ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 06 June 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-track5-06jun18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording**:** https://participate.icann.org/p8b696447i2/

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

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

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5, Geographic Names on Top Level taking place on the 6th of June, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now?

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to our coleader, Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, staff, for preparing all the materials for the call and thank you all colleagues for joining in this nice evening afternoon and could Buenos Aires. We have a quite busy agenda.

We hope that we'll finish in one hour, we have one hour time for our call. And if not, we will try to follow up in the next week.

And first we will have some feedback about the document, then we will talk about what we will be doing in Panama in ICANN and then some potential areas of agreement and the city names issue and any other business. So we'll go directly to the first slide. Please, thank you, the next one.

Statement of interest updates, please, any? I see none and I see no hands up so let's go to the agenda please? Okay so the first thing that we will do is talk a little bit about the working document. I've been contacted by some colleagues privately asking me if this is a document that is somehow making any decisions or taking any conclusions in any way, this document should be considered as final or even any kind of agreement, is just a fantastic work that has been done by our staff in collecting all the comments, all the opinions and all the interactions we had in the calls and in the email exchange.

So is being developed by staff and it has been reviewed by us, the coleaders, summarizes the perspectives and key points and the document is not a public comment document so it's not open to the full community. For the moment it's open to you, members of the Work Track 5 work track and you are able to send your comments and make your comments to it. But it is not open to the full community so please take it as it is.

I know it's a long document, it takes time to review but I am sure that all of us here are quite used to what we are talking about, the things that we are talking about so the document seems long but at the end the document is what we have been talking about for some so us for years and some of us for some months. So remember it's work in progress. Your comments and contributions are very much welcome. So we can have this as a very raw material for moving forward. Can we go to the next one please?

As – I won't go into details into the – I won't go into details into the document, it's a very long document, just briefly remind you about the main parts of the document. It's what is relevant in 2007 about implementation guide. How was implemented in 2012, what are the preliminary recommendations and on implementation guidelines, what are the options under consideration, what specific questions are the PDP working group seeking feedback on, that's perhaps for the future, some deliberations and other activities in the community that may serve as future input to this topic.

These is our general type of the long document, I encourage you to take some time, review it. As I said, I think we all know the content and we all know what we have to make our input.

Kavouss, it's a new hand? Do you want to say something? Okay, Kavouss, I cannot hear you. If it's an old hand please…

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me now?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I can hear you now, yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, thank you very much. Thanks a lot. I wish to suggest a change in name of the document. This document should be called "Working Document towards preliminary draft new report of the group." Working documents toward preliminary draft report of the Work Track 5. This is number one. Number two, I have not read this document. I have read only six pages and there remains another 24 pages to read. Thank you very much, very, very kind words, very (unintelligible) good activities and so on so forth.

However, madam, I have serious concerns about the content of this document. Some 20 people or 30 people or 40 people getting together and decide on the identity of 8 billion people on the world. This is not acceptable. Talking about the city, the size of the city, the criteria of the city, what is a small city, what is a big city, who has the right, whether we should go to the

authority of the city or authority of the government, we don't need to talk about government anymore. I'm not talking government, of the people anymore, everybody is free, total liberty and so on so forth.

Madame, I don't agree with that. This is the right of the people of the country to defend their identity is associated with geographic names. Has nothing to do with the government, I'm not talking of the government, I'm talking of identity of the people, I'm talking of the culture of the people, I'm talking of the belief of the people.

So I don't think that is subject to the judgment of 37 or 40 people getting together at this meeting and at this group and try to decide on the whole world, Chairman. This is different from the PDP and so on so forth. This is very, very delicate and serious issues. So we have to be quite careful. I have seen that people talking about some subjective criteria, which has no legitimacy, there is no legal background, there is no support of that, and I cannot agree with any of these definitions that leave everything, don't talk about with people, no need for the supporting (unintelligible), no need for the no objection letter, and trying to have total freedom and total liberty.

