ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 13 June 2018 at 05:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-13jun18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p6qgi78gry3/

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/MycFBQ

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Operator: The recordings have now started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5, Geographic Names at Top Level taking place on the 13th of June, 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now?

Hearing no one, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription and recording purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to our co-leader, Martin Sutton. Please begin.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Terri and welcome, everybody to the Work Track 5 call. I'm just noticing the countdown time as it's been introduced and I missed the last

week's call so it looks as we have a random number so depends when you turn up as to how many minutes you get. But at the moment I think it's – it may stick on 2.

So we have sent out the agenda, the agenda that we're going to work through today will focus on capital city names, and it should be then followed by more discussion on non-capital cities. We will, towards the end just cover off the ICANN 62 planning, which is coming up fairly quickly at a pace and so we'd like to cover that as well before opening to any other business.

So before I go any further, does anybody have any additions that they – or concerns with the agenda for today? Hearing none, so I'm not sure how exciting the week it has been for everybody but if anybody's got any changes to their statement of interest please come forward now. Quiet week then. Thank you very much. Let's move on then.

So don't know if we can switch the screen to the document that we've been working on? So I hope everybody's had an opportunity to read through the working document. I know it was referred to on the last call but it is important that you take the opportunity to read through and ensure that it captures the essence of the positions and statements that have been put forward by various members of the working track.

This, today, will be a focus of our attention to run through, as I say, the capital city names and non-capital cities. This isn't to regurgitate statements so let's be conscious of the time that we have available to us today to actually start looking at the mixture of comments that we have and work our way through to see if there is any improvements that we think could then be made on the basis of the mixture of statements put forward.

So if we move to Page 22, and I think you have – yes, you should have your own control of the document on screen. It does – it is rather small so if you have the opportunity to open the document at the link we sent with the

agenda, you may find it easier to refer to that or the attachment that was sent around with the email should you not be accessing Adobe Connect.

So if we move to Page 22, okay, so the reason we wanted to revert back to capital cities is that throughout our process of going through the different categories that were contained within the 2012 Guidebook, there was – we worked through the capital cities but it tended to merge in very quickly with the broader discussions about non-capital cities.

So we'd like to take this opportunity just to revisit capital cities just to see if we can at least judge where we stand with that particular category before we start going into the non-capital cities which has generated, as you can see from the document, numerous aspects and positions from the audience.

So on – if I could kick this off then. With capital cities, I'm not going to read the excerpt from the – but in essence capital cities were restricted somewhat because they did require a letter of support or non-objection. I think generally there is merit raised in the way that the downsides included trying to find the appropriate authority to obtain the letter of approval or non-objection. So what we would like to do today is just to see if there is convergence towards a treatment of capital cities for the future.

Does anyone – based on what we've discussed within the Work Track 5 and what we have collated within the working document, have any need to – or strong impression that we should change the treatments going forward for capital cities? I'll leave that open now to you and please put your hand up and we can start the conversation.

Liz Williams: Martin, it's Liz Williams speaking. I'm sorry, I'm not able to get onto Adobe Connect at the moment but I just wondered if we could – if I could put my hand up when you're ready please?

Martin Sutton: Your hand is ready and waiting, you can go first. Thanks.

Liz Williams: Wooh, wooh. So first of all I'm having terrible trouble getting to Adobe Connect and it wants to keep asking me to download more software and get more permission so maybe there's a technical problem today or more likely it's my problem. So I wonder, Martin, I sense that there was a ongoing frustration on the list about the treatment of the city names and capital city names in particular.

I just wondered whether we should split this question into two forms? I thought, and perhaps I'm wrong, that the treatment of capital cities was fairly stable and perhaps we could move on from that. But in terms of other geographic identifiers I needed to go back to a threshold question that I proposed to Alexander the other day, and not only to Alexander but to others, about why we would need any other kind of separate treatment from any other geographic identifiers that was not a capital city or a UNESCO region or a two-letter code that was on an ISO-3166 list?

