ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 08 August 2018 at 13:00 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-track5-08aug18-en.mp3
Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p58832j45ut/**

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/zARpBQ
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the call on Wednesday, the 8th of August, 2018 at 1300 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the AC room. Please mute your lines if you're not speaking at this time. Thank you. If there are any participants who are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names, as I stated before, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to Annebeth Lange. You may begin.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. And welcome, everyone. Before we start I would like to say a few words about the order of the agenda, that has been discussed on the email list. There has been a suggestion to alter and discuss the non-AGB names first but the co-chairs have decided that we need to get started on explaining the process of consensus calls so we take that first.

Work Track 5 is a special case since it consists of members not usually participating in GNSO processes and that means that many are not familiar with the consensus process. GAC has their process and ccNSO has theirs and ALAC theirs, so it is important to understand for all the members that Work Track 5 is part of the GNSO process with their way of using consensus.

We therefore found it necessary to go through it more thoroughly before we are moving on, even if members from GNSO which know the process from before, find this a little boring, we hope it will be useful for all of us to get a better understanding. We also consider it useful to if possible to get some of the less controversial issues that have been discussed for months off the table now and concentrate on more contentious issues.

Before we go on, are there any changes in the SOIs? I hear none. So I go onto the next slide please. One more so then we start. And the standard way of making decisions is included in Section 3.6 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines and you find the link to go into it later. It all starts with draft recommendations based on deliberations and input from the group and email list.

The recommendations will be reviewed and revised and the standard steps of a consensus call are after the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues within the item under the discussion to have been raised and understood, the chair, the cochairs in our case, make an evaluation of the designation of consensus or agreement, if you will, and publish it for the group to review.

Possible designations are full consensus, consensus, strong support but significant opposition and divergence. Minority views refers to proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation, and this may occur in response to any of the designations. Coleaders will then send their evaluation

of the designation of consensus levels by email prior to the call where the item will be discussed.

After the group has discussed the cochairs' estimation of designation, the co-chairs will reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation. Steps 1 and 2 which described above, should continue until the co-chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group. Next slide please.

It is important to understand that consensus calls are not about voting. The designation, "consensus" is a position where only a small minority disagrees but most agree. It does not require full agreement by every individual and full consensus exists when no one in the group speaks against a recommendation in the last meeting.

Once Work Track 5 finalizes its recommendations for the initial report the full working group in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group will consider this recommendation and take into account public comments. All recommendations may go through the consensus call in the full working group and the final consensus call won't happen until the working group is putting together the final report and after the public comment period on the initial report. This is a layered approach.

Before we move onto the next issue on the agenda, are there any comments or questions on that? And here I must have help from the staff if you go into the details. Any hands here? Christopher. Christopher, I can't hear you. Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: I have unmuted. No?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, now I can hear you.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay. Just to say in the previous slide there is an internal contradiction referring to strong support from significant opposition, you know,

either it's criticism of opposition, if you like, or it's support but I'm not quite sure what strong support but significant opposition is. So I believe that's a rather ambiguous phrase in this document. But at this stage I have no further comments. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. Emily or Cheryl, does anyone have an answer to Christopher on that?

Emily Barabas: Hi this is Emily from staff. I can speak to that.

((Crosstalk))

Emily Barabas: Oh, unless Cheryl would like to?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, go ahead. I'll jump in if need be.

Emily Barabas: Okay. So Christopher, that's a good question. Just referencing Section 3.6 of the Working Group Guidelines, strong support but significant opposition is defined as a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation there are a significant number of people who do not support it, so that's one of the categories in the Working Group Guidelines that can be a designation of consensus level. So I hope that helps. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth again, yes, and I see in the chat is a good explanation as well so it might be a typo there, so we'll sort that out. Olga, your hand is up.

Olga Cavalli: Can you hear me?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, we can hear you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Sorry for my voice I have a horrible could. There is a question in the chat about if there will be opportunity to comment before the document goes for public comment.

Annebeth Lange: Will there be an opportunity to comment before the document goes out for public comment? That's the question.

Olga Cavalli: I think the question means that if we as a group will have a chance to review the full document with the recommendations and agreement before it goes to public comment.

Annebeth Lange: Emily, can you answer that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Cheryl here, I can certainly answer that if Emily doesn't mind. Not only as I thought Annebeth went through very, very clearly – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. In your deliberations, you all should have plenty of opportunity as you generate the text and agree on what you can agree on. Your final recommendations, if and when you agree upon them, once you agree on what you can agree on, will be going to the full plenary before, in an ideal world at least, certainly in the plan, before it would go into an initial report and out for publication anyway. So I guess the answer is yes, on several occasions. Thanks. Back to you, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Cheryl, for making that clearer. And Javier, you have your hand up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes, this is Javier Rúa for the record. Yes, on this point on – yes, as Annebeth mentioned early on, you know, this is – this consensus call process is really, you know, part of the ongoing temperature-taking – temperature-gauging of the ongoing opinion of the work track. And, you know, as Cheryl says, it's especially, you know, it's not – there's no finality to it; it's an important step of course.