We need to have a fair idea. So please kindly record my objection as one people in 8 billion people around the world. I'm not representing government, I do not think about the government but I know how some people are sensitive about government. So I don't take that on please. We have serious difficulty with the language…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Kavouss. Thank you very much, Kavouss. I know your concerns and the concerns of many, many other colleagues especially your recommendation about the title. Would you be so kind to send to email list or write it into the chat so we can share it with other colleagues and see if it's – if there's agreement in changing the title of the document? And the rest of the

comments I – they are very valuable, you know, several of us may share some of your concerns. But this is a working group with different views.

Christopher, you want to say something?

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, thank you, Olga. And thank you, Kavouss, but really we know what we need to say with far fewer words. On Point A, I would recommend that the staff liaisons base devoted to 2007 whatever it was. I think it is not policy in any meaningful sense. We're spending a lot of time and space and paper on 2007 which is irrelevant today.

Secondly, in terms of the general structure of the document, which is an extremely interesting and the staff who've worked on piling it have done a great job. But there are several points at which I would, as we say in French, (unintelligible), it is not a question of the default being no protection and then we discuss how to – what the exceptions are. I think if you turn the argument on its head without changing the balance of comments, that you turn the argument on its head, the default is protection.

The question that we're addressing is what are the terms and conditions for either removing protection or allowing registration subject to conditions. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Christopher. And your comments are noted. Greg, you want to say something? Go ahead please. Greg, can you hear us? You're twice, Greg, two Gregs in the call, Greg 1 and Mobile 1.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I had to – I needed to see the unsupported content which I couldn't see on the tablet but I see it's just a countdown which isn't bad to see. In any case, I agree with Kavouss up to a point, this document seems more like the preparation for a later preliminary report rather than being a preliminary report itself. And I understand the desire to play catch-up with the rest of the group, the rest of the working group.

But I think it's premature to think that we're in the state of creating a preliminary report unless, you know, it's really more of a document zero than it is a preliminary report. So whatever we call it, thinking that it reflects what the final report looks like subject to some tweaks and responses to public comment probably incorrect.

Secondly, I think it's very troublesome to hear comments that the policy decisions and policy recommendations of the GNSO, the organization, the supporting organization, charged with making policy recommendations are now irrelevant and a waste of paper to at least one member of this group. The fact that policy was later changed in some ways by implementation, by GAC advice, by other means and methods does not destroy policy; if anything it destroys to some extent the way in which ICANN is supposed to do the business of policy and who is supposed to generate policy recommendations.

So whether what happened after the policy was – recommendations were made, was right or wrong or good or bad and probably a little bit of the above, does nothing to make the actual policy decisions of the GNSO irrelevant. I know that they're…

Olga Cavalli: Greg, your time is up.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Oh okay. Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry for interrupting you. Can you – thank you. Thank you very much, Greg. And Christopher, you have a hand up again. Can you please remind about the time?

Christopher Wilkinson: Very, very shortly. Greg, if you read the 2007 recommendations of the GNSO, for many of us it looks like a license for piracy. Cannot defend that. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Christopher. There was a suggestion by…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: May I respond to that?

Olga Cavalli: If it's very, very brief.

Greg Shatan: Very briefly, you're entitled to your opinion, which I think is quite consistent with all of your other opinions, doesn't make it right. And I don't – I think the 2007 recommendations were quite sound and not in any way a recommendation for piracy, which is, you know, that sort of accusation is borderline (unintelligible). Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you. This reminds me of how important this issue is to all of us and I think this is why we are having this effort and previous efforts done in different spaces – working spaces in ICANN so I think it's worth the effort of all of us getting information and sharing ideas and respectfully exchange our thoughts.

Okay, can we move to the next slide – Greg, please, I think this is an old hand, if you can put it down? The structure of the working document, we already reviewed it so if we can go to the next slide please? Remember there are three ways that you can provide your input. If you use Google Documents, you can comment in the Google document, highlight the text where you want to insert the comment, in the top menu click Add Comment icon, and there is a bubble with a plus sign. Please make sure you put your name. So if you're familiar with this kind of document this is very useful because other can see your inputs as it goes.

Other way is you can modify a Word document, if you don't like to use Google Docs, you go – you can insert a comment into the Word document that was shared with all the members of the working team – of the work track, sorry, and then send it to the email list and the staff will compile all the comments. And another way if you don't like to make it in Word document, or Google document, you can send comments to the mailing list, comment by sending an email but please include the page and section number of the text that you are referencing and commenting so staff and us can put them all together and compile them. So any questions about the procedure?

