

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 17 January 2018 at 05:00 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/gnsso/gnsso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-17jan18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p53yy146cve/>
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/eh1yB>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Olga Cavalli: So good evening, good morning, good afternoon, good night for everyone.
Emily, Julie and Michelle please can you start the recording please?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...but I cannot hear you.

Woman: Yes. Thank you all.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes so one moment.

Olga Cavalli: Tell me when I'm ready in the chat room. Oh record - meeting is being recorded. Fantastic. So thank you for being with us and good night for me.
We have a interesting agenda today.

We have several things to review with you. First of all I would like to thank all the community for the comments we have received in relation with the definition of a (unintelligible) name.

This is something that we will review later in the call but I am happy that you are participating and given your input because that's the essence of our work and it helps our work very much.

We – before we begin - and let's see, we have several colleagues online. I would like to know if there are any Statement of Interest updates. If someone has to state remember that I cannot hear you.

I hear no comments in the landline. Is that correct? If not please let me know in the chat. Jeff says, "No updates on Statement of Interest," so thank you very much for that.

And can we show the agenda please Julie or Emily? So you can see everyone is okay with the agenda and as I said in the agenda we have a brief – a reference.

Just in terms of reference the idea is to agree on them and move forward. Then we have some history of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and background of years before about this issue.

Then we would go about the second part of the finish and of the Geographic Names from the Applicant Guidebook perspective and then what needs to be changed.

We have some input from the community. We – I have summarized those comments in a document that we will show you later today, and then we will go through any other business.

Are we okay with that agenda? Okay I see no comments and thanks Jeff for being my (unintelligible) Adobe Connect. And so let's move forward (unintelligible) review with you is the Terms of – Annebeth hello. I didn't say hello to you.

Terms of Reference. I know we have many comments. I know we have many inputs. Perhaps it's not perfect for everyone but we need to agree in this version if we want the – thank you Jeff.

I cannot see. But let me try something. I will try to use the phone. Let me try something. Can you hear me now? Oh okay. I will – now I have the Adobe Connect room.

Thank you very much. I'm on the phone now. So Terms of Reference – I was talking about that and as I said we have a version that we sent to you when we sent the invitation to this call, and we know this is not the perfect text for everyone but we need to agree on something so we have to – so we can move forward.

We have to send this document to the different Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees for their agreement and eventual input to the text as it is now.

So I would like to get some comments or input from you if we are okay and you think this document – this Terms of Reference - I/we sent to you the latest version that we have worked with – if we can send it to the different parts of

the ICANN community is that okay? Okay I hear nothing in the – also in the phone.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Hi Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay I hear you. Thank you. Who was that?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Annebeth?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:This is Sala from Fiji. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

Olga Cavalli: Oh Sala. Perfect. I can hear Sala. This – so this is great. I can hear Sala from Fiji.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Wonderful.

Olga Cavalli: So Jeff is making a relevant comment in the chat room. “We are not the ones to approve the Terms of Reference but we ask for comments and we have to agree in a version.”

Is there anyone that want to say something about that? I hear – I see no hands up. Maybe Steve if you can display them although it is not a text that we can review in the chat room. We have to – it – it’s a – it’s not – it’s a lot of text just for you to know.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Hi Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Sala again. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: So just – I – thank you Steve for sending the draft – the clean – the Terms of Reference through and consolidating the commentary that’s been coming through the mailing list in the different threads.

And I note that we’re scheduled to send it to the Supporting Organizations and you’re calling for comments on whether this is okay to go.

I thought that if we’re going to be sending it for – personally for me it’s okay for us to send it for people to have feedback into the TOR and at...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: ...the same time it’ll give us time to – the – in the event that we would like certain things tweaked we can certainly input, but just so that we get the ball rolling I think it’s good to go.

Olga Cavalli: Okay I cannot hear you very well but you’re saying that you would like to maintain more inputs to the document? I cannot hear you very clearly.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Can you hear me? Can you hear me now?