And I think I've really missed the point really because we have to ask why we would change anything especially given the – and add additional criteria in especially given the problems that we run into of competing rights and competing protections.

And I just want to throw that open to a discussion I hope, because I'm just not clear about the purpose of expanding those protections or no protections. And I think we really need to answer that question separate from capital city names.

Martin Sutton: Okay thank you, Liz. And I think that's why we wanted to separate this out today is so that we can put this one into – you know how we treated the first few categories, we've put a proposal out and there was general feel that those could remain as they are so that was the two characters, country codes, three character codes and short long form country names.

So similarly we'd like to make sure that we can do this for the capital cities so the question that you've posed is absolutely right for the next section, that's why we split this out.

What I want to do, if we can, is – possibly as quickly as possible is to see whether there is any objection with at least putting that proposal down properly now for the work track so that capital cities can be parked, if you like, and we then focus more dramatically on the non-capital cities, which has generated a lot of discussion.

Liz Williams: So, Martin, it's Liz again. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Martin, but I think we need to be really careful about even using the word "city" because capital cities are well known and Jorge has made very specific inputs on subsidiarity and identifying identification of capital cities and what they actually mean to nation states.

But I think that we should not be talking about cities; I think we should just say geographic identifiers that relate to places where people live because cities then get – the notion of city gets us into how big, how small, where is it, what are we going to do with it, how do we – how do we address it, what do we take as a marker, how do we measure it, and that just gets into all hell of a mess.

When in reality we have to go back a step and ask the question about beyond capital cities, why would we wish to have any threshold additional criteria that an applicant would need to meet when they wish to apply for a geographic identifier that may be from a tiny town called (Dennes) with 2500 people in it, that's my hometown, to city like Bangalore, which has millions and millions and millions of people in it, but it isn't the capital city. So I really wanted to come back to that…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: So if we can – yes, let's – if we can, we'll seek anybody else's opinions as to phrasing capital cities but for now if we can just focus on capital cities, we will move onto that other section as per the agenda. I've got Christopher in the queue and then Greg. Christopher, please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Good morning. Good morning. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. First, Liz, I sympathize with your experience. Yesterday morning I had exactly the same problem with Adobe; it took Adobe half an hour to connect. But strangely this morning, the connection was perfect the first time so it's not you and it's not me, it's Adobe, which is unstable.

Martin, just to go on the record, I have several comments on the draft documents to save everybody's time I've set them out in writing and sent my contribution to the list. So I may join the conversation so for points that come up – new points that come up during the conversation. But I would like the staff and the participants to take my written comments I've read and particularly on the point 2.2 I have addressed it for problems that Liz has just outlined. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay thanks, Christopher. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. This is Greg Shatan for the record. With regard to capital cities, in particular, I think that viewing them as unique, which they are essentially, one to a country, and exceptional, and of exceptional interest and treated as unique sort of geographic identifier, I can see my way to accepting that as a category that will remain as it was.

But I think what I'm concerned about, and not to get off into the other cities or identifiers, it should not be seen as a slippery slope; it should not be seen as acceptance of the larger concept that we can have a list of 1000 or 10,000 or infinite number of other cities, towns, wide spots in the road, whatever they may be so taken as a unique category unto itself, I think that it is, you know, a

unique enough interest that it should be taken. But that's as far as it goes. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Greg. Does anybody else have any comments regarding the capital city treatment? I can see some in the comments, Jorge, "Capital cities was clear work well according to the record, treatment should be kept." I sense that that tends to be the theme running through a lot of the comments for capital cities, hence we just wanted to make sure that this is something that we could put down as a proposal for the group and then read this at our next meeting to put it on record.

So I think there's still some caveats to that in terms of the different languages and how that is applied this particular category as amongst others as well but in principle that would be something that we would head towards.

And notwithstanding the comments that have been received and perhaps some of the refinements in terminology, we will be going through the different comments within the working document.