Kavouss, I see your hand up. If you can remind that we have only one hour, go ahead please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, very shortly. Thank you for the Word document but I hope that if we send comments we expect that these comments to be considered but not to be ignored. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Kavouss, I will try to work with staff and also coleaders and trying to put all the comments and not missing any comments in the way. So can we go to the next slide please, which is about how are we going to work during the Panama meeting? Next one.

So we have two cross community sessions planned for the Panama meeting, one session is Monday June – 25 of June from 3:15 to 4:45 in the afternoon so it's about background, progress and timeline, validation of preliminary outcomes and brainstorming session and trying to find solutions. You see we have different ideas, different perspectives so this is one opportunity to exchange these ideas about geographic names.

And then there's another session on Thursday, 28 of June, from same time, 3:15 to 4:45 in the afternoon, recap on the Monday session and new discussions topic that may arise in the Monday session. I would like to share

with you also that different – and these are organized in sessions about this issue especially talking about the GAC, which is my advisory committee where I participate. On Sunday there will be a capacity building where I will be presenting the work that we do. This will be during the PDP explanatory session in the morning from 11:30 to 12:30, part of that session, not all of it, will be devoted to the Work Track 5 process.

And then GAC has two sessions about this, cross community sessions, Monday and Thursday. Monday 25th of June and Thursday 28 of June at the same time both days, 3:15 to 4:45, so it's cross community session that the GAC will participate, it's in our agenda so it doesn't overlap with other activities that the GAC is doing. And I've been invited by the ccNSO and I think that other are planning to have this session so I encourage all of you to engage as much as you can with different communication spaces so we coleaders with the staff can gather new inputs and new ideas and see how we can move forward.

Any comments about the next activities? Kavouss, your hand is up. Remember that we have one limited time.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Olga, I'm sorry, I have a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, please. Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: That coincides with the day that GAC provide its communiqué and there would be not possible for many GAC to attend, number one. Number two, some people they have organized a slide back on Thursday afternoon, is it not possible to do it on Wednesday? Please? Or maximum on Thursday morning back coordinating with GAC that we do not have the communiqué at the same time as this because this important point has many interested people in the GAC community. If we try to do it at the same time it would not

have the possibility to discuss. Is it not possible to review the timing either Wednesday or Thursday morning provided that it is not coincident with the GAC session having the communiqué. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Kavouss. It is my understanding that GAC staff has been working with other ICANN staff in preparing the full agenda and it's a shorter meeting, it's only four-day meeting, but your comment – your point is well taken and we will share it with those who are working on the full agenda. Thank you very much for that. Jorge (unintelligible), please let us know your comments.

Jorge Cancio: Hello? Do you hear me okay?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Jorge. Go ahead, we can hear you.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Buenos noches from Europe. And hello. I just was wondering about the – well about the organization of these two cross community sessions. As could you perhaps elaborate a little bit on how these two sessions will be organized or whether there will be speakers introducing specific topics or not, what will be the format of the sessions, the interactions with the audience, whether you have any plans to make sure that those of us who speak all the time during the sessions shut up during those cross community sessions or not? And we have a list of issues that will be dealt with priority. Thank you. And by the way, the communiqué drafting is on Wednesday evening if I'm not mistaken. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Gracias, Jorge. I had the same – I had the same impression about the timing for the communiqué but I will check with GAC staff and see if it doesn't overlap with our communiqué drafting but as our colleague, Kavouss, said it's an important participation space and also this cross community session about Work Track 5. Jorge, the organization of the session is work in process for the moment. If you have specific suggestions about how to manage time, and how to make the participation more open to everybody, please share with us and share those comments in the list.

I think that the format will be similar to what we had in the last meeting in Puerto Rico and my personal idea would be to have enough time for interaction for the audience which I think is the richest way to understand the different ideas perspective and in getting comments, but I cannot share more information than this. I don't know if Javier or Annebeth has more details but I think that's what I can share with you. But your comment is well taken and we will try to make it very useful and interactive. And thank you for sharing that comment with us.

