Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: New gTLD SubPro PDP Working Group Meeting Part 2 (Work Track 5)
Wednesday, 14 March 2018 at 8:30 AST
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 transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Annebeth Lange: Good morning everybody and welcome to Part 2 of the GNSO new gTLD

process. And here we're going to discuss the geographical names Worktrack

5. So I start with presenting their four co-chairs. On my left side is Javier Rua-

Jovet.

Man: Perfect.

Annebeth Lange: Oh, representing ALAC on my right side is Martin Sutton GNSO and Olga

Cavalli for the GAC and myself Annebeth Lange here for the ccNSO. So

before we start because of the thing that happened with Adobe I would leave

the words to our perfect staff to say something about the practical way we

should do this meeting.

Emily Barabas: Thanks Annebeth. This is Emily Barbara's from staff. So as you've probably

heard we do not have Adobe Connect for the remainder of this meeting. And

we are the first session of the day to day which means that we're going to be experimenting with the new system that we'll be using. So the first thing is that there are absolutely ways to participate remotely and I'll just very briefly talked through what those are.

If you navigate to the Meeting Page on the Meetings Web site you'll see a page it looks just like this displayed on the screen. If you're in the working group you've already received an email with some additional information. But if you're not or if you don't have that handy just navigate to this page and you can see that there are three little boxes that say we're under remote participation. The first one is Live Video so actually this is primarily for people who are not physically in the room. You can watch live video of the session.

Under that there is a box that says is Adobe Connect. If you click on that it will not take it to Adobe Connect it will take you to some instructions including an email address where you can send any comments. And the remote participation managers will read out any comments that goes to that email address onto the record in the room. (Steve) is just demonstrating that right now.

And then finally there's an audio stream there as well. If you're not physically in the room and you want to make a comment you can dial into the audio bridge and there the co-leads will periodically pause and ask for any interjections over audio from people who are participating remotely. If you're physically in the room we encourage you to get close to a microphone either sitting around the table or there's a microphone in the center of the room there and you can just queue up. So please speak up. There is no chat so audio interventions are the way to make yourself heard.

And then finally we have a Google doc that we've been working on for some time and you're still welcome of course to comment in that Google doc. And maybe later we can display the link as well although it should also be in your email because we've have been using it for quite some time. And of course if

all else fails you can always just send an email to the Worktrack 5 mailing list and that will be incorporated into the Google doc and/or if you specify in your email to the Worktrack 5 mailing list that you want that read into the record during this session we'll also be monitoring for that.

So lots of ways to participate, speak up get in touch. We're hoping this will be successful. And then at the end of the session please do provide feedback about ways we can hopefully continue through the rest of the week effectively so come grab us if you have additional suggestions. And that's it. I'll pass it back to Annebeth. Thanks everyone.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Emily. And I suggest that we just start the slides now and get going. So you can just click forward for a while. This is what we're going to do today. We'll look at the work completed, current status and the next steps. We have a work plan and initial report and (future) treatment, the specific categories of geographic names and any other business.

Next please. We are already wished you welcome so then I leave the word to Olga to take you through the next item.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Annebeth and good morning. ((Foreign Language 0:04:36)) everyone. So this is a different kind of meeting without Adobe Connect so we will have to manage a different way. Let's see it's – there was a time that there was no translation, no Adobe Connect and no transcribing. So - no for 30 years I have always experienced that but there was a time so we are going somehow backwards.

So let me tell you briefly we have no translation right because the translator complained to me that I speak too fast. The work completed what we are doing now and the next steps. So the group the Worktrack 5 began meeting in November 2017 so the last part of last year. We have completed the terms of reference. There is a link there. I – during the GAC meeting I presented some slides with a summary of the highlights of the terms of reference. So if

you want you can ask me or go to the GAC Web site. Maybe they're available. But it's in a big document if you want to review what's the text of the terms of reference.

In February 2018 we organized a Webinar which was very interesting. We got many consultations and questions about which was the background and the history about the use of geographic names and new gTLDs. So we have that idea of organizing this Webinar that it's available online. I suggest that if you're interested in that information you go and listen to it and check the information that it's recorded.

Annebeth was so kind to present all the information and at the end there was an interesting discussion about the use of geographic - terms of geographic significance that were not in list. So for example the case of the (Ramason) came up and there was some exchange of interesting views and information about that. So if that is of your interest I suspect that you go and check that information about the Webinar.

And for the moment there are categories of geographic names that received specific treatment in 2002 Applicant Guidebook. So there is a document that you must have seen. It's an Excel file that has information about the existing 2007 policy and different - and any difference with 2012 implementation and positive negative impacts that this use could have focus in the 2012 implementation and other comments that you may have positive and negative. And then you can include there your comments.

After this which is ongoing work we'll begin discussing future treatment for this category of strings. And after that we'll discuss categories of geographic names that are not addressed in existing policy of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook implementation. If you recall in the first round of new gTLDs there was some conflict because there was some names that were perceived as geographic terms of with geographic significance that were not in any of this list or in these categories of the Applicant Guidebook. And some of some

conflict came up after the use of those names. So this in this part of our work we will address this type of geographic significant name that are not in list.

And finally accepting recommendations for inputs to the work track discussion reports and analysis. So I will stop here and I will give the floor to Annebeth again. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Olga. And then we will look little into what we are going to do now with the timeframe. So could you click a little? Oh, it's slide number yes that's right. That's the right one.

So here what we think about the Worktrack 5 work plan. In March 2018 we began the discussion of the future to increase (terms) of the Applicant Guidebook. And this has been going on and we will continue with this until May 2018 and we really hope that we can get as much input as possible.

After we have decided what is a geographical name or not then we have to see what is the future treatment. Should we say the way it is today or should we take something out, put something in and find another way to treat it?

So the treatment of terms not included in Applicant Guidebook we will start to discuss after we have found the solution or at least options for what is in the Applicant Guidebook today. Our hope is that we can have a draft initial report ready until Panama June meeting. That demands quite a lot of work and also input from all the working group members. So we have something to present. And if we manage that then after the draft initial report it will go out for a consultation. So it's possible then again to comment on what has been suggested. And the hope is that we can publish in the initial report in July.

The reason why we have to do this fairly quickly is to get in line with the Worktrack 1 to 4 in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group so we can present the total report in the end also including the geographical names. So

then we can take go forward with one more slide. So now I give the word to Javier.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Good morning, Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. Good morning to the co-leads, staff, everybody in the room ((Spanish Spoken 011:16)).

And by the way please feel free to and specifically especially today due to the lack of Adobe Connect feel free to intervene at any time, to interject and to ask questions. Of course we'll have, you know, more questions and answers in the process but feel free. Yes? Oh no what did I do? Jorge Cancio.

Jorge Cancio: ((Spanish Spoken 0:11:43)).

Javier Rua-Jovet: ((Spanish Spoken 0:11:45)).

Jorge Cancio: Yes. I was just waiting for that (unintelligible).

Javier Rua-Jovet: I am ALAC, openness.

