ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 03 October 2018 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. The audio is also available at:
https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-03oct18-en.mp3 [audio.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p38z51jtu9v/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/DQarBQ
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Before we get into the nitty-gritty, please, if staff can put up into the AC Connect, the schedule of things to come where we're at, so we can all be in the same place, just to remind us all where we're at? There is a slide that has some good -- excellent.

So, okay, so this is -- this excludes today, as we can see, so it -- this slide clearly sets out the next steps in our work as a group towards ICANN 63 and beyond on what we're tasked to do. So, in October, it's just before we all get on planes to go to Barcelona, and then we have our face-to-face in Barcelona, where we're going to keep on looking at feedback from the community, from all of you, on where we're at in our draft initial report and beyond, and beyond Barcelona.

So, this is where we're at. And if there is no objections to the agenda, which is basically we're going to go (inaudible) document and see your comments and your insight on the language there so far that you have created, that we all have worked for. So, if there's any objections on the agenda, please state so now. Seeing no objections, please, let's just dive into the document.

We have a good attendance today. This is great. Welcome to all. So, right in front of us, draft of initial report, section C, D, and E, 27 September, 2018. So, I hope most of us have looked at this document and read it through. These are your recommendations. These are the language that we have, as the community, come up so far as our work track. I think we can just go right through it recommendation by recommendation. And maybe before we do that, does anybody want to discuss a particular section first? I see no hands to that, so I guess we'll go in order, one-by-one. Can we just go in order rather than jump around? Okay. Yes, okay. Very good, Paul. So, let's go in order and not jump around.

All right, so preliminary recommendation one. As described in recommendations 2-9 -- okay, Emily, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks. This is Emily from staff. I just wanted to provide a little bit of context -- and I apologize, my printer is running in the background -- for this document, because I think it'll maybe head off some of the questions that will come up.

So, this is section C, D, and E. Those are the preliminary recommendations, options and questions for community input. And this follows more or less the same format that we

used for the subsequent procedures initial report, so we're only sharing three sections of a total of six sections of the report at this time.

And there are a couple of comments that we've already encountered that have said this seems to be missing, or that seems to be missing. I raise this point, or added pros and cons for a specific thing, and I don't see it here. And I just wanted to be clear that there's a lot more coming. The deliberation section, which sort of talks about a lot of the different perspectives, will capture a lot of that. So, this is just three sections of six, and it might be good, once we have all the sections together, to look at that holistically and find the gaps.

But, for now, we're just focusing on are these the recommendations we want to put forward at this point, noting that, one, no consensus calls have been taken and that the recommendations can change after the public comment period; two, the option section is basically saying here are some places where people have put out a bunch of alternatives. And the question for all of you is are these the right alternatives that we should be putting out for community comment, are any missing, should any be eliminated.

And then, finally, section E is the questions for community input. And the broad question there for all of you is are we asking the right questions to the community? Do these questions make sense? Are there any key questions that are missing here? Noting that anything in the report, including the deliberation section, any point raised, are subject to community comment, and members of the community are welcome to say whatever they like and weight in on any of those items. So, this is not the only thing that we're asking for feedback on. It's the entire report. So, I hope that's helpful as we go through. And if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Emily, very, very helpful. So, since I'm looking at the document in my whole screen, I can't really see the Adobe Connect unless I collapse. So, Martin or -- if you can flag any comments in the chat or -- this is moving around a lot. Wait a second. Okay. I lost control of this. Can we go to the beginning here? Emily, could you put the document in the correct section? Because it -- I moved it around, I think. There we go. Okay.

So, we have the language here from preliminary recommendation number one. As described in recommendations two to nine, the work track remains unless or until decided otherwise, maintaining the reservation of certain strings at the top level in upcoming processes to delegate new gTLDs. As described in recommendations 10 to 13, the work track recommends, unless or decided otherwise, requiring applications for certain strings at the top level to be accompanied by documentation or support, or non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities.

Any comments on this? Any comments on this section? I see no hands up. I see a hand up by Christopher. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, good evening, everybody. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. First of all, just let's check that you can hear me.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes, we can hear you.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay, because there's sometimes (inaudible).

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Keep on going, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes. I would prefer at this stage just to take the comments which I've already made as read, and I notice that, at least in one case, the staff has already put that in as the flyer to

be on the right-hand side of the text. I don't know how to describe that. So -- and on this particular recommendation number one, I queried the use of the world "certain," because that implies that there will be other strings that are not protected. And I think that we do not yet have a consensus on that point. So, I'd suggested deleting the word "certain." But, I'm not going to take the call's time on repeating all the points that I made in writing, which you already have received. Thank you.

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

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady for the record. Is there a way for us to make it clear here that we are talking about the applicant guidebook as written rather than as applied? I don't think we want to preserve necessarily, at least a lot of us don't, restrictions on strings as applied. And there may be some consensus here, I'm not sure, for it to be as written, but I definitely think we need to make that distinction. And I've asked that question, I think, in a previous work group, and I think everybody says that we mean as the applicant guidebook is currently written--.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: --Thank you, Paul, for your comment. No, it -- any other comments right now on this? Comments on the comments made by commenters? So, let's -- I see no hands, so let's move forward.

So, preliminary recommendation number two: "The work track recommends continuing to reserve all two-character letter-letter ascii combinations at the top level for existing and future country codes. The starting point of these recommendations is section 2.2.1.3.2, string requirements part 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-character ascii strings are not permitted to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 3166-1 standard. The work track's recommendation specifically addresses 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 this subject area. The work track notes that work track two of the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group is considering two-character letter-letter combinations. This recommendation is consistent with the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of the new generic top-level domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. It is also consistent with provisions in the 2012 applicant guidebook.'" So, I see -- any comments from the community at -- there's a comment -- there's a hand up by Susan. Susan, go ahead, please.