At this stage, just for reference, we have not made any redline changes to the working document; the notes will contain the input from various members of the work track and this will be reviewed and we'll work through some of this as well with the group where we've got more questions or would like to put that out for further discussion amongst the work track.

But we have received quite a few comments, as you'll see, within the document and we are going through those. We will probably try and do some of that within the next agenda item. So does anybody have anything further to say? Okay, so Nick Wenban-Smith, "The working document seems to cover capitals nicely, seems to be the right thing to stick with 2012 treatment." And from Katrin in support. Okay so what I would propose then is that we put that forward as an item – a proposal to read through to the work track our next call

so that we can firm that up. Okay. Wonderful. Thanks very much for the input there.

So let's move onto the next item, which may generate a little bit more discussion as we've already heard on the call, which is non-capital cities or whatever reference might be suitable in the future for representing a – that geographic representation.

So we do have, you know, very diverging opinions put forward on this. And to the extent that some would say that there doesn't need to be any controls applied, whereas others want to extend controls from 2012 very generally put.

So if we look at that scale, if you like, of no controls to be applied to more controls to be applied, and there's a lot of in betweens there so there's ideas that have been put forward with regards to put some quantitative measure around the size of the population of a city; there's been, you know, removing any control so that this is, you know, as flexible and easy for people to at least apply and go through the process whereby there's other controls in place that could capture any undesirable intent of using non-capital city name.

There's also the issue that as that name space is much more broader than just the capital city names, the likelihood of it matching a generic term or a branded term something that perhaps otherwise may exist, there is a whole mixture of those that could come forward and wish to apply in the future for a particular intent of use and one which may not have any relevance to the geographic reference at all.

So I'll open up this discussion now to the point where we've heard lots of the arguments, we've collated this, you know, a lot of information into this document so we don't want to be repeating and repeating the statements that we've received; all we'd really like to hear at this stage is ideas about how we

could actually work our way through and navigate our way through all of those different opinions and see how we would think the next application round could be improved by any changes to the 2012 treatment. So I'll open up to the queue and invite your input.

Jorge, you are first. Please go ahead.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Do you hear me okay?

Martin Sutton: We do, yes, loud and clear.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Good morning everyone. And I will spare you the repetition of all the arguments that are in the working document. By the way, thanks to staff for compiling those.

I think that if we want to reach a good solution for everyone on city names, we should try to look into requirements of parameters that would help meeting the different interests at stake. Let's define, okay, from government perspective or from some government's perspectives, we need this prior contact because monitoring is not possible for public, local authorities.

For others we need predictability, we need clarity, we need support perhaps on deciding this and what is not a city. We may need also clarity on the rules of the game and this goes also with to the discussion about intended use and how that can be managed and so on and so forth.

So I don't know, if instead of throwing things at each other we would try to define the requirement that each and every interest group has, perhaps we could see whether there is a package that could cover all those.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Jorge. Yes, I would very much support the notion of let's stop throwing things at each other and work towards some good solutions, so

thanks for that. Liz. Liz, you're next in the queue. Can't hear you at the moment.

Terri Agnew: Liz, this is Terri from staff. I do see where your microphone is activated and unmuted on the Adobe Connect side. Please check mute on your side. It appears we're unable to hear you.

Martin Sutton: Well I see that…

Terri Agnew: If you want a dial-out on the telephone, please let me know. Again this is Terri from staff.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Terri. I note that Liz has added her comment in the chat, which is – I can just go back. Let's see if we can make – so this is from Liz Williams. "Let's see if we can make a distinction between preemptive conditions going into a process which discounts potential applications – applicants and then conditions in an evaluation process. I don't think anyone is arguing for open slather?" I'm not sure what that means. "I think we're looking for clarity in an open process and then sensible measure to evaluate applications."

Okay. No further comments there. I'm just reading from the chat. And Katrin, "How should we take into account that many cities have been out there for much longer than brands and quite some brand names derived from a city name rather than the opposite?" All good points and chicken and egg situation. So Greg also makes a comment, "Why is monitoring not possible for public entities yet expected for everyone else?" Okay.