Jorge Cancio: Thank you so much, Jorge Cancio for the record Suisse government. I was looking at the planning and I apologize if I have missed the discussions where that was decided. But I think it might be a very aggressive timeline especially if we consider the governments and government input. We had a discussion in the GAC on this issue a couple of days ago. And the impression was at least for me personally that it was quite difficult to get people up to speed but that at the same time people have very strong views. So it would be probably wise from this PDP Working Group sub track or worktrack to give enough space to government input and to also adapt the timelines accordingly if this is needed because otherwise we risk that inputs may come later on when this worktrack has already advanced and that may create some conflicts or some divergences.

And just for your information but of course (Manal) is here, (Al Sitalias) is here. I would like to inform you that it was suggested in the GAC meeting that it – and there would be a compilation of GAC input to the different categories of geo names of the 2012 HAB and also of other possible geo names and that for doing that the GAC secretariat would develop a special information sheet because amongst other things even for somebody like me who is part of the worktrack and who is following these proceedings quite closely it is very hard to work with that Google Doc. And I have access to Google Docs but there are other people who don't have access. So that creates an additional hurdle to the hurdle of the mere understanding of the issue.

So I don't know. But I was talking before with Taylor from Canada and he had a good idea that would be to merge this effort of making that form or that kind of information sheet for the GAC with effort from this group. So I don't know if staff support from this group could get together with staff support of the GAC so we avoid duplicating streams and so on and so forth and that a user friendlier device or method is developed in order to obtain as much input as possible from governments or from other stakeholders. So I'll leave it by that and thank you and sorry taking the floor so quickly.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Anybody?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Is that all?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Okay.

Woman: We started there.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Martin has a response.

Martin Sutton: Oh hi. Thank you, Martin Sutton for the transcript. So I do agree these are challenging time frames but to try to manage expectations we do need to put those down, put some markers down at least and understand that there are ways that we can try and break this down into manageable chunks so that we can actually feed discussions into an output report, the initial report within the timeline suggested.

So I love your idea in terms of trying to make sure that, that information is more digestible. And I'm hoping today as we go through the following discussions where we do keep it sort of breaking down into the existing geographic terms that we can compartmentalize those, make better sense of that and pass that into, you know, a single form that is manageable to understand and circulate amongst the groups. So I think we'll take that on board.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. So just - sorry this is Jeff Neuman, one of the overall Subsequent Procedures co-chairs, just a little bit about the general format we've used for initial reports. Initial reports are really there to present the position that are being discussed within the working group and then to if there are any initial recommendations or preliminary recommendations to set – put those forward. But generally we've used that as a place for presenting different options. It's really a tool for us to get additional public comments. So while it says July as

being the publish initial report that initial report is at least from our experience has been a tool where there are more questions than answers and more a presentation of possible ways we can go forward. So if you look at this timeline while it looks quick if you think of the initial report as being one where we've all got together, we've all figured out different paths forward and now we're seeking public comment on which of those paths we can eventually have as much consensus as possible in moving forward that's really the way we use the initial report. It's not – it's a little bit different than initial reports that have come out from other groups previously. And if you think about it more as a tool to get additional input hopefully it won't seem as aggressive as it might otherwise. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Jeff if I may Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, the timing here in the track - worktrack plan that the team has put together is clearly looking at the opportunity for discussion at ICANN 62 of what will be a draft initial report as well. So that will be our - so that people who are going together like the advisory committee may have opportunity to have that on their agenda and discuss further. But let's certainly take up what you said Jorge and have our staff look at opportunity working smarter not harder. I think that's always a good idea. Thank you.

Jim Prendergast: Good morning, Jim Prendergast. I think too maybe parallel to Worktracks 1 through 4 is this initial report could almost be viewed as community comment one. So that – maybe that's just a terminology that might help folks better understand it. If I'm getting ahead of you tell me to shut up. I was expecting the next slide to be the next steps timeline. Is there a similar timeline that takes us from July 18 to final report in your presentation?

Annebeth Lange: No it's not. And I think the reason for that is that we also we're aware that this is quite tough line to follow, that we will try as much as we can. And then, you know, that – and then timeline for the Worktrack 1 through 4 and we hope to align with that in a while but probably this will take a little longer time than we hoped but well Jeff can you add to that perhaps?

Jeff Neuman: Yes sure. I mean so we knew that in presenting this slide it would be seen as aggressive. And we did not want to presume that the public comment period we didn't want to cut a public comment period short. Ultimately it would be our goal if we could line up this report with the Worktracks 1 through 4. And just for the record Worktracks 1 through 4 is expecting to publish a final report by the end of this year. Because of the more narrow set of issues, in theory it is possible to align those two but we did not want to presume that.

So at this juncture we're keeping the schedule the way it is. And the reason we – it's like a community comment one but everything in a GNSO working group requires something called an initial report and something called a final report. So we have to keep the title being initial report but only because that's what's required in the charter and the operating procedures. Got a question over there.

Annebeth Lange: Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Good morning, Christopher Wilkinson in this Adobe free zone. I take what has been said and I hope it materializes in a positive and fruitful matter. But I think the WT5 needs to work on its public relations. Most of the people who are - have a major interest in this in our work are not here and they're not on the mailing list. The – a lot of people will have read the terms of reference and have been disappointed. We - the draft terms of reference made clear that the worktrack would be addressing the whole of the issue. The final version is more restricted and although from what we've just heard now it is the intention to address sooner or later the whole of the issue. This is not at all clear from the - to the outside world but I would recommend in addition to the terms of reference some sort of progress report or information note on a regular basis which could be diffused more widely. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Jeff would you respond to that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thank you, Jeff Neuman. I – we're doing the best we can in our public relations. We look to you all as well to help us with the message. You're all part of the discussions.

We've had several calls on the terms of reference. We have certainly had a number of discussions. I've tried to make myself available to - and Cheryl as well and the rest of the worktrack leaders have made ourselves available to any group that wants to have us there to discuss it.

I sat in on Worktrack 5 discussion in the GAC but unfortunately as you know it's not easy for those that are not members of the GAC to participate. And while I did watch some of that discussion I tried to meet with certain people afterwards to help them understand where there may have been some misunderstandings. And look the – we're doing what we can to get out there but there's a lot of members of this working group. There's 145 members, full participating members and about another 80 observers. So that makes us one of the largest working groups. And, you know, we have representatives from each of the advisory committees and supporting organizations. And so as members of the group like Christopher and others help us with the public relations and we're going to do everything we can. Thanks.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes just as a supplemental I have been doing and I must say the people I've talked to have focused on one specific point that apparently it has been said that in the absence of a consensus the Applicant Guidebook definitions will be maintained. No way. I think that would be a recipe for long-term disputes, disagreements and obstruction and I think it would be very wise just to forget about the so-called mantra.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you for your comments Christopher. It's noted. Taylor?

