ccTLD strings --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: A proposed time for the next review is five years. Although it says within five years, it's actually five years (inaudible) drafted.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Vaggelis Segredakis: I feel it's kind of much, let's say. I would propose something like three years maybe.

Chris Disspain: Well, again, Vaggelis, if you'd send a note to the list w can --.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: We can put that in as a five/three for discussion.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay, sounds fine. But, let's get it noted in writing and we can go from there.

Bart Boswinkel: Say -- the reason for not -- for, say, five years was there is now also -- if there is a real need to do it early then it can be done, but there is also this -- the advisory to the Board if there is -- if there are any issues with interpreting the policy. And experience has shown that reviews could take quite some time. The review itself wouldn't take much time but, again, to change it because that's, again, a long and painful process so you don't want to do it too often. So, that was the consideration. But, I'll make it explicit in the comments or in the notes and comments for the next version.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Okay. So, I think -- unless there are any other points, I think we just need to -- Bart, you'll make the necessary changes and --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Chris Disspain: And (inaudible) we'll gather on Thursday in Prague and see if we can sign off on the document for public comment, yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's the --.

Chris Disspain: Excellent.

Bart Boswinkel: Intention.

Chris Disspain: Excellent. Well, I appreciate everybody coming onto the call. I know that those of us that are here are missing the exciting press conference that's currently happening in London to reveal the 1,900 and whatever it is names on the list. My favorite so far has been that there are three or four applications for dot.spot. I'm completely and utterly amazed that anybody would want to apply for dot.spot, but apparently a number of people do.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I also heard dot.sucks.

Chris Disspain: Well, dot-sucks I can understand, Jaap, because --.

Bart Boswinkel: It's only once or twice.

Chris Disspain: But, there are four or five applications for dot.sucks. I can understand that --.

Bart Boswinkel: So there's going to be an auction on dot.sucks.

Chris Disspain: Well, there is an auction on dot-sucks. But what blows me away completely, I have no clue why the dot.spot. Anyway --.

Lyman Chapin: Well, that one might be -- that's one that might be similar to something, but I don't think it'll ever be confusing.

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible.)

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Chris Disspain: I've got to get to bed now. Thank you, everybody.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. Bye-bye.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay.

Vaggelis Segredakis: Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.