ICANN
Transcription
Work Track 5 on Geographic Names at the Top Level
Public Comment on the Supplemental Initial Report of the
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process
Wednesday, 09 January 2019 at 20:00 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.
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p178vc52osi/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/Wwn_BQ
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Operator: The recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you so much. Well welcome, everyone. Good morning,
good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Work Track 5 on
Geographic Names at the Top Level call in Regards to the Public Comment
on the Supplemental Initial Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures
Policy Development Process meeting on the 9th of January, 2019 at 20 UTC.

Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the
audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now? Hearing no
names, also as a reminder, all lines connected via the phone bridge today will
be muted until the end of the presentation and at that point all lines will be
open for a Q&A session.

As a reminder all participants to 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 it is my pleasure to hand the meeting over to Martin Sutton. Please
begin sir.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Michelle. And on behalf of Olga and Beth, Javier and myself, as the coleads of Work Track 5 it's our pleasure to welcome you to the webinar session today. This will be recorded so it will be available for those that were unable to join us at this time or if you need to catch up at a later stage to listen again it will be made available for you.

So if I can move onto the first slide I think – are these – right, you have control in Adobe Connect of the slides so we'll move to the Slide 2. Just as a reminder, this webinar has been set up to ensure that we give an opportunity for those that may not have been entirely close to the Work Track 5 proceedings and discussions and to provide an overview of the work undertaken by that group over the last year which has resulted in the publication of the initial report, which we'll go into a bit more detail further on.

It's not designed to be a discussion – a reemergence of all the discussions that we've had within Work Track 5, but just essentially to help you understand what the approach was of the group and to provide an opportunity to answer any questions you may have particularly if you need any clarity on some of the questions or suggestions that have been put forward in the initial report.

So I do see that we've got a number of our Work Track 5 colleagues that have joined the call and appreciate them joining us as well to guide through the session today.

If we move to the next slide, okay, yes if we could actually sync the slides so that we don't get out of kilter between the audience and the speaker that would be helpful I think. But just to give you a flavor of what we'll cover today, we will provide a bit of scope and the overall purpose of the Work Track 5, the current status and what we plan to do next but more specifically we'll go a bit deeper into the supplemental initial report that's been published and where we're seeking some valuable input from yourselves.

We will open this up to Q&A so that we cover off any questions. If you do have questions as we go along please feel free to put those into the chat; we'll either try and respond to those during the course of the presentation or we'll store them to the end and be able to respond at that stage so feel free to populate the chat with any questions you may have.

Okay we go to Slide 5, so to give you an idea about what Work Track 5 is about, it is a part of a wider policy development process for Subsequent Procedures. As you may be aware that there are a number of work tracks that were created to try and divide up the work and focus on specific topics to review. So previously there was an initial report published for Work Tracks 1-4 which covered a multitude of different topics. Work Track 5 was a specific group set up to focus on geographic terms at the top level.

So this working group – the charter for this was to really focus on what has – what was developed and implemented in the 2012 New gTLD Program and the experiences of that program as it panned out and to see whether there was any improvements or recommendations that should be made to the existing 2007 policies that exist under GNSO and under Generic Names Supporting Organization.

So the work track is – has actually been running for over a year meeting regularly, much often than once a month, more likely every two weeks in most cases and also providing updates and opportunities to share updates and include community input at various stages particularly at ICANN meetings where we've had open sessions and very productive input from the audience to help us along with our work. And that work has been pushed forward by a group members to the Work Track 5. We had 160 or over 160 members that signed up to the group and another nearly 100 observers so you can imagine that there was a broad array of views and positions that were brought into this group to discuss all different aspects of geographic terms at the top level.

So we did encourage, you know, diverse group of people to join up and be part of this process in order that we can get all of those opinions and opportunities to discuss within that group those positions and understand if there is opportunities to improve any policies and implementation work in regards to the treatment of geographic names at the top level.

I'll move onto the next slide. So it's important to understand that this focused on the top level only so did not regard anything to do with second level or any other further level of domain names within a TLD. This is purely looking at top level and how this was treated within the 2012 round. And within the Applicant Guidebook there was specific areas that were covered and we're particularly we're highlighting these here.