Taylor Bentley: Hi. My name's Taylor Bentley. I'm from the government of Canada. So I would agree with assessments that this timeline is aggressive but I understand it's out of necessity and not choice. And I'm just speaking as

someone who's wanted to be more involved but not. And I think everyone would agree that we want, you know, everyone to be as involved as early as possible. And while I appreciate that the final report is a mechanism to get more involvement it's just kind of with the understanding no one wants to feel like they're coming late in the game, myself especially. So I believe I heard some good things about using kind of the rest of the day to kind of workshop not just the specific substantive comments but the presentation, the outward appearance of some of these documents in order to bring those of us who haven't been as engaged as we'd like to up to speed quicker, you know, working smarter not harder. Thanks very much.

Annebeth Lange: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. With regards to Jeff's comments that the initial report is called for in our formal procedures and is one of the drafters of those formal procedures I'll point out that it – Jeff is correct but it doesn't specify what size font we have to use. So if we call this solicitation for public input and in really (tall) letters call in the initial draft report we may get - give the right impression instead of the wrong impression.

Annebeth Lange: Good advice Alan. Thank you. And (Catherine) had you your hand up down there?

(Catherine Marcus): Yes thank you. I'm (Catherine Marcus) from the Norwegian ccTLD. I just sorry for missing the point if you happened to mention but just a quick question, is the draft initial report the plan is to discuss it during the Panama meeting? And if so I would like to draw the attention to the fact that the ccNSO meeting is going on right now so many of our members are not there and it's very – some of the discussions we would like them to be able to (consult) the coalition of the actual face to face meeting is -Yes so I would like to - just like to draw their attention to that fact, of course a difficult thing to get meetings scheduled out but yes.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Do you want to respond to some of it Martin before we go on with the rest of the question?

Martin Sutton: Just quickly if I may thank you, Martin Sutton. We also should probably realize the fact that, you know, this is a plan that we've put in place here for March that they actually started many months ago. So we already had built up this community and started work on this prior to which there were a number of different activities looking at geographic terms in pockets of the ICANN community. So we've got quite a lot of resources to work with to help guide us through this workplan. So it's not as if we're starting from scratch. So again just to bear in mind that these are not beginning of discussions. We've already been doing quite a bit of work even before the work truck was formed. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Benedito?

Leonardo Benedito: Thank you. Good morning everyone. My name is Benedito. I'm from the Brazilian government. We are one of the members speaking on part of the guard. And although we have not been able to participate actively we hope to catch up. But one point I'd like to make is to second the issue that was raised by Jorge Cancio. I think it's a really very aggressive timeline especially think about how governments input are going to be sent through this process especially because it's not as it has is that it's not linked to a very clear-cut date in which the work has to be done. So in a way we do expect there to be some kind of official deadline.

Of course I know I understand I think the point we are working is we want to align with the other worktracks. And I also take on board the promise made by Jeff. I think it's very – it helps to verify exactly what we'll be doing in that first phase. Although I also support what was said by Alan Greenberg that maybe we could do it in a way that avoids any interpretation of what we are doing. That's first phase. However in regard to subsequent phases of the work I would caution against engaging in such an aggressive timeline for the

sake of a line of the other worktracks. The transition itself has demonstrated that there are some streams of work that needs more work. That was the reason why was sent to establish at some point. Of course it's different here because all those worktracks should convert to one single document different from what happened I take it – oh thank you. Thank you (unintelligible).

It's different, thank you. It's different what to play in a transition which we do things would go separate now we have to convert. However I would very strongly be very concerned if we would be guided by some – by the process or by the need to work in full speed. And again without having a very clear-cut target we want to change just for the sake of working. (Unintelligible) and in the process maybe losing the opportunity to have a process that is fully consistent and endorsable and embraceable by everyone.

So just a word of caution in regards to the subsequent phases of work. I think for that first presentation with the clarification provided by Jeff I that's quite okay. But we'll be concerned that in subsequent phases we'll keep the same spirit of being aligned with something that is in full speed and which in our view is not linked to something very concrete in terms of dates we need to achieve. So there – is there really a need for that speed if I'm sequence (unintelligible) if there is a like to illustrate it because it would help me back home to explain why we're working such as speed because maybe if we have a very clear-cut deadline we - that that might help. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you very much for your comments and it's Annebeth Lange again. Hi. I agree it's aggressive and we have to think it's through because we'll begin if we can find a solution that all relevant input come before we have to report to (unintelligible) instead of like last time that a lot of things happened after. So I think we all of the same goal here. So we've tried to find a way to get in all the things we need. Any more comments on this point? Yes Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Annebeth, Donna Austin from Neustar. I appreciate the concerns about what seems like an aggressive timeline. I'd just like to make a I guess

it's a high-level point. July 28 only six years on from the closure of the 2012 round. We do believe that - and when I say we Neustar's involved in the industry where a backend provider we provide support to a number of geo TLDs that are currently existing. We do believe that there are cities and others that would like to, you know, bring themselves up to speed and get a city TLD same as you know .Berlin has. We have Melbourne and Sydney and Australia.

So one of the balancing pieces that I see is that if you slow down this work -- and I'm not saying that anybody's suggesting that if it deliberately slows down but if we don't meet some of these timelines and we're getting a – I've heard Jeff say this this week -- we're looking at a decade since the last round. And I wonder, you know, how fair that is to others sort of looking at, you know, city and other types of geo TLDs and saying, "You know, this - we really see the value in this. How can we get one?"

So that's, you know, when you think about what we're trying to do here I think you also need to understand that there's a balancing here. The longer this takes the longer it is that those people or regions or cities that have a real interest in a TLD that can represent them they're not able to have it. So, you know, I think (Matt) made the point that these discussions have been going on for a long time. I know Annebeth was involved in a cross community working group that went on for probably two years or more Annebeth. So it's - you know, if we can just keep that in mind that, you know, if this is all important work and we really appreciate the work that's being done but let's think about those that we're potentially disadvantaging by not moving on, you know, with some kind of understanding that we're, I hate to use the word anti-competitive but, you know, .Berlin has .Berlin. .Melbourne and Sydney have, you know .Melbourne and Sydney. So let's be conscious if there are others out there that are seeing the value. And would also like to have one as well. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Donna, noted. Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. This is Olga Cavalli from the Government of Argentina. Well I appreciate all the views from colleagues I think that perhaps we should think about a concrete outcome of this exchange of ideas. I think that yesterday we had an exchange of this idea proposed by Jorge Cancio from Swiss government about aligning all the comments in one document. I think that a concrete outcome could be that we work together to get a lot of the GAC (unintelligible) ahead of the - or Worktrack 5 and try to put all the comments in a kind of a similar structure document so it - the input is easier into the work of our worktrack. And while I appreciate that the sentiments of the companies also that governments have their own time to decide we have to go to copy time bring this discussions into our governments and that takes some time.

                  So I think if we want to put over in terms of community we have to have in mind the aggressive timeline but at the same time we need to perhaps communicate a little bit better and align our work together so that it goes easier into the input of the work of the worktrack. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Olga. I think we move on out to the next slide. Javier?