And but it's part of you know, of our communication about this process here to know where we're at and start – and that's why we also are taking some of the topics that were – we have come to the, in some ways this preliminary,

you know, consensus or some agreement and not, you know, so we have over several topics once or twice, maybe three times. So and we will continue to do that of course.

And so I mention this because from the email list initially, I think I perceived some reactions that I think are based a little bit on the notion of perhaps there's different definitions of consensus out there or the idea that somehow consensus is a, you know, an election or a vote or, you know, some sort of vote that predetermines things. It's – again, I think we should not be concerned – overly concerned with finality on this. It's a step. We're moving an agenda forward of course and but I think you know, Annebeth has (unintelligible) of what is and what isn't the – with the aid, you know, the comments by Cheryl and Emily and others that can chip in.

I think there's other people that have a lot of experience with consensus calls in this call that can also help us call out to ease our minds on the idea that a process is moving, you know, in final ways when it is not. So that's my comment right now. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Javier. It's Annebeth again. And what we are trying to do is to find a predictable way so we can establish some agreement to any recommendations we are planning to send to the PDP as a group and then later on to the wider ICANN community. So this step in the agenda was – try for us to explain a little further on the consensus call process. As I said in the beginning, it's quite new for a lot of us since we are not used to the GNSO processes. But it's important to remember that Work Track 5 is part of that wider process and that's what we are working with.

So w – I think we go onto – now to the short summary of the road ahead, so we just go through the work plan that we have started with and the target date for the publication of the Work Track 5 initial report is the 30th of September, 2018. We know that it is ambitious but we will try to follow it. And this timeline for Work Track 5 fits into the overall timeline of the New gTLD

Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group and allows us in the Work Track 5 for our recommendations to be fed into the overall PDP before it completes, and that's important.

The leadership team has developed a work plan to map out steps to publication of the initial report, but this document may be revised by the leadership team as work progresses. It depends on how fast we can work and how the input come from you as well. Questions or comments?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: This is Javier for the record. I see a comment by Jorge Cancio on the chat. He's restating, you know, his concern and (unintelligible) and also by other GAC members regarding the schedule. To that I think we can say that, yes, we know it's demanding. One of the reasons why we're moving forward with the strategy, you know, set out today and in the earlier emails is really to keep on moving in a way that everybody can understand and agree to. But, yes, I mean, there's no denying that we are – Work Track 5 in many ways is – or almost in every way is playing catching up to the other work tracks as possible.

My hope is that we can continue at this pace and have something good to show before the Barcelona meeting, and that's the wish of I think of the work track in general. But we understand of course, because we've heard these concerns on the aggressive – not the aggressiveness, maybe the, you know, the speed of things. We have heard that or we know we can move forward at a decent speed and do a good job. That's my reply to Jorge but thanks for your comment.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Javier. It's Annebeth again. And we completely understand that the GAC has another way of doing things and they have to take into consideration a lot of things. So we of course will try to listen to that as much as we can.

So Christopher, you have your hand up and then Alfredo Calderon.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, Christopher Wilkinson…

((Crosstalk))

Christopher Wilkinson: Of course I have (unintelligible) schedule but if I look back over the past six months it's taken us this long to reach full, frankly, (unintelligible) recommendations on the ISO aspects so I'm not particularly optimistic about the schedule down the road, but we'll try. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. Alfredo.

Alfredo Calderon: Yes, this is Alfredo Calderon for the record. Can you hear me?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, we can. Thank you.

Alfredo Calderon: Okay so I just need a point of clarification, when we're saying that by September 30 we'll have the document ready for public comment, how does that fit into the timeline that the Work Tracks 1-4 have? Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Cheryl, could I ask you to answer that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Because at the – allowing for public comment to come in in that timeline after – whichever call you want to talk about it, the end of year period, it allows then for public comment to be looked at by your work track and it – to be hopefully, integrated back into a final report with Work Tracks 1-4, which of course we will be – and we can republish if you wish the timeline for the full PDP. If your aspirational timeline is not met, and the Work Track 5 initial report does have to run with a out of sync final report with the Work Tracks 1-4, that would be highly regrettable and we're doing our best to avoid it.

So one of the reasons Jeff and I are keen to support the – and staff are keen to support your coleads in this timeline is to allow for integration back into a single coherent final report with any final reports from Work Track 1-4 that may occur, that's yet to be determined, and there's a slide which we will send out to the mailing list if you like, staff don't worry about pulling it up now but send it to the mailing list which we've used in several public meetings now to show how the timelines should integrate. Thank you. Back to you, Annebeth, so you can get back into the primary agenda.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Thank you, Cheryl, it's Annebeth again. And it's just a note from Kavouss Arasteh here that we do not want the pressure to be (unintelligible) while other working groups – work tracks will be given more flexibility to complete their works afterwards. My impression is that this is not the way it will be but Cheryl, again, how do you interpret that sentence or that fear?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr again. I think a higher aspirational timeline such as you've put together, is not unfair or unreasonable pressure; it's exactly what it is, a timeline which if you can pull it off, if it works as you plan, will allow for integration with the rest of the PDP process. The other work tracks, as Kavouss may have heard, those who participated in all of Work Tracks 1-4 whilst they got the initial report out, complained similarly, in fact I think Kavouss's voice was one of those complainants about the pressure that was put on them. So Work Track 5, believe me, is not being treated in any different way. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Cheryl. Javier, you have your hand up and Christopher Wilkinson and then we must move onto the rest of the agenda. And after you – the two of you have spoken, Javier will take over the lead. Perhaps we can take Christopher first…

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Christopher. Christopher, you're on mute.