Olga Cavalli: Yes I can hear you better now. Yes.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Okay. So basically I’m saying it – the draft as it currently is should be good to go to the wider community for input. And while they’re

making the input it also gives us time in the event that we want to suggest other tweaks.

But so far for a first draft as for commentary I think it's good enough to go, but I'm referring to the fifth gen version that Steven sent through the mailing list.

Olga Cavalli: Okay let me give the floor to Jeff. He has a comment. Jeff can you tell us your comment please? Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Olga and sorry about the technical glitches. We'll have to figure that out moving forward. This is Jeff Neuman and just as a – as the Co-Chair – overall Co-Chair of the Subsequent Procedures PD – wanted to just make it clear that we're sending this out to the SOs and ACs as kind of a courtesy.

At the end of the day we should be considering this as the final version subject to anyone that has any strong comments or objections, but at the end of the day it will come back to us as a working group to approve this Terms of Reference.

So just want to make it clear that unlike a, you know, a CCWG that's been set up before this one does not require signoff by the Supporting Organizations or the Advisory Committees but rather just agreement from us as a working group, and that's what lets us also move on to do some of the substantive work today. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jeff. Yes. Annebeth go ahead please. Annebeth? Can you hear me? Can you see? Maybe you're on mute? Annebeth I think you're muted. No I can't hear you Annebeth.

Maybe you can type – Adobe Connect room chat. Okay. You're not – your unmuted. Okay maybe you can chat and you can type your comment in the chat. And that says Alex on there.

Annebeth? Okay in fact Annebeth just wanted to say the same as Jeff. “We have got the mandate to approve and I would send it to the ccNSO for information. We have to move on now.”

Thank you Annebeth. I will send – I hope we have now many, many comments and in spite of being a courtesy maybe there are some comments and I hope it is quite final.

Any other comments – Terms of Reference? The document is – has been sent to you. It has been reviewed several times and it's displayed in the Adobe Connect room but as I said it's a lot of text – not expected for you to review it. So are we okay moving forward with the agenda? I see...

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...no objections. I'm reading the chat. Okay let's go to the second point of the agenda and it is a background about 2012 Applicant Guidebook. You know, you may know – some of you may be new to this process.

The GNSO worked for several years in that project of new gTLDs. It went through several rounds with the community, with the different stakeholders of the Internet – of the ICANN community and finally this became the first version of the Applicant Guidebook, which was the basis for the new – their first round of new gTLDs.

Whether perfect or not it was a document that was agreed by the community and all the stakeholders were in agreement with it, so it is that version that we want to refer now as background.

I don't know if – I think that Annebeth wanted to take this point of the agenda. Are you okay Annebeth with the sound? I cannot hear you Annebeth.

Okay. Let's wait one second for Annebeth. And so then there was also this – a suggestion of having a specific Webinar about the Applicant Guidebook and all the background materials, which could be a good idea to do.

For the moment we want to do some revision with you here in the call to see which is the background of this documentary. I think it's very important and there was some conflicts but we also have to recognize that in general for many of the applications it went fairly well.

So the intention of this Working Track 5 about Geographic Names is to see which were the conflicts, review them and try to enhance if possible the text of the Applicant Guidebook from 2012; if not have it as it is.

Okay Annebeth is not hearing now so we have some problems with the Adobe Connect today. And Jeff want to say something. Jeff go ahead please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I can – this is Jeff Neuman. I can – I could start us on the history...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay. Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...until Annebeth joins us.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: And I'm sure there's others on here that can – she's outside. So I'm sure there's others that – in here that can help out as well. I think there are a number of documents.

I think early it – I think it was earlier this week, maybe the end of last week that for information purposes we sent around – I think you probably got it from either Emily/Steve a whole list of documents that provide a bunch of background information.

So all of these documents that we're referring to in the slides you can actually get a copy of by looking at that list, and of course we'll send these slides around as well.