Javier Rua-Jovet: Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. We're going to move on. So this slide really, you know, takes upon the previous one too. so this is, you know, it's fleshing out a little bit what's going to happen. And, you know the format of the draft report that's due in June this slide is self-explanatory. So the initial report shall include for each category of geo names existing policy, the implementation of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. And these three points are, you know, highly important but I appreciate the great discussion today.

                  We must continue having, you know, input for community deliberations of the work. They're going to have to do with your comments and what we do inside recommendations if applicable, options and questions for community feedback. This is what really, you know, gives sense to this process, the level

of community involvement that this structure in a GNSO PDP that has colleagues from all the communities, the outcome, real multi-stakeholder outcome. So this is the format and so this - that slide is pretty self-explanatory. I think we can move on.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. So (Manuel) I didn't see you. Do you have a comment to say? Okay thank you. All right then we go into the more working the rework here. So Martin can take over?

Martin Sutton: Yes so an opportunity to roll our sleeves up and actually have an opportunity to participate in some of the discussions going on within the worktrack and help us please. This is the rest of the meeting is really around this next stage which is we've been working through – if we go on to the next slide I think - so we're on Slide 11 for those tuning in.

What we've been doing in the group is taking the existing geographic terms that are referenced in the Applicant Guidebook and what we've done is to consider how that treatment relates to the original policy outcome from 2007 and also then how it was finally treated within the Applicant Guidebook. And their variances so there is differences in that treatment. So we've been exploring how that worked, what was good, perhaps what wasn't so good about that treatment. And within our worktrack discussions we've then started to look at potentially better ways to treat us in the future.

Now we haven't got that far. We've gone through there's 13 different specific terms in the Applicant Guidebook. We have gone through initially and looked at the pros and cons for each of those identified terms. And we are now starting to discuss the future treatment. So I'm going to take you through an example of there's a first one which is a two character ASCII streams. So within the treatment of the Applicant Guidebook the policies out of that was that it was, you know, essentially, you know, easy to understand. It was predictable. So there was a restriction that you could not apply for two

character codes, two letter characters as they may either resemble a future two letter code that's taken off for a country.

So it was clear from discussions also from CCWG work, working group that there was some good consensus previously in discussions that drove towards the idea that two character strings would work effectively in the same way that they've been treated in the Applicant Guidebook.

However we also obviously want to tease out what could be problematic or missed opportunities by making that treatment. But even in that space where there could be confusion against the existing established ccTLD environment it was difficult to assess what any opportunities may have been. And that was difficult to assess. So in terms of what we've had from previous discussions within ICANN from prior to the Applicant Guidebook and beyond the Applicant Guidebook there's a sense or can I say trending that gets - so there's no consensus or anything like that. If I say trending to - towards treating two character strings in the same manner as the African guidebook delivered. So that's the kind of steer that we're getting from the discussions that we've had so far. They'll continue but that's the generalized steer that we're going through.

So what I want to do is to go through another couple of areas where we have not really honed in on the future treatment aspect and I'll encourage us all to have discussions on that and tease out what we could consider as an optimal way forward or options to put forward. And I think that ties in nicely with our discussions about this initial report which is that it won't necessarily have recommendations agreed by the group. It may well of a lot of options that are created from those discussions to put forward and obtain a lot of feedback from the community which is a great opportunity then for those that cannot get involved to the degree that they would like in the worktrack efforts, an opportunity to comment and feed in once they've send the - either the questions, the options put forward or even any suggested recommendations that may emerge through these discussions so this is an example.

Does anybody have any questions on the two character strings before we move on to the next category? Hearing none so we'll move on to Slide 12. Okay so with two characters obviously there was a limited permutation of use strings that you could use for two character. Three obviously opened it up to a lot more permutations and those then different terms used in everyday use that also match ISO country codes. And they could be nouns. They could be verbs. They could be organizations that have been established over time.

So this starts to make it more difficult to manage all the different interests that start to emerge in the community that would like to have opportunities to make use of three character strings at the top level. So what we've done here is going through this discussion. Let me just cover the sort of benefits that were teased out and the negatives as well. So there was a geographic connection for alpha three codes on the ISO 3166 list so good easy to define terms. There was a list to refer to.

There's also a national identification for alpha three codes on the ISO 3166 list. So that's positive in terms of understanding where you can go to to find this information so Africans could feel confident that they either fall into that category and therefore would not continue with an application or they weren't on that list or the opportunity to apply was easy to progress.

So the negatives in this is that prospective applicants would be unable to apply even if they could have come to an agreement with the respective owner of the three letter code. So this is important to understand because in the way that this is treated even national authorities did not have the opportunity to apply for term that would benefit their community. So that was a kind of lockdown.

Similar these strings as I said earlier, the permutations and the coincidence with lots of other frequently used terms or acronyms meant that there was other opportunities potentially that were lost, the non-geographic terms of the

same string. So it's all about the different context in which they would be used. So with that I've tried to just briefly pull together some of the sort of negatives and positives of the treatments that we saw. Now this is the opportunities that we really want your participation and to tease out your comments and ideas about future treatments or if you have any questions that you need clarification on what I've just talked about we're happy to proceed on that basis. But I would encourage you all to come forward with any of your ideas options and we'll open the mic. (Catherine) and Jorge.

(Catherine Oma):   (Catherine Oma) for the record. Why don't we consider that governments which want to have their respective code could apply for that? I understand that the first time is more globally and doesn't really refer to whether the applicant would be an open one and whatever brand or generic applicant. But how if we would kind of define a mechanism for government to apply for their respective string I would think that this might be something governments would take into account.

Martin Sutton: Thank you (Catherine). We will log all of the comments that we can, you know, move through and gather as much input as possible. Jorge?

Jorge Cancio: Thank you Martin. Jorge Cancio for the record. Well and perhaps it's a very general comment but I think the - something that is not captured in these slide as far as I see and the thought is the following. These different variations of country names be it three letter codes, be it two letter codes, be it longform short form or permutations -- whatever were excluded in the end from the 2012 AGB because there was not an agreement in the wider community that these were cTLDs. So and that's not only a question of calling it gTLD or ccTLD or something different TLD.

The question in the end is where lies the underlying policy authority? In the ccTLDs the policy authority lies with a national community in different flavors. Sometimes it's purely set organized, sometimes it's national regulation. Sometimes it's even government run. But the fact is that the basic difference

is that those TLDs that identify a country -- and today's those are the - and ccTLDs are under the policy authority of the local community. And that's the underlying thought why in 2012 AGB there was no agreement to put them under the gTLD space because the gTLD space moves the policy authority to the global level in so many issues.

And there was of course resistance that something identifying your country the same way as ccTLD identifies your country would be under such a global policy authority instead of the local one.