Okay, and as I say, other SOs and ACs that are organizing sessions about this and maybe those of us cochairs will be participating in them, depending on our agendas and if the time allows that. So we will have hopefully enough time to express ourselves.

Any other comments about the sessions? Can I ask staff if they can contact GAC staff, Julie or (Tobian) and if see if this overlapping of the drafting of the communiqué that would be very useful. I think it's on Wednesday but I will check it on my own as well.

Javier Rua is saying that we shall focus on audience interaction and breakout sessions. And Julie is – Julie from staff, Julie Hedlund is saying that the GAC communiqué doesn't conflict. So, Kavouss, your concern is solved that we are not overlapping with the GAC communiqué. Okay.

No other hands up. Can we go next slide? Yes, next slide. Thank you. So let's go to substance now, and see we have like 25 minutes so we have some time to review some possible areas of agreement. This is captured by us as coleads and by staff that we have been listening to the comments and reading your comments in the email list. And about geographic names and about 2012 Applicant Guidebook, let's think about other things – not city names, not city names, if we have time we will talk about that today in this call.

Let's discuss about the following categories of geographic names from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and please, let us know your comments. Representation in any language of a capital city name or any country or territory listed in ISO 3166-1, exact match of sub national place, name such as country, province or a state listed in ISO 3116-2. And there's a reference to the working document there. And strings listed as UNESCO region or appearing on the composition of macro geographic, continental, regional, geographic, sub regions and selected economic and other grouping list, also referenced in working document.

So the question is, to what extent is there support in the group for keeping the requirement in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook to require support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities for these things? So I will open it to now for letting you share with us your comments. And please remind that we have a timer, we have three minutes to share at the most. Please share your comments with us. Kavouss, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Olga, I think I have read in the mailing list several people that think that this support letter or non-objection letter helps a lot and I don't see any reason why something that generally I would think 100% generally worked well, why we have to change that. We are not changing for the change, we are changing for (deficiency), so on so forth, no doubt we have to remove deficiencies. This is point one.

Point two, Olga, with respect to this working document towards preliminary draft report of the group, this seems to me a compilation of views. Some people said this, some people said that, one member said this, another member said that, so it is far from even a consensus building; it just compilation of various views, Madame, so we have to see in what way we could reconcile among all these at a minimum to bring it to some level of consensus, some level of consensus, not full consensus, but some level. For

the time being this compilation of different views. So two points I made. I hope that you will kindly take that into account. We've made change if there is a need for major change, if something work almost good, we should retain that. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Kavouss. And I agree with you that the document is a compilation of different perspectives. I think we haven't reached agreement, this is why we are having this working group. We haven't reached agreement for a long time. And perhaps this is the richness of this group discussion.

And I saw something in the chat which I thought it was interesting to – Katrin Ohlmer says, "Geo TLD group we support to maintain the requirements." Thank you, Katrin. Greg, please go ahead, your hand is up.

Greg Shatan: Yes, Greg Shatan for the record. I'll point out my question to Katrin in the chat, "What geo TLD group are you referring to?" just not familiar with which group she's representing in that regard, so I'll look forward to hearing that. And my point first off, the idea that the consent non-objection letter ain't broken or was helpful, seems to be held by those who support its continued use, not necessarily by those who were involved in it or have – and or those who have made much of analysis of what actually happened in many situations.

Certainly where there was an application that was a buyer on behalf of or in conjunction with a city or another geographic area consent or non-objection was almost irrelevant. The involvement was far more extensive than that. On the other hand, numerous problems were in fact caused by the letter of consent and non-objection in other cases. And, you know, we should be studying those cases. I actually put up a chart of the 66 cases where they were judged to be geo TLDs and that has received no further input from anyone else. Maybe I'll recirculate that. But I think we need to take a look at the facts. But regardless, even, you know, for these other areas such as the sub national place name, that is one where Tata got tripped up where the

$151 billion annual turnover one million plus employee company with 27 publicly listed companies couldn't even get a response from Tata the province of 120,000 people in Russia.

So certainly it's broken there and there's a lot more broken besides. Just to answer the exact question, I actually support the capital city section, the first one; the other two I…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Greg, sorry, your time is up. We are not talking about cities.

