

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5  
(Geographic Names at the top-level)  
Wednesday, 16 May 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/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-16may18-en.mp3>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/4BcFBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Julie Bisland: Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5, Geographic Names at the Top Level call on the 16th of May, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants on the meeting. If you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now?

Jeff Neuman: Hi, this is Jeff Neuman. I'm only on audio for a few minutes.

Julie Bisland: Thank you, Jeff.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Carlos Gutiérrez. I'm on audio only. Thank you.

Julie Bisland: Carlos. All right. And as a reminder to all participants if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise during this call. With this I will turn the meeting back over to Javier Rúa. You may begin.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you. Thank you. So this is Javier Rúa-Jovet for the record. I will be cochairing this call today, Work Track 5 call today. As you know I'm from the ALAC. The agenda was sent out by email and I hope you all had a chance to see it. Emily, if you please could put the slide on with the agenda etcetera? Next slide please. So, yes, welcome. I don't know if there's any SOI updates out there? Anybody from staff maybe? Hearing none, so today we're going to – as you can see we have a, you know, really two major agenda items here.

Number 2 is administration and capturing of input, managing of input. That's going to be a short discussion. It's really summarizing how we're trying to reflect the discussion going on in a purposeful and useful manner. And agenda Item 3, geographic names process review, which as you might have seen from the slides, there's several procedural slides, you know, flow chart type of slides that I tried to take a snapshot of the current situation in the Guidebook how things move along in the process.

So with that said, let's go to the next slide, perhaps slide Number 3 with agenda Item 2. And this is assuming is that nobody else has a comment; that everybody agrees with the agenda. Any comments there? Hearing none, thank you. And I want to please tell the other coleads I think, Annebeth is in the call and also people from staff, that any hands that I might miss – that I will probably miss, are pointed out. And I have no problem being interrupted for, you know, hands and queue and also relevant comments in the chat.

So in this Slide, administration capturing and managing input, what we want to – what the coleads want to communicate to the work track is that as we all know we've been having great conversations in the chat, I mean, in the mailing list, the conversations really since the face to face meeting in San Juan and of course in these calls. And what we want to try to do – is what actually doing we gave some instructions to staff, the coleads gave some instructions to staff to put together a document, you know, an (unintelligible) to manage document, maybe a narrative document that clearly, you know, categorizes and, you know, and divides the different thread and, you know, and the different positions in a way that everybody can easily understand – and please mute, I can see some background noise – in a way that everybody can easily understand and so that we can be more effective in our conversations.

I think there have been great back and forth, you know, in the, you know, in the email and even today, even today on very specific issues. And, you know, that document is still a work in progress. This – we don't have a name for it but it's kind of like a narrative, a pro and con type of documents. It's a work in progress. We still cannot share it because we have some – it's not quite ready for prime time, but we'll share it as soon as possible for your comment and your – and the community's and the work track's feedback on it. We've seen some early drafts that we're discussing and we

just want to make this as you know, as transparent and as – and easily – and easy to understand as possible.

So on that, does anybody have any comments or any, you know, questions, anything they want to add?

Annebeth Lange: Javier?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: It's two hands up, Heather Forrest and Christopher Wilkinson have their hands up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Perfect. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Javier, very much. This is Heather Forrest. I think the document is a great idea but I have a question as well. So I thought it was a great idea, you know, a fantastic email chain that was started by Liz Williams, the title of it was something to do with city names. And I had a number of points in that that I wanted to respond to in detail. And I hesitated only because I realized I was going to be the 73rd post to that chain. And the comments that I had to make weren't just about city names, they were about other things and other people had that problem as well.