So perhaps I don't know how to capture this thought but it's common to all the different variations of country names. So the real crux of the issue it's not whether we go for a non-objection or a non-object or and a different kind of procedure or whether we go for an exclusion or a non-exclusion. I think the key element is how could these country names fit into a gTLD process without having to fall under the global policy authority and superseding the local policy authority. So I hope that I made myself understood but that's really the key of the issue.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Jorge. That seems to be sort of more of an overarching comment so it will be something probably relevant to a number of the categories that we go through so we'll know the point of this data and move on to collect some more.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Oh sorry (Jim). I have Christopher next and then...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: ...(Vero)? Thank you. I've got Olga and then Nick and Jeff.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Christopher Wilkinson for the record. In response to Donna earlier I would just comment that if we apply a good deal of common sense and political realism to these issues a consensus could be reached very quickly. The history is interesting but the history reveals a certain degree of entrenched positions which have just had the effect of postponing the issue because of no consensus. There are positions around the table which I believe will have to be flexible on all sides.

Secondly, I don't want to go too deeply into what is a gTLD. But just to say that semantically geographic names are not generic. You can use another word that begins with G if you like but you cannot claim the geographic terms are generic. They're all, nearly all specific to locations, communities and regions. And if we followed the original terms of reference we would also be saying that geographic terms with cultural, economic significance would also be included but they are not generic.

Finally we do tend to focus on 3166. I love 3166 but it's there, it's been there for decades and as far as I'm concerned we can leave that to ccNSO. If you in the interest of regrouping geo work in this group you force us to redo what ccNSO has done over the years. We are going to waste some time.

Now two-character codes, we're strictly talking about ASCII, the alphabet. In certain scripts to characters are a name and three characters can be a sentence. So I'm not at all sure how these principles will port or can be transported to the other scripts that we will have to deal with in order to produce a global policy.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Christopher. Just to add to your points made there I think the one word I did pick up on is balance because we have already gone through some of these discussions where there are different positions, you know, vastly different positions. And we're trying to achieve some balance by bringing everybody together discussing these opportunities to change the

treatment so that it is accommodating, you know, as best as possible. So I've got (Bilo) and then Olga. (Bilo)?

(Bilo Langiporta): Yes thank you, (Bilo Langiporta). From an end-user point of view the three letter codes are in many countries as familiar as two letter codes -- sometimes even more. They are license plates. They are in different areas. So from that point of view and to avoid end-user confusion which to my mind is the paramount point of view let's not use them in a generic way. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Can I just clarify there though that because one of the points is that at the moment the treatment means nobody can use them but what you're saying is work out a way that they can be released for a particular countries use. Yes thank you. So I have Olga, Nick and Jeff.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Martin. I would like to refer to this idea that government may - they lack the opportunity of a plan of this three letter code, four letter codes, full name for well-known name, long form name. The thing is we - it's very difficult a company, a private company and the government. So the procedures for a government in taking such a decision of applying for example for a new gTLD would be extremely different from the decision of a private company. Think about those governments that are involved in ICANN.

There is a budget decision to make. There is a strategic decision to make. There is skills needed to apply for such a TLD. And think about those governments that are not aware of this process that even come to the GAC and are not active or those that don't come to the GAC.

So in the case of there would be a process for opening these names and that governments would be a possible applicant the process should be totally different. So and I would like to support the idea that these names are not generic but geographic. So in any case the issue with the government is extremely complicated and should be considered not as a regular applicant

but a specific applicant different and different process should be established in the case that it's open for everyone in the governments. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: I've got Nick, Jeff and Jorge. Oh sorry. Nick?

Nick Wenban-Smith: Thank you. This is Nick Wenban-Smith for the record. When (Norman) had started talking about creating a geo TLD for the Welsh community they - their first choice was CYM being the first three letters of the Welsh world for Whales (community). And they were very taken aback to be told they couldn't have this because actually that's the alpha three for the Cayman Islands.

So it is something which obviously does prevent legitimate uses. We can't avoid reconciling that. And it does produce some sort of kind of perverse outcomes. You can have a .vodka you - oh yes but my favorite example you're not allowed to have a .gin which seems like totally wrong if you prefer gin over vodka right?

But there's some still - my point maybe it's a slightly pedantic one and Martin just to pick you up really we're talking about 270 alpha-3 codes here which is a smaller number in fact than those - all of the combinations of the ASCII 2 which is 676. So we're talking actually only about 274 out of 17,500 total alpha-3 combinations okay? So it's a very, very small number. And where I'm -- and this is why I believe really that the rule should state as it is because there's just not a very obvious or quick consensus and given your aggressive timeline. So I totally support you in trying to get this through its gating issue before any more new gTLDs can be created.

This is just too difficult. So the last round went ahead with these rules and it was, you know, for better or worse quite a successful round for many, many people. This is not something which can be easily solved. This is in the too difficult bucket. So that's why the rules are in place. And I, you know, I advocate for keeping the rules in place so that we can move on and get on with the next round of new gTLDs.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Nick. I think that's useful in terms of perspective on the volume. I
                   suppose the other addition is what about what could be future codes because
                   that's like the two characters captured by the fact that nobody can apply for
                   any of those and that can be – so as they're allocated in the future then
                   they've got a home to go to in the ccTLD.

Nick Wenban-Smith: I understand exactly that point.

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Nick Wenban-Smith: I think that's the compromise that the national communities have made
                   which is that as we all know as those of you who work in the retirement policy
                   development process where we're looking at what happens when the country
                   names change and perhaps there's a change in the Alpha 2 or the alpha-3
                   codes. You know, these things it turns out are surprisingly dynamic.

                   And the compromise made by the countries is that unlike with the Alpha 2s
                   where all of the future possible combinations which might arise in the future
                   are blocked forever. Actually here we recognize that some of those will be - I
                   mean obviously (com) is the classic example for the (comeras). There are
                   going to be some situations that a three letter combination might be taken
                   and in future that might be put on the alpha-3 list but, you know, it's not
                   perfection here. That's a pragmatic compromise.

Martin Sutton: Thanks Nick. I have Jeff then Benedicto. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Jeff Neuman. I was just going to respond to some of the
                   comments that Jorge made but Nick took a lot of what I was going to say. At
                   the end of the day Jorge we understand these issues are difficult. And one of
                   the recommendations could be, you know, keep it reserved or push it out to
                   some other group to make a decision on with a very narrow, narrow scope.
                   So what we're looking for are specific recommendations of what to do with

this so that we don't - if it is too difficult as Nick said we're not going to spend a lot of time working on that. We can, you know, push that off.

And if any national entity wants it then at that point in time they'll have to kick off another process to figure out how to allocate that. But at this point I don't know if we've had too many national governments request the three character code. If that does happen though at some point we are going to need to address it. We as a - when I say we I mean the entire community not this work track.

Martin Sutton: I've got Benedicto and then - and (Catherine).

Leonardo Benedicto: Thank you, it's Benedicto speaking for the record. On the same point I think that in taking from where Jorge has left and actually we are sharing the same plate. That was the (unintelligible) besides sharing also the same microphone. But in roughly the same ideas in a way. But I say that as the issue that was raised by Jorge reflects kind of overarching issues which I have indicated I think it should be in a way reflected in the text.