Greg Shatan: Okay, I switched from talking about cities, I mentioned Tata. And I'd also like to point out that the composition…

Olga Cavalli: And your time is up.

Greg Shatan: …of whatever it is lists can't be found. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. And apologies for being so rude but we have to let everyone speak. And, Greg, you have been asked if you can recirculate your – the information that you mentioned. It's here in the chat. And I wanted to read something else in the chat which I thought it was interesting but I lost it. Okay, and Jorge said we are not talking about cities and this is exactly what I said.

Thank you, Greg. Jorge, you're next. Jorge, can you…

((Crosstalk))

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Do you hear me okay?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jorge Cancio: Yes, do you hear me? Okay…

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I can hear you.

Jorge Cancio: Then well I will be very short because you already know our opinion on this. We think that in these three categories it's worked quite well. On the case of Tata, I note probably of the facts of the case but in any case, we should be consulting with the applicant and with the relevant public authority to have the full picture of what happened. And maybe this could lead us to make some – within the requirements of the letter of non-objection. So if it worked for many dozens of cases for one case, where we have some possible issues, I think we should investigate that with help of staff and reaching out to both of the parties and see whether any adjustments could be made. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olga, we're not hearing you.

Robin Gross: Hi, can you hear me? This is Robin speaking.

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Robin.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me okay?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Robin, we can hear you. Can you hear me?

Robin Gross: Yes, I can. Okay, so…

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead, Robin.

Robin Gross: …in answer to the – thank you. Thanks so much. In answer to the question about keeping the requirement for requiring support or non-objection letter, I would say no – I am concerned about the freedom of expression aspect here.

And I think freedom of expression advocates are generally very concerned about this particular requirement because it doesn't pay any respect to applicants' freedom of expression rights and I think it's also worth pointing out that it is a provision that the community did not actually decide upon; it was something that the Board created sort of at the last minute because they were getting a lot of lobbying and a lot of pressure from some governments in GAC and so, you know, they did this to try to appease them.

So this was not a policy that came out of the policy development process from the bottom up process. And so I think that puts it squarely on the – thin ice to begin with, and then when you add in a lot of the problems that others have noted and the concern that many of us in the freedom of expression community have about allowing governments to control the use of language this way on the Internet and how that actually violates the government's commitments to the freedom of expression rights that they have adhered to already in international treaties, it's a very troubling policy. So, no, I would not say that there is support at least from the communities that I represent in keeping this requirement. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Robin. I want to share with you a comment made by Jorge in the chat that the freedom of expression of the local communities should also be considered, and I agree with that. And I'm not sure if I understand your comment about government controlling use of the language, maybe we can talk about that in Panama. Just a personal thought. Greg, is that a new hand?

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Olga, if I may, Carlos Gutiérrez speaking.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Carlos, you're in the bridge. Greg and Kavouss, can you let Carlos make his comment please? Carlos, go ahead please.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Thank you very much. Sorry. I had troubles with the mute before. Thank you very much. I fully agree with the comment Robin made, but my feeling is one thing is when we are talking about cities, and I thought we were

still talking about cities, and another one is when we're talking about people, when we are talking about minorities, when we are talking about language, when we are talking about small communities that live only in one part of the country, or live in three different countries like the Kurds and so on. I think that Robin's arguments are most appropriate and I support them in the case we're talking about minorities, linguistic culture or religious communities.

I don't think they are that such a good fit when we are talking about political entities like cities. That was only a comment I will extend on the paper and thank you, Robin, I support most of your comments. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Carlos. And, Robin, is responding. "My comment, Olga, governments control the use of the language on the Internet. If others are not allowed to use words in TLDs or ways that governments don't approve of. Thank you." So thank you very much, Robin, for clarifying my question. And I have – oh by the way, Greg shared – or someone, I think it was list, shared that Greg link to his document that he referred to in the chat so you can check it and use it.