Christopher Wilkinson: That's better. Christopher Wilkinson.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, it's better.

Christopher Wilkinson: Just to go on the record – on the record that – can you hear me?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, we can hear you.

Christopher Wilkinson: …some latency in this mute button. Just to recall that the (unintelligible) to the draft initial report for the PDP in effect protects Work Track 5 from pressure from the Work Tracks 1-4. It is recognized that the Work Track 5 is as necessary an independent exercise. Now I'm obviously in favor of full integration but there are so many issue on which Work Track 5 questions will interfere with Work Tracks 1-4 that I think the preamble of the PDP documents is essential. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. Noted. Javier, will you take over?

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes, this is Javier for the record. And to – I was going to comment, yes, on what Christopher just mentioned. Work Track 5 we all know has a different speed or schedule than the other work tracks, and we are the bosses of our own work track and we should determine our own – our own speed on this. But at the same time and to take – and to, you know, answer also other comments by – I think even by Christopher, I mean, we've – I think our work track, we've been discussing topics sometimes back and forth and sometimes early on we were doing a lot of circles.

And, you know, by setting out a clearer, you know, a more granular, a more precise timeline today we've always announced, you know, the Barcelona meeting as a type of, you know, goal generally but now we've been a bit more specific and a little bit, you know, we're talking about September before Barcelona. We've always discussed that but now we're just going into more detail and that also, you know, protects us from ourselves in the natural, you know, the natural instinct to go over and over, you know, conversations and try to, you know, as much as possible generally settle some of the topics and then keep on moving. So just – that's on that.

So this is a slide on the work plan, again, there's an initial report target date for the end of September. That's basically almost a month before Barcelona. I hope we hit it; I think we'll hit it. And the timeline for Work Track 5 fits – we have discussed this – it, you know, we fit into the overall timeline in a, you know, in a particular way but as Christopher mentioned, we are not under the pressure of the other work tracks, we're under our own pressure.

And we have developed this map, this work track, this work plan. And it's an ongoing, you know, living document, we're always checking our own decisions, our own speed; it's – nothing is completely (unintelligible). And if, I mean, our goal is to reach consensus here, you know, as much as we can on the topics and we'll keep on working for that. Next slide. Next slide.

So to the substantive – before the substantive you know, consensus call we're suggesting, there are some comments, let's see, on the chat. Kavouss asks, or posits, "A note to secretariat, would it be possible to identify the total number of GAC participants?" Okay, please take note of that. Anybody else has any comments before we go into this slide? There are multiple people writing in the chat. I see Steve and Cheryl, others. Okay. Hearing none, I'll keep on going.

So country and territory names, as we have mentioned in prior calls and also we did some, you know, temperature-gauging in San Juan, there appears to

be some, we used the word "convergence" – I don't want to get mixed up on terminology but some type of agreement or convergence on future treatment of country and territory names. We have asked – the community have asked the work track, generally we have had calls on this.

And the email that was set out, that was sent out by – I think by our coleader, Martin, you know, we flagged these areas of convergence with the draft that reflects these areas of convergence or general agreement on ways forward on country and territory names. And these draft recommendations are, you know, generally consistent with the 2012 AGB except for the topics that are listed here.

Before I read this, I see – I saw quite a large comment on the chat here. Carlos Gutierrez says in the chat, "General Comment on this consensus call on the Aug 8 draft document Number 2. As I have noted my written comments to the draft recommendations on the list, I want to restate my comment that the drafting style in which the present so called "recommendations" do not fully reflect neither the full range of the deliberations nor all the group input as per the GNSO consensus call rules. Draft recommendations based on deliberations" and group input unquote, the only segment of each of the proposed recommendations that gets close to a real recommendation avoids taking responsibility for the substance of the recommendation, by suggestion to send the issue back to the community without any procedural consideration."

Okay. I don't know if Carlos wants to speak on this. I think he's referring to the part of the recommendations – there's a part in the recommendations that have some language regarding future consideration of the topic by the ICANN community. We can look into those language and I, and the coleaders, really we all want you to, you know, so maybe changes of drafting or recommendations on these particular texts that we sent out by email. Maybe there's some different draftings – ways to draft this language that can be done.

So going on with this, draft recommendations are for the most part consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook except, Number 1, for long full names listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard; short form names listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard and separable components of country names designated on the separable country names list. Change translation in any language the translation is official languages in the country and the official UN languages.