One thing that I was just wondering if we could just make a slight reference to this just o not to look it in the overall picture would be in the second bullet when that refers to harms like that I identified. When we say these strings weren't available for potential users no geographic TLDs we could add a comment say as they were considered out of scope or something like that so we do not lose sight of the context in which that decision was made in the past. So it would be another way to relate to that kind of discussion we are having here. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Benedicto. Before we carry on I keep missing the fact that we do have somebody on the line. We've get Greg Shatan. So I'll ask Greg to go next and then I've got (Ann), the lady at the microphone and then Rosalia.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I'll stick to the narrow issue of three character codes and not get into larger issues of what generic means in the context of a generic TLD versus other context. We'll get to that later I'm sure. I think with regard to three characters it seems there are probably a limited number of choices although maybe variations. I think at best one could say that the current three character codes could be given some sort of priority for governments or they could be left reserved. And unfortunately then nobody has a .gin or a .rum. Considering that we're in Puerto Rico that's perhaps a better example. Maybe that's good or bad.

                 Beyond that I think the rest of the three character combinations are fair game. I don't think that we could move beyond that. And they certainly were in the last round. Just look at .car .kim and so forth. So there may be some concept perhaps of having a - an ability to unlock those or to give maybe a first chance, kind of an offer, a first refusal if you will to governments on the three character codes and then releasing those for public consumption so to speak.

                 And I realize actually .gin is blocked because it is a current one. I don't believe that .rum is blocked as a current one. So but I think as to the current ones the question really is whether they should remain blocked when there is no kind of technical historical reason as there is with the two character codes which are recognized at least when they're use letters as ccTLDs. And there's no recognition that three character ones are used in the domain space in the same way.

                 Ultimately I think we'd be better off giving governments a chance and then throwing the ones that don't get claimed into the pool in some fashion. What that fashion is I'll leave that for another discussion. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Greg. And just to remind you calling in please notify us so that we can put you in the queue. I've got Ann-Cathrin Marcussen. Ann-Cathrin Marcussen and the lady at the mic. I've got Rosalia, gentleman at the mic, and (Tima), (Timo).

Carlos Gutierrez: And Carlos Gutierrez.

Woman: Yes.

Martin Sutton: And Carlos.

Woman: And Carlos.

Martin Sutton: And sorry was that - yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: So I see no sorry, (unintelligible) mic, right. Ann-Cathrin Marcussen?

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen: Hi, Ann-Cathrin Marcussen. I just want to echo and also point out
                    that the three letter codes already assigned to countries it means identity and
                    we have used them. So to be opening up for them we'll as (Georgia) also
                    points to quite a lot of discussion. So getting onward yes I support the
                    suggestion of letting them stay as they are now and move on with the rest.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Ann-Cathrin Marcussen. Lady at the mic?

Elsa Saade: Hi. Elsa Saade for the record NCUC. I understand the different contexts that
                    are here and the fact that GAC is more represented on this table. But there is
                    also - I always feel the need to make sure that the context of other countries
                    that are not completely democratic and also about territories that don't
                    necessarily have a government represent them here also exist.

                    So I just wanted to put this out there, put it on the table and reassert the fact
                    that some territories don't have governments here representing them and
                    might already in the future have the need to have a three letter code or

whatever it is they would have wanted to assert their being actually and their identity as you mentioned so just putting it out there. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Rosalia?

Rosalia Morales: Rosalia Morales from .CR Costa Rica. So following Jorge Cancio's holistic perspective and also following Nick's and Ann-Cathrin Marcussen's comment I would also agree on maintaining this domain, the three letter code domains as reserved for geographic terms. And also let's keep in mind that when we look at that Google spreadsheet that I know many of us haven't had a chance to look at but in general terms there is many, many, many categories for us to discuss. We are just beginning. And we're aware that we have a very tight deadline.

So in a way to meet our deadline to give an opportunity for all the other communities involved to participate in the other categories to come I think the best way to go is to maintain those three letter code as we (serve) as it has been and continue with our discussions and meet our goals and deadlines. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, sounds good. (Pierre)?

(Pierre):   Thank you, not going to be very long to say that I fully agree with 99% of what has been said before. Just on the – to going in the same line that has been said on the three characters a lot of three characters are Gs historically .com, .net, .org and a lot of new gTLDs are three characters. We are talking about three characters that are country codes because they are in 3166. So I think for sake of saving time if we can avoid to talk about that as Gs whether they are new Gs while they are obviously country codes and stick to the previous agreement and consensus that we reached in the AGB of 2012 would be better and would let us have more time to discuss about the other categories. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. I have (Timo) and Carlos. (Timo).

(Timo Orcner):   Hi. (Tima Orcner) from Estonia ccTLD. I'm very strongly support for his
                   statement in meaning what's the difference between ccTLDs and gTLDS
                   meaning that it's a question of policy or who makes the policy. Estonia as
                   many of you know is very interested in their three letter TLD to become
                   available. But we cannot use it on the current ICANN or gTLD policy. So in
                   that sense as ideally it should be question in ccNSO PDP but if we see some
                   I don't know potential of using some of these three letter codes in the ISO list
                   that maybe the respective country is not interested in use and make these
                   available as gTLDs this would probably mean very big exceptions in the
                   GNSO PDP or policy-wise making this like, making it available for countries
                   and local Internet communities if interested to make their own policies.

Martin Sutton: Thank you (Timo). And I have Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you, Carlos Gutierrez for the record. I don't have a problem with three
                   letter codes. I have a problem with the ISO list of three letter codes. It's not
                   unique. It's not bottom-up. It has been used for generics before. ICANN has
                   assigned it to certain regions like Catalonia, Serbia, (Britani), et cetera. So I
                   think we have to turn -- and we spent two years Annebeth and Heather
                   discussing three letter codes. We sent questionnaires to participants and to
                   governments.

                   The problem is not three letter. It's the problem is taking the ISO list three
                   letter codes believe me. So if we are talking about geography let's talk about
                   geography. ISO list might be one option but it's not the only option and it has
                   been spoiled from every side. So I really object to title starting with the
                   assumption that we should discuss the ISO three letter code list. Thank you
                   very much.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. I'll turn to Jeff in a second. I mean the main reason is that this list was included in the Applicant Guidebook so that's why we need to have these conversations to see what should change so thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes just a question Jeff, sorry Jeff Neuman just to Carlos. If we don't use - if you're recommending that we don't necessarily use the ISO 31661 list are you recommending – is there a list you're recommended to use?

Carlos Gutierrez: We can of course look at permutation of three letter codes and see if it's still usable for geography. In my opinion it's not. We shouldn't use it. That's the problem. That's why we lose so much time here. We should really scrap it.

Martin Sutton: Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you Nick, Christopher Wilkinson for the record. First of all yes there is a real problem with the bias within the CC – the 3166 list. Nick has given one example of it but in general subdivisions of states qualify for a code if they're islands. Now maybe 50 to 100 years ago that was a relevant concept but nowadays the Internet with bias on status of islands is ludicrous but that's where we stand.