So in - 2007 was pretty much the first year of actual work being done on trying to figure out what to do with geographic names at the top-level. There was – at the time there was a movement from the ccTLDs to start a – or what later became the...

Annebeth Lange: Hello. It's Annebeth here.

Jeff Neuman: Annebeth. Great. Can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I think she joined.

Annebeth Lange: Yes but can you hear me clear enough?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: We can.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So why don't you...

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...take over for me?

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: I will drop and let you take it from here. Thanks Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Okay I – I'm not sure what you said but – so I'm going to...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: He was just talking so you can...

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...start.

Annebeth Lange: So I heard that it's still people on the – in this work track that has – they don't have the history so what we do is we go through for some minutes – so the vote for Geographic Names – domain names started already back in 1984 and now we moved quite a lot ahead.

So the system that was followed in the beginning was that they started with the ISO 3160 with the codes for a representation of names of countries. And the reason behind that we all know is that IANA was not in the business of deciding what was and what is not a country so we needed something outside.

But when ICANN started the process of expanding the number of top-level domains, the first thing was the IDN Working Group on Internationalized Domain Names in 2007 and same year several things that had impact on geographic names happened.

In 2007 the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC, published their principles regarding the new gTLDs and the main message was that new gTLDs should respect the sensitivities regarding terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance and should avoid country, territory or place name and country, territory or regional language and people descriptions unless in agreement with the relevant governments or public authorities, and to avoid confusion with ccTLDs no two-letter gTLDs should be introduced.

The GNSO Council the same year initiated the Reserved Names Working Group, which is an important background for us, to find out if there should be any reserved names.

The main message regarding geographical names was all two-letter strings should be only for ccTLDs. For other geographical names there should be no reserved name but there should be a challenge mechanism for governments.

So could you go to this text of this slide then Emily so we see on the screen? It's – in my screen it's the first slide still or we can perhaps take down ourselves.

So the recommendation of the working group were then integrated in the GNSO PDP on the introduction of new gTLDs, and in that document then Recommendation 5 is especially important for us.

A string should not be a reserved word but since there should be no geographical reserved name this did not have any impact on what we are now discussing.

However, the applicants should be made aware of the GAC principles on new gTLDs, and the proposed challenge mechanism would allow governments to initiate an objection.

The next step then was the first version of the draft Applicant Guidebook in 2008. It required that applied for string must consist of three letters or more. Consequently two letters should be left for ccDLT space.

Any string that was a meaningful representation of a country or territory name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard must have support or non-objection from relevant governments.

The first version therefore respected the GAC principles stepped forward in 2007. Up till now it was mainly stakeholders from the GNSO that had been active in the discussions, but when the initial draft was published the rest of the stakeholder groups woke up and things began to happen.

The AGB went through a series of comment periods, discussion meetings and revisions and the second version was mostly unchanged but the description of country and territory name was extended and refined.

Also the third version stated that applicants needed support or non-objection from governments for application for country and territory name. However, after the GAC in August 2009 stated that meaningful representation and/or abbreviations of the country or territory name listed in the ISO 3166 standard should not be allowed in the gTLD space.

The ICANN Board at the urging of the GAC supported by the ccNSO directed the staff to exclude country and territory names for delegation in Version 4 of the AGB.

So one thing we can say is that leaving two-letter strings in ASCII to ccTLDs has been agreed on through all these different documents and versions. In addition to not allowing country and territory names as defined in AGB 2.2.1.4.1 as gTLDs, the AGB also sets conditions in the next point, 2.2.1.4.2 for other geographical names requiring governmental with support.

Since it's – obviously is a gap between AGB 2012, the terms and conditions the applicants had to abide by and the GNSO has not developed any additional policy recommendations since then, our task in my view is to find the way to close that gap. Are there any questions?

Olga Cavalli: No questions Annebeth.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Oh there's a hand up...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: ...Hadia.

Olga Cavalli: ...from Hadia.

Annebeth Lange: Hadia?