What I would like to do is perhaps – and I know we've got a lot of good input from a number of parties but is there anybody that hasn't typically been able to voice their opinions and ideas and that is willing to go in the queue? Happy to encourage others to come forward please.

Okay, so let's go back one step then. So in the current – okay, sorry, I won't – I've got Greg in the queue. Greg, please go ahead. Greg, we can't hear you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Thank you, Martin. It's Greg Shatan for the record. Just to kind of rather than to say things that I've said a number of times before, and may say again, the – I think a interesting thought experiment or at least a – something to help try to sort us out into different buckets to some extent, may be to look at the issues where you have an applicant city or an applicant that is relating to the city as a city and another applicant for the same string that wants to use it for purposes not related to the city as a city.

You know, so and contrast that with the situation where we have an applicant who is interested in using the string for other purposes, a brand, a generic, a community, that is not the geographic community, and then there's no application from the city side of things. I think those are two really very different situations.

Maybe – and they need to be dealt with differently. Maybe they come from the same overarching standards; maybe they don't. But I think there is a difference between dealing with applications where the applicant – one applicant will end up presumably with the gTLD, and the idea of reservations and basically putting claims on strings that prevent them from being delegated without permissions.

And then we have – I think we need to look very hard at what the basis of those permissions is, what the – why the privilege – why is it anything more than a privilege or a prerogative. And so I think we – just a thought about how to try to at least kind of divide up the issues that we're dealing with. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Greg. I think that's similar to the process. And we've got an echo. Going through the process, that was a similar exercise where we see which route an application took and I think that's helpful in terms of trying to augment it further. Okay thank you.

We have – sorry if I pronounce this wrong, is it Yrjö in the queue?

Yrjö Länsipuro: Yes, this is Yrjö Länsipuro. Good morning.

Martin Sutton: Good morning.

Yrjö Länsipuro: (Unintelligible) related to the cities and not related is not (unintelligible) it was we also had (unintelligible) that somehow want to raise association with the ideas that is (unintelligible) a certain reputation that a city or another geographic (unintelligible) and once the – and to use that for purposes unrelated to the city but anyway the question is whether (unintelligible) for some other purposes. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Yrjö. I think we've gone through a number of examples where there might be different use cases that would be very – just different to using the string as – for the purpose of representing a geographic term.

We've included those also in the document so we will, you know, continue to try and capture anything that's, you know, useful in addition within the working document.

So sorry, so others that may not Yrjö, you were very quiet on the call there so in essence if I get this wrong please revert back to the queue, but essentially it was how to manage the intention of use, could there be somebody that applies for a term that matched a geographic city that was not being used in that way to represent the city but subsequently could change in the course of its operation.

And so I think we've captured examples of the types of things that may have a generic reference – generic meaning as well as a geographic meaning so there would need to be some understanding of control of how that was used in future if they'd committed not to use it as a geographic reference.

Is Yrjö, is that a reasonable summary?

Yrjö Länsipuro: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry, I was sort of not loud enough. Well what I meant was that the distinction between (subtle) geographic use and non-geographic is not very clear. I mean, there can be cases where somebody wants to use the name of a city because of a certain reputation or that is a place (unintelligible) without trying to represent the people of that city or anything like that.

Martin Sutton: Okay, so does this – does this tie back in with the ideas of the public interest commitments so that if they're applying but had stipulated in the application that they are not applying to use it as a geographic reference, so therefore they would not require the existing treatment – the letter of approval or non-objection, then assuming that they proceeded to use it as referencing a geographic place, then that would actually be against the original intent.

Yrjö Länsipuro: Yes.

Martin Sutton: I think that's – I think your…

Yrjö Länsipuro: Well I would (unintelligible)…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: So I think that there's already – that – sorry, just so – if we go back to the process map that we had I think that can – that would be captured in terms of it's not intended to be used in a certain way but if subsequently it is found to be used then perhaps we need to look at the controls that are – can be embedded within the Registry Agreement, so there are other places where that can be controlled.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Does that make sense?