I wondered, is there another way, you know, you're talking about effectiveness, is there somewhere, somehow that we can be recording comments that's more effective than these super long email threads? I mean, I think the email is super useful because it's impossible – if you try and keep your intervention here on the call short and not monopolize the call you can't give the full background and examples and everything else. So I just wondered had the coleads thought about any other mechanism for capturing input in that sense, not just, you know, capturing it second, you know, putting it all in one place after it's all been submitted? Thanks, Javier.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Thank you, Heather. That's the – that's precisely what we want to do with this document that we haven't, you know, that we haven't circulated yet among the work track. It's not really word by word codification of things, it's more, you know, the general – the positions that are being taken on particular issues for or against or the comments and, you know, the different positions, that's what we're trying to do. I

mean, the email, I mean, the email I encourage you to put your, of course your comment in there. Please do. And but, yes, the whole idea is that sometimes of course in the email list things might get lost.

But we're doing, I mean, staff is also doing an incredible job in getting everything together and they're really following up on our – you know, on the coleads' instructions, really, really – in a really detailed form. The draft that I saw of that document is – I like it a lot and I mean, it requires some more work but I hope – our hope is that it will do exactly as you wish. It's a way to be effective in a more condensed and manageable form than scattered email lists. Please, if somebody can mute I can hear their typing. Heather, I hope that answers your question. I don't know if another colead might want to chip in, maybe Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: And this is Annebeth...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: I'm trying to answer Heather on the chat as well. I think that even if it's the long email list – I understand you completely, that was totally difficult – very difficult to follow, Heather. But if you have substantive input I think you should write it in a separate email because everything will be captured by us.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Yes. Thank you, Annebeth. I see your points – I see your points on the chat. And I see Heather's points also. Great.

Annebeth Lange: And Christopher still has his hand up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: I see it. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi. Good evening everybody. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. I very much sympathize with Heather's concern. I can't possibly follow on an hourly basis all the threads that are emerging from this discussion. This is why from time to time I have summarized my points of view in a substantive comment including a PDF comment – copy. So I think – I look forward to this document from the staff and from the cochairs. And I very much hope that it will indeed encapsulate all the substantive comments that have been made including perhaps some of my own. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Christopher. I can tell you that from what I've seen so far it really does reflect the feelings of the work track on specific points. I hope the community will take it as a great document when it comes out. So I see Emily's hand up I think or...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. ...or is it down?

Emily Barabas: Hi, Javier. This is Emily from staff. Yes, I can just briefly speak to the process that – from the staff side we're going through to try to consolidate some of the feedback that's been received so far. And indeed as all of you are working to try to follow the rather large volume of email and the various threads, staff too is working diligently to try to sort through that information and kind of bring the pieces together in a way that's perhaps structured a little bit more coherently. And the hope there is that this is very much a working document, this is very much something that requires feedback that if you see things left out or you feel like a point you made was not captured properly, the idea is that, you know, this is evolving and something that we can continue to use to frame discussions.

And I think it may also be helpful then for us to take chunks of that document and look at them in pieces and structure some conversations around that and that might help to focus the conversations a little bit in terms of – because obviously there are these different threads and many of them are overlapping and intersecting and it's easy for conversations to go in many directions.

So we're hoping that it might be a tool to help structure some of these conversations, Heather, as you said potentially on the wiki in the Google Doc and so forth and so on. So that's the hope we're obviously very much welcoming feedback in terms of other ways to help the group stay on track in terms of deliberations and let everyone make their points so of course don't be shy to provide that input as well. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Emily. Thank you. So I also see Jorge's hand up. Jorge, please go ahead.

Jorge Cancio: Hello? Do you hear me okay?

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Yes we can. Go ahead.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. Good evening from Europe. Jorge Cancio for the record. I would like to refer also to comments I have made previously. I think that it's – this is a very good initiative from coleads and staff. And I think that it's essential that in summing up the different points of view nobody is lost, nobody is forgotten or those who maybe with only one email have supported one point of view or the other. And I think that also in this setting of the Work Track 5 it is important to map a little bit where the different people are coming from in terms of SOs and ACs and of regions because that gives us also an impression of where the traction is going.