This part of language is important because, you know, one thing that I don't think we have discussed enough is if we're going to – if the work track wants to stick to some, you know, existing list of languages that will be used maybe official UN languages or something to this effect. I don't know if anybody has any comments on the issue of languages. And I see Annebeth has a hand up. Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth Lange here for the record. I just wanted to remind that these recommendations we are talking about now is only on country and territory names, as I see some of the comments in the chat. So this is not for geos in per se but what we are discussing today is for the country and territory names. And as for the languages, what we had before was all languages.

We have been discussing some that it's really difficult to find a way to have all languages preserved in a way, it's so many languages in the world, so therefore a suggestion from several has been to restrict it to the official language of the country and the UN languages that we all know are. Thank you. Back to you, Javier. Christopher has his hand up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:.Yes, Christopher, go ahead. Thank you, Annebeth.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, Christopher Wilkinson. Very, very briefly in response to Annebeth, this is very close to a proposal I made a long time ago. But please note that this should be in any script. There are countries where it's all very well to have country name in any language, any official language and the UN

languages, but in some countries the script is important too. So I think we should just add, "in any script" or "any applicable script" or something like that. Sorry to interrupt.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. That's a good suggestion.

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes, thank you, Christopher. Thank you, Annebeth. Does anybody else want to comment on the concept of maybe sticking to UN official languages and their scripts as mentioned by Christopher here? And it would be – I see Jorge's hand up. Jorge, please go ahead. Jorge, are you – we can't hear you. Okay so we'll keep on going here so he's muted. Jorge, your hand is up, maybe if you're not going to speak, put it down please?

So our screen we have some of the specific recommendations – Greg, please, if you're going to – quickly go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. A question about process but it really is very important with regard to how we answer these recommendations is whether we will be putting together finite lists where those lists don't already exist in a third party area. Obviously ISO 3166, alpha 2 exists, so we don't need to make our own list. But if we're talking about other languages or scripts that are not listed how are we going to know which ones are in and which ones are out unless we create finite lists?

In the IGO INGO reconvened working group that just delivered its recommendations to the GNSO Council, we were very conscious of the fact that we had to create a finite list, not necessarily a closed list, it could be amended if there were new countries that – or new societies but it was in fact a finite list in part needed for technological reasons that a reservation has to be seen and whatever the reason is, we need to be clear that we're doing finite lists where there isn't already a finite list available. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Greg. I see Annebeth hand up but I think that's – that's what we're trying to do. So the initial position seem to be very, very open like all languages which is evidently unworkable, and as Christopher and Annebeth mentioned, we're, you know, maybe stick to some finite list as you mentioned, which, I mean, the list of UN languages and, you know, I don't know if there's a list of the scripts in the UN, but the list of UN languages is I think pretty – UN official languages maybe are we referring to? Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth here. Well one thing is that Jorge has problems getting on sound here. But he says, "Please read my comments in the chat out. As long as there is no factual basis for the limitation in languages I would tend to object to the change from the 2012 AGB." So I think that a lot of the governments have this view that the UN languages is a way of course because we know who those languages are, but it's quite few and then many other countries will perhaps have problems with that, I don't know why, but I think (unintelligible) should have the opportunity to pencil this out a little more before we decide anything, it's a lot of opinions on this here.

Another thing he has put in the chat here is also about the two-letter or two-character that was in the AGB, and now it's taken out and only is letter-letter. And the letter character or letter-digit is moved on to Work Track 2. And the reason for that is that it's not considered to be within our scope since one letter, one digit is not a designation for a country in a way.

So but that doesn't mean that you can't – anyone can give input to the Work Track 2 initial report – the initial report is out now so it's easy to give input on that and explain why it's not a good idea if that's what you feel. Thank you. And Greg is on – has his hand up again. Greg.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Greg, go ahead. No it apparently was an old hand.

Annebeth Lange: It was an old hand.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. So moving on, if nobody else has a comment at this point, we have on screen, you know, the specific recommendations by, you know, that have been drafted according to the prior calls, etcetera, that were sent out and include some of the corrections and tweaks that, you know, we thank the working group for sending out so many, you know, good emails as always, you know, in the past few days. So I guess we can go, you know, over each again just for the interest of everybody.

So going down to Recommendation Number 1, and I just put the document in my whole screen so I can't see who's commenting on the chat or raising their hand so, Annebeth and please, and Olga, help out – and interject clearly if need be.

So in Recommendation Number 1, I'm going to read out. "The work track recommends reserving all two-character letter-letter ASCII combinations for existing and future country codes. The starting point of this recommendation is Section 2.2.1.3.2, string requirements, Part 3, 3.1 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook which states applied for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two characters ASCII strings are not permitted to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO standard."

So does anybody want to comment on this first bullet of this recommendation here generally? Okay, so we can keep on moving on. "The work track recommendations specifically address letter-letter combinations because the focus of the work track is on geographic names. The work track considers letter-letter combinations to be within the scope of its subject area. The work track notes that Work Track 2 of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group is considering two character letter-number combinations. This recommendation is consistent with the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of new generic top level domains policy recommendation from 8-

August, 2007. It is consistent with provisions in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook."