Later in the discussion I will introduce a different set of boundary conditions for the geographic terms but though I would treat 3166 as a subset, an existing subset which is highly codified good, but it's only a subset of the problem that we have to discuss. And nearly everything that we have to discuss is not in 3166.

Martin Sutton: Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange. I agree that it's confusing Carlos and perhaps out of date but this whole story started with the two letter codes taken by or John Purcell or the grandfathers found a list that they could use for the domain name system. And that's how it all started. So I think that will be the background for

we have the ISO 3166 for the two letter. And a lot of countries many, many country also use the three letter codes. It's there. Tt's a list that they use and I know that in Norway they used for example for identification of sales when they compete. It's Olympics. It's a lot of things.

So countries have identification with these with the names on the ISO 3166 three letter as well. It is a lot of other lists. So of course it's possible to expand but that will be an impossible task. We will never end up with something at all. At least the 3166 it's there, we know it and it's historically in our regime. So that's just a comment.

Martin Sutton: One of the other - oh Paul in the queue.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady, so two questions, one with regard to the list. I understand the comment but what would we replace it with right? That's the next question and that – so right and then going back to the previous comment about the governments that are not recognized that are not participating here again how do we solve that problem? Do we infer that those governments would all take the position that I personally would take or do we infer that they would take the position that my colleague to the right would take? Again how do we - it's an identified problem but in this context both with the list and with the governments that are not here I don't know how to solve that problem. And so we do have to at some point sort of agree on some basics so that we can move on and get the work done. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Do we have any more comments on this section? Otherwise we can take the opportunity to move on and discuss a couple of other categories? Okay great. So if we move on to slide…

Woman: Yes, 13.

Martin Sutton: …13? Thank you. So this is the long form country and territory names. Again similar to the other category there it was thought that with the list at least it

was easy, predictable and objective standard to follow which, you know, is often a criticism of other elements of the application process where there was a lack of predictability so again that was a positive.

On the negative side if a country wanted to apply for their long name as a TLD again this is – there was no opportunity to do so. Similarly with other cases it's hard to assess that missed opportunity because we don't know who would have applied to do so if they have the opportunity to. So what we would like to know then is from participants here and the phone is, you know, going forward is this again something that should be treated in the same way that it was in the Applicant Guidebook or are there other options and considerations that we should look towards for this category? Taylor?

Taylor Bentley: Taylor Bentley, Government of Canada. So I'm just looking at the Google Doc in the last vertical which is future treatment and the options that are discussed here and also in the previous one as far as the opportunity for government to apply to UCs or any kind of other mechanism for sort of refusal what have you aren't included there. So I assume what we're doing is we're kind of building up potential options and having those in as concise a form as possible would facilitate us to shop that around back home. So that would be appreciative and I think we're coming up with a lot of good recommendations here so thanks very much.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Taylor. I have (Catherine). Paul is that an old hand?

Paul McGrady: Adobe Connect (unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: (Catherine).

(Catherine Oma): (Catherine Oma) for the record. I would like to echo the comment Jeff made earlier. This was not also - not only apply to the three characters we just discussed but also to the long form and maybe also so next categories like the short version. So in case any government wants to have that name they

could open up a new process and see how they can apply for their respective short form long form whatever they want.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Anyone else? Jorge?

Jorge Cancio: Thank you Martin, Jorge Cancio for the record. I think that consistent with the comments that I made before for all these categories of country names for the future treatment I would propose something like the opening of such TLDs use TLD on purpose not gTLD because that would be something open for the community to further decide and would be perhaps possible under the assumptions that the appropriate policy development is made so that policy authority remains basically or mainly on the local community.

So I don't know if that's usable but that would be my take on this so it's not really saying let's close it forever whatever but I doubt that Worktrack 5 is the right place although I don't know perhaps we could recommend let's think about this possibility of delegating it to government but under a completely different set of rules whether policy authority remains with the local authority.

Thank you. I've got Christopher and (Beth). Javier, sorry Javier first Christopher Annebeth and Jeff and just carry on. Javier?

Javier Rua-Jovet: So Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. Just quickly Jorge I appreciate your comments but in your comments you said three concepts that are different to - say the same thing, this part of complication. So in one part you said local authority and then the other you said government. That could be equivalent and the reason you also used local community. That's another one. So it's interesting the concept of community is, the definition of community is another discussion that the whole community in ICANN has to have to determine what that exactly means in this context so just to point that out. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson. Since actually some of my - I think I'm the (unintelligible) of this meeting. I will allow myself to regale you with a little bit of history. Just to say that the - when ICANN with my assistance was managing the allocation of country names in .info there was very considerable interest by a large number of governments to obtain their usually short form name in.info and to use it subject to domestic regulations and policies. And I would be very surprised if this same general interest was not - did not reappear when we get round to this one in public. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange. Jorge just to choose make it clear what you really are saying here we're back to categories again. As it is today we have two. We have the CC that's been for the governments for the local authorities and that kind of thing. It's the local Internet community that decides what kind of policy to have. And then we have the gTLDs which generic is one thing but actually more that the G can stand for global because they all have to get under the global regime of ICANN.

So what we really - what you really are looking for is new category that's not a two letter country code but a TLD that could be under the local Internet community's regime the same way as a ccTLD. But all country and territory variations should go that way instead of being a gTLD. Is that right?

Jorge Cancio: Yes that's correct. And in the end it's a principle or subsidiarity that policy authority remains with the local community. And the local community for instance if you look at the GAC principles on delegation and re-delegation of whatever -- I don't remember the exact names of ccTLDs -- it's always an interplay between the government, the local community and ccTLD manage.

Annebeth Lange: Right, just a couple comments back that I agree that this is an idea but it will not fall - then fall under the gTLD work that we are doing now as far as I can

see. Then the only thing would be another PDP somewhere in the future to do something with that thought. Could you comment on that Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: So I think - this is Jeff Neuman. I think we're jumping a couple steps ahead. If there's an agreement within the community that these three characters or country names are in fact country names that fall outside the jurisdiction of the GNSO then this group could recommend that these names be reserved or not be available, let's put it that way so reserved, that they're not available for the next round with a recommendation on the broader issue to ICANN because I don't think this is a GNSO, ccNSO issue. This is a foundational issue of ICANN because we have a GNSO and a ccNSO. And as far as supporting organizations with respect to names that it. And those are the two entities that are responsible for policy development.

What seems to be implied by some of those statements is that well at this point they're not - it's not agreed-upon that they're gTLDs. It's not agreed-upon that they're ccTLDs so therefore they don't fall within the GNSO, they don't fall within the ccNSO. They fall somewhere else. And that is an existential question for ICANN that can't really be handled by us.

So the most we could recommend if everyone agreed if we had consensus was - and again it's limited to country names because someone help me with this. Does the ISO two character deal with two character territories or is it...