Olga Cavalli: Hadia go ahead. We can't hear you Hadia.

Hadia Elminiawi: My question here is basically...

((Crosstalk))

Hadia Elminiawi: Yes my question here is basically – so – and so you are suggesting that the need is to close the gap between – and to close the gap because GNSO has not applied the policies.

But, you know, I think also there is a need to look at what happened in the previous round with – and how was that the AGB work, and if there were some problematic issues then how could we avoid this if we feel that there is a need to avoid this or maybe I understood you?

It's – is the problem closing the gap or is it as well looking if we have some problems in the previous round that we would like to avoid next time?

Annebeth Lange: Hadia...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: ...with you. I think it's both because – oh and since the GNSO policy today is not the same as the AGB 2012 we have to find something that works and will in the future be the GNSO policy.

But of course it's important now to find out what went wrong, what worked, what did not work, what can we continue with, what should we change? So I totally agree and that is one of the things we tried to figure out now. Is that good enough answer for you Hadia?

Hadia Elminiawi: Yes. Yes absolutely.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Any more questions?

Olga Cavalli: There was another hand up but it disappeared. I couldn't recall who was it. There are still...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...some colleagues in the chat asking if you can define the gap.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: And hi Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Hi. Who is talking?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Right. This is Sala from Fiji. I just have a quick question. I was listening to your historical overview and I was making notes - just a clarification.

So you were saying that - I just wanted to clarify whether the GNSO Council that initiated the Reserved Name Working Group - whether they developed the - whether they were the ones who helped develop the draft Applicant Guidebook that you referred to in 2008.

Annebeth Lange: What – and what I said was that after the Reserved Name Working Group delivered their...

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Right.

Annebeth Lange: ...statements that was - their decisions were taken into the GNSO policy. But after they started with the Applicant Guidebooks it was a lot of changes during the road to the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and...

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Right.

Annebeth Lange: ...not all of the decisions in the Reserved Names Working Group went through. But the problem is that the GNSO policies is what it was in 2007 and the Applicant Guidebook is something else, but that was the one that was used and all the applicants in the last round had to use the terms and conditions in the Applicant Guidebook.

And the other Co-Chairs please correct me if I'm saying something wrong here but this is my collection of the history and what...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: ...I've tried to find in the documents.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:And just the other thing I'd like to request for is a Webinar if possible on the...

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:...history. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Yes we talked about that and I think that is a good thing to do. We need some time to do it but – and as – on the list suggested I think it's a good idea and then we would try to find out what went well/what went wrong.

And in – I think later today in the input we got on the geographical names we got some comments on that as well, so we will work with that in the future, try to find out what worked, what should be changed, what will be the better, what should we take away, et cetera.

Olga Cavalli: And we have support for the Webinar in the chat room. There – several colleagues are saying Plus 1 to the Webinar so we have to think about it and not demand it. And Jeff is saying, "We have heard the call for a Webinar." So that ends in a few weeks. Yes that's it. Good.

Annebeth Lange: And that was – and just ask people to – it's been sent out as documents with links to background papers and I really think that it – to really understand the process of what happened from the GNSO process and up till Applicant Guidebook 2012, it's a good idea to go through it and see what was similar, what did they agree on, all the different papers that were out there and what were changed during the way?

What I could do is to send out on the list a short summary that makes it easier to not have to go through it all if that would be helpful.

Olga Cavalli: It's (Alan) in the – with a hand up. (Alan) do you want to say something?

(Alan): Yes, thank you. I think it's really hard for people who didn't live through that part of the process to understand, you know, where the problems – and I put that in quotes – have come from. We certainly had changes that were made.

Maybe not to the policy, but certainly in how it was implemented because you'll have to remember that the whole derivation of the applicant guide book was, in concept, was implementation. Then, we had the various same issues that were addressed in board gap discussions along the way which led, you know, to certain changes to be made with regards to geographic names. And then, we also have the situations that arose in the process of the application process, or during the application process where strings were applied for and the reactions to it by some parties were not envisioned in either the policy, discussions, nor in the details of the applicant guide book.