Any objection to this – the general drafting of this recommendation here? I see some comments in the chat. I see – I'm sorry if I mispronounce your first name, Dessalegn Yehuala, "The Work Track 5 is about geographic and territory names at the top level and exists," the chat moved, sorry, "and exists – the Work Track 5 is about geographic and territory names at the top level and existing label generation rule prevent top level names having digits." Thanks for the clarification.

Other comments, we have Jorge, "I have repeatedly made a comment on letter-character combinations that might be similar to two-letter country codes. Thank you." He was replied by Steve. Thanks, Steve. Greg also made a comment. Thanks, Greg. I see a hand by Annebeth. Annebeth, go ahead please.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. It's Annebeth here again. I just wanted to make a note on the sentence in the recommendation Number 1 that it says that this recommendation is consistent also with the provisions in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, that's not completely correct because in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook we had two letter or two character; it was not letter-letter, it was two characters. Even if a letter and a digit is not a code for a country, that was the text in the 2012.

And another issue is that it's kind of changing the system if the two character domain name should be a gTLD, but that's another matter; that should be handled in the Work Track 2 since it's been taken in there, and everybody is free to give input. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Annebeth. I see some comments, Kristina Rosette, she says, "For clarity I suggest a slight revision to the recommendations with suggested change here," she says. And my chat moved again. She says, I don't know if

Kristina wants to speak because the chat is moving so quick that I can't find it. Okay, so Kristina says, "The work track recommends reserving at the top level all two character," does anybody want to comment on this revision – this suggested revision? Thank you. Kristine.

I see Heather gave a plus one – give a plus one to Kristina for that revision. And also Paul McGrady and some others, thank you. I see a lot of support in the chat – from the chat for this revision. Thank you, Kristina. I see Kristina writing again, okay. Thank you. So anybody else want to comment on Recommendation Number 1 in terms of the drafting?

You know, one – this is just an idea, just reading this, the recommendation – I see Kavouss has his hand up. Kavouss, please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, a simple clarification, in Bullet 1, in the third line, two character is it two letter-letter character or it is something else? Is it two character? Character may be a letter, or character may be not a letter, so could we clarify when (unintelligible) two characters are we talking two characters that could be letter-letter or we talking of the two character that would not be letter-letter? So could you clarify that please?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Of course. Of course, Kavouss. Thank you for your comment. So I don't know if it could be improved but, yes, what the group – work track had focused on is letter-letter combinations. The, you know, the word character in that text in itself might sound broad, I think including other characters that are not letters. But yes, it's letter-letter. And I see Emily has her hand up. Please go ahead, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Javier. This is Emily Barabas from staff. So to clarify a little bit, the scope of the recommendation for this group is focused on letter-letter combinations for the reasons that were discussed previously regarding the fact that letter-letter combinations that are geo names. The quote from the Applicant Guidebook from 2012 talks about two character ASCII strings and

that encompasses all two character ASCII strings including letter-number and number-number and letter-letter combinations.

So none of those were – only gTLDs had to be three or more characters in length in the 2012 round which is why the current recommendation is sort of a subset of what the text was in 2012. So I hope that that's helpful in explaining why the term "character" is used in that quoted text from the Applicant Guidebook whereas the term "letter-letter combination" is used in the recommendation itself. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Emily. Kavouss, I hope that answers your question. We can – we have always been clear we're talking about letters. I see some comments in the chat, I see Rahul and Jorge are sticking to their guns in terms of a wide variety of relevant languages to be used and not – and we have to keep on thinking about this then because I see there's some views on, you know, for and against, you know, the idea of official UN languages and (unintelligible).

So maybe we can go ahead to the – and look at the next recommendation, if there's no objection? Any objection? Hearing none, let's go to Number 2. So Recommendation Number 2, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved and unavailable for delegation as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook Section 2.2.1.4.1," I think point I, it's very small, and the bullet is alpha 2 code listed in the ISO 3166 standard. This recommendation is a revision to the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of new generic top level domains," and this is the same language as before.

I see Christopher has his hand up. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Javier. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. I didn't want to intervene on the previous recommendation but I have two general points. The first is substantive, in the final paragraph under this recommendation we say – the ICANN community may want to consider whether a future process,

etcetera, shall be established. I think anybody reading this from a public comment, for example, or substantively would (unintelligible) to saying, well, you know, what has Work Track 5 been doing? If this is an option, and we strongly imply that it is an option, why haven't we done it? I think this applies to several of the recommendations. If we are offering governments and other entities, other interested parties, the option to register some of these strings, I think that's the kind of thing that most people think Work Track 5 ought to have been doing.

I don't agree with kicking it down the track. And that final paragraph should either be deleted or we set up a subgroup or a simple text drafting by the secretariat and the coleads to say how this should be done; not – it's nothing like it's complicated as some of the other things that we're going to have to deal with. So I have a problem with that last paragraph.

My second point is – secondary and designed to in fact we probably won't be able to pay attention to it, but looking at this exercise from the outside, the constant references to the 2007 text are frustrating if not misleading. There is no way that everybody who looked at this matter for public comment or even for implementation will be able to go back more than 10 years to 2007 to assess whether or not they're doing the right thing.