Susan Payne: Yes, thank you. Hi, it's Susan Payne. And apologies to people. Having been away, and I'm afraid I haven't had time yet to catch up, and so if I'm saying something which has been addressed in another conversation, then I do apologize. But, it just -- it strikes me on reading this that it would be -- we don't give any explanation of why we're making this recommendation. I mean, we do say at the bottom that it's consistent with GNSO policy on the introduction of new gTLDs from 2007, but we don't really explain why we are making this policy recommendation. And I do think it would be beneficial for us to do so. We did have quite a lot of discussion on this about the existing policy in relation to ccTLDs. And indeed, the work of the cross-community working group on the protection of country and territory names that was meeting before this PDP kicked off. And there's no reference to any of that. And I think it would be helpful, in order to kind of explain to the wider community why we've come down to this recommendation, what our rationale is. And I don't think we have that yet. But, maybe it comes somewhere else, and in which case I apologize.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Susan, for your comment. I don't know if Martin or staff can take a stab to answer Susan, but the discussions have been very thorough so far, and they're reflected in our work and the rationale (inaudible) discussions themselves. And these are the kind of

concerted languages so far. I don't know if Martin wants to take a stab at this, or maybe staff?

Emily Barabas: Hey, Javier, this is Emily from staff.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Emily, go ahead, yes.

Emily Barabas: I know my hand is kind of in a different spot than the rest of them, so it can be hard to see.

So, I just wanted to clarify a little bit more about the structure of the report and where some of the different elements are going to sit. So, in this section, section C, we're really just putting the text of the recommendation. A lot more context is going to be provided in the deliberation section, which is section F, and that's coming soon. The leadership team is now finalizing the text of that section and some of the other sections, all that sort of background and the different positions, the pros and cons and so forth, will be covered in there. So, I think once we look at this as a total package, if there's missing pieces, we can certainly fill in those gaps. But, for the moment, if it's possible to sort of focus on just the text of the recommendations for this section for them (ph), look at it in the context of the deliberations down the road once we're just a little further along. That should give a fuller picture.

And actually, since I'm already talking, I'll just touch also on the fact that Jorge Cancio also had a comment on this recommendation, speaking to letter-digit combinations and potential confusion. And I just wanted to mention that that's something -- we talked about this a little bit before, but this is an item that's being covered by the full working group and was discussed in work track three. It was an item that was covered in the public comments that recently went out, and quite a lot of responses have come in. So, the full working group is going to be considering all those comments, further discussing it, refining recommendations, but this group has determined, it's staff's understanding, that because they don't want to have parallel discussions and parallel processes on the same issue, that that would just be handled by the full working group and not by work track five.

So, I hope that that clarifies, and I think we can drop a note also into the deliberation section. And maybe we already have, but I'll double-check to make sure that that's mentioned and that the reference to the full working group initial report is in there. So, I hope that that's helpful. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Emily. Susan, I hope this answered your question, very thorough answer by Emily. I know Greg has his hand up, but I'm going to give the word to Martin quickly. Martin, go ahead.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Javier, and thanks, Greg, for -- I'd just step in just quickly to add, in terms of process that's occurred, and as a reminder, because I realize that it's happened over perhaps for many what was a holiday period. We were running a working document that was contained (inaudible) deliberations. And what we said was that everybody was to review that, provide any final comments or clarifications on that document, and then what we were doing were transferring elements of that into the initial report. So, that part where the deliberations will be added, as Emily quite rightly said, will be at a latter point. But, these are based on all of those deliberations from the document that we stored, that everybody reviewed, had an opportunity to clarify, and now we've moved it into -- or it will be added as a separate section to this report.

What we're focusing on today is to make sure that the recommendations, the options and any questions that we put across, are clear, understood, that if we still want to debate

some finer items to that, let's do that, but it's -- the ultimate idea here is to be able to produce a product that we are happy as a group to put out to the community for their comment. So, I just wanted to add that, as well. Thank you very much, Javier.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Martin. And welcome to all that have joined since the call started, including the -- my Chairman, Alan Greenberg. So, Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, it's Greg Shatan for the record. I think this is a minor comment, but looking at the last bullet point where it says that the work track notes, that work track two is considering two-character letter and number combinations, shouldn't this also refer to number-number combinations as well, since that would be essentially the universe of two-character combinations would be letter-letter, number-number, and number-letter, assuming we're not using ordering, in which case we have to distinguish letter-number from number-letter, but hopefully we're not (inaudible) quite that pedantic or specific. So, in any case, that would be my suggestion, is to say two-character, letter-number and number-number combinations in the last bullet point.