Yrjö Länsipuro: I try to put in the chat. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you. Okay so carry on here, is there – I can see there's a lot of chat and still going on, so it's moving around rather rapidly. Is there anybody that wishes to (unintelligible) of those points and – or make the point vocally? Okay, Liz, please go ahead and then Susan.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Martin. Thank you, Martin. I wonder if it's not helpful for us to then – listening carefully to the conversation – divide the analysis into three parts. You referred to Part C, which is control and compliance, which is one part of it, which is very most a post-application and implementation, that is something that we could make recommendations on about an implementation guideline but it's not something that we have any control over here.

                      Then there is an analysis in the objection contention process, which is itself two different things, objecting to an application for a top level domain is very different from resolving a contention set.

                      So there might be two applications for and I'll use my old example of Perth or (Rock) or whatever where it's a commonly held term that would be possible for different kinds of applicants to apply for the same name whether they are geographically-based or brand-based or generically-based because its' just a plain old ordinary word and then that's Part B.

                      And then Part A is to use your term control in providing instruction to potential applicants about the types of names that might fit and the warning for them to take care and do their own due diligence in the application process, which then feeds into an evaluation process. So I think if we split it you in terms of, A, application requirements; B, contention objection resolution; and then C,

implementation and compliance with a contract, we might be able to reach more agreement more quickly about the problem we're trying to solve.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Liz. I'll come back to that in a minute. Just let Susan speak up and some useful points, again, referring back similar to the process map which is good. Susan.

Susan Payne: Hi, yes. Susan Payne. Yes, and I put my hand up before Liz started speaking but I do think so I'll quickly make a point but I do think it'd be quite good to come back and explore what Liz was suggesting in a bit more detail. But I'm sure this point's been made before, but it does keep I think keep getting lost, that although generally within Subsequent Procedures generally we've been trying to kind of treat all types of application relatively equally and there are relatively few distinctions between them all, you know, different work (strands) for different application types.

The fact remains that brands are different and if we're looking at these concerns that have been raised about change of use and so on, there are very, you know, there are currently very strict contractual qualifications for being a dotBrand set out in Specification 13.

And so that, you know, providers, you know, if you want – if an applicant wants to keep those the benefits that come with Spec 13 they have to abide by the terms of Spec 13 and consequently those TLDs are not going to have a change of use in the sense that you know, names are not going to be issued to the world at large because that undermines the qualification for Spec 13.

So although it may be that we need to think about the post-contractual provisions a bit more, you know, it is possible to build contractual restrictions in place but help to address the things that have been raised as concerns. And I guess that goes to partly to what Liz was saying about the three areas we should be looking at, and I guess would fall into the third one. But, you

know, I think it's perfectly possible to build in contractual restrictions, to try to address concerns.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Susan. Liz, is that an old hand or did you have a further comment? Okay thanks. So I think that would be worthwhile just refer back to so, you know, there are different areas of control that can be applied.

And the comment raised there with regards to an applicant specify their intended use and purpose of the TLD, can have restrictions applied post application. So the great example, thank you Susan, but also, you know, for generic terms. So if somebody wanted to use a generic term more broadly and it wasn't intended for use about a city name, those references can be built in.

I'm not – I don't think we have got those built in currently and that could be certainly an area to explore and try and apply some logical controls that perhaps we can leverage from some of the other examples like the Specification 13 that is used for brands.

And that helps to – for any deviation – subsequent deviation then that can be hauled in by certain control mechanisms, rather than prevent somebody from applying in the first place that has a good intent and an opportunity to make a good use of a TLD string.

Does anybody have any further thoughts on this sort of theme of additional controls? I think we took – that's about – it was Point 3, let me just check. Okay Part 1, control and compliance, so that's basically, you know, trying to make sure that if there's concerns about how somebody may change the use of a TLD after having a certain intent originally, how is that controlled? So we have a Spec 13 as referenced there, some TLDs but for generic terms perhaps I don't notice anything other than the PIC that we have currently. Jorge, please go ahead.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Do you hear me okay?