Kavouss, you're next, and remember that we don't have much time. Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I don't think that the rights of the public community or the people of the country should be compromised under the freedom of expression. There is a balance, there is a tradeoff. You cannot sacrifice one in expense of the others. So I am not in agreement what people say that in the name of this – what they call them freedom of expression I have read many times, this is very delicate issue. We have to preserve the right of the public entities, public communities, and right of the people in a country and not have a total evil in the name of the freedom of expression. So this is something that we disagree, totally disagree.

And I don't know somebody said they are representing community, what community? We don't represent any community. We representing ourselves so people speak on their own, we have, but not on behalf of the community. There is not such a proxy, there is no such authority given to anyone to speak on behalf of the community. And this community does not represent the people of the country, does not represent public entities. I don't know what community that people said that I'm representing a community. What community they represent? Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Kavouss. It was something Robin mentioned the pressure from government. I think each of the different stakeholders in this Internet ecosystem has its role and maybe governments could consider that other stakeholders are doing pressure. So I don't think that pressure is the right word; I think each stakeholder group has its own interest, its own perspective. And the challenge we have here is to find something that could at least make every one of us a little bit unsatisfied but somehow satisfied. If we want to be totally satisfied with our idea, I think we won't make it. If we are too radical in what we think we won't make it. And we will have the same conflicts as we had the first round. And I think that at least this is not a decider of the coleads of this working group. So let's have that in mind and be constructive.

Anymore comments about this? I don't see more hands, so maybe we can move to the next slide. Greg, you want to say something? Go ahead. Remember we don't have much time.

Greg Shatan: Just briefly, first I support Robin's intervention on behalf of the freedom of expression community. And second, just more of a point of order on the third bullet point, I went to the – in the document to look for the composition of macro-geographical continental regions, geographical sub regions and selected economic and other groupings list and I couldn't find it at that URL. So I think we need to, A, extract it into something other than a webpage and, B, somebody needs to go back and, you know, truly well identify the resource

that we're seeking to rely on. Maybe it no longer exists, if that was from the AGB. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Greg, for pointing that out. And…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I hear noise. Can you all please close your mics? Thank you very much. Thank you for that Greg, and please, staff, take note and we will fix it. I don't see more hands up, so we have a lot to discuss about this and let's see how this moves forward with the document and with our face to face sessions and next calls. And please let's think about this and start try to find a way of agreeing among us somehow.

Can we have the next slide please? And we have like nine minutes. Now we're – have some time for city names. The other comments were about – not about city names but in general names of countries and territories and sub regions. This city names issue was very much discussed in the list and also summarized in the document that we have shared and prepared for you. And I will share with you some high level comments and see your reactions, that will be of course very useful.

On the mailing list we have discussed a proposal to require support, non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities or cities above a certain size, which size? Working document, that's a reference. So some options that were discussed are the following, and it could be good while I read them to have your thoughts about that. Kavouss, let me finish and I will give the floor to you.

Cities that meet a population threshold, for example, 500,000 people, quite a bit city, by the way. By relative size, for example, ten largest cities in a country or three largest cities in a sub national region. That makes sense for

example if the country is small and has not that high population, maybe 500,000 people, it's a very big city for that country. So this also makes sense.

Requirements for only – only for cities that hold percentage of the country's population, or a combination of the above thresholds. So what you think about this idea? I think they are constructive but somehow they may be challenge. What are the pros and cons of this proposal? Is there a reference or a preference for one of these suggested solutions? And are there ultimate suggestions for determining if when a city should receive a special treatment? And I will open the floor and I will open the queue for comments. I have – and reminding you that we have three minutes per speaker and we have like six minutes to go or seven minutes to go. Kavouss, the floor is yours, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, hello. Olga, I don't see any logic, any rationale, to make such a decision about size of the city. Here no. I don't understand any logic. Do you confirm the size of cities is compared to the population of the country? A country like 1,300,000 people with another country with 22,000, 30,000 of the country and the tiny city in that 11,000. I don't understand this logic. I don't know where the idea comes from to make a category relation of the cities in the population and so on so forth.

A city might have a combination of various entities, various people with different type of belief, different type of culture and so on so forth. You cannot – you cannot make such a categorization. It is not logical. It has – it lacks the logic and rationales. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you, Kavouss. And my apologies to Liz; I didn't see – I didn't see Liz in the list – in the queue. My apologies, Liz, it should have been you first. Apologies. Please the floor is yours. Thank you. Liz, can you hear us?