I also see Jaap's note that we don't describe the difference between a letter and a character. I guess that's a question of how knowledgeable we expect the readers to be. But, if we want to drop a footnote that a character is a letter or a number, I would have no objection to that. And ascii -- if we wanted to get into ascii as a concept, that's a whole different kettle of fish, since that's really numbers -- a numbering system. But in any case, I don't think (ph) we need to get there, maybe we just say that, by character, we mean letters and numbers. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks, Greg. That's a great flag. It's important to clarify these terms. Very good. Okay, so that's noted. If I see no other hands -- Greg, lower your hand, please, so that's erased from there -- so we can carry on. Preliminary recommendation number three, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category, a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation as stated in the 2012 applicant guidebook, section 2.2.1.4. -- I don't know, that's small in my screen, but I'm sure that it's there, and there's a bullet -- alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. This recommendation is a revision to the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of the new generic top-level domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. However, it is consistent with provisions in the 2012 applicant guidebook." Any hands? Any comments on this section? I see none. I see a hand up by Greg. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan again -- thank you. Greg Shatan again. And I believe we discussed this, so I'm not sure exactly where things came out, but there was certainly discussion that the (inaudible) the alpha-3 codes are not used, or at this point intended to be used for ccTLDs. So, I think we discussed moving this into the category of strings that could be applied for potentially accompanied by a documentation supported on objection (ph), or all -- there are close to 50 of these codes that overlap with common words or other things that would be -- that have alternate meanings or interest in the gTLD space. So, reserving them completely from delegation seems to be extreme. Note (ph) that of course the 2007 policy, it's not just inconsistent with the new -- the 2007 policy. The 2007 policy did not make any recommendation with regard to reservation of these strings. That was a (inaudible) in the guidebook, and I'm suggesting that perhaps we take it back 90 degrees. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Greg. I see a hand by Christopher. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, Christopher Wilkinson again. I have no comments on the recommendation as it stands. I'd just take this opportunity to flag that I have also later in the document recommended the reservation three-letter for -- three codes for currencies.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Okay. Thank you, Christopher. Any additional comments? I see no hands. There's a bit of background noise, if staff can check if -- which mic is generating that. Thank you. I still hear it, but let's carry on.

Preliminary recommendation number four--.

Martin Sutton: So, Javier--.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: --Yes? Sorry, go ahead.

Martin Sutton: It's Martin. I had a late hand.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Oh, I see. Sorry.

Martin Sutton: So, on the last recommendation three, and just thinking about Greg's comments, I mean, I do recall that there were different perspective put forward on this, and we've ended up as the leadership group is kind of positioning this back in the middle. Yes, there was the discussions about how many of these are generic words as well as three-letter country codes, and that there was the potential to relax restriction. But, there were other points that were one, maintain no use, or if there was going to be some use, there was a wider debate then that was going to take us outside the loop of this PDP work track because it was going into the realms of not being GNSO territory. It was more ccNSO.

So, with that in mind and some of the conversations that took place, especially across e-mail, because there was very lengthy discussions on this, that I do recall one point being raises as there is a certain number of these that are listed under the list of codes, and it would not be painful, I would say at this stage, to leave that as a restricted list so that they would be unavailable for the time being. But, any other three-character code could be applied for other than those residing on this list.

So, that's why I think we've come to the present recommendation, and that would be covered probably more deeply in the deliberation section when we add that. So, I hope that clarifies, but we can revisit, obviously, and just check those again, to your point. But, I just wanted to make sure that we understood that there was quite a lot of debate on this. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Martin. So, I saw that Cheryl and Alexander were typing in the chat, but now there's nothing coming up. I don't know if either of you wants to say something at this point. No? I guess not. All right. Cheryl? No. Okay.

So, if there's no objection, we can carry on. I see no hands. All right, so let's carry on. Preliminary recommendation number four, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation as stated in the 2012 applicant guidebook, section 2.2.1.4.ii, 'Long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard: this recommendation is a revision to the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of new generic top level domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. However, this recommendation is consistent with the existing provisions in the 2012 applicant guidebook; but, as currently drafted, it does not address the issue of translations of these strings. Please seek questions for community input in section E." Okay. Every time I do this, I have to then collapse the document to see what's going on in the chat and in the AC room to see if there's hands. I see no hands. I see a comment that is not a comment by Cheryl. (Inaudible), yes. Who is this, sorry? Something happened there in the mic. Yes, I see hands now. I see a hand by Greg and Christopher. I don't know who's first. I'll give it to -- quarter -- (inaudible), go ahead.

Greg Shatan: If you can let Christopher go first, because my comment is actually a super-late comment on the previous section. So, why don't you get -- let Christopher go first?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks for clarifying that answer and not letting me commit an injustice here. Christopher, go ahead. Christopher? Christopher, are you there? Christopher, muted--.

Christopher Wilkinson: --I'm here (inaudible). No, it's unmuted. Again, (inaudible). I'm a little bit more liberal than this recommendation, but I don't speak for ccNSO or -- and I certainly don't speak for AGB. So, maybe you'll just take this as a -- I think the problem is that we have not got an agreement on prior authorization and geographical use. But, if -- it seems to me excessive to prevent countries and other entities who are authorized from registering these three-letter codes as a matter of principle. But, clearly, as long as we have no consensus on absolute priority for prior authorization and geographical use, we have to maintain this restriction. But, it's a price we have to pay. I'm not in favor of open registration of geographical terms for non-geographical use. But, if you could solve that problem, you could liberalize this recommendation. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks, Christopher. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I've got a couple of points now. The first one is, on the previous recommendation three, do you think we need to clarify that we are not recommending that any three-character terms on the ISO 3166 list be removed from delegation? And specifically that we are not taking the position that dotcom should be removed from delegation? Because it is on that list, and therefore we've created an inconsistency, so I don't know if we need to make that note, but it is at least a logical inconsistency. I don't know if there are any other already-delegated strings on the three-letter -- alpha-3 list, but that at least one kind of jumped out at me. I would hate for someone down the line to think that we were somehow hinting that dotcom should be removed from delegation because ISO 3166 lists had an absolute preference. And when I heard Christopher mention things like an absolute preference, it seemed to me quite logical that someone could come to that conclusion if one were to think that we could actually end up with something like an absolute preference. So, we might want to nip that in the bud.