These included things like the two-character country codes, country and territory names, capital cities and sub national names and other areas that included things like UNESCO regions and other wider context of geographic terms such as rivers, mountains, so more geographic features and culturally significant terms related to geography. So that was the focus of that group. So as opposed to Work Tracks 1-4, which had a variety of topics to cover and had started a couple of years back, Work Track 5 was formulated to make sure that we had an opportunity to focus on a single topic and bring in different members of the community to share those views so that's – that was how we approached forming the group.

I'll move onto the next slide. Looking at status and next steps, so after, you know, many months of deliberations and conversations amongst Work Track 5 members and also the ICANN community, the result of that was a supplemental initial report issued early in December. This includes preliminary recommendations formulated by the Work Track 5 team, not the policy development process working group, so this is call contained within the Work Track 5.

It also includes options and proposals and questions that were teased out through those deliberations and conversations within Work Track 5. And now what we're seeing is an opportunity to gain further input from the community and feedback so the initial report was published with slightly longer than the normal comment period to basically allow for the holiday period over the end of the year, so the comment deadline is 22 of January. So I'll just highlight that for now so that, you know, if you're interested in this topic and you'd like to make some comments and feedback on the initial report there's still good time to be able to provide that and submit that by the deadline of 22nd of January.

So what do we do after that? Well there's a lot of work already been done within Work Track 5 but all of our members will then be looking at the comments that have come back through and we'll analyze those comments and work out how to develop those final recommendations into a report that we hope will actually be merged with the full working group, so this is where we aim to see this converge with the overall policy development working group to deliver a single final report.

So that's the intention still remains and we hope we'll be able to achieve that based on the feedback and input that we receive from the community during the course of the rest of this month and complete those deliberations. So that's our approach so far, and current status and next steps.

I'll now hand over to Olga who will just talk us through more deeply in terms of the approach towards the initial report and we'll, as I say, have an opportunity for questions and answers after this section. Okay, Olga, I'll hand it over to you to take over.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much, Martin. Can you hear me well? I guess so. Can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Yes thanks, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Oh fantastic.

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Just trying to check my audio. First Happy New Year to everyone, feliz año nuevo. Want to – hello from this very, very hot summer afternoon here in Buenos Aires, yes it is warm here, not cold. And thanks to colead and thanks, Martin, for explaining the first part of this presentation and thanks to Annebeth and Javier and to staff for all the hard work done to achieve and get us there to this state of the report and thanks to all of the community of you being with us today.

And let me go on with this presentation. Before I move on, let me tell you – remind you that the summary of this report has been translated into other languages than English, Spanish and – I cannot recall exactly how many languages but just you can check that on the website and the link that you have for the report, so that is important for colleagues who don't speak English as a first or second language.

So the general approach of this report it is – documents different perspectives, and summarizes the status of all of the discussions that we had in this work track. So where appropriate and applicable, the report presents preliminary recommendations, so this important, your comments, your feedback because we have different recommendations, questions you will see when we talk about that part, which is Annex B where all together so your feedback is very important so we can finalize this document with your input.

In some cases work track member or individual members have put forward some proposals that – that (didn't) – were in consideration or proposals right in the work track are documented in the report; everything is in the report regardless of the level of support so that is important to stress.

The report also includes a series of questions of which the work track is seeking additional input from the community to support further deliberations. So see the executive summary, as I said, it is already translated into some languages for overview, and preliminary recommendations. In addition, all recommendations – this is very important for you to have in mind – if you look at the whole document, it's a big document, it has a lot of detail, it has many pages, but all recommendations, options, proposals and questions for community input are (unintelligible) from the report and listed in a table as Annex B.

So maybe you want to check first the Annex B and you check the questions, you check the proposals and if you have doubts, that is the reference – it's a clear reference in each of them to the section of the document that has more explanation and more detail about the origin of that question or that proposal. So don't get – don't get paralyzed by the size of the document, just take a look at it, take a look at the executive summary in whichever language that you're more able to read and then go to Annex B and then go one by one.

That would be my piece of advice to you because the document as a whole, it's very detailed and long, but if you go to Annex B that may get things easier for you to comment and to understand all the content. The table is intended, of course, as I'm saying, to help commenters organize their feedback.

About consensus calls, with the initial report of the full working group, there were no consensus calls taken prior to publication of this Work Track 5 supplemental initial report. The two main reasons to this approach, taking consensus calls at this stage it can have unintended consequences for locking work track members into positions or support, different positions, prior to soliciting public comment which is what is happening now from the community about this recommendation, so we don't want to – avoid any idea or any comments.