Liz Williams: Yes, I can.

Olga Cavalli: Please, go ahead. You have a comment?

Liz Williams: Yes, can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, we can hear you very well.

Liz Williams: Perfect, thank you. I just want to use this particular slide as an example of where arbitrals do not service. I live in Canberra, that's our capital city. We have about 420,000 in our city. I would suspect that if we wanted to apply for dotCanberra, I'm not suggesting that we do, then an applicant would not be – if we use these rules – required to have a letter of support from our local government. These – it just doesn't help us to use these arbitrary constructs because cities change, cities move.

And I think that if we just remove the requirements for having these size-related thresholds, which have to be tested in an evaluation process, and it just doesn't help us. So if you want to go down the road of having government support or, in our case, this is our national capital, so it's very important in the property, even if wasn't – even if it wasn't our national capital, then one would suspect that the city name ought to be subject of more stringent tests if we were to go down that road.

Then if I flip this on its head the other way around, I come from a tiny, tiny, tiny country town of 2500 people. I'm (unintelligible). There is no reason that tiny little place shouldn't be given the same, in inverted commas, protection, and I'm using that word very, very carefully, then in exactly the same way as we would seek the support of the local Council if that is what an applicant is required to do.

But at the bottom of that, I just really think that the better way of solving this is to ensure that we have very, very robust objection processes in place and that anyone who wishes to object can object to an application at the correct time and it's up to the applicant – the burden is on the applicant to do what

they know they should do for making sure that for whatever string they apply for, they have the buy-in of a community that (unintelligible). Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you, Liz. I have Greg, Jorge and Javier. I give you each of you one minute. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. I'll be brief. I agree with what Kavouss and what I see from Heather in the chat and also Nick and what Liz said as well. These lists are arbitrary, they're random, there's – the cutoffs are just – there's no basis for them. The prerogative to block or veto or consent or non-object or whatever you want to call it, a string is something we need to give out very conservatively. We should not be liberal in giving out preemptive rights, you know, we should be liberal in allowing people to register and conservative in making rules that say that they can't. So whatever, you know, cutoffs or groupings we pick they need to be very select, very conservative and, you know, some random collection of thousands of cities, through some criteria just doesn't cut it. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you, Greg. Jorge, you're next. Jorge. One minute, Jorge.

Jorge Cancio: Hello? Do you hear me okay? Yes, I think that it's important again to use the principle of subsidiarity and this means to be respectful of local laws and policies and to defer to what those local laws and policies say about what is a city in each country. It isn't so much, it's about 190 countries and this information could be very well in the hands of an advisory body that could advise the applicant as I mentioned in some emails.

At least for Switzerland and this is a second point, cities of all kinds of population have the same right under the (serial) code. So unless we attempt to the subsidiarity principle, and the local laws and policies, we would set up some artificial thresholds. Thank you.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Olga…

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jorge. I see Greg…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, who was that? I couldn't get that.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Olga, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro here from Fiji.

Olga Cavalli: Oh yes. Go ahead, just one minute because we're running out of time. You're welcome.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes, one minute. Thank you. For the record (unintelligible) from Fiji speaking. Just like to build on Jorge's point, that's been articulated. I'd also like to emphasize that you have small islands developing states, which is part of the 190 countries that Jorge mentioned. And I don't think that they should be marginalized or our categorizations should be prejudicial to countries and territories that may not have the same demographic – that may not have the same population size to their counterparts. And, yes, that's all I'd like to say at this point. Hope that was a minute.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Sala, it was a minute. Thank you very much for being brief. And it seems that there – for most of the participants, these rules are somehow arbitrary so we will take those comments. I think we're running out of time. I thank all of your for your passion and for your engagement.

I think we are in a way but we have to do – we have to trying to find a way to bring those different views in a way together. So I wish you a good (unintelligible) some of you online in the next call or in Panama and let's keep in touch through the email list. Thank you very much to all of you and thank you, staff, and all colleagues and all friends from your participation. Bye-bye. Ciao.

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

Terri Agnew: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, (Grace), if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END