So I would really like to urge the coleads that whatever the process we follow we keep the barriers of entry as low as possible and we don't force people explicitly or implicitly to have to repeat the points one time and another in different formats, Google Docs, sheets, and that we really get the – most of the value of the long and extensive discussions we had on the emailing list. And I'm sure that staff will be more than able to do that. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Thank you, Jorge. And to that point, let me say that, you know, I appreciate as – I'm something like a junior member here and in many ways I do appreciate documents that take into account comments that, you know, without being difficult in terms of access, you mentioned low entry level or, you know, that's a good way to put it, so no barriers. And, yes, and from what I've seen the comments are getting in there, older comments and the newer comments are getting in there.

So are there any hands – Jorge, your hand is up, I think that's an old hand? I think that's old. Does anybody else have any comment on this topic? Have any of the coleads or staff seen any comments in the chat that we could read out or – because I haven't been really paying attention to the chat that much. My...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Emily Barabas: This is Emily from staff. I actually just wanted to respond to a comment from Liz in the chat, who raised a suggestion about asking staff if there was the possibility of the idea of building a schematic that shows like a temperature gauge...

((Crosstalk))

Emily Barabas: ...background noise. Please mute if you're...

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you.

Emily Barabas: Thanks. I think we're back on track. A suggestion from Liz that we build sort of – that staff build sort of a temperature gauge of where we're headed in terms of consensus for different positions. And I just wanted to clarify that the document that's being prepared right now is a summary of positions and points of view but is not an attempt to gauge consensus at this point because it's really not the role of staff necessarily to be gauging that consensus, it's the role of the coleaders within the work track.

So I just – I wanted to clarify that a little bit but of course we'll be continuing to draft documents and reflect anything that the coleaders have determined with respect to consensus levels but at this point that's not kind of where we are yet in terms of what we're trying to capture so I just wanted to put that as a point of clarification. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Emily. Yes, and definitely gauging levels of consensus is a colead task and we're not there yet, I mean, we want to you know, map comments out there so that everybody's on the same page literally on where everybody else is. And it's a tool to facilitate, you know, future consensus level taken. On this topic, does anybody have any other comments? I don't think I see any hands in the queue. I think old hand. All right, so I think please Emily, if we could change to the next topic if there's no objection to this? And maybe the next slide.

So, yes. Recent discussions have focused on issues related to the geographic names requirements and geographic names review in initial evaluation. There are a number of additional elements related to string contention and post delegation that may be relevant to view and discuss. So what are we doing about this? So like you've seen from the slides, if you've had a chance, and peruse through them, we have put together, coleads and staff and with some also early heavy lifting by Mike in

particular, these flow charts to try and – in a very accessible way explain what the Applicant Guidebook of 2012 says in terms of (unintelligible).

And maybe, let's go to the next slide. And, you know, we've been talking a little bit among the coleads on the idea of what we're asked to do is, you know, think about what's in the books in 2012 and how we can, I mean, if this seems to enhance, if we will enhance things, what are those things that we will change, if any. And we've been throwing the phrase around which is really – is really a bit old now but the idea of thinking, you know, outside of the box and trying to move this conversation along in a way that focuses on specific issues in the procedures that are in place and how to better them if they can be bettered and enhanced or, you know, simplify them or modify them in any way.

And, you know, I think one of the coleads came up with the idea of just flow charts and it's a great tool for thinking outside of the box because you see the little boxes and circles and diamonds and other geometric shapes. And it's a very, you know, to borrow from Jorge, a very low barrier to entry tool in terms of how to visualize this in a you know, from a bird's eye view and, you know, like a general 1000 foot view and then concentrate on little boxes.

So on this slide, I mean, there's basically two slides on flow charts here that we would be along this presentation. And in many ways we could give the whole call without moving forward a lot, but we'll move forward. So let's keep on moving forward. Next slide please.

Annebeth Lange: Javier, it's Annebeth.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Just to let...

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Go ahead, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Just to let you know that I was kicked out of WebEx so I can't see the hands anymore, they're trying to get me in. So just...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. All right, so I don't see any but I trust that the great people out there will help me out and staff and perhaps Cheryl, I don't know if you can see hands, but anybody that can see hands please interrupt me in any moment and we can get the work track members to discuss.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Javier, this is Carlos Gutiérrez.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Thank you very much. I had a conversation before with Emily, I think the flow charts are great. They are very, very interesting to read each on its own. I see two problems on the format is that is a PDF format, very difficult to download and it's a frozen format so we cannot comment on the paper. And it must have been six or eight years ago that I mentioned that there are some things called mind maps that are very practical that can be in the cloud that are free and everybody could play with the flow charts and we should keep the idea of the flow charts but in a more flexible way. This is didactically top down very good but very difficult for conversation of 60 minutes over the phone to make amends. Thank you very much.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Carlos. You know, you mentioned this is top down tool, we don't see it that way. I mean, these flow charts are not in any way prescriptive, we're submitting them to the work track. If this is incorrect or things can be moved around, you know, around, please give suggestions, this is what we're going to do now. I'm sure that...

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: I said the format is frozen, nothing against the flow chart. They are great but it's frozen into a PDF so nobody can comment...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Oh I see, I see what you're saying, you need a more – a more flexible technology to move stuff around, I see, I see what you're saying.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Exactly. Exactly. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you. So you know, we saw the prior flow chart which is a general you know, process with a little, you know, that goes into (unintelligible) and now this is (unintelligible) process. So I trust some of you have seen these slides. I don't know if from a, you know, general perspective besides Carlos point on some sort of different technology to comment in the chart or move things around, does anybody else have comment perhaps to Carlos's comment or to the slides themselves in general? Because they're going to go into different boxes as we move along. I see a hand by Christopher. Christopher, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, Javier. Muchas gracias. Just to say first of all congratulations to the staff for producing these slides at all of the technique required to do this is extraordinary so I thank you all. From a policy point of view, I just have to put down a caveat, I'm not convinced that the 2012 exercise was successful at all in this particular field. And so I have in the back of my mind in reading these slides that that's all very well and it looks extremely logical and procedurally correct but the final result of – was not particularly admirable from several points of view.

So I have a caveat, I'm not – I think it's very interesting historical exposition of what was supposed to happen in 2012, but I'm not at all convinced that this is the basis on which we would be able to go forward in the future.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Christopher. Gracias, Christopher. But the whole – I think the whole point that we're trying to – I mean, the – let me clarify something. The first draft of the slides was definitely made by – it wasn't staff, it was Martin, he's not on the call, but he – and I don't see a lot of difference from what he initially sent to the rest of the colleagues to this later version so the heavy lifting in terms of drawing these slides out, weeding them out of the AGB was Martin, it wasn't staff, although of course our staff is awesome.

On the success or non success of 2012, this is why we're here, I mean, and, I mean, these slides are really an excuse, a pretext for if there's I mean, first to understand procedure, and if there's procedural changes that can be drawn into this, you know, into future slides of proposed processes, that would be a very didactic tool to turn those, you know, little blue boxes into words into a future policy or future AGB. So

that's – I guess that's what we're trying to do and thank you for your comment, Christopher.

So I mean, this slide is also, you know, the particular, you know, geo name procedure, you know, as it comes out of the AGB. And you can see of course the different categories of geo names and the different levels of protections or if I may or, you know, whether they're completely disallowed or there's some way to get a non objection letter or a, you know, other type of authority approval. It's pretty simple in this procedure. Of course as Christopher said, in real life it might have not been as simple but that's what we're here for.

So in order to get into more detailed discussions, if nobody has any other comment, I don't see any hands, if anybody wants to respond to Christopher or any other comment or to me or any questions to anybody else, please do so now. But we're going to keep on going into more detail as we go along. We're already 30 minutes into the call, this is an hour call so we'd better move it along. And if we don't finish we'll you know, we'll continue on another call but we'll see how far along we can get.

So let's go to the next slide to get into more detail, please Emily. Okay, so you know, in these slides, again, as you see there's a section in the top that is really the applicant world and a section at the bottom which is kind of like – is the ICANN world. And in the applicant world we see, you know, around the square, you know, circle with a red – line which, you know, is really the initiation or the beginning of a process, you know, as per the Guidebook and, you know, the applicant says or doesn't say whether he thinks what – the string he or she is applying for is a geo name or not.

And the process starts and we can see the different boxes that have to do with, you know, as the process moves along, you know, we see some string contention processes in the end. We will be talking about in the – in the next few slides. Let's move along please. The next slide.

So in the prior slides we had the little box in the beginning which is this, it's the applicant belief that there are strings of geographic names per Section 2.2.1.4 of the AGB, they should indicate that such – as such, via Question 21 and provide required support, non-objection. So that's the beginning, I mean, that's self explanatory. If anybody has a comment on that – sometimes the comments on this is, you know,

why would somebody, you know, out of the goodness of their heart reveal whether they think it's a geo name or not a geo name, I've seen some discussion there. I don't think that's something we – I don't know if somebody wants to discuss that right now but I've seen it in the mail. I think it's, yes, a relevant point if anybody wants to discuss it.

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: So, I have my hand up. Alexander.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Alexander, go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, hi. So it's Alexander Schubert. I'm not really sure that this can stay like this. It's not about whether the applicant believes the string is a geographic name, it's whether he is intending or at least in the 2012 AGB it was whether he was intending to use it in the (unintelligible) of the geographic name. So there could be a string that is identical to a geographic name...

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: Yes, so this has to be kind of changed.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Agree, agree completely, Alexander. It's not up to – it's the intention. And that will be collected definitely. Thanks a lot for your comments. Thanks a lot. That's...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: You're correct. Is that somebody that wants to come in? No. So maybe we can go to the next slide if there's no comments and we can move along?

Annebeth Lange: Javier? Kavouss has his hand up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, good afternoon, good evening, good morning, good night, whatever it is. In the Slide 2 that you were quite quick, I did not see any decision box for instance, ICANN

begin evaluation. If there is anything in the evaluation we need feedback, we need a decision box saying that evaluation result was positive and evaluation result was required to go back to the applicant. So in the first slide I saw two decision box which more or less was appropriate, and in the second I did not see any decision box, everything going sequentially one after the other. So all of these...

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...evaluation or examination so on so forth might have not necessarily but might have some decision making that, yes, everything is okay in accordance with the rules or not. So this is something that I did not see. And the second I don't exactly know at what stage the applicant should provide the support or non-objection, at the earlier stage, at what stage? It should not be too early; it should not be too late, but where? Before in evaluation by ICANN...

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...after evaluation by ICANN, these are not clear. And then I raised a question in the email today about this panel – the combination of the panel...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, you don't allow me to talk? Okay. I stop.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. No, no, no, Kavouss, on your comments I think they're very important. I think to keep on discussing with you right now I think you should keep on going, but let's go – I think we should jump to Slide Number 12 and then we can look at that slide, Kavouss, and I think you are – let's go to Number 12 and go to the next one because this is – we see some of this kind of decision boxes here, and, Kavouss, let's look at this and everybody else, let's look at this flow chart and I mean, I see a comment by Jorge in the chat on normative or whether the accuracy of the slides.

These slides are completely open for community – for work track review. And these are, you know, these are suggested tools by us. And I welcome Kavouss's comments and Jorge's comments on this and everybody else's. so in this box we see, you know, I think Kavouss mentioned that geographic names panel. I think on the – we

can talk about that on the mailing list. I think the short thread had to do with a panel – some sort of instance early on in the process to facilitate conversations between parties. I don't think that's in the flow chart because it's not a – it's not a procedure that's, you know, formally in place, I don't think that – maybe we can revisit that conversation from the mailing list right now and just wrap it up and answer everybody else's questions including Kavouss's on that panel.

Maybe, Jorge, you can summarize what you mentioned, I think then other people replied and there seems to be some sort of level of agreement on early conversations. And then we saw very important concerns of the other side on substantive issues in terms of, you know, objective predictable norms that have to come hand in hand with that.

So, Jorge, if I can volun-tell you, if you – just maybe we can relive that conversation today on the mailing list regarding a panel that was kind of start by these flow charts and I thought was very interesting. Will you go there, Jorge?

Kavouss Arasteh: Javier? Hello?

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Yes, I can hear you, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me, would it be...

Jorge Cancio: Hello?

Kavouss Arasteh: Would it be possible that you allow me that I finish my comment then you comment, is it possible or not?

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Of course it is possible, Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, thank you. I have not finished yet. I did not finish yet. I said that this is the first one and second, I said that I made a comment about the panel, what is the duty of the panel, what is the composition of the panel, what is the responsibility of the panel and what is the authority of the panel. And perhaps we have to – and then this Question 21, I have not read the Question 21. And I wonder that this document should be self-contained. We do not refer it says, Question 21, we should refer as

indicated somewhere. So now I am finished and now you can comment. Thank you very much.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Very good. Thank you, Kavouss. I just wanted to make sure that your comment regarding your question in the email list was answered. I really found that conversation (unintelligible). Sorry. Okay, please mute.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Javier...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Go ahead, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: ...yes, I just wanted to try to ask Kavouss questions. I think...

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: ...Jorge's suggestion today is more like it is – things that we can consider, would this be a good idea. And it's much too early to go into details how it should be, what is the mandate and how it should be established and all that. The first thing if I understood his suggestion right was that is this a way to consider to try to prevent problems afterwards, to try to find another way to help the applicant in the – before they apply, to sort out some problems and get some help like an advisory body. I might...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: ...understand but it's much too late to go into details there. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Thank you, Annebeth, thank you. I hope that answers...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: ...has his hand up now so.

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Jorge, go ahead.

Jorge Cancio: Hello? Do you hear me?

Javier Rúa-Jovet.: Yes, we can.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. This is Jorge Cancio again for the record. If we go back to Slide Number 10 or Slide Number 9, I think that we will see that that first step which is in a red circle, it's really very important for applicants. Before they enter into the whole process I guess that it's really key for them to have a certain level of certainty of whether the strings they are thinking about make the application fits into one of the categories of geo names which will be established in the future Applicant Guidebook. So without prejudice to what categories there will be, let's assume that there will be at least some and similarly to the 2012 AGB.

And that in some of those categories for instance if in the category of city names, remains there, there might be cases where it is a little bit clear for the applicant whether – and their string really fits – is a city name or not because at least in 2012 AGB there were no authoritative lists of cities. So I think that this advisory panel – this idea of an advisory panel would help with the (full) for the applicant to go to that advisory panel with its string, with its idea about this case and get some level of certainty whether there might be geographic name affected by this string.

So and my initial idea would be that similarly to the panel established for the geographic names review, which is part of the initial evaluation, this advisory panel should be expert, should be independent, and instead of making their determination as was done by the geographic names review panel, this advisory panel would help with advice, just in light of the future Applicant Guidebook.

And this help would be on one side, as I said, in determining whether strings is a geo name according to the criteria laid out in the AGB and also it could help in identifying the public authorities that might be relevant for that case and perhaps with the help of ICANN Org and if needed of the GAC and its members, it could help in establishing the link between the applicant and the interested relevant public authority so that the contact is made and if we go forward with the idea of non-objection letter that this non-objection letter is obtained as quickly as possible and then we come up with...

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Okay.

Jorge Cancio: ...our solutions after this contact that these other solutions are sorted as quickly as possible. And this would avoid that the applicant invests too much money before having this certainty that he or she is (unintelligible) geographic name implications. So that's the idea. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you. Thank you. So I, I mean, I allowed this digression a bit but we should, again, focus on process. Thank you, Jorge. I heard something in there? Did I hear somebody wanting to speak?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Javier, it's Cheryl, just very, very briefly. Thanks for that, Javier, and this is an example of the type of iteration and interaction that's going to be extremely valuable. I think we need to put a pin in it now though, extremely valuable for us to come back to when we look at what changes may be proposed to this process. But do remember that right now we're asking for a sanity check and accuracy check on this process. We believe it has captured what happened in 2012. But before we want to start looking at overlaying specific changes, which is obviously the purpose of why you're all gathering for these meetings and the email list discussions, we wanted to make sure that everyone had a clear and agreed-on snapshot of how the 2012 process went. Back to you, Javier.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Cheryl, for that. And, you know, the – of course there might be a little bit of disagreement on these slides but the whole idea is to (unintelligible) and try to gauge that people are kind of okay with the boxes that I presented here. So we saw this one already and we can go to the next slide please was it next one, just – we saw that. Let's go to the next one please. So we generally saw this is the geo names process in detail with the different categories. Does anybody have any additional comment on this as a general concept? I see no hands. I see no movement in the chat. Let's go to the next slide please.

“All applications and the respective strings were included in the geo names review procedure regardless if they were designated as such in the application. Applications that were designated by the applicant as a geo name could be determined to not be a geographic name based on the criteria in the AGB. Applications that were not

designated by the applicant as a geo name could in fact be determined to be a geographic name based on the criteria in the AGB.” Does anybody disagree with this comment, with this idea, with this concept? This is straight out of the AGB as an idea.

I see a hand by Christopher. Go ahead, Christopher. Is that an old hand, Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: No, it's not an old hand.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Go ahead. Go ahead please. Don't seem to hear you, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Right, okay. As Cheryl notes from other calls, at least from the depths of the Spanish countryside, the latency of WebEx is impressive. No, on this slide I suppose my comment is mainly the second bullet rather than the first bullet of there's been several comments on the list and in the documents that I have submitted that it, from my point of view, absolutely unacceptable that the applicant can designate his application as being not relevant to the geographical use. That has to change. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Christopher. I see no other hands, let's go to the next Slide please.

Annebeth Lange: Javier, it's...

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: ...Kavouss and Susan have their hands up...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: And also...

Greg Shatan:: ...I'm on audio only.

Annebeth Lange: ...only 10 minutes left so we have to take care of that. Yes.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. So Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, my question is first of all how we could comment on this dialogue? Could you comment (unintelligible) and how – what are the tools? I'm sorry, I don't know the tools. And on the section for – how we comment on the section for – and in the previous Slide text I agree, I don't agree with Christopher that it is not up to the applicant to decide whether their name is or is not geographic.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Kavouss.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, yes.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Kavouss. On ways to comment on the slides, that was I think the suggestion also by Carlos Gutiérrez early on and of course you can comment on the mailing list and Carlos suggested some technologies that were available for you. We're going to look into that of course. That's what I can say right now. Susan, please.

Susan Payne: Yes, hi. Thanks. It's Susan Payne. Yes, I mean, normally I've been taking an approach where if people say things that I don't necessarily agree with I haven't particularly been wading in and commenting on each situation. But I think we have to recognize that there are probably a lot of people who have been taking a similar approach to me, and there's a fundamental difference of opinion here which is that, you know, because there are multiple different meanings for names and many, many names which have a geographical connotation have multiple other connotations as well, be that they're dictionary terms or they're brand names or both, there absolutely is a situation where a name could be geographic in one context and not in another context.

And so statements from Kavouss and from Christopher that suggest that it's entirely down to a government or to – I'm not sure who, a community to decide that a name is geographic rather than the person who's applied for the string, are simply unacceptable. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Susan, for that. I think Greg Shatan is next please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan. Susan said everything I was going to say and so I'd just say I agree fully. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Greg, for your brevity. So seeing the slide, I mean, I know this is pretty quick but we can maybe move to the next Slide which puts into the detail of the circled part of this slide. Of course the strings that are unavailable for registration by any part as per the AGB, this should not be controversial, this is reflected in the slide and in the previous slide. Let's – if there's no comments, I think Christopher that's an old hand, let's – is it an old hand, Christopher? I think so.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well not really.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. No, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: I think Susan and Greg should explain the extent to which they regard these multiple plural interpretations of strings as relevant. I mean, for the sake of argument, I would say that existing brands and trademarks that correspond to existing geographical names should be grandfathered in one way or another if – in agreement with the relevant geographical community. But to have an open ended option for non geographical use of geographical terms globally will bring ICANN into disrepute.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: I see where Susan and Greg are coming from but I just want to put on record that I think this is most dangerous for ICANN's international credibility.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you. If Susan, quickly answer that or we can move along. Or let's just – go ahead.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: Hi, it's Susan.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Oh, Susan, go ahead.