Secondly, I don't think that what Christopher said is correct. I don't think it's a price we have to pay. I don't think there's -- that the issues of potentially delegating country names in applications by those countries is in any way coupled with the issue of non-geographic use. We could certainly have a category like country names that could in fact be delegated, and we have had continent names and other things like that come in. So, that's -- it seems to me to be perfectly appropriate to say that, if Canada wants dotcanada, that there should be a pathway to them having it, and I don't think that the issue of non-geographic -- of terms that have both geographic and non-geographic meanings stops (ph) that.

And finally, I would say that I'm not in favor of allowing the reservation or the delegation of non-geographic terms for geographic use. Whether you look at a term as being geographic or non-geographic is entirely a matter of context. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks, Greg. Yes, we definitely want to send the right messages out there, and yes, and avoid inconsistency to the maximum amount possible. So, your comment is well-taken, noted. Does anybody want to comment on Greg comments, or any other prior comments, the section itself? I hear none. I hear none. Very good. So, let's -- if there's no objection, let's move on. Let's move on.

Recommendation number five -- and please, if there's hands, flag them out, because when I'm reading, I put the whole document on and I can't see what's going on in the room.

	Recommendation number five, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation as stated in the 2012 applicant guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1iii, 'Short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, this recommendation is a revision to the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of new generic top level domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. However, this recommendation is consistent with the existing provisions in the 2012 applicant guidebook. But, as currently drafted, it does not address the issue of translations of these strings. Please seek questions for committee and put in section E." Did I just re-read the same section? No. No, this is not (inaudible). Very good. Okay. Let me go back. I see no hands. I see some comments in the chat by -- a conversation by Chris and Greg in which I hope they agree to disagree.
Christopher Wilkinson:	Paul's got his hand up now.
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Oh, okay. I see Paul. Paul, go ahead.
Paul McGrady:	Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. So, I guess my question is I don't understand. The -- we say we recommend continuing something that's in the guidebook, but then we say it's a revision. Essentially, are we saying that the guidebook was inconsistent in this area with GNSO policy?
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Oh, is -- that's a question. Martin, want to take a stab at that? I think we're making new policy, which includes clarifying past policy, and we're trying to be as clear as possible. And, well, we're making -- even if we repeat something, it's new -- because it's new, but I see a hand. I see a hand by Emily. Emily, go ahead.
Emily Barabas:	Thanks. This is Emily from staff. So, this is a request I think early on in the recommendation drafting process that some of the members said that they would like to see specifically whether -- well, it would be standard, of course, to look at the existing policy and say if this would be a revision of the policy. So, I think initially we had that language in there to say this is a revision to the policy, if that's the case, there was a request to also look at the applicants guidebook and say whether it's consistent with the guidebook or a revision to the guidebook. In this case, there's a discrepancy between the guidebook and the policy, so this is attempting to say that essentially it's consistent with the guidebook, but as a revision of the policy. I hope that clarifies. And if you have suggestions for wording this in a different way that's more clear, those are welcome, of course. Thanks.
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Thank you. Paul, would you word this in any other way that would be more satisfactory?
Paul McGrady:	Yes. I think -- thank you. This is Paul McGrady again. So, I think what I would do here is say something along the line, as noted above, this recommendation is consistent with the existing provisions of the applicant guidebook as written, right? We say drafted, but the applicant guidebook is finished. I don't think we mean drafted. And -- which -- and we can say it doesn't address the issue of translations of the strings. And then, I would say, however, the recommendation we believe is a revision to GNSO policy at (inaudible) interaction to new gTLDs August 8, 2007, right? So, I just think that I would put that at the end and clarify drafted as -- to mean as written. And that way, it's not quite as jarring, right, because we go from -- we recommend everything to stay the same, but this recommendation is a revision. I think the average reader who's not been participating in this process may find that even more confusing than I'd (inaudible).
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Thank you, Paul. Very good. I see a hand up by Alan Greenberg. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I agree with Paul that the word "drafted" is incorrectly -- is incorrect and misleading, because it is cast in stone right now. So, as written or as published or something I think would be the appropriate place in all occurrences of that phrase.

However, I agree with the order that is there, because that is the order. Historically, we had the policy and then the applicant guidebook. And if I remember correctly, the rationale in these cases is it was not part of the policy. It was part of the Board's agreement with the GAC prior to release of the round. And therefore, it was put into the applicant guidebook. These names were reserved even though they were not reserved in the -- at the policy level. So, I think the order is correct. The wording needs to be changed for drafted. And perhaps we need an explanation somewhere early on of the document, because this situation occurs a number of times, and we may want to put it in the historic framework to explain why we have a number of cases where this is the case. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Alan. I see a comment by Alexander, so I think he's suggesting language (inaudible). Thank you. So, Alexander suggested some language here, policy as established by the 2012 guidebook. And if there's--.

Alan Greenberg: --It's Alan. And if I may intercede, if we use the word and start calling everything in the guidebook "policy," we are going to be into a debate we don't want to enter.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes. Do you have grandchildren, Alan? Is that what I hear in the background?

Alan Greenberg: That wasn't mine. That wasn't from my side.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Oh, okay. Okay, all right. Very good. So, there's some discussion -- constructive discussion in the chat, but yes, want (ph) -- flag (ph) that right now. Any -- there a hand by Emily. Emily, go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks. This is Emily from staff. So, I just want to clarify. Maybe we can get some additional perspective on the ordering of that (inaudible), because it is something that obviously repeated in a lot of these recommendations, and it would help -- be helpful to get some guidance about if there's a general feeling of the group about the ordering, or how much it matters to everyone. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you. So, any other suggestions regarding ordering or language or ideas? I think we can take a note of that and think how to word it as discussed here by Alan and others. Emily, I see your hand is still up, I think. Do you want to speak again, or -- okay, it's down. Very good. I see no hands, so let's keep on plowing forward.