And as I see it, our job here is to try to come out with a new policy which is implementable and tries to address the various problems and issues that arose along the way. So, it's not just a single gap that we're looking at. It's a series of changes, interpretations and issues that arose during the actual applicant process that we're trying to make sure that in the future rounds, or UGTLD applications, we don't have those same problems arising again.

So, I don't think it's a single gap or a single problem we're looking at, but we're trying to end up with a robust process that will allow us to go forward, have new GTLD's and not have the issues surrounding geographic names that we've had before. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I agree with Allan that there were several – this is Olga Cavalli (unintelligible) in the phone. I agree with him that there were several different issues with all the process, the transition application stuff that it's been an interesting approach.

There are some comments in the chat about doing the webinar in two different time zones proposed by Jeff which it seems to be a good idea for several co-

leads are saying it's a very good idea. Any other comments about what (Annabelle) was explaining to us? And also (Emily) has shared in the chat a link to a set of documents and links relevant about the history of the applicant guide book and of documents that are related with it. Any other comments?

Okay, (unintelligible). So, let's move forward just very quickly.

Annebeth Lange: Just, very quickly, Olga Cavalli. Sorry, the link that you sent to the chatroom, apologies if it's already been sent to the mailing list. If somebody could just resend through the mailing list...

Olga Cavalli: I think it was sent to the list. But, maybe we can resend. It's very easy to resent.

Annebeth Lange: (Unintelligible). Wonderful, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: We will do that for sure. That's (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) If there are no more comments or hands up, let's go to the next point of the agenda, which is the definition of a geographic name.

We want to do two things about the definitions. We will review what's in the applicant guide book of 2012, then we will see how that can be revised, enhanced, modified or not. That's one of the important things because from the definition then it comes a different interpretation of what it is, a geographic name.

And then, perhaps it's' one of the sources of the different views and different conflicts we had in the first round. So, let me please, Emily says we are on slide nine. Remember that you can move your slides in your - at least I can move it - you can move the slides in the chatroom yourself.

So, the slides we are on now is geographic names 2012 applicant guidebook. So, let me tell you the - what the applicant guidebook said about application of strings not approved. So, those that I will tell you now should be considered geographic names and if someone requested them, then they would not be approved as a new GPOD. Two point two one three two of the applicant guide book said application for six not approved, applied for (unintelligible) in (unintelligible) must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters.

Two characters ask if strings are not permitted, to avoid completing with current and future country codes based on ISO 31 66 dash one standard. This is quite clear. They want this idea of not collapsing with the current (unintelligible) or future (unintelligible) based on the ISO 31 66 one list. So, this is one of the restrictions three letters or more.

Point two, two one four one says applications for strings not approved when it's a (unintelligible) three code listed in the ISO 33 66 dash one standard, when it's a long or short form name listed in the ISO 31 66 dash one standard or a translation of the long form name in a language. When it is the short or long form name associated with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 31 66 maintenance agency. When several or more connected with (unintelligible) and there's a link.

And then, point two two one four two applications for strings requiring government support. Capital city names of countries or territories. City names with use for purposes associated with the city name (unintelligible) mention of places on ISO 31 66 dash two list, which is in general provinces or states of the country, regions of UNESCO, or on UNESCO list of the United Nations Statistic Division Region List.

And that's the list that we have. Let me move my slide (unintelligible). So, we have a pretty interesting set of lists. In my humble opinion, one of the discrepancies that...

With names considered of a geographic significance or importance for certain countries, or certain communities, or certain regions, which were not in this list. So, the lists are clear. We may decide in next rounds to open the list or not, but it's easy to identify an ISO list and United Nations list, a UNESCO list.

That's quite... It's defined. The problems I think we had in the first round were names, or references to geographic regions, to rivers...sub regions and that was complicated because for communities and for countries, those things were significant. They meant a lot for the people living there, or they were companies at the national level, registered as a trademark at the national level and they wanted to request for (unintelligible), which is unique for the whole world, which is first come and first serve and we have that conflict.

And checking the chats, Paul McGrady says that slides aren't expressing themselves can the (unintelligible) definitions be (unintelligible) put in chat. Okay, I don't have that information at hand, so maybe someone can share that in the chat. So, one of the things that we have to start - we think it can be very important to start with is the region of the geographic name.

Having this experience from the first round and having this different conflict – the first exercise that we did was to ask to the community what is that should be changed, what is the suggestion? What can we have in mind for this second round? And before going to a document that I have prepared that I

think you don't have that we will circulate, I would like to open the floor if there are any comments at this stage.

Can you hear me, by the way? I hear nothing from the room.

Woman: We can hear you.

Olga Cavalli: That's good to know. Okay, I see no hands up. I see some comments in the chat. (Emily) says we're on slide nine. Paul McGrady had some problems (unintelligible). And Jeff says (Martin) sent all this out via email a week ago. So, you have to check your email for the documents. Okay, we have received several comments from the community, as I said, and it's a shared document.

You have the link, so you can check that easily, but at the same time I took the liberty of summarizing them. And I went through them I read them very detail and what I noticed, there were some coincidence in some of the comments. So, I put together the ones that I think are similar, or have similar backgrounds and then I put the with some color so that at, least for me, colors usually help me when there is a lot of text and I have to quickly identify.

So, if – we will (unintelligible) this text. What I would like to add to the summary is not only the name of those making the contributions, but I would also like to add the stakeholder group they mainly work with. And we will circulate the document with more detailed documentation if other co-leads or co-chairs think that would be useful.

So, the first grouping that I made – and please, this is a document I made yesterday afternoon, so it's my whole responsibility. If you don't like it, my dear co-leads, co-chairs only said yes that that could be a good idea, but

honestly there was not a lot of time for us to work as a team. So, if you like it, it's a merit of the group. If you don't like it, it's my fault.

So, the first thing I notice is a reference to one point in the applicant guide book, which is two, two one four two, which says in the event of any doubt, it is in the applicants interest to consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support on non-objection prior to the submission of the application in order to preclude possible objections and readdress any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirement. So, this is – specifically this point, in the event of any doubt, this consultation generated a lot of doubt. When should a government be consulted? And which part of the government should be consulted? And who in the government should be consulted?

So, there are some suggestions about this text. The first one is from (unintelligible). She says this phrase could be highlighted and get an own paragraph.

The highlighting with this paragraph. In addition when filling the application, applications can check box stating that I confirm that I have get in touch with the relevant authorities. Also, it might need some rephrasing as interest preclude possibilities and ambiguities might not be clear enough what the expectations were and what the consequences might be especially for non-native English speaking applicants.

There are several comments about more clarity in the applicant guidebook, especially thinking about those of us that are not native English speakers. Other comments, some territories may have regional and governmental organizations which have a different perspective than a single local. So, the

issue about government, who to contact when having the approval of the government?

Can you hear me? I hear noise. Can you hear me?

Woman: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay thank you. I heard a noise. Other comments, who should offer a mechanism of where to consult the string the case of darkness? This is something we have discussing – discussed a lot in the (unintelligible) of the working group of geographic names.

If the applicant has a doubt, where he, or she or the company can go and check. So, there was this idea of the repository. There was this idea of a previous consultation in between parties to avoid conflicts and have those in the same page.

What we learned from the first round is that some communities, governments, or authorities were not consulted and then (unintelligible)... and then you have the conflict, and then for the applicant also is not a nice thing because they have invested time in preparing the application and all that and then, they find this problem. So, there are two comments related with that one from (unintelligible) and another from (unintelligible) which are mainly related with that.

What happens with the names that are not in this? And where the applicant and relevant authorities could know that this is a name that should be reviewed and consulted with the authorