

**ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5 Geographic
Names at Top Level
Wednesday, 07 February 2018 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5 Geographic Names at Top Level call on the Wednesday, 07 February 2018 at 14:00 UTC. 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.

Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/LwCvB> Recordings may be found at:
<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-07feb18-en.mp3> AND
<https://participate.icann.org/p3uljoq3r6r/>

Coordinator: Recording has 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 at Top Level, taking place on the 7th of February, 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. Currently at this time on audio only I have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Juan Manual Rojas and Bram Fudzulani. In addition to those three names, is there anyone else on audio only?

Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones

and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to co-leader, Martin Sutton. Please begin.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Terri. And welcome, everybody, for today's meeting. An agenda was issued earlier to everybody so I'll just quickly run through the agenda that we have. It is in the Adobe Connect for those that are tuned into Adobe. Essentially we will have an opportunity just to quickly provide an update since our last meeting. The core of this meeting will be the review of existing defined geographic terms and that was listed in more detail in the agenda that was circulated. At the end we will have a chance to discuss or raise further actions for additional geographic terms and a call for any others business.

So if anybody has any other business that they would like just to quote now that they would want to raise at that later point please let us know either in the chat or raise your hand at this point. Okay. Seeing none at this stage then.

If we could just do the normal checks please for any statements of interest that are required to be updated, if anybody has anything to voice at this stage could you please raise your hand or get in the queue? It must be a quiet month then. So thanks very much.

We'll move then onto the updates since the last meeting. So the good news is that the terms of reference that we've been working on have been completed and distributed so that's a great step forward so that we can now focus on the core piece of work around Work Track 5. That was circulated, if you haven't received a copy there's a link on display as well there and you'll be able to find that in the wiki for the Work Track 5 activities.

The other update is regarding webinar planned for tomorrow and in light of the discussions that we'd had during our last call and previous discussions, it was thought that a history of geographic names would be welcomed by those

that are new to this space and that would like to understand a bit more detail as to how things came about from the time of the GNSO policies being derived in 2007 through to the Applicant Guidebook being published in 2012 and some of the activities that have occurred since that point in time. So this is planned for tomorrow at 1900 UTC and Work Track 5 members are welcome to join that. It is focused on newcomers so that they can appreciate the types of issues that have been reviewed in the past to come up with the version of the Applicant Guidebook that was used. But we also welcome other experienced members to attend either as a refresher to be able to help respond to some of the questions that may be asked at the end of that session. So please mark that one in your diaries and please join us for tomorrow at 1900 UTC if you'd like to. Is there any questions regarding tomorrow's webinar? Okay. Great.

So we'll move swiftly on then to the core part of this meeting. From our last meeting where we had prepared to discuss the existing definition of geographic terms, it was apparent that the discussions were becoming quite broad in context and very difficult to assign to any particular relevant term of the geographic definitions that we had already in place.

So what we have done since then is prepare a very much more detailed breakdown of those geographic terms so that we can actually start walking through each of those to try and work out whether we can validate their existence so that they are a good representation of a geographic term for the purpose of top level domains that we can use to apply certain treatments that we will get through.

But for today's session, as I articulated in the agenda that was circulated, there are three key things that we want to focus on for each of the 13 terms that are identified within the AGB. So first of all, as I say, one is to try and validate whether that is a good geographic term for our purposes and then to open up discussions on what were the positive impact merits based on the treatment applied to that term in the Applicant Guidebook.

Then we would look at what were the negative impact and opportunities lost based on the treatment applied to that particular term. That will help us build up a good background of essentially the pros and cons of how – of the impact of the way that we treated those specific terms in this last round.

A spreadsheet was circulated so I know people have had an opportunity to look at that. We've also, prior to the last meeting, we had started to collect some information and I'm really pleased that members of the work track have started to populate the spreadsheet that we were looking at for rationale why change is needed or what was useful to retain. And we'll reflect on some of that as we go through the relevant individual terms that we're going to go through today.

Does anybody have any questions first before we leap into the first term? Just want to make sure that that's clear. Okay. Right, hearing none then so if we move onto the first term so this is the popular one I think that has been discussed previously in great detail within the cross community working group. And here we're talking about the Alpha 2 code listed in ISO 3166 standard.

Now for the first few we will be referring to this 3166 list so as an example here dotAF for Afghanistan is what we're referring to in the Alpha 2 code list. And the way that it was treated within the 2007 policy PDP was that a two-character code would not be available as a generic top level domain. They're not permitted and the reason being it was to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on that list.

In terms of the Applicant Guidebook that was mirrored so that it was not available as a generic top level domain. So that was exactly the same. We'll go through others where there's a difference in the way that they were treated from a policy perspective to the implementation perspective.

So I would like to open up the discussion and rather phrase this as a – is it a valid geographic term? Perhaps if I just ask for anyone that – does anyone have any reservations about using this two-character 3166 reference as a geographic term? This is your opportunity to speak to that. I have Paul in the queue. Please go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. Not so much a reservation but a question, when we say that this was adopted to avoid conflicts with country code top level domain names, does anybody recall the thinking behind that? Was it people were worried about typo variations and therefore the use two letter domain names were banned? Or was it concerns about competition that for ccTLD operators not wanting additional two character domain names out there?

There's all kinds of examples of things you can think of that are not necessarily country codes that do represent by two letters. I always go to aa.com to book my air travel, for example. So there are commercial uses for these. I'm not saying we should reverse course, I'm just curious was the concern about misdirected traffic or was the concern about competition? Or perhaps both? Anybody that can speak to that would be – I'd love to hear the story of how we ended up with this particular restriction. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Paul. And I think we'll keep that question in there and see if anybody can respond to that. And I've got Nick Wenban-Smith next please.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Hi, can you hear me okay?

Martin Sutton: Loud and clear, yes, thanks.

Nick Wenban-Smith: All right. I think before we talk about the attitude just to be totally crystal here, the Alpha 2 on the 3166, that is not every single two letter combination so the two letter combinations total 26 times 26, that's 676 combinations. I think the 3166 has less than that, I think about 270.

But what we're talking about here is it's not just that it is eligible or is already a ccTLD two letter but also that the ones which have not yet been registered or not yet on the list as a two letter code are also not available for registration because as it says in the text, because countries change names actually and two letter codes also occasions of change names, think of Yugoslavia, Czech, and so that – it's a relatively small number of two letter combinations, less than 500, and those that dropped as I said, for future use in terms of potential to yet be named in the form of countries just to be totally clear about it.

Because I think it's important as we talk about this it's the first, you know, it's the easy one that the policy matches the implementation. It'll be – is this a slightly different position for the Alpha 3 codes for example, and it's just worth pointing out that some of these – like AA, for example, I don't think that is on the ISO 3166 Alpha 2 list, but therefore it's not geographic but nonetheless the policy was, and was implemented such that it would not be eligible as a TLD, even though it's not actually a standard two letter code for any country.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Nick, for the clarification. I think that's worthwhile to raise. I mean, what might be interesting is to understand the – the volume of additions that occur to the two letter country code list over a period of time so is it something that, you know, is a 10, 20 a year that are added to that or is it something like over 10 years you might see 10 changes to that list, might be helpful to understand that a bit more as we're kind of, if you like, blocking access to all two character two letter characters but we may never actually apply those to a country in 10, 20, 30, 50 years. But thanks for raising that one.

Nick Wenban-Smith: You're right, you're right and that was the policy recommendation from 2007...

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Nick Wenban-Smith: And that's the way it was (unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you, Nick. I have Jaap next. Please go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, this is Jaap speaking. And...

Martin Sutton: Sorry, Jaap, I've lost...

((Crosstalk))

Christopher Wilkinson: We don't hear you. Yes, we don't hear you.

Martin Sutton: Sorry, Jaap, I've lost.

Christopher Wilkinson: Jaap, we don't hear you. We don't hear you.

Martin Sutton: Okay whilst Jaap might be trying to connect again, I've got Christopher in the queue and, Jaap, I'll go back to you once you've connected. Christopher, please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson. I know a little bit about this because I was closely involved with the creation of the dotEU registry. On the general matter, Annebeth is the authority but I believe she's not yet on the call. My only substantive point at this stage was that ICANN and this group, needs the presence of International Standards Organization explicitly to advise on their policy because they own 3166, ICANN doesn't, their policy on the use of codes that have not yet been assigned.

On the one hand I fully understand there's a lot of two letter codes are interesting, say, VW, and they're not used as country codes. On the other hand, we have had several experiences in recent years, at least I'm 76 so my concept of recent years may be longer than – above average, where country

codes did change radically and ISO had to allocate new codes. There's a whole story behind that which we don't know about. And I think the International Standards Organization should be invited by ICANN or the GAC, whoever is most appropriate, to give an opinion on this – on the use of their standards particularly as they relate to codes that have not been allocated. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Christopher. Jaap, are you back online?

Martin Sutton: I hear you.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I'm back online, I guess, if you can hear me?

Martin Sutton: Jaap, I can hear you now. Please go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay. Thanks. Being a member of ISO 3166 (unintelligible) hat back on and there's an understanding that ICANN confirms through the list of (unintelligible) in ISO 3166 and we only use that for ccTLDs, (unintelligible) understanding this goes back to 2000 and whether or not it cover (unintelligible) term it doesn't matter.

If you want to use it for something else than ccTLDs you should convince ICANN that it change its position totally, it means that you completely develop ISO 3166. I think that – there's no way in between. You cannot pick and choose just by – and you cannot pick and choose elements from the standard and forget about the parts you don't like. I mean, you have to be very consistent. And actually the Board actually confirmed this – somewhere the Board has (unintelligible) for they will only use the two character names for ccTLDs unless there's a real exception (unintelligible) EU. But if you want to use two character names for anything else than ccTLDs I would say that you change completely all the policy work in ICANN.

Martin Sutton: Okay, thank you, Jaap. I think these are really interesting points. I think there is a – I suppose what we're allowing here to occur is just to discuss and validate whether the two character code in the spirit that it's used at the moment is still valid and should be retained. There may be reference points from 10, 20, 30 years ago when this started to develop that were absolutely reasonable to take on board at that stage. But I think what we're trying to also make sure is that as things have changed and do we have to adapt any of this? So this is an opportunity for trying to tease out if there is any questions that we need to cover on existing terms including the two character codes.

But I'll move on. Alex – so I've got Alexander was in the queue next and then I've got Christopher back on afterwards. Alexander.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, hello. Yes, hello. It's Alexander Schubert. I would like to add to this that AA.com was mentioned, American Airlines. And that is one of the examples of two letter code that can never assign to a country because it's one of the codes that is reserved for the public. So dotAA could indeed be assigned to American Airlines without ever any country being impacted because there will be never a country called AA because it's exempted.

But still I say we should not – any two letter gTLD because it's not just about that we have to preserve the two letter name space for other countries, but additionally the Internet user in all those decades is conditioned to understand at least out of the United States, is conditioned to understand that two letters are somehow connected to a country and they're used by countries, and anything else is used by somebody else.

I mean, this is something that is probably not known in the United States because most Americans don't even know that they have an owned ccTLDs, or which it would be, but there are 95% of the world population living outside the United States and those have a very good understanding and feeling for ccTLDs and gTLDs. And if we would start to assign AA to American Airlines,

which wouldn't hurt any country, then the distinction between ccTLDs and gTLDs would completely vanish in my eyes. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Alexander. Just to flag again, let's go back to the point here, we've got Alpha 2 code listed in the ISO 3166 standard that we use to represent the geographic term for policy purposes and for the AGB. So let's first of all go through this question, is it a valid geographic term for the purposes of new gTLDs? I think you know, there's a lot of argument that says yes it is, so what I just want to tease out is there any real objections or concerns with using the two character code as a basis for working out how we treat those particular terms rather than going to the detail of, you know, how we will treat those terms?

So please bear that in mind as I go through the list here. So I've got Jaap and then Greg please. Jaap, go ahead. Oh, it was an old hand. Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I think we to distinguish between two letter – letter-letter – codes and those that are number-number, letter-number, number-letter purely ISO 3166 uses two letter codes and understanding the need for expansion as countries may be created or change their names, I'm willing to concede kind of the future two letter-letter codes to the kind of geographic space in the making.

But I don't think we need to come to the same conclusion letter-number and number-letter as well or number-number since those won't fall within ISO 3166; as we've called it, it's Alpha 2, not Character 2. I think we also – in listening to Alexander it strikes me that the first – I think there's far more people in the United States that understand that the two letter codes like dotFR and dotDE represent countries even if dotUS is not a particularly popular or significant TLD.

On the other hand, there are a number of two letter TLDs that were assigned or to some extent owned by countries but are no longer operating as ccTLDs. It's probably outside our – and to consider anything about them especially in this forum. But in a sense those countries are taking advantage or those TLDs are taking advantage of the assumption that Alexander states which is that all two letter codes are countries. So if you have a dotWS for instance, which was marketed or may still be marketed as World Site, and has nothing to do with Western Samoa anymore, it's basically just a gTLD without any of the policy protections that gTLDs operate under.

So that in essence is a – it's a sham to a certain extent, it's also a third rail issue here. I don't know that we want to get into it but I don't think we can just slavishly say that there's a correct assumption that all two letter codes operate as ccTLDs. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Greg. So can I just ask a quick question in return because based on those comments and previous ones, is it reasonable still though to use Alpha 2 code list 3166 as a basis for creating policy requirements? So whatever they may be, and, you know, you've articulated some variances already within that space, but whatever they may be is this a good list to include within the geo terms? I think that's the point that we're trying to make sure that we cover and validate as we go through each of these terms, geo terms. Could I ask you just quickly respond to that?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again. I think I would say yes, I think so far I haven't seen a concrete reason why it's not good and the fact of the matter that it's, you know, external and is used in other places and has other places where one might understand it, might be equally arcane but all trademark docketing software that I know uses the two letter codes to represent the countries. So the fact that this is tied to a larger universe and has a consistency across that universe is I think an advantage. And I think there'd have to be some demonstrated problems with why we would want to break away from that system. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Greg. Appreciate that. I've got Alan and then Paul and then I'll close it off at that stage because we've got quite a useful set of feedback because I'd like to go on to start talking about the positive and negative impacts of the treatment in the last round. So over to you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm not sure if I'm being overly pedantic, but my recollection is the Applicant Guidebook and the policy said two letter alpha codes were not allowed and what is in this chart it says two letter codes listed in ISO 3166. And there's a – more than a subtle difference between those two. Can we have clarity of what was actually in the policy and the Applicant Guidebook? Was it just those that are listed today? Or was it all two letter alpha codes?

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Alan. I wonder if Steve or Judy or might – or Emily might be able to just extract the reference there and post it into the chat please if that's possible. Then we can validate that. Thanks, Alan. Paul, I've got you next.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. I sort of feel like we've already talked about B a little bit, what were the positive impact merits based on the treatment. You know, so for example some folks said less, you know, less conflict between ccTLDs and potential new applicants. Nobody was able to identify whether that conflict meant misdirected traffic or whether that conflict meant that ccTLDs would have more competition. If we could kind of leave that where it's at.

The other good point that was raised earlier is that, you know, countries change names, that's interesting, right? Countries do change names. And so that would seem to be a positive impact under B. but the – in terms of C, the negative impact and opportunities, lots of, you know, the negative impacts and opportunities lost, we really don't have the answer to that because there was no opportunity for ICANN, you know, ICANN didn't say, you know, please apply here and if for some reason you're not applying because of our

policies please let us know that here. Right? So we don't know who didn't apply for a two character domain name so we – there's no way for us to quantify C. So in the absence of somebody being on this call who has an affiliation with a registry that would -- or an affiliation with some sort of commercial entity that would have applied for a two character TLD in the first round, speaking up and saying yes, we were going to apply it but then we found out the policy precluded us.

I don't think there's any way for us to respond to C. So I don't mean to jump ahead to B and C, but I think we've already talked a lot about those already and we do need to answer those in order to answer A, which is, is this still a good list. And I've not heard anybody put forward a good -- any reasons so far why this is not a good list. So I just wanted to state that. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Paul and thanks for moving into the B and C questions for this one. I think you're right, some of the questions that have been posed already and some of the comments relate to more of the impacts rather than explicitly using that specific list for the two characters. So let's now move forward. We've captured a lot of this. I think what we'll end up with is quite often more questions than answers, which isn't a bad thing. It just means that we can then go off and explore some of those open questions as we move forward.

So let's move on. I'd like to hear from those in the group regarding what they consider to be a positive impact and the merits based on the treatment of the two character codes in the applicant guidebook. So I know Paul has already highlighted a couple. It would be useful if I could ask others to contribute as well. Paul, is that an old hand or are you back in the queue? Thank you.

Jeff, over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so I think positive impact was that it was a consistent rule. It was easy to apply. It was objective so for all of those reasons, limiting it all two characters was a positive impact on the treatment. As far as C, the

opportunities lost, we do know that Hewlett Packard has sent in a couple letters on .HP. I don't think that was on the ISO list but that was certainly one that would have been prevented with the two character.

Now, they just sent letters in to have the rule limited but there's no evidence that they would have necessarily applied as they did not state that they -- I don't think they directly stated that they would have applied. I think one of the questions we should ask on the two character is should we limit the two character restriction to letter-letter combination as opposed to all two characters. In other words, should we allow number letter or letter number combinations is probably the right question at this point. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: So Jeff on that point, I kind of regard personally the letter number combinations as outside of scope. What we're looking at here is geographic terms so we don't currently have a letter number based policy. So on that basis, is there some other work track that would be involved net income looking at that aspect?

Jeff Neuman: If this group does see that a letter number combination or number letter combination is outside of scope than we would -- this would then be covered by Work Track 2. I think at this point, Work Track 2 has refrained in making a recommendation on that simply because it was waiting for output from this group. So I think the answer -- I think this group would need to say that letter number and number letter is definitively out of scope before Work Track 2 picks it up. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Jeff, and I'll refer to the queue in a second. I just want to clarify that a bit further because I think we should take that as an action from the group to liaise with the relevant work track and give them whatever information that they need to discuss that further. Because I noticed in the chat also the point raised that these are irrelevant because it's got to be three characters or more was the applicant guidebook.

But the discussions that we're going through are specific to geographic terms. The policy and the final guidebook closed off anything that was under three characters, whether it be geographic term or not. So we've got some other issues there that probably need to be parked in more relevant buckets that are not related to geographic terms. Probably the letter number combination is one of those. So that may be something that we need to take forward as a further discussion point for the next meeting.

So I've got -- I thought I had Susan. No, Susan's gone. Jaap, in the queue please.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, very quick, the (unintelligible) being out of the scope as you mentioned, I also want to point out that there has been longstanding rule in the DNS standards that domain names should not start nor end with a number. So it would be just (unintelligible) number. Although it's been relaxed in some form. It probably will a lot of (unintelligible). But again that's not for us to consider. Just as a fact.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you, Jaap. And I'm just reading through some of the comments going through with the letter number combination. Is there anybody that actually has an opinion that letter number is in scope? I'm hearing lots of otherwise not. But if there is anybody that has a strong opinion that it should be included, please let yourself be heard.

Right, so I think there is an action coming from this that we do need to send that specific piece of information to the relevant work track and I'll liaise -- Jeff, can I liaise with you in terms of how we process that?

Jeff Neuman: Well, you also have Michael Fleming on this call. He's one of the co-chairs or the co-leaders of Work Track 2. So between Michael and I, I think, -- and Cheryl -- I think that's fine.

Martin Sutton: I just don't want it to fall through the gaps. So that's great. Okay. Thanks very much. I'm not seeing any more in the queue but is there anybody else that has any other positive impact or merit? I've got a phone call in the background here on my speaker. If you're not speaking, could you please mute? Thank you.

So before we move onto C, is there any positive impact or merits anybody wishes to raise? And I know we've heard some comments on the lost opportunities or negative impact. Is there anybody else that has a point to raise for the Alpha 2 code list? Okay, well, we'll take those comments and we'll feed that back into the spreadsheet in a shorter form. So thank you. Let's move onto the next term. Can we move the slide on please? Thank you.

So Alpha 3 code listed, again, 3166. So in this example we've got AFG for Afghanistan. For the policy work, it was available but a challenged mechanism to government to initiate an objection. Applicants should be aware of the GAC principles and applicants must represent that the use of the proposed string is not in violation of the national laws in which the applicant is incorporated. There was a difference so that in the actual final ATP it was made not available. So these weren't available.

So in terms of our policy discussions, does anybody have reservations about using the Alpha 3 code list to work out a treatment of that particular type of term in our work? I will assume silence is -- I've got Javier saying that three letter codes are also out of scope. Could you explain your rationale for that please? If you can't join by phone, if you could include that in the chat please. Please know that when we're asking that question, is it a valid geographic term for the purposes of new GTLDs, it's not about how we treat it. It's about using that list to then consider if they need to be a certain type of treatment or treatments applied to the Alpha 3 code list.

Okay. So I've got Nick, Alexander, and then Jeff, Susan, and Greg. So Nick, fire away please.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Nick Wenban-Smith for the record. (Unintelligible) would be better saying it.

Martin Sutton: Sorry, Nick, you're very faint. I don't know if you could get closer to the mic.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Is that better?

Martin Sutton: Yes, a little good.

Nick Wenban-Smith: So unlike the Alpha 2 code, which all of the letter-letter combinations, whether or not they're on the (unintelligible) list as a standard, only the Alpha 3 codes, which are on the standard, that is to say about 270 out of the 17,500 more or less three letter combinations are blocked (unintelligible) distinction. And I think it's pretty much undeniable. We can argue about whether they should be blocked as a GTLD or not but it's undeniable to say that there is obviously a geographic connection with the Alpha 3 codes, which are down and country three letter codes in ISO 3166.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Nick. We've got Alexander next.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, this is Alexander Schubert. In addition to that, I would like to refer the application for that BAR, like a bar where you get drinks. That one was obviously treated as a geographic name as well because it is in some other place of ISO 3166. So if we are treating BAR, a completely generic geographic term, because it is -- you can find it another place of 3166, I think three letter country names are even much more geographic because a country is a more important or impacting entity than a small region like the region BAR. So per the 2012 applicant guidebook, clearly three letter country codes are geographic terms.

Martin Sutton: And Alexander, is that similar in terms of dot com as well? That was prior to new GTLDs.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, that's -- I think that's the only case where a legacy (unintelligible) remain (unintelligible) violated the rule. But that should be the case. It's a very small area with a very low internet usage and obviously, no one is going to (unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thanks for that. I've got Susan next and if I could just ask people to remember the first point of this is just to say is the Alpha 3 code list suitable to hang off how we will treat that kind of geographic term going forward. So that's the precise question at the moment. So I've got Susan next please.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Susan Payne. I think a couple of things and just to quickly respond to Alexander, since I had my hand up straight after him. I don't think it's really a question that dot com was a sort of one of breaching of the rules. I think there wasn't a rule. There's a distinction about two characters and country codes and three characters meaning GTLDs, going back to that early RFC. So it's not really a question of a dot come breach of the rules but only a small situation so it doesn't matter. These are the rules from when the AGB 2012 were developed significantly later obviously.

But all I was going to say was really that I agree with Nick Wenban-Smith. I think how we treat them is definitely something we need to consider and discuss very clearly. But we do know that the three letter codes are allocated in the ISO list to indicate countries. And so I think it's reasonable for this purpose and given that it was treated in that way in the applicant guidebook for the 2012 round to think of the most geographic terms. But that's not to say that they get the same treatment necessarily. That's something that needs discussion and had extensive discussion in the cross-community working group on country and territory names without an ability to reach agreement.

So obviously, work needs to be done.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Susan. So I've got Greg and Christopher in the queue. If we could just focus on, first of all, is this list useful for the purpose of developing or continuing policy. That's what we're aiming for and then we'll move onto B and C. So if I can ask Greg and Christopher to keep your points related to question A and then we'll move on. Thank you. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. I do think -- can you hear me now?

Martin Sutton: Yes, thank you.

Greg Shatan: I think as far as the three letter codes that are actually listed on the list at the time, it makes sense to consider those geographic terms. But as Paul McGrady notes, all three character combinations were not barred in the previous round, shouldn't be barred here for a number of reasons, including the fact that the three letter codes aren't used at CCTLD.

So we need to stick to the list as it exists. I've checked the list and BAR, B-A-R, is not an ISO 3166 three character code. So for whatever reason, it was excluded. It was not excluded under this particular rule. So I think the rule that the current list is a list of geographic terms and is an appropriate rule.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Greg. And I think we'll be able to pick those points up as well for the next two questions. So Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, Christopher Wilkinson again for the record. Thank you, Martin. My first point is that to the best of my understanding the CCNSO already has a fairly detailed policy on this matter and I would be included to defer and not try and invent a personal opinion to amend it.

The second point is similar to the one I've already made. ISO 3166 does not belong to ICANN. It belongs to the International Standards Organization and

I would strongly recommend that ICANN, not necessarily this little working group, but ICANN formally requests from ISO a considered opinion on these questions. because if we don't have that, sooner or later down the line somebody in ISO is going to say either stop or ouch.

And I don't think -- and I include myself in this -- I don't think this group is really competent in all the spellings and languages of that word, really competent to try and reinvent and ISO 3166 Alpha 3 policy. I think that we should defer to the office and authorities of this and I think Jaap has already indirectly confirmed that point of view. But it's not just enough to have an opinion on the call. I think we need a formal written opinion from ISO on this matter. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: So Christopher, are you saying that -- because I'm trying to get back to this question. Is the list generated by ISO 3166 a relevant and purposeful list that ICANN can use for the purposes of creating, or developing, or changing policies in regards to geographic terms? I'm not quite sure I'm clear if that was a yes or no from...

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, speaking entirely personally and off the cuff, I would be included to say yes. But we have a full session in the webinar tomorrow of the whole history of this will undoubtedly be reviewed. So I'm not going to say more than that. I think the feeling of this meeting is -- the answer is probably going to be yes among the best we know about it. But I just think we're not an authority in a formal forum for that purpose. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Christopher. No, I just wanted to clarify because I'm just trying to see -- these have been applied to policy and the applicant guidebook development with good reasons at the points that they were created, and this is an opportunity as a checkpoint to say is this still a valid source for us to base policy decisions on. So these are strong reference points in the applicant guidebook.

So one, are they reliable? Can we continue to use them as a basis for working out the policy development. So thank you. That's exactly what we needed. So can I now cut the list on A and we'll on please to the three character code, so how the treatment of these was applied in the applicant guidebook. Could I ask people to -- and I don't mind if we combine these two -- to voice positive impact and merits on that treatment in the last round and any negative impact or opportunities lost. So I've got Greg and Christopher. Christopher is that your last hand? Yes, okay. New hand. Old hand.

Okay. So I've got Paul. Please go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. Same answer as before for letter C, which is we don't know because there wasn't apply here or I would like to apply here but your policies don't let me. As I look over the list, there seem to be few opportunities on there. Maybe somebody wanted to operate a registry about the Eastern Standard Time Zone and they've applied for .EST. Not sure. Seems farfetched but there could have been somebody who wanted to do that but they are captured here, at least nobody on this call, so far has indicated that. Maybe there is someone on this call who will indicate that they know of somebody who would have applied.

But unfortunately, ICANN didn't collect any I didn't apply data and here's the reason why. So we really don't have the answer to Question C. So absent that, I think that unless we have some strong reasons why we would fiddle with this particular component, I don't know why we would. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Paul. And I think it would be helpful not just from -- I know we probably have a tendency to think of brands that might use these. But these are starting to become more useful in generic terms as well as we get a longer string. So a three string will have many generic terms as well as perhaps the same as a country code as well as brands as well. So there will be a very high mix, I should imagine, of potential applicants.

I don't know if anybody is on the call that could speak to the point, is there any countries that would have been willing or keen to have applied for a three character country code? Happy if somebody could get in the queue for that if they've got a response. I think that would be useful as well. In the meantime, these will be open questions, Paul. So where we haven't got that data, at least for us to be aware that we might be missing opportunities based on the way the treatment of a particular term was made in the last guidebook.

Okay. I've got Susan and then Nick. Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks very much. I'm noting Paul's comment that yes, that's correct. I suppose ICANN wasn't gathering data and I might have applied but I didn't. I think there is an awareness that there are some brands on that list, some of whom may well have been interested in applying but obviously knew from pretty much the outset that they were not going to be able to apply for what they wanted to apply for.

But the three letter combinations in question also include a few common words such as CAN, which is Canada, but also is a common word in English (unintelligible) that and some commonly used acronyms including things like IoT, Internet of Things, and IDN, Internationalized Domain Name, as well as some common abbreviations including GEO, which we're all using furiously in the context of this conversation for meaning geographic.

So there are a number of potentially different uses that were excluded from the outset. And the justification that perhaps exists in relation to the two characters doesn't exist in quite the same way because these three letter terms are not being used as CCTLDs. So they were merely blocked.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Susan. As Nick mentioned previously, this expands quite considerably once you move from a two character string to three character string where there's a huge, huge overlap. Nick, please go ahead.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Thanks, yes, I'd agree with Susan that yes, some of the -- about 270 I think there are three letter combinations on the ISO standard that are not available. And that includes, I mean I'm very disappointed and I think it probably would have been (unintelligible) G-I-N, there's a .vodka and a .beer but G-I-N is Alpha 3 (unintelligible) for example. So it was blocked and probably would have been registered.

So a small number of these and don't forget there are 17,500 or so ways to arrange 26 letters of the alphabet. And for those 17,500 only 275 are blocked. There obviously would have been some (unintelligible) you could have L-E-G, Leg, but you can't have A-R-M, Arm. It does produce some slightly curious outcomes, which you don't expect at the first flush I guess (unintelligible) improve the rules.

But in terms of the positive impact, I would say that there's a huge strength of feeling in the (CFC) community that the Alpha 3 is very strongly associated with the country names. Quite often it's a common abbreviation of the country name or it's used a lot in terms of country sports teams or other things. Canada I know feel very proprietorial about C-A-N even though it obviously has (unintelligible) as a common English word. Norway, you know, (unintelligible) explained to me, it's on the King of Norway's yacht (unintelligible) sales up and down towards Oslo.

And so we can understand why there's a huge (unintelligible) activity around confusion of country names, notwithstanding the (unintelligible) CCTLD.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Nick. So have we got any more comments? I'm just going through the chat. I can't see anything initially on the chat beyond what's been spoken to. Alexander please go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Yes hello this is Alexander Schubert again. It's that we only made this requirement of a letter of non-objection for the (unintelligible) courts are that we rather denied them the application. But was there was another rule that

said that some permutations and transpositions are also not allowed. So if you wanted to go for let's say what front F-R-A you wanted to go A-F-R that's a permutation of FRA for (funds) and you can apply for it as well.

And some people felt this was a little bit of an overprotection because nobody ever, ever will - makes a permutation of a three letter code with the original one because it's just impossible. You can't. So that would be one rule that we could - that was a rule that turns out was an overprotection to even protect permutations and transpositions.

Martin Sutton: Thanks Alexander. And I think we've got a term coming up similar to that that we'll go through. So I'd point from (Catherine) on negative impact if we could copy the (unintelligible) applicant even though they might have reached agreement with respect to owner whoever that might be of the three letter were banned. So there's some potential opportunities lost in that. Okay so I got Susan. Please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes thank you. I just wanted to respond to Alexander's point about the permutations and transpositions and not that I can answer it because I'm afraid I don't have the rule sort of sitting here in front of me and I don't know them well enough to do so off the top of my head or I don't say and turn out to be wrong. But that wasn't my understanding at how this worked. I thought that was - I thought the permutations and transpositions related to words rather than letters so that you would get a permutation transportation of FRA into AFR or other combinations.

But I think I guess I just wanted to flag that maybe it would be helpful if perhaps staff could look at this for us and confirm whether, you know, precisely what the position was because I would hate to have to be going down a path with incorrect information.

Alexander Schubert: Can I reply to that?

Martin Sutton: Yes please go ahead Alexander.

Alexander Schubert: Okay this is Alexander Schubert again. I have waded into this very, very deeply because early in 2010 a year before 2011 I created an applicant for a three-letter code. So I have studied this in great, great, great detail. And you're right the transpositions are for country names but the permutation rule is explicitly for three letter codes. So you couldn't apply for AFR because it would have been permutation of FRA.

So you are right transpositions for three letter codes not but permutations. Permutations were not allowed to be registered. I'm finished.

Martin Sutton: Thanks Alexander. And I think (Emily)'s currently added some of the working through to the chat so we'll pick that out as well. And I – it might be worth us relaying that back into the spreadsheet I think just to make sure that that's - we've got clarity on that so thank you. Okay I'm going to close off the alpha three code and move onto the next section.

We've got probably 15 minutes to keep moving through these. These are quite challenging these ones already so but it's great to have the input and the different perspectives being pushed forward here so that we can capture those. If I can move to the next slide please.