All right. So, preliminary recommendation number six, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name, which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation as stated in the 2012 applicant guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.iv, I-V, short or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as an exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency. This recommendation is a revision to the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of new generic top level domain policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. However, it is consistent with provisions in the 2012 applicant guidebook."

I see -- any comments? Anybody that hasn't spoken? Many people are turning off their microphones. Not everybody has them off. Paul put a comment in the chat still regarding "drafting." Thank you very much. Nobody wants to comment on this? I see no hands. There is some conversation in the chat. But, if there's no objection, maybe we can keep on going.

Unidentified Participant: Jaap's hand's up. Jaap's hand's up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Jaap, go ahead. I see it. Jaap, go ahead. Thank you.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay. Just want to note is that are you talking here about -- or some (inaudible) talk about exceptional reserve (ph). And acknowledging this is actually listed, if it is listed somewhere, I recall we had no (inaudible) to it, so I don't know where this comes from, the bullet.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Interesting. Thank you, Jaap. Does anybody want to comment about Jaap comments on the exceptionally reserved? Martin, anybody from the group? Anybody from staff? Anybody in the chat? Emily, I see a hand. Go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks. This is Emily from staff. Getting some feedback. Is there an open line? Seems better. So, I just wanted to clarify that this is a category that was in the 2012 applicant guidebook, so I'm not sure if that clarifies what the origin is, but that's sort of the genesis in the category as it was discussed. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Emily. I see two hands. I see a hand by Christopher. I think Jaap's hand is old, but I'll ask after Christopher. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you. It's Christopher Wilkinson for the record. My recollection is that there is a category of exceptionally reserved codes in ISO 3166, but I would have to re-read the text to clarify exactly what that refers to in practice in this context. But, I would suggest that, for the time being, you leave the text as it is, and some time next week I'll go through the 3166 text and come back to it. By then, I'll have further comments. But, my recollection is that this category does exist, and it still exists.

Jaap Akkerhuis: The 3166 doesn't mention any code, nor any short or long name of a country. It's not in 3166. So, I assume that this isn't (ph) something which was not correct in no regional (inaudible) group, as well. So, something else is meant (ph) there.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you. Sorry, I see several hands up. I'm going to take Alan first. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. They define exceptionally reserved codes as codes that have been reserved for a particular use at the special request of a national ISO member, governments or international organizations. For example, the code U.K. has been reserved for the -- at the request of the United Kingdom, so it cannot be used for any other country. GB is the official two-character code for it, and the Wikipedia also echoes that. But, this is directly from the ISO site. So, this is in reference to -- remember, it's in reference to -- the code is reserved, but we're talking about the names associated with it, for anyone whose code is reserved. I'm not quite sure why they -- why it needs that, because GB is already in the code, and we have the long and short names for it. But, I guess we're just covering all bases.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Alan. Sorry, I see several hands up still. Martin, go ahead, please.

Martin Sutton: Yes, thanks, Javier. This is Martin Sutton. Just as a thought here, and I think as we construct the document, we can slot in the actual list. This one I do recall researching months and months back when we first started looking through the whole (inaudible) terms that relate to this. I haven't got it handy, but there is a list somewhere that I remember seeing, whether it was something that was appended to the applicant guidebook or was referred to elsewhere to research. I can't recall. But, I think, just for a matter of formalities for this report, we should actually append a list of wherever we can determine the items listed in this category.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Martin. Jaap, is that an old hand/new hand, please? Go ahead quickly if it's new.

Jaap Akkerhuis: It is a new hand. There is no list in 3166 for exceptional reserved codes. I mean, it just doesn't exist. And so -- and there are way more codes reserved which -- than one thinks, and there are codes which don't get (inaudible) as long (ph) names (inaudible). So, that's exactly the point I'm trying to make, that when there is something exceptional to (inaudible), it doesn't need to be exceptional. I mean, it doesn't mean it (inaudible) geographic area in the way you talk about it here. So, I should be careful in (inaudible). Going to whether there is a list of that, there was -- there used to be a list available on request by the secretariat. I don't know whether anybody ever asked (inaudible). And there is -- there used to be overview of all the codes with all the statuses in a previous version of the website, and that's the one we see in Wikipedia. Somebody has actually maintained and (inaudible) that list. But it's not an official ISO list, and (inaudible).

It will be hard to produce (inaudible) that is on the (inaudible) that's -- and Wikipedia is not an authoritative list for this (ph).

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Jaap, noted. There's a comment in the -- a suggestion by Susan in the chat, which I think we'll accept. She's basically asking for me not to read the whole document, maybe just go to the recommendation itself. Does anybody have an objection of following Susan's recommendation? I see none, taken. So, let's go back to the document. Let's go back to the document.

So, we're in preliminary recommendation number seven now. I'm going to skip the first paragraph and just go to the bullet. "Separable component of a country name designated under separable country names list. This list is included as an appendix to the 2012 applicant guidebook." I'm also going to skip the following paragraph, which is repeated generally in other recommendations. So, going into that text, does anybody have any comments on this language? I see no hands. We're getting close to the top of the hour, in five minutes, and then we have another half an hour, but let's keep on moving if there's no objection. Let's move. There's some general comments in the chat, but let's keep on going. Very good.

So, moving on to preliminary recommendation number eight, skipping the first paragraph and then going to the bullet, it says, "Permutation or transposition of any of the names included in items I through V," one through five, I through V, "permutations include removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation, and addition or removal of grammatical articles like quotation V, quotation. A transposition is considered a change in the name of the long or short-form name, for example, Republic Czech or Islands Cayman."