Man: Well yes I guess…

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: They're sub territories yes. So that would then fall within – so obviously we know from the bylaws the two characters on the ISO 3166 falls within the ccNSO. From the ICANN bylaws everything else falls within the GNSO. If there's any change to that that's got to be a full community ICANN bylaws change.

Back to this group all we could recommend would be that if everyone agreed that country and territory names and three characters because of the discussions here would not be available to register and would need to be handled in a process outside of this subject to the following concerns. But I don't think we should go beyond that or can go beyond that and say and it should be up to the local Internet community. That's not really an appropriate thing for the GNSO to say at this point because that hasn't been decided. But hopefully that makes a little sense. We can only take a couple steps in the GNSO. We cannot go further.

Martin Sutton: Thanks Jeff. I've got Heather, Rosalia and Greg on the queue.

Woman: And then...

Martin Sutton: And then and Christopher and then we'll close the queue after that.

Woman: Oh (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Yes go on Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Jeff I think we don't need to go quite so far and quite so fast. GNSO as far as I can see from the history insisted on driving this bus. The bus contains what I shall describe as CCWG light. The participants are CCWG and the procedures GNSO. Okay but I don't think it's appropriate for GNSO to start the discussion by throwing people off the bus. I think we are in this together and my main purpose is to bring GNSO into line with realistic international policy.

Martin Sutton: Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks Martin, Heather Forrest. So I have some concerns about the interventions that have just been made particularly - I'm sorry Christopher I don't understand the point that you just made. Jeff kind of focused on the process. And I think from a substance point of view I have concerns about moving things to a local authority because one of the objectives of what we're trying to do here -- and I don't want to lose sight of that objective -- is to provide clarity and certainty and predictability and fairness for applicants. And by moving things to a local frame that doesn't in any way provide any of those things to applicants. So I have concerns that we're losing sight of the ultimate goal and I don't want us to get into a position where we undermine this PDP from we're on the way to doing really interesting things here and I don't want us to lose sight of that. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. I've got Rosalia, Greg and (Christina), Liz and Olga and then I think we'll have to close the queue there. Thank you. Okay.

Rosalia Morales: Hello. This is Rosalia Morales from .CR. So following the discussions we've had with the two letter code and the three letter code I believe that a long form of country and territory names follow very similar characteristics. They identify country, they create confusion with different users and it's also a very limited group of names that we're talking about and we still have a lot of other geographic terms to discuss and to contribute.

So and also looking that I feel the discussion is going into things that do not pertain to this particular PDP process or even this particular community part of the GNSO. I strongly believe that these terms should be reserved as they were in the past and we should continue our discussion. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Greg? You may be on mute Greg. We'll move on then to Kristina then Liz then Olga.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. And I agree with the points that Heather had made with regard to predictability and certainty and to some extent I

agree with Jeff. But I would actually stop short. I don't think it's the place of the GNSO to - and a GNSO PDP make recommendations about a kind of existential restructuring of ICANN. I think at best what we could say is there is agreement or disagreement or wherever it is that we actually are because I'm actually not quite sure and I think it would be helpful to recap that on these prior categorizations and that note that there was interest by members of the PDP Working Group particularly participants who were also active or were GAC representatives and perhaps exploring different approaches but that it was beyond the scope of the GNSO. I think we just need to be very clear about what the scope of the discussion was but also be equally clear that it's not the place of this. So to make recommendations or to start those types of processes.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Liz?

Liz Williams: Thank you Martin, Liz Williams. I've been listening carefully to the, a little bit of feedback maybe from Greg's sorry…

Martin Sutton: If anybody is on the phone bridge if you could mute.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Okay thank you. Liz and…

Liz Williams: Sorry Martin. I've been listening carefully to the conversation that we have been having this morning and it's as – and I agree with Heather it's gone into an odd direction. And I wonder if we could think about it in a slightly different way because what we're trying to solve the problem which we're trying to solve are being clear about our policy, being clear about the guidance that we can provide to potential applicants because the policy is then manifesting in a new Applicant Guidebook. Then we have to provide instructions to objective evaluators and we need to give them measures and tools for assessing potential applications.

And I just want us to remember that the historic distinctions we make between what could be called a generic TLD and a ccTLD has in effect been blurred by the changes from the 2005 round where you had to sign a contract with ICANN whether you were a ccTLD operator like Nominet is now a gTLD registered or for example. In Australia we have Melbourne and Sydney which means that an Australian government authority has the agency for determining policy for those two city names. And we are not alone. There's many, many other examples.

We also see that governments want to have access to what we will call top-level domains. I'm not going to make them one level or another. So not a generic, not a city, not a TLD. A ccTLD just at the top level. So how do we enable that to happen clearly and precisely and carefully? How do we manage the expectations of applicants? How do we manage the responsibility of evaluators and then how do we enable the management of a good top-level domain organization whether it is any kind of applicant?

So I don't want to see us getting in the in a sense negative weeds of presenting limitations when as Donna quite rightly said when she was speaking this morning we're also talking about competition innovation, activity to enable the representation of communities wherever they want to be. Now I'd like us to be thinking more positively about that if we possibly could. And overall we have a responsibility to behave in a timely way to move forward with policy recommendations that we can all come to some relatively small amount of consensus and move on because we can't keep talking about it for another decade.

Martin Sutton: Points noted. Thank you. I've got Olga and then Greg's just rejoined so then we'll go to Greg.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Martin. About predictability we agree but it should be for all stakeholders not only for applicants, should be for governments, for civil

society for all the members of the community because they are global names that impact – we see that the rules of the Internet impact everyone and not only one country, group of countries. They impact all of them. So predictability for all the members of the community not only for applicants. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay Olga. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. I come back to what Jeff said and – about the fact that essentially all TLD space is divided into two parts kind of like (Gal) minus one part. And it's ccTLDs and gTLDs and the way it's defined until an existential change is made this is where we are. And that is in fact why we're where we are. Unlike Christopher I don't think Jeff went too far too fast. I think Jeff went too far too fast I think Jeff in fact went nowhere at all other than the present situation.

                  And while we can talk about decisions perhaps about how to manage these, you know, various categories and we have another worktrack that's discussing a lot of other categories or may come up with the idea there's no categories really make sense it's still within the GNSO space. And I will go back and say that if we're going to quibble about what the word generic means let's just say it doesn't stand for anything like the middle initial of President Harry S. Truman which stood for nothing. So these are just gTLDs and G is just a random letter. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Greg. So we are coming to the close of this session. So first of all I think we do have this natural deviation as we start to open up discussions. We're trying to go through segment by segment so that this preliminary look at what existed prior to Worktrack 5's efforts gives us something to work with and then consider any other geographic terms. So we will continue to go through these existing categories on the worktrack calls but we will be able to grasp all of the good input that we've heard today.

And just to remind everybody of our next call that will be on 28 March at 5:00 UTC. So early for some but we'd encourage you to continue good participation on the worktrack. For members that have been turning out in force on those calls and thank you very much.

I think unless there is any other business we will close. Does anybody have any other business? We have 60 seconds left? Great. You have 60 seconds of your life back. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you everyone.

END