Martin Sutton: I do, yes.

Jorge Cancio: Hello? Okay. Hello again. And this is Jorge Cancio for the record. I think that what was proposed by Liz before of looking into the requirements on the objection and the control part, is useful in the sense that it may be part of our analysis as part of the solution to resolving the different interests at stake in a way that is agreeable to everyone.

                  But I think that as the first step, we should acknowledge mutually that there are different interests at stake, that there are different stakeholders with legitimate interests on this unique resource, which are the city strings, and then I think it would be very useful to define the parameters or the requirements for each interest groups.

                  And when – as soon as we have that, as soon as we can of requirements and parameters, we can look into the solutions which is where we would go into the list that was proposed by Liz. So I leave it by that. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: I'm just wondering whether this is – this is a useful time just to mention work that's been going on beyond the process map and seeing whether that is a useful (unintelligible) the mind map. Steve Chan.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Martin. This is Steve Chan from staff. Perhaps, let me wrap my head around the mind map first. But actually just to actually to interject about the process flow, the – I guess the purpose of developing that process flow – and Martin, correct me if I'm wrong – was indeed to look at the different areas of the process and to sort of look at the way that Liz has mentioned and to say that there's not necessarily only a single way to look at potential solutions; there may be different ways to look and to solve it in a more holistic fashion.

So some of these things that exist to protect the different interests here they're not necessarily mutual exclusive, they can all form a package at the end that might help keep everyone moderately happy.

So Martin, let me take a look at the mind map I had developed and maybe speak to that in a second but just I guess a plug for the process flow, I can actually load it into the Adobe Connect room if that might be useful to the work track members. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Steve. And sorry to put you on the spot there, but I think that would be useful for us to consider and also I'm conscious of time, I think let's do it. If you've got the document handy for the process flow, let's bring that back again just to start working through some of these examples just so that we can build on the ideas of, you know, where it may be best to apply some of these controls and make sure that we do appreciate that there are different ways to approach this.

So obviously those that are not on Adobe cannot see it. And I think we only got a – just – oh I see, right. So you have control for scanning the document. Just see if we were working backwards. Be good to try and get the document. So this typically starts to look at – so on the first slide the blue boxes referencing this really which is ongoing responsibilities as a contracted party, so as it states in here for registry operators deviates from conditions of support, non-objection, support can be withdrawn. ICANN commits to complying with a legally-binding order from a court in jurisdiction of government, public authority that provided support.

So that's really referencing those that are being used as geographic terms where they've sought approval, non-objection and certain conditions could be applied. What it probably doesn't reflect is those that are non-geographic terms such as the brands that have already got those Specification 13.

Perhaps, Steve, we could revisit this to (unintelligible) some of those post delegation conditions but are applied-for terms that could match a geographic term but are used in a different way and so we can then put in the Specification 13 but we may then want to also consider, you know, what would happen if it was a generic term being used and what sort of conditions, whether that be a PIC and how does that get applied into this process flow as well.

So, Liz, I've got a tick in the box is that a hand? I'm not quite sure. And then I've got Steve.

Liz Williams: Martin, I'm sorry, I just wanted to see if I could be a little more helpful. It wasn't – stupidly I ticked the wrong thing rather than try to put my hand up and down. So what I would like to do then with Steve is to – looking at the slide you've got on the screen now, which says, "Applicant submits application, if applicable," blah, blah, blah. What I'd like to do is flip this whole discussion on its head which is to think about how to deal with Timeframe A, Timeframe B, and Timeframe C.

And then we can identify who are the actors that might be impacted in each of those frames. So for example, if we go back to Timeframe C, which is the application has been approved, the contract has been signed, it's in operation, the stakeholder communities – the ICANN Compliance function are very, very different sets of actors than those that are in Section B, which is going through objection or contention or contract negotiation and they're very different from Part A which is applicant maybe public authority, maybe city administration that's looking for a partner.