Susan Payne: Oh, well no I was just going to say there seems to be a certain amount in the chat about this is the not the time for this discussion and that's one of the reasons why I've been reluctant to speak up because it didn't seem like it's the time for the discussion. But there are times when it feels like one needs to at least put a marker down that there are fundamental disagreements here. And, you know, if we're going to talk about bringing ICANN into disrepute then I think you know, whole scale ignoring fundamentals of international trademark law, which have been signed up to by most governments, also would bring ICANN into disrepute. We're not here to be recreating trademark law. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Thank you, Susan. So if we can move along to the next slide please? We have three minutes...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You have Steve – if you might, sorry, Javier, you have Steve with his hand up. You weren't able to see that where you are, Javier, just briefly go to Steve.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Go ahead, Steve quickly please.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Javier. Thanks, Cheryl. This is Steve Chan from staff. And so I guess I just wanted to provide a basis and a reminder for why we wanted to go through the current process. And so why we were looking for feedback more about factual inaccuracies or whether or not something is clear or not in the way it's presented. So part of the reason why the coleads thought it would be useful to go through this existing process is firstly to provide a basis of understanding for what the current process from 2012 looks like.

Secondly, one of the other benefits of looking at this current process is to help identify the specific issues that are problematic. I don't know whether or not this is the case but there may be instances and parts of the process that are fine as-is but there

may be areas that are specifically problematic that the work track may want to focus on more diligently.

The other benefit was also to look at the various points within the process and recognize that there are many different ways to solve the issues and as Jorge provided an example of one way that looking at the process provides inspiration for finding – may be treated in ways to actually solve the issue. And so I think it's hoping to provide some of the nuance between some elements of the process where it's a preventive protection which we're looking at right now in terms of the geographic names designations but also there's elements later in the process where perhaps in the contract there can be protections through contractual measures or even post delegation.

So I guess I just wanted to remind everyone that the idea was to look at the process, we weren't really looking to take suggestions on board now; that's obviously something that's going to be welcome later but just to provide a basis for understanding but also room for inspiration for future ideas. Hopefully that's helpful. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Steve. Thank you. So we see in the slide we have few, not a lot of time left. In this slide we see the circled part, let's go to the next slide (unintelligible). So in Slide 17 these are the geo names that what it says here, "Always require governmental support, non-objection," I would say as per the AGB required governmental support, non-objection and desire. Of course as we all know representation in any language of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in ISO-3166-1 exact match of some national place names such as county, province or stated listed in ISO-3166-2; three, string listed as a UNESCO region or (unintelligible) composition of macro geographical continental regions, geographical sub regions as selected, economic and other groupings." This is straight out of the AGB.

Any comments on this?

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you see my hand?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Kavouss...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. We are at the top of the hour. We will be continuing on from where we are now. The leaders really need to look at next meeting and if you have an additional intervention on what has already been moved on from, please utilize the email list. I said that in chat. Javier, you need to wrap the call.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Yes. So we – we're in Slide 17, I think we're going to have to continue these slides in the next call. If anybody – any other co-leads, maybe Annebeth wants to add something right now, anybody else, please? Annebeth? Anybody else?

Annebeth Lange: No, actually it's Annebeth here. I think we should just ask if it's – anything on the any other business, if not we just go on next week.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Very good.

Annebeth Lange: And input are of course welcome on the mailing list during the week to come.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. So if anybody wants to bring out any other business for today quickly, please do so now. I don't see any hands.

Annebeth Lange: I think we just stop now and since we have decided that we should have one hour, we are taking this out and see how it works. And then we talk next week.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Very good. So...

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. ...to everybody. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

Annebeth Lange: Thanks, Javier, for leading the meeting.

END