So now we're talking about longform names. Oh no we're not. Yes we are. Are we - I think you moved on one ahead. So we're on slide I said nine. So longform names in the ISO list again or a translation of the longform name in any language.

So okay so let's think of the list first of all. Is it a valid geographic term for the purposes of our policy work? So if I could just ask is there anybody that would have strong reservations about using that phrase the terminology a longform name in ISO3166 to work on relevant treatment of that now going forward? Jaap I have you on the list. Go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes I'm not sure whether I made (unintelligible) or I support this information but (unintelligible). But it's good to know that the ISO actually likes for the names the longform and the short form (unintelligible) on the UN terminology database because basically they check what's happening in the UN terminology database. So if a council changes its name in the database it (unintelligible) will be updated. The recent one is (unintelligible) a month ago (unintelligible) change name in (unintelligible) database of the ISOs changed (unintelligible). Well we might use it as a point to (unintelligible) quickly but it's not authoritative and just consider itself authoritative of whether or not this is the correct name either the long or the short form.

Martin Sutton: Okay thank you Jaap. Is - just thinking that through is there anything alternative that we should also consider or is this still (unintelligible) in your mind...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: ...is it still a viable reference point for the purposes of trying to develop policy around specific terms?

Jaap Akkerhuis: It is - I mean it is a reference point. And but note that they only and this - they are not always right just depending on the other sources. And sometimes the official name differs from what is in use common. And so it's you can only treat it as (unintelligible) and which the fact that it actually (unintelligible). This UN due protocol using subcommittee (DUTN) which is dealing with (unintelligible) names and but they have been not doing anything for a long time. I think that's (gaining) up again.

And but they also use UN terminology database. It seems that (unintelligible) in the UN terminology database these changes are often initiated by their countries or the representative at the UN itself. And so that's where most of these things come from.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you very much.

Jaap Akkerhuis: The way ISO works it's only thinks up things themselves if it's not in UN term database but that seldom happens. And I kind of remember anything that - (unintelligible) another community authority experts surrounding ISO to help with these things special in the case when we (unintelligible) which that's another thing you'll notice that the names as listed in ISO list are only transliterations or into trends in English means not even in the six UN official languages (unintelligible) terminology database as that.

Martin Sutton: Okay. So that could be...

Jaap Akkerhuis: So if you are aware - so if you are aware about the limitations you could use it.

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Jaap Akkerhuis: But not...

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Jaap Akkerhuis: ...(unintelligible) you (unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Thank you Jaap. What I'll do is move on to the next two questions on this then. So is there any points people would raise in terms of the positive impact, the merits of applying the treatment as it was for the AGB which is that these terms were not made available as a gTLD as opposed to the policy that was developed previously that stated they would be available but a challenge mechanism available to governments to initiate an objection? So this is very similar to the last one.

So applicants should be aware of GAC principles and applicants must represent that the use of the proposed string is not in violation of the national laws in which the applicant is incorporated whereas that was then changed for the final guidebooks so that these were not available. So I'd be interested to hear any positive impacts and merits that people would like to raise in terms of this particular geographic term that was used? Was there any positive impact?

Okay I'll open it up then to negative impact. I notice that (Catherine) has posted an item. If a country wanted to apply for the long names as a TLD they were not allowed to. Any other points on this element, the longform name?

Thank you (Jeff). So positive impact similar to last time. It was an easy objective standard to follow. So predictable right.

Okay anybody have any more points on this one? Otherwise I'll move on and squeeze in one last one before we move on to the other points of the agenda? Okay seeing none if we can move to the next one which is the short form name.

Now this is the same principle as the longform name so I'm not going to go through because I think unless anybody has a comment in terms of valid geographic term it'll be the same – it will mirror the last one. Has anybody got any points to B and C that would differ to the points that have just been quoted in terms of positive and negative for the longform name? Excellent thank you. We can move that one along.

Okay if we move to one more and we'll see if we can squeeze this in. Now this is a short or long form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency. So these were reserved for a particular use at a special request of the national ISO member body, governments or international organizations.

For example the UK actually are two letter code is DB so UK is reserved for United kingdom. And the treatment of this in 2007 was available under the policy principles but challenged mechanism to governments to initiate an objection. Actually this is a repeat of the previous one so won't read through that. The final application guidebooks said no not available as a gTLD. So first of all if I could ask anybody if they've got any reservations about this particular term being used as a geographic term for purposes of TLD? And I've got Nick in the queue. Please go ahead Nick.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Hi there, Nick Wenban-Smith. I don't think the UK is a very good example of this because GD was a list. The names and fill in longform names Great Britain or whatever the United Kingdom and Great Britain and Northern Ireland were already protected. I think an example might be European Union would be caught by this rule just for clarity on that point. And I think it's exactly the same integrations as the previous two points.

Martin Sutton: Thanks Nick. No I don't – I kind of assume some of these might mirror others but we just want to make sure that we have the opportunity to identify any variances as we go through as well. So if I could ask for anybody else if you've got any different positive and negative impacts to raise on this particular term that hasn't already been raised for the previous two items which was the short – the long form and short form names? Otherwise we don't need to dwell on this. So we can just mirror that for this section as well.

Okay conscious of the time but I'm keen to move on one more if we can. So let's try and cover one more on Slide 12. So this is the term is a separable component of a country name designated on this separable country name list, a well-known list I'm sure almost for us all or is a translation of a name appearing on the list in any language according to the annex in the applicant guidebook? So an example here is Aland, separable component of Aland Islands. And there's a look at that link in for those that can go and find that.

So this was the same treatment as before. So the 2000 and policies, 2007 policy was stating it would be available but with a challenge mechanism in place. But the final guidebook dictated that these were not available. And so just want to check if anybody's close to this and has any reservations about this term being included is a geographic term for the purposes of our policy work?

Okay not hearing any. And then does any - is anybody aware of any positive impacts or negative impacts based on the treatment of this specific term of geographic term? Okay I have Greg. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan for the record. I just would want to review the separable country name list before opining on this and I have not yet done so. I don't know if others have and have seen a reason for no change or otherwise. I'm...

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...interested to know until I form my own opinion looking at the list itself.

Martin Sutton: Absolutely.

Greg Shatan: If other people haven't looked at it yet then maybe we should, you know, not opine on it yet.

Martin Sutton: Greg, understood. And I think what – if we could take an action to circulate the annex and the terms that this relates to I think that will be useful one to cover before we deal with that. So I think this is a good stopping point. I'll take Christopher as a last comment on this particular section of the agenda. Please go ahead Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you Martin. I agree with Greg it would be desirable to review in greater detail what this exactly implies. My recollection is that the main problem in terms of moving forward with geographical names the main

problem is that 3166 privileges territories notably that are islands and that's from a political, economic and social point of view many, many, many territories who consider themselves to be geographical entities are not specifically referred to in the 3166. So I think although we have very good reasons for respecting vigorously 3166 as far as it goes I think we will have to in due course address the question of how do we treat geographical names typically sub national, regional, local names which are not covered by 3166? Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Christopher and a grade segue into our next section. So if we could move – so we'll park this until the next meeting so that we can continue through the rest of the existing terms but if we could move now to Slide 20 and jump through to there. I think in response to your comment that there Christopher, you know, we have stated that we will be looking at the items that have not been included to date. So please what I would say is start thinking about that. There is the spreadsheet that were circulated previously has a tab, a secondary spreadsheet where we'll start to compile all of those items that people think should be considered in terms of a geographic term and how they may be treated. And we can start going through those as we've got through the - towards the end of the existing terms.

But doing that we've got the ability to leverage as a foundation our understandings and the merits and the shortfalls of what we have already in existing terms and we can start to discuss them – those other terms that the work track wishes to explore as items that have been excluded to date. So we'll hopefully start to populate that.

And if you have any considerations at this time I would be happy if you could forward those or start to populate the spreadsheets so that at some point we can have a look at those and build out a plan for discussing those with the group. Is that clear or does anybody have any questions on that comment?

Okay so we'll move on to any other business. Does anybody have any other business? Oh sorry Avri did you raise your hand on the last point? Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Martin Sutton: I'm not hearing your Avri. Are you on mute? You may still be on mute Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh dear.

Martin Sutton: Oh, we can hear you now.

Avri Doria: Oh you can hear me now?

Martin Sutton: Yes. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay the question I had was on the previous section you were going to be talking about since you were still in the and since we're still in the discussion of what is a geographic name I get confused when we're calling the things that have not yet been included as geographic names in the AGB geographic names. And I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding correctly that these are potential geographic names but for the purposes of WT5 they are not yet geographic names?

Martin Sutton: Exactly Avri. So what we're doing at this stage is going through what was expressly communicated in the applicant guidebook so that we can confront ourselves that those are valid geographic terms for the purposes of policies that we're working on or wanting to develop or recommend changes to. But there are other types of geographic terms that are not expressly included within the existing guidebook that we'll be open up to discussing. So where there is a strong feeling that there is gaps and it's not clear as to how to treat certain geographic terms we can then start to explore what should be

included and how that should be treated. Does that make sense? I can hear you but are you back on Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes it does. I was just confused in the fact that we were calling them geographic names already. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Okay we – that is a good point actually. So I wonder whether we should rephrase this something differently just to avoid that confusion. Let's have a think about that and in making sure that we can keep that clear and understood. Thank you. Okay so call for any other business if anybody would like to raise anything. I've had just got a couple of points I could flag at this point?

Okay have - any other business. Can anybody update briefly regards to a short summary of the recent board discussion on Geo names during this past week's public meeting? Is anybody able to...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I can.

Martin Sutton: Oh great. Thank you Avri. Over to you.

Avri Doria: Okay just a brief bit on it. So at the board workshops that were just held there was a public session, you know, that was held on Geo names. Now what these sessions are, are informational. There was no decision making or anything as part of those. It was really just a session to inform the board of the work that was going on here, its status, some of the questions that were open and some of the issues they may hear about in coming months and its projections for, you know, when the board would have to be taking looks at the outcome of this work.

So it was a purely informational session with questions and answers and such as that but no decisions were made at that meeting nor were any intended. And I should remind that while I'm saying this now I'm in this group

just as a participant and not as a liaison from the group but of course I know I can't separate the fact that I am on the board so just wanted to give that update since it was asked for. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: That's very kind of you. Thank you Avri. So I just want to raise a couple of points just to flag to everybody. We've had to adjust, the Leadership Group has had to adjust the work plan that was previously drafted and discussed at previous meeting as we had to sort of rework how we approach this. We will be working on developing a – or adjusting the work plan now and we'll have that ready to discuss before our next - and circulated hopefully before our next meeting but we'll cover that off at that stage.

The other point to raise is ICANN 61, we're looking at what to do during the session that is designated for Worktrack 5. So more news will be coming out shortly on that. If anybody has any ideas and contributions that they'd like to forward through please welcome to do so. So with that I think we are on time. I have no any other business and thank you very much for all of your participation -- much appreciated. Have a good day.

Woman: Thanks Martin. Thanks Philip. Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you everyone, the operator 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