So maybe Steve or one of the ICANN staff members, I'd be happy to submit something a little different to this particular slide which is taking us back to the process flow for 2012. And honestly I don't think that this is actually helpful for us in the (main) when we're talking about a potential new round.

So rather than take up time on the call now I'm happy to talk to Steve or anyone else who can do a mind map together and see if we can come up with something that we can present to the group for the next call because then we start to see quickly where the pressure points are for particular stakeholders at particular points of time.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Liz. And thanks for the offer. So happy to consider alternative ways to illustrate this to help the discussions, so let's connect then after the call because I'm also conscious of time. Steve, did you have anything further to say? Your hand was up earlier.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Martin. This is Steve. I was actually just going to make a comment about so you – you're referring to the blue end point in this process flow as post delegation measures.

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Steve Chan: And so to the extent there are post delegation measures which might be enforced through a contractual compliance that of course means that those protections would be integrated into potentially integrated into the Registry Agreement.

And so for those protections to be built in by this work track that would seem to be within your remit if you felt those protections might be useful. So I guess when you refer to them as post delegation that might be outside your remit but if it's part of the contract that would be within your remit.

And actually just to briefly respond to what Liz was saying, and I guess the reference you made, Martin to the mind map so what – the – I guess the genesis of that was to try to look at the different parts of the process and to try to work through a series of questions and to work through those iteratively and build some understanding and agreement amongst the work track.

And so there's questions about the, you know, what the basis of protections might be and then that basis how it applies to different terms which might not be uniform in all the different cases which of those terms require support or non-objection and so on.

And so that also flows into things like the challenge mechanisms, the contractual requirement and so the idea behind the mind map which you know, hasn't been shared obviously yet and is still being discussed by the co-leads is, you know, whether or not it makes sense to work through the questions iteratively and see if we can build on discussions. So thanks for bringing this up, Martin, and maybe it's something the co-leads can take back and share at a later date. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Steve. And perhaps that's something that we think about for ICANN 62 leading up to that. So I'm going to close off there for the discussion on non-capital cities, conscious of time.

We've only got a few minutes left. I did want to move onto ICANN 62 planning just to make sure that you have received and read the information regarding the schedule for ICANN 62. Hopefully if you're able to attend in person you've earmarked those sessions. We've got Work Track 5 sessions on the Monday afternoon and the Thursday afternoon.

And then so please make sure you mark that in your calendars and if you're unable to join face to face, then please if you can join in remotely. We should have all of the Adobe Connect services available for then although I admit there has been some teething problems noted today.

We are still planning out the activities of those two sessions so it's only in a sort of rough draft at this stage. We'd certainly want to make these as interactive as possible. We have an hour and a half each session so that should allow us to move on with some of the topics of discussion and perhaps more the contentious areas that we've gone through.

So does anybody – oh so please note also that, you know, without a doubt there's always conflicts with other meetings on – at ICANN sessions so this is no exception; there are a number of other sessions that will be coinciding with the Work Track 5 meetings, so would just impress upon you the need to make sure that you can prioritize this one if possible and attend the Work Track 5 sessions. That would be very much appreciated.

Okay, and then we have a minute for any other business so if there's anything else, please. I'll need to go back through the chat because I've noticed there's a lot of activity in there but I've not been able to keep track of that at this stage. So if there is any other business please come forward. If not, oh, Emily, thank you. Please go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Martin. This is Emily from staff. I'm wondering if it might be useful to do a quick poll of folks in the room to see who will be already traveling next Wednesday for ICANN 62 given that we have a tentatively scheduled meeting for next week. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: So can we just quickly do a hand up? So if you're in Adobe Connect you can just put your hand up. Very few. Emily, does that help? I mean, we have got a lot of attendance on this call as well due to the time.

Emily Barabas: Perhaps we'll maybe send an email to the list to follow up.

Martin Sutton: Okay thanks, Emily. Right, okay well we're bang on time so thank you very much for your input today and look forward to catching up again soon. Okay. Bye for now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Martin. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned.

END