I have said this before and I think it's a mistake (unintelligible) secretariat, it is a mistake to reference the 2007 documents. We've got enough problems to deal with with revising the 2012 document. But the – my first point is more substantive, you can't wave this option in front of everybody and then say oh, but we didn't do anything about it. No, if you want to have that last paragraph and each of these recommendations WT5 should say up front how we propose that the interested parties such as governments and local authorities know that (unintelligible) can exercise this option. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Christopher. Thank you for your comment. And, Christopher, for everybody's benefit of course, is focusing on this paragraph, the one that

says in all the comment – in all recommendations, I think it's this paragraph in the last one that says, "The ICANN community may want to consider whether a future process should be established to determine if, when and how specific interested parties such as relevant government authorities may apply for country and territory names."

I think Christopher suggested that that paragraph be completely deleted. I'd be interested to hear from the work track, you know, whether deletion is the way forward, whether partial deletion is the way forward, whether it keeping it as-is, I haven't heard anybody speak of this too much here, so maybe Greg and then Annebeth, you have points on this? Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. I was actually going to respond to Christopher's second point and remind him that this is, you know, a continuation of the work of the GNSO policy recommendation process that issued policy recommendations in 2007 and as such, that is that we are following on as well as on the various permutations and mutations that took place between that time and the AGB and other things that we're stuck on.

So I know that Christopher is not a fan of the conclusions that were reached in some cases in 2007 and maybe other people aren't, but we can't pretend that that's not part of the process we're involved in, so it would be a huge mistake and one I don't think we have any danger of making to take away references to the 2007 GNSO policy recommendations. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Greg. And, you know, I see Jorge hand is up. I'm going to defer him, you know, before Annebeth just for, yes, he hasn't spoken yet. Jorge, go ahead. You have to unmute and go. So…

((Crosstalk))

Jorge Cancio: Hello, do you hear me okay?

Andrea Glandon: Jorge, I have unmuted your line.

Jorge Cancio: Hello, do you hear me?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, we hear you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes, thank you.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Thank you very much for giving me the floor and sorry for the technical issues. I wonder whether could just go back at least for the record on the languages issue? And I think there are two aspects or two sides on that. First side is okay, how do we get from the 2012 AGB with all languages to this new recommendation? Why are we deciding this? And I don't see any rationale and I don't honestly recall any factual basis for making this change.

So I think that is a very important procedural point. And as long as we don't have a basis for making that change, which is commonly understood and accepted, I think we should keep the things as they were in the 2012 AGB.

The second point as to substance, is, as I mentioned in the chat, is first UN languages is a very limited set of languages which in many countries are irrelevant or largely irrelevant. And official languages is a notion that exists only in some jurisdictions, for instance as far as I know, the US has no official language. In many other countries you may have a similar situation where languages are not official as such but are used by the administration or are used by the people to different degrees.

And thirdly, as I said also in my comments, in Switzerland, for instance, we have four national official languages, but we have many other languages which are very relevant to important communities in our country which amounts to about 1/3 of the population and it would make no sense whatsoever to include the four official languages under the regime, but to

exclude other relevant languages from that regime although they are used by very important parts of the community.

So I think that there are both reasons of procedure and of substance, for really taking a break on this change from the 2012 AGB and to really think it over and have a discussion on list or on the call or whatever. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Jorge. And, yes, it's a good point. So as, you know, as chair then I'll take this opportunity to ask the whole work track what do they feel? Do they have strong objections? Does anybody have any strong (unintelligible) on keeping the, you know, the current in any language quote – quote, in any language, unquote, language that is currently enforce instead of revisiting that? Does anybody have strong objections on keeping the current wording of the – that's in the books right now? I see hands by Annebeth and Kavouss. Please, Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Annebeth for the record. Actually I wanted to comment on Christopher's first and Greg said what I had to say about the 2007 versus the 2012, it's actually two different things. What we are doing here is to try to see if the policy of 2007 should be altered. Even me, from the ccNSO side, have learned that this is what we are doing. And it's a long time ago and the 2007 is a policy and 2012 is more an implementation; that was the result in the end.

And I think this is one thing. And the other thing that he took up was this sentence that we want to consider whether a future process, that was brought up in San Juan and the reason why if I remember that correctly, is that a lot of people think that country and territory names are outside the scope of the GNSO and that it should be considered in another kind of working set with more ccNSO and the countries and it should not be a gTLD in the end. And that's why it was suggested to set down something after this process of new gTLDs has finished to find out a way to use country and territory names in different forms. That's how I remember it.

As for languages, I think it's a good question to ask as you did, Javier, do we really have – does anyone have very strong objections of keeping the languages as it is? I agree with Jorge that the UN languages are – it's kind of a historical selection of languages, made after the Second World War, and it's not a way the world is today. So a lot of other languages could be more relevant than those on the list and at least as relevant.