From such defensive positions at this early stage could have the diverse effect of members being less open to modifications to their position as a result of community input, so this is why we had no consensus calls, this is why the document is so detailed and so complete. This is why, also, your comment – your comments and input is so important.

So what is the structure of this report, we have already mentioned about Annex B, which summarizes all the questions and the proposals, also the summary, the first part and the initial story of the report, but the core of this document is Section 2; that section has all the detail that you need to understand all the questions and all the proposals. Deliberations of the working group, the high level structure of this section is similar to the initial report published by the full working group early this year. And I will go detailing the following parts that part of it.

A, what is the relevant 2007 policy and implementation guidance, if any? B, how was implemented in 2012 round of the New gTLD Program? C, what are the preliminary recommendations and/or implementation guidelines? D, what other options and/or consideration along with the associated benefits and drawbacks? E, what specific questions are the PDP working group seeking feedback on? F, deliberations. And, G, are there other activities in the community that may serve as dependency or future input to this topic? So this is – these are part of the Section 2. I will continue describing the Section 2 content.

Then, other recommendations, the preliminary recommendations, these are also included in the executive summary, as you can see if you check it. So these are the preliminary recommendations. Continue to reserve as unavailable at the top level - of course your comments are welcome – all two-character letters ASCII combinations; alpha 3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard; short or long form names listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, and there's a call there for these items translation in a language were reserved in

2012 Applicant Guidebook, Work Track 5 has not yet agreed on whether translations should be reserved in the future, and if so, in which languages.

Short or long-form name associations with codes that have been designated as "exceptionally reserved" by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency; separable components of country names designated on the "Separable Country Names List"; permutations and transpositions: Work Track 5 preliminary recommendations suggest clarifying that permutations and transposition of the following are reserved. This is an adjustment of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, should apply to all categories above with the exception of strings resulting from permutations and transposition of alpha-3 codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, which should be allowed.

Names by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name and an intergovernmental or treaty organization. I will move onto the next one because there is a continuation. Second part of the preliminary recommendations.

Continue to require a letter of support of non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities, sorry, at the top level for, capital city names or any countries or territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, and then there is a note there, for this item, translations in any language were reserved in 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Work Track 5 has not yet agreed on whether translations should require support/non-objection in the future, if so in which languages, so your comments are welcome in this regard as well.

Continuing, city names, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name, see specific language from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook for details; applications for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a country, province or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard; applications for a string listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the "Composition of macro geographical

continental regions, geographical sub regions, and selected economic and other groupings."

Any comments? I am not reading the chat; maybe I'm missing something important, if colleagues made some comments about that, please let me know.

So moving on, options in Section 2, these are Part D and the questions in Part E. So if you find there's questions in the Section 2, remember that all questions and proposal are summarized in Annex B. So you will find in Section 2 a more detailed background of each of the questions and proposals but perhaps once you get the time for commenting, go to Annex B and that you will have the list of questions and proposals.

So in the full working group initial report, options were captured in Section 2, Part D of the report. However, in the Work Track 5 report, the options/proposals are captured in the appropriate section of the deliberations section, given the extensive number of options and proposals under discussion. See the following slide. I will show you further detail.

Section 2, Part E contains a number of questions, apart from proposals, there are also questions, where the work track is seeking additional input from you, so it's very important that you give us your comments about it. Topics here include overarching issues, country and territory names, geographic names requiring letters of support or non-objection and additional categories of terms.

All recommendations, options, proposals and questions for community, as I said, are extracted to make it easy for you to comment and find them in Annex B. So you go to Annex B, you check all the comments – the questions and recommendations. If you need more details, then you have the reference where to find them in the Section 2 of this preliminary report.

Moving on, more deliberation summary, Part 2, Section F. Section F includes the discussion of specific categories of terms and also reflects high-level discussion on broader issues like, who owns a string? Who has the right to a string? What is the appropriate role of a geographic community and government? Then we have to check the f.1.2.1.

What type of mechanisms should exist to exercise rights or establish roles in the process? Then you see all the details in f.1 – oh, this is – 1.2.2. What law and policy considerations should be taken into account? Which should take precedent, f.1.2.3. What is geographic name for the purposes of the New gTLD Program? Does the intended use of the string matter or not? See f.1.2.4.