There's some examples. Well, I'm going to read the following part also. "The work track recommends clarifying the permutations and transpositions of the following strings (inaudible) are reserved. The work track recommends clarifying that the permutations and transpositions of the following strings are reserved: long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency, separable component of a country name designated under separable countries list -- countries names list. This list is included as an appendix to the 2012 applicant guidebook. Permutations and transpositions of alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard should be allowed." I will not read the finishing language.

Anybody has any comments on this longer bit of recommendation here? I see Jaap mentions in the chat that the third bullet has the same problem as I mentioned before. No -- anybody that hasn't spoken wish to speak? No hands up by nobody, no movement in the chat. I guess we can keep on going.

Moving on to preliminary recommendation number nine, skipping the first part and then just going straight to the bullet, "Name by which a country is commonly known or demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name, by an intergovernmental or treaty organization." Will not read the following language, which is repeated. Any hands? No hands. We're flying through these sections now. No comments. I think Jeff just joined somewhere. So, let's keep on going. I see no objections. Let's keep on going. Very good.

Primarily recommendation number 10, skipping the introductory part and going straight to the bullet, "An application for any string that is a representation of the capital city name of any country or territory in the ISO 3166-1 standard." Will not read the following language because it's generally repeated. Any comments here? I see no comments. I see no hands. I see no movement in the chat. So, if there's no objection, I'll just keep on plowing forward. And stop me if you -- at any point, please, if you need it.

So, going on to preliminary recommendation number 11, which actually has some comments made before by community members and that are reflected here, skipping the introductory part, going straight to the bullet, "An application for a city name where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with that -- with the city name, an application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirements, i.e. will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities if; A, it is clear from applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with that city name; and B, the applied-for string is a city name as listed on official city documents." Will not read the ending language, which is repeated. I see a hand by Alexander. Go ahead.

Alexander: Yes, this is Alexander Schubert. You said initially that you are not reading the introduction, and then I was occupied to get my microphone, because the introduction now changed. Now it says you need a letter from the government and so on, so forth. So, now it's not any more the standard introduction of the other pieces.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Well, let's just -- good point. Let's just go and read it again. Very good. So, let's go and read it again. So, it goes, "Preliminary recommendation number 12" -- no, no, number 11, sorry -- "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at the top level. Application for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support for non-objection from the relevant or public authorities." Yes, and read the rest. Thank you, Alexander, for that flag. If there's no objection, can we go to commentary? Hands? You can also read it yourself and go ahead and tell me. I see there's some comments on the side of this section. I see no hands. Let me make sure then if I go forward that I read anything that -- there's a hand by Greg. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Sorry, Greg Shatan for the record. As I said, I had to step away and I said BRB, which stands for be right back, not Barbados. So, on preliminary recommendation number 11, what is now being recommended as a change, I'm sorry? (Inaudible), sorry.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: All right, so what we're reading here, number 11, it says, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at a top level. Applications for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities. An application for a city name where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with that city name. An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirement, will require documentation of support for non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities if; A, it is

clear from the applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with that city name; and B, the applied string is a city name as listed in official city documents." So, that's what we're dealing with, Greg. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: No further comments at the moment. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Oh, I see. Very good. Any -- there's a hand by Emily. Go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Javier. This is Emily from staff. I just wanted to highlight a couple of comments on this recommendation that came in through the mailing list. So, we had a comment from Christopher Wilkinson where he says that the text here and elsewhere omit to refer the issue of non-geographical use, and has a bunch or text that I encourage everyone to read specifically about that.

And just wanted to highlight from the staff perspective that a discussion of intended use in different contexts, including in the context of city names, is included in the deliberations section. So, look out for that. It will include pros and cons and some of the different positions taken. So, I hope that that's helpful

And then, Jorge Cancio had also a comment on this recommendation, similarly mentioning that intended use has been hotly debated in this work track, and he said from his perspective, he feels that it's premature to include this as a preliminary recommendation as it stands. So, that might be something to discuss further in this group. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Emily. Yes, there was a lot of discussion on that in the prior call, and there's some in the e-mail. Alexander, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, this is Alexander Schubert again for the record. If I look at the text, and I raised this several times, and I think a few people supported me and others were against it. We have this word for the description primarily for the propose associated with the city name. That kind of means if someone just mentions, yes, will be also for the city but for many other things as well, then it's not anymore (inaudible), and he doesn't need a letter. So, if we maybe could at least think about the word primarily, it is associated, or the use is associated with the city, well then, it needs a letter from the city. Otherwise, for almost any city name, you could claim, well, it's for all kinds of stuff and also for the city.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Alexander. Does anybody have a comment on Alexander's comment, or the section, for the comments made on the side? I see a comment -- I see a hand by Greg. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. I can see a lot of mischief going on in the -- if we removed the word "primarily", where one could assert that selling a domain name -- a single domain name to somebody living in that city somehow means that you're using it in -- for purposes associated with the city name. And maybe primarily isn't quite the right word either, but I think we need to avoid kind of unintended consequences.