So this is perhaps not the right way to do it but we have to ask all of you are there strong objections and will it create many problems keeping it as it is? See that in relation to the country and territory names, really is a kind of a borderline between CC world and the G world as well. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thanks, Annebeth. Kavouss and Greg in that order hopefully on this issue of language. Go ahead, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, the UN official language has a political background back to 1945. I don't think that that sort of constitutional division or description of language should get into the technical and administrative issue of the gTLD so I agree with the two comments made by Jorge and I don't see any reason why we have to change unless we have a strong valid reason we should not change that, so I fully agree with two suggestions or comments made by Jorge. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Kavouss. I see Greg. Go ahead, Greg. I think you have a different opinion here.

Greg Shatan: Yes, Greg Shatan for the record. Yes, I have strong concerns, objections to the all languages standard. And I'd be curious to know where that in the process that got into our Guidebook in the past. Just because something's in there doesn't mean it was reasonable or rationale at the time. After all, a camel is a horse made by a committee. So the, you know, problem is it's unworkable, it's unlistable, it's unexistable, it's unpredictable, it's not transparent and it just, you know, tries to set the broadest possible net.

And again, if we're talking once more about preventive lists, this is, you know, reservations, this is what we're talking now about reservations, which is the you know, the strongest way in which a string can be held back from use or at least held back from use by anyone other than, you know, some rightful claimant under some claiming process, whatever that may be. So that goes back to the discussion we've been having the last couple of days that by using a cannon to solve all of our problems, we don't – we lose any chance at nuance in solutions.

Whatever the word for Canada is (Anunkitut), and maybe that's a bad example because that may actually be a quasi-official language, hopefully we could find that out, but you know, there's, as I said, 40 languages spoken at my son's school and that's one school in New York City with only 600 students and it's not a diplomatic school, by the way, it's just a magnet school.

This is just a way of, you know, piling up as many geographic names as possible, which overall as a general concept I object to especially when using the preventative method which is supposed to be the method used with the most care and restraint. Hopefully we can get back to our discussion of methods and I thank Jorge for putting his suggestions back in the chat about how to, you know, make the consent method perhaps a little more nuanced. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Greg.

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:….my line. Kavouss, is that an old hand? Okay, so…

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes. Echo. Echo. It's done. Perfect.

Annebeth Lange: Better.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. So on the language issue – thank you – we heard some support by a few track members on keeping the broad any language text and very, very strong opposition by at least Greg on having a broad, you know, text there on language. We have to see what we can work out there. I do think that the, you know, thinking back on this that, you know, UN official, you know, UN official languages lists is a pretty – it harks back too much to post-colonial, you know, messages and could, you know, who knows? So I see a hand by Carlos Gutiérrez. Go ahead, Carlos. Carlos, we can't hear you. Sorry, Carlos…

((Crosstalk))

Andrea Glandon: Carlos, your line is unmuted.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. I can't hear. Carlos Gutiérrez. We have only 15 minute to go here – is it 15 minutes? Yes. So we have to keep on moving. Carlos, go ahead. Carlos. So sorry, we couldn't hear Carlos. We were…

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Sorry. Sorry, can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Go ahead.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Okay. My hand was raised the first time on Recommendation 2, it goes very similar to some of the previous comments. And I'm going to be very short. I strongly object overall restrictions, the big cannon policy that Greg just discussed on any recommendation other than Recommendation 1. I accept it's on Recommendation 1 for tradition. But if we are going to argue for restrictions in all other recommendations, they need to have a rationale and

there is no rationale for keeping restrictions in Recommendations 2, 3, 4 and following.

And my second comment goes in the same direction of Chris Wilkinson on the last paragraph, I don't fully agree with Chris but I agree with Javier that the last paragraph has to be discussed and maybe redrafted, only the last paragraph is the first step in the direction of our real recommendation if the Work Track 5 takes the responsibility and doesn't just send it back to the community. Thank you very much.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Carlos. Yes, I was going to go back to that last paragraph mentioned by Chris. I think that's – no that's a very important paragraph. I see the concerns of what (unintelligible). Maybe we can have on the chat and on the list, you know, suggestions on drafting or, you know, (unintelligible) drafting this paragraph. Chris suggested deletion – Christopher, sorry, suggested deletion. I wonder if this paragraph could be tweaked to send a message that the community can have – can support generally.

But I hear your strong objection, Carlos, and I hear Christopher's strong objection and others that I've seen on this, you know, future process language in that informs every recommendation. So please, let's look at this text and let's try and focus on specific recommendations on maybe deleting or adding and focus on that very specifically in the chat or in email in the maybe the next day and maybe we can delay next – maybe we can put an email out on how to do this but this is I think this is very, very important.

So let's…

Annebeth Lange: Javier, it's only 10 minutes left.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes, yes, yes, so let's keep on going. Thank you, Carlos. We have other recommendations here and I think that the work track has read them. I think the general concerns that might be – that might persist by some track

members on these recommendations are the same. And something like this last paragraph, the, you know, the paragraph that starts, "The ICANN community," etcetera, "may want to consider," that informs every recommendation, and maybe we could focus on enhancing that for more – even more consensus here.

Please, Kavouss, quickly. It was an old hand by Kavouss. So, yes, so the work track has I trust have read over these and if anybody has more general comments about the other recommendations please state your piece, go ahead, anybody?

Kavouss Arasteh: Please read my comments in the chat, please.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. I shall. You can go ahead and say it, Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I put some comment in the chat with respect to the language. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Okay. So please I don't know if I can find it right now. Oh, yes, Kavouss starts, "If you want to retain reference to UN official languages, you may precede that by including but not limited to read including but not limited to UN official language." Thank you, Kavouss. So again, to the whole team, to the whole work track, we have as we mentioned early in the call, we have read over these ideas. There's some preliminary agreement on this way forward. Today we've heard concerns about that last paragraph by some, Chris, Carlos, others. We've heard concerns on the language issue, let's keep on working through that. I think we're moving, which is great.

So please, anybody wants to speak on recommendations before we move on, any other concerns, objections before we move on on the recommendations? Seeing none, let's keep on going to other parts of this slides, please staff?

I think we have some like housekeeping slides on – oh well, yes, non-AGB terms. I don't know if we want to start with non-AGB terms. Next slide now. But we all know in this work track what non-AGB terms is, which is terms that are not in the AGB that are geographic in nature. I've seen there have been some back and forth in the – including me on the email. I even put out a fun – I think a fun (unintelligible) start talking about this with more detail some wanted to put this issue early on before the other issues like Chris or but I think we have to focus on the next few calls on this – on non-AGB terms on detail, on problems that we perceive might exist.

That's why I put out the you know, a hypothetical out there on Apache Helicopter Corporation. Maybe that's a problem that could be (unintelligible) a solution, maybe it's not, and other like topics here that have to do with names of geographic significance to peoples, countries, people's linguistic groups and others and how we can move forward on non-AGB terms. I think I've always said, and some have always said since the beginning there's a great chance on this topic to innovate and to do interesting things for the community and for applicants and everybody on this topic. I don't think we have time to go into this on detail today and even less to wrap up.

But I think there's some good discussion starting out – that started out in the mailing list sometime ago and it's restarting now. I think this is the subject of a very specific next call, it's a topic that is I think again a great chance to innovate. I see a hand by Paul. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here. So I don't know whether we're supposed to talk about these hypotheticals on this call or if we're supposed to do them on the list. But Apache Helicopter is a great hypothetical. The Apache Tribe as far as I know is a North American tribe and it may be purely within the United States. The United States has legislation protecting against claims that goods or services are produced by Native Americans when they're not. And if somebody were using dotApacheHelicopter to claim that the Apache Tribe

were making helicopters then there's already legislation in place to deal with that.

So it's a terrific example of how this sort of thing should be and can be handled by national or local legislation and a great example of why ICANN should not be in the business of trying to become the international legislator on these sorts of topics. So sorry if I was supposed to say that in the mailing list – on the list instead of in the call but when I saw that hypothetical I thought, what a great example of something that's actually already been handled by national legislation and a great example of when ICANN should, you know, not, you know, run ahead and try to become some sort of congress for everybody. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Paul. Thanks. Yes, great discussion. I wanted to discuss at this granular level this type of thing, and thank you. And I can think of other hypotheticals that could be helpful that might even be more complicated than that one. I can think of a country that is opposed (unintelligible) for something and how would that work – how would that work out? And should ICANN get into that?

So I think we can keep on moving on this unless there is strong objections on keep on moving. Anybody want to speak quickly on this? Okay, thanks, Paul. Thanks, everybody. Next slide, please. Okay, so there's some housekeeping issues here, interesting, maybe staff, somebody, Emily can help out here?

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Javier, this is Emily Barabas from staff. We just briefly wanted to touch base on some logistical changes that are going to be happening on the upcoming calls and future calls for Work Track 5. So basically there's a new telephone service provider and for those who are dropping, please check carefully your invites for the upcoming meeting and the call details, that's the take home message.

You can see here on the slide and this information will also be in the invitation for the upcoming calls. Basically if you're dialing in, the number is going to change and there's a slightly different interaction flow when you got on the call so you're going to have a different method for entering the pass code and you're going to record your name which is just a little bit different. Everything else stays the same, we're still using Adobe Connect, the functionality will all be, you know, the same quality but this is a way to save a little bit of money and hopefully it will not have a big impact. So please do read your invitations carefully before you dial into the call next time. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Emily. Okay, so next slide. Do we have – what's next? Any other business? What's next? Next slide please. Is there a next slide?

Annebeth Lange: No more.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes, I don't have it printed out to the last one so what's the next slide? Is it any other business?

Annebeth Lange: Javier, we don't have any more slides, we are finished.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Okay, perfect.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Under the line here.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfect timing, Javier, well done.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Okay, so thanks to all. I think we've had a good discussion today on very specific ways forward. Thanks to all that participated on the chat and speaking. And please continue doing what you're doing in the email. I think we have, you know, the specific drafting of the language of the recommendations. I hope we can see some quick, you know,

recommendations by the work track, you know, today and tomorrow so maybe we can put out, you know, a more (consentual) text out in the consensus call process. So with that said, good day, good afternoon, good evening to all. Bye-bye and see you soon. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, everyone.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Annebeth. Thanks, Javier. Bye for now.

Annebeth Lange: Bye.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END