What are the key takeaways from the 2012 round of the purposes of future policy development and implementation? See f.1.2.5. Are there alternate methods of consultations or collaborations in the application process that could satisfy all stakeholders? See f.1.2.6. So during the public comment period, your feedback is welcome in all aspects of the report whether the questions, the proposals or any other comments that you want to add in relation with the report, I just mentioned the Annex B because it I think – I personally think that it may help a lot during the comments to the full report.

Moving on, well, we have come to the question and answer section so I will give the floor to my dear colleague, Annebeth, and Annebeth, the floor is yours and thank you for your attention.

Annebeth Lange: Hello, everyone. This is Annebeth Lange here speaking. Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Annebeth, loud and clear.

Annebeth Lange: Good, good. Well, we are now at the point that we have presented what we have done so far. So I'm looking for hands here, are there any questions? We haven't had many questions sent in before, so what we really want you to do

now is to think, do you have questions to the report as such? This should not be a session where we debate the substantive issues contained in the report but to ensure that you understand the structure and content of the document so that the thing that Olga has (issued) as well to look closely at Annex B to then it will help you to understand the report better.

I also think it's important with such a large report that you think that perhaps it's just a few things in the report that you want to comment on, and that is the things that is important to you. So pick those out and send an answer to those things even if you don't have the interest in everything that's in the report; it's important for us that all – without – or outside those who have been members of the Work Track 5 also now have the opportunity to send in their comments on what we have reached.

We have been up to – what we have been up against is that we have experienced in the Work Track 5 a lot of different opinions from as said in the chat by Martin that from more protection to less protection. So it is difficult area here. We don't agree and therefore we have to find a solution that we can live with all of us.

So I open the floor for questions and so are there any hands up there that we can help clarify things? I don't see any hands here. Is everything crystal clear? Olga, please.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Annebeth, thank you. For colleagues who speak Spanish, we have a – I coordinate with Brazilian colleagues working group about Internet governance in Latin America in our region of (plan) of action for the Information Society, and we plan to organization a webinar to do a similar explanation of what we have done today in Spanish. It will be next Monday.

So if you're interested those colleagues from the region who speak Spanish want to join or spread the news in the community send me an email, let us know and we will send you the link to the Adobe Connect.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: And perhaps – I would like to – I think I said this like five times but I've been in contact with some colleagues in private and they say well, it's a huge document, yes it is because it includes all the different views. And I think that's a real value of the document. So don't (paralyze) (unintelligible) that big document, go to Annex B, go to the question proposals to have (searched) and then go into details of more explanations of each of them to – and give us your input whether you agree or not or you want to give a detailed explanation of each of the questions and proposals. So thank you, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Olga. So Javier, do you have anything to add?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Hi, hello to all. Happy New Year again to all. I don't know if any of the work track members want to go to any particular slide and review it. It's – I know it's a lot of material but this is the purpose of this seminar, this webinar, just to try and dive a little bit deeper. So it will be a, you know, a pity if you miss a chance to ask a question or make a comment.

In general, you know, I'd like to stress that one very important aspect of Work Track 5 is the fact that it has, you know, a very cross community character; as you see we are coleads from different communities that in many ways ensures, you know, a very wide and open, you know, participation of different viewpoints and different types of, you know, angles in our conversations and that's very important. As coleads colleagues have mentioned, it's, you know, the initial report is a complex long document.

Again, we stress, look at the, you know, perhaps the more summarized annexes, it's important to have a sense of it and then, you know, go into the deeper conversations once you have a sense of it if you don't – if you're somebody that's just starting out here. It could be very, very dense if you're just starting out. But in general, please, you know, after this webinar spread

the word. The, you know, the comment period is open, it's, you know, we have preliminary recommendations in this document, they are just that.

They are based on some prior, you know, the implementation, the Applicant Guidebook in many ways, the 2012 actions, but they're still preliminary and it's important to get – have a real, you know, a better sense of the wider community views on things in this comment period.

So those are my comments, so far and thanks to coleads for all the, you know, the great camaraderie and also all work track members for their great inputs throughout our many, many meetings and that's that for now. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Martin, I see that you have your hand up?

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Annebeth. Yes, can you hear me okay?

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Martin Sutton: Great.

Annebeth Lange: Yes we can.

Martin Sutton: I just wanted to point out just for those that were maybe on the phone as well, there was a question posted into the – from Sebastien about the public session where there were various proposals made to use lists regarding cities. And I know Olga's responded already to that in there.