Part of it here too is the question of when it says the applicant will use the TLD, I guess there's a question of what you saying a TLD means. This may have been -- does that -- I would assume that includes selling to the general public? Or does that -- is that not a use, or is it only a use it the TLD is used like in a dotbrand, where actually the applicant itself uses the TLD? Use is kind of an odd word here, a very -- maybe appropriately vague, but certainly vague. So, part of it is to try to decide what we're getting at here, and share a concern with just opening things up to gaming in either direction. I think the intent is to really have as clear a road (ph) as possible, kind of two separate (inaudible) here, and

having somebody pretend they're (inaudible) when they're really largely or in the other is not good for anybody, and certainly not good for the good of the order. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Greg. Thank you for that. I see a hand. Alexander, if you can also (multiple speakers) -- yes, go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Just one minute, and it's Alexander Schubert, and just 30 seconds, actually. To respond to Greg, well, one could also take the opposite stand and say if the applicant considers any use for the city, he will have to get a letter from the city. So, the applicant has actually to make sure that there is no use for the city. And in the case of a brand, that's fine, because it's a (inaudible), and nothing would happen. But, if someone goes to dotchicago and says, well, it's for all kinds of proposals, and maybe also a little bit for the city, we actually have no plan, and then they market it only to the city, no, that doesn't really work well. Yes, finished.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you. I see in the chat Paul saying that he has trouble following what Alexander was saying. Paul, do you want to go -- ask a question to Alexander open here? I don't know if you're talking about a previous part or right now. Paul is writing in the chat, maybe (inaudible) previous. Okay, yes, so you want to speak on this, Paul?

Paul McGrady: Hey, thanks, this is Paul McGrady for the record. No, I just -- Alexander was talking very quickly, but I think I've been able to deduce from Greg's response, and then from Alexander's response to Greg's response what was meant to be said. This is a topic that we've spent quite a bit of time in at the list, and I'm not -- I just don't -- I'm not exactly sure where we are on this in terms of whether or not it's right to be in this report. And I'll leave that to everybody else. But, I just would like to note that there's been quite a bit of back-and-forth on this, and there are a handful of people who are pressing hard on this, but there's also the folks that are very clear in this area, people, including myself, that I think that we need to really take a look at whether or not we want to foreclose a bunch of words unnecessarily if those uses are not in any way tied to taking the false representation that you're associated with the city itself. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks. I see a hand by Jeff, but before we go in there, there's a comment in the chat by Robin in her always very clear pink text, "I disagree with recommendation number 11 as it ignores free expression rights to use words with geographic meaning in lawful ways." Thank you, comment noted, Robin. And Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Jeff Neuman. I just wanted to on -- just respond to Greg's comments on the word "use," and to some extent Alexander as well on the world "primarily." This language was actually in the guidebook for 2012. I'm not saying that the guidebook language was perfect at all, but I don't recall this ever becoming an issue with a city name. It may have been an issue in other aspects.

But, before we go about changing and expressing concerns about this language, let's think about what happened in 2012. If in 2012 we thought there was an issue with the wording, or it was unclear or there were problems from the city name provision, then I think -- then we can work on changing the language. But, at this point, just looking that it is pretty much the same language, the word "primarily" is in there, the word "use" is in that section -- this is page 2-17 of the guidebook. So, this is wording that was there, for the most part.

And I would just urge us not to come up with problems if they were not shown to be problems previously. And to respond to Alexander's comment, on page 2-17 in sub-bullet A of the applicant guidebook, it does talk about, quote, "It is clear from the applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name. So, that's in there. Again, maybe it's not the

	exact wording, but let's just see if -- the main point is was there an issue for this particular city name provision. Thanks.
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Thanks, Jeff. You know, in (inaudible) conversations with Steve, things like this, maybe, Steve, you can jump in and maybe take a stab at what -- we've spoken about this before.
Steve Chan:	Thanks, Javier. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I guess sort of at the risk of overstepping the staff bounds, I just wanted to take the opportunity to try to remind the work track that there's a number of levers that could be pulled within this process. So, for instance, I guess touching on the concern that Alexander raised about a TLD that asserts that they will not use it for a non-GO purpose, but then once the TLD is launched, it does actually engage in marketing to a city, so one of the things that the work track could consider is the other mechanisms that it has at its disposal.
	So, for instance, putting in a contractual requirement which was not there for the 2012 round except in a more general sense with maybe something more specific about requirements related to continuing to not use the TLD in a geographic sense. So--.
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	--Thank you, Steve. (Inaudible), go ahead.
Steve Chan:	I'm sorry. I thought (inaudible) audio dropping. That's some else's audio. Thanks.
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Yes. Thanks, Steve, good point on contractual requirements and non-GO use. There's some movement in the chat, primarily just people going on. No hands. We're at 15 in the hour, so let's -- if there's no objection, let's keep on moving forward.
	So, up to preliminary recommendation number 13, and I'll read the whole thing, the beginning. "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category at a geographic name requirement government support at the top level. Applicants for these strains must be accompanied by documentation of support for non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities." Bullet. "An application for a string listed as a UNESCO region," and it has a footnote which links to the page, "or appearing on the composition of macro-geographical continental regions, geographical subregions, and selected economic and other groupings list," there's a footnote there also. "In the case of an application for a string appearing on either of these -- of the lists above, documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national governments in the region, and there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant government in the region and/or public authorities associated with the continent or the region. Where the 60% is applied, and there are common regions on both lists, the regional composition contained in the composition of macro-geographical, continental regions, geographical subregions, and selected economic and other groupings takes precedence." And we'll read the last part. Any comments? Any--?
Martin Sutton:	--Javier, this is Martin Sutton here. Just a point out from the chat that we've skipped one of the items, and it had some comments in there.
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	Let's go back.
Martin Sutton:	So, if we could just nip back to recommendation 12 regarding (inaudible) names?
Javier Rúa-Jovet:	All right, so -- yes, sorry for that. Sorry for that. So, let's go back to 12. Back to 12, yes. The recommendation -- preliminary recommendation number 12, "The work track recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at the top level. Applications for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support for non-objection from the relevant government or public

authorities." Bullet. "An application for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a country -- such as a County, province or state listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard." Won't read the rest. Any comments? Hand by Christopher. Go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Javier. In my written comments, I linked the question of the current (inaudible) to this recommendation 12. That's arbitrary. I think we need a separate recommendation dealing with the currency codes in other respects of TLDs referencing regulated markets or businesses are treated specifically. The currency codes are very important in the financial markets of my experience of the economics and finances of international trade. Maybe a bit rusty, but I certainly argue, and I made the case in a response to Jaap Akkerhuis recently. I would certainly argue, and I have done on several occasions in this context, including the face-to-face meeting in Helsinki, I would argue that this is extremely important to make sure that the currency codes which are three-letter codes derived from 3166 are protected. Otherwise, we expose ourselves and we expose ICANN to potentially serious problems because top-level domains and currency codes, for example USD, could be abused. Doesn't take very much imagination to work out how. So, I definitely think that there's a lacuna here that, in spite of two or three proddings (ph) on my staff (ph) the co-chairs and the staff have to date ignored. And I think that's a mistake. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Great comment. Noted, Christopher. There's a echo there. Okay. Some comments in the chat, but let's go first to Greg. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I'm a little distracted by Christopher having brought this up here where I don't really think it fits. As he notes, it's arbitrary, but -- so I'll just kind of get that out of the way by saying that I don't support the introduction here of -- the idea of reserving the currency codes. And I would have to say it's -- if that were the case, dottop would not have been registered, and maybe, depending upon one's view of things going on in that particular domain, maybe that wouldn't have been a bad thing. But, I'll have to say, this is a nice try, which is the Turkish lira, by the way. But, in any case, I'll grab my pen, which is the Peruvian Sol, and write about this at another time.

On the actual subject of the topic that is in writing in front of us, I think that this is really primed, and I think we discussed this at length. I'm not sure how we arrived at this recommendation being in this (inaudible) that the sub-national place names should, like the city name, non-capital city names be open for reservation for non-geographic uses without the need for a letter of support or non-objection. There are literally thousands, if not tens of thousands of counties in the United States alone, and very little kind of privilege that should be attached to those. Of course, if any of those counties, provinces or states feel like applying, more power to them. Would love to see it happen. But, according privilege to use such -- so to every kind of square that can be drawn around an area just seems to be too far.

I think the compromise is to allow for the second swim lane for those that are not using it in its geographic context. And I think that, obviously, the poster child for this being unfair is dottata. I don't represent them, not talking as a brand owner representative at all, but it seemed to me to be rather a sad result. And I don't know if people were happier about it, but I did not think it was an appropriate result at the time. This is just a very, very long list of names that we shouldn't be giving this kind of absolute privilege to to say yes or no when it has nothing to do with their -- when it's a non-geographic term, as well as a geographic one. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks, Greg. There's some conversation in the chat on scope and bank notes and interesting. I'm not going to go in there right now, where it's 24 minutes over the hour, so maybe we can do a few more sections, but we're really close again on the hour -- the half-

hour. So, I -- as I mistakenly read recommendation 13, so it's pretty long. I'll ask you if I can't -- I don't read it again, and maybe as you have read it and heard it, if there's any comments on preliminary recommendation number 13. There is some discussion in the chat on it, or the previous. Any hands? Anybody that hasn't spoken? Anybody that wants to make a statement, the question? So, if there's no objection, let's move on quickly to section number 14.

Okay, so wait, this is -- all right, so we're moving now to sub-section D (ph). The question is do we want to start with this now, or should we stop here for any other business? Any recommendations here? Martin? I think we should--.

Martin Sutton: --Oh, Javier, I think it might be a good point just to break off and cover ICANN 63, any points there. But, before we do that, and I was just writing a comment in here, in the chat. Just regarding the currency codes, I just wanted to clarify that opinions have not been ignored. I think where there's been substantial support and discussion on driving forward anything, we've tried to accommodate that. But, I don't recall there being any real support for treading into currency codes within work track five, which is about geographic terms. If anybody thinks otherwise, please raise their hands. Christopher's put in the point in his comments, so if there is anybody that supports that, we'll take that on board as a consideration. But, I've not heard it. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks, Martin. And just to remind everybody in the work track that these three sections -- I mean, you can -- we encourage you to just look at them and send your comments during the next week, a week from now, have more comments on these three sections in the e-mail list, and we'll keep on putting them -- considering them and putting them on the comments. There's plenty of time to finish this up, but just take a fresh look and send your comments.

On ICANN 63, maybe staff can speak on ICANN 63. Go ahead, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Javier. This is Emily from staff. So, just to do a little bit of a recap of kind of where we are and where we're headed for ICANN 63, coming back to the work plan; so, at this stage, we've released three sort of subsections of the initial report. The co-leaders have given an initial week for people to review that. It looks like we've only gotten a few comments so far from a couple of different people. So, I think the idea is that maybe we'll give people another week, so a week from today, to review those sections and submit comments.

And right around that time, we'll also be releasing the additional sections of the initial report, so we'll have a full package of the initial report at that time. And that'll be prior to ICANN 63. So, that means that we'll -- everyone will have a bit of time before ICANN 63 to go through the report and do some review. And I think the idea is, in addition to doing some status updates and outreach for those sessions at ICANN 63, we'll also have some time to talk about the initial report, talk about any gaps that might exist or items that might need further discussion, and kind of have some focus time to also potentially get broader community input on issues where it seems that that's needed.

So, that's the plan so far, and we have three back-to-back sessions on that Saturday starting at 9:00 a.m. and ending at 1:15 p.m. local time, with two breaks in between. And lunch will be served during that last session for work track number. So, do show up. There will be a box lunch waiting for you. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Great. Thanks, Emily. So, quickly, if there's any other business, anybody, quickly, for a minute? So, I see no hands for any other business. Thank you all for your patience and your great comments, and this call is adjourned, or stopped until the next one. Bye to all.