

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes on Tuesday, 21 February 2017 at 20:00 UTC.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_vLPDAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=df2LISIZOs9zdVILaqSPUC8gEYIJeOcUohBNBou2\\_k&s=CQ-9WVCMuc-3Ac3E2TopHy6r\\_HOU3Qloa9znfQ8r9ck&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_vLPDAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=df2LISIZOs9zdVILaqSPUC8gEYIJeOcUohBNBou2_k&s=CQ-9WVCMuc-3Ac3E2TopHy6r_HOU3Qloa9znfQ8r9ck&e=)

Terri Agnew:everyone can scroll themselves

Rubens Kuhl:Me

Gg Levine (NABP):Yes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yes

Rudy Mendoza:+1

Rubens Kuhl:Full reading in the WG is my opinion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and I am ok with full read in Mondays call

Rubens Kuhl:In the plenary session.

Terri Agnew:finding echo

Rubens Kuhl:There is a general feeling among applicants about SWORD not being useful or representative.

Karen Day:did we lose steve?

Rubens Kuhl:I'm hearing Steve...

Jeff Neuman:i hear you through adobe

Kevin Kreuser:hear you fine

Karen Day:sorry must have been me I'll try to come back in

Terri Agnew:@Steve, I am able to hear you as well. Karen please let me know if a dial out is needed

Karen Day:I'm back sorry for the interruption.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):and online shopping in Japanese

Jeff Neuman:I would like to go back to string similarity review after review of these slides

Rubens Kuhl:The cases with no responses could be the applicants agreeing to being placed in the contention set. .KID and .KIDS were like this, where all 3 applicants agreed so they preferred to not pay to respond and accept all as a single contention set.

Jeff Neuman:Here is the standard for string similarity review: Standard for String Confusion – String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For the likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):+1 to Rubens

Jeff Neuman:Karen?

Karen Day:still haveing issues. sorry. Jeff go ahead

Terri Agnew:@Karen, let me know if a dial out would be helpful. I see your mic is active and unmuted

Terri Agnew:Karen is now on a telephone connection

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):I was part of the RySG team that developed the recommendation Jeff is describing.

Trang Nguyen:@jeff, so essentially the recommendation is to expand string similarity review to encompass meaning as well (new vs. news)?

Karen Day:sounds like I still have no audio

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):@Trang: No.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):New/News was not a good example.

Karen Day:my sincere apologies everyone, but it seems my company is experiencing a VOIP outage now.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):yes

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):or, cake and cakes (as used in the doc)

Jon Nevett:.child and .children too?

Jon Nevett:how about ING?

Rubens Kuhl:.cool x .kühl ?

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):not covered

Jon Nevett:conduct and conducting?

Jon Nevett:should we expand?

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):@Jon: Up to this group. RySG sub team decided not to go beyond singular and plural

Jon Nevett:right -- think and thinking is no more or less confusing than child and children

Jeff Neuman:potentially.....but what about .book and .booking? There are more examples where adding an ing is not necessarily confusing

Jeff Neuman:As long as there is a short appeals process for someone to challenge the string similarity review as well, I think we are covered

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):@Rubens: My recollection from the RySG subteam discussion was that we didn't want to cross languages/scripts because of the potential disadvantage to IDNs.

Jeff Neuman:@Kristina - correct

Rubens Kuhl:Most phishing activity does not require support from the TLD. Unfortunately firstbank.tk is as effective as first.bank. Hopefully that might change in the future, but the current situation of phishing is not much affected by TLD.

Terri Agnew:@Jeff, your mic is not active at this time

avri doria:when we say we don't support plurals, do we mean they go into a contention set? someone may prefer the plural.

Terri Agnew:@jeff, it is now active

Rubens Kuhl:@Avri, I believe it would be contention set if similar to applicant, denied if similar to existent TLD.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):@Avri: Yes, they go into a contention set

avri doria:ot it. just checking. the phrase don't accept threw me

Jon Nevett:but new and news ok

Rubens Kuhl:.campus x .campi

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):@Alan: Yes, that's why we referenced using a dictionary to determine the plural

Jon Nevett:forum and fora would be in the same set

avri doria:does the rule apply across all languages?

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO 2:In Norwegian it is another way - adding "en" for singular and "ene" for plural. But I suppose not many Norwegian years will be applied for

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):i can answer this . . .

avri doria:both inter-language and intra-language

Rubens Kuhl:Stras, Stras-se

avri doria:ok only intra-language

avri doria:any language for which there is a dictionary?

Greg Shatan:Was cross-language but not cross script considered?

Greg Shatan:That would avoid the IDN issue.

Rubens Kuhl:@Avri, I think languages without written form is already excluded from the domain name system. Like Tupi-Guarani.

Rubens Kuhl:(are)

avri doria:just lookiing for a generalizable rule

Jeff Neuman:i think we should defer

Jeff Neuman:until next call

Terri Agnew:next call: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes will take place on Tuesday, 07 March 2017 at 15:00 UTC.

Jeff Neuman:I think we should also spend some time next time on String confusion objections as well since we only hit similarity

Jeff Neuman:There were 2 other recommendations

Terri Agnew:@Karen, apology is noted for 07 March call

Jeff Neuman:good call!

Robin Gross:Thanks Karen and all. Bye!

avri doria:bye, thanks