But yes, there were multiple discussions; in fact cities was a regular and in depth topic that was covered through Work Track 5, various different ideas and considerations that were put forward. And we have included those in the report and included where people have had suggestions, some of those are in there as well for comment and feedback, so it is worth going through to some of the detail of those deliberations.

And perhaps that speaks to some of the comments from Farzaneh regarding the fact that, you know, this does resemble very much the 2012 treatment of geographic terms in many of the preliminary recommendations. That may be correct, but to even reach that there were months of deliberations and discussions and I just want to make it clear that there are completely varying degrees of positions within Work Track 5 and beyond within the community that were considered during those discussions.

And that's why it is important just to read through some of those comments and certainly do present your own comments and feedback to the report; that will be highly useful for us when we start the analysis work at the end of the month. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth here again. I agree with you, Martin, that is very vital point. And the interesting thing is that also it's not the ccNSO that have one opinion and the GAC has one opinion, etcetera, it's within all stakeholder groups there are different opinions, so it's not like – from the GAC side is the same and etcetera that way, it's not like that. And that's rightly point as well I think.

So if there are no more hands up, perhaps Steve, is it possible for you to say something about the plan forward? It's been asked by Tom Dale about the ICANN 64, what are we doing now after the 22nd of January when the comments come in? Could you please enlighten the group on that?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Annebeth. This is Steve from staff. Hopefully you can all hear me well. Sure, I can try to provide a high level overview of what lies ahead for Work Track 5. So the public comment period is set to close on the 22nd of January so a couple weeks from now. From that point forward the intention is that the public comments will be organized and prepared essentially in a matrix and that would – is intended to help serve the Work Track 5 in analyzing those comments.

So we're allotting approximately about two weeks to do that organization of the comments. And so the idea is that the Work Track 5 will have an opportunity to meet prior to ICANN 64, hopefully once and maybe twice beforehand. And so the coleads can correct me if I'm wrong but I think the assumption is then that the focus will be to actually start going over those comments and try to understand them as well as to see how they might impact any final – well additional deliberations and recommendations.

In terms of what is to be covered at ICANN 64, I don't think we're exactly clear yet; I think it depends on how much progress we see is made in reviewing those comments. It could be a continuation of the review comments or it could be some other level of substantive discussion. So I think it's a great question, Tom. I'm not sure if the coleads want to add anything to the discussion at ICANN 64 but I think there's probably some – still discussion needed to finalize those plans. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth here. Thanks, Steve. I agree with you that we don't really know by now what will be the program for the ICANN 64, it depends on what comments are coming in. So we will see after you make them in the matrix and the first meeting after that is finished and all the members have had an opportunity to go through that and then we can make plans for how to deal with this through ICANN 64. But it's certain that we will have discussions there as well and also to present the comments from the community. Martin, do you have anything to add?

Martin Sutton: Hi, Annebeth. No, I think we're still largely dependent on the comments coming in and how those – and the analysis of those. So that will pretty much direct the work that we do at ICANN 64. Before I hand back again though, just to – I would just like to close off a bit here to say, you know, a huge thank you to Work Track 5 participants. It's been, you know, a lengthy process as many of these Subsequent Procedures elements are, and we've had, you know, great contributions through different parts of the community over the last year culminating in the initial report, so a big thank you to those and we

look forward to receiving comments and feedback from the rest of the community as they peruse through the output of our work. Thanks, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: And thanks to you. And Olga, you have your hand up.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Annebeth. Final comment about the value of the multistakeholder approach to this document, and the value of having the different coleads from different groups within ICANN, I think it has been a great exercise. I don't think there is any stakeholder over another one or, as Annebeth rightly mentioned, all the comments are detailed there without any reference to who made it. So please give us your feedback, give us your comment as it will be very important so we can finalize a very nice document to move forward. Thank you very much.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Olga. I agree that if there are no more questions here, what we can do as coleads is to encourage everyone to go to their community and tell them to engage and send in their comments. The more comments we have the more fields we will have on how the community looks at this and try to find a common ground.

So from my side, thank you very much for everyone participating in this webinar, it's quite a lot of people, and that's nice to see. And if there is nothing more from me, it's – I think we can just close off.

Martin Sutton: Bye to all.

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Bye. Thank you, everyone.

Annebeth Lange: Bye-bye.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye. Thank you, everyone. Bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you for your participation today. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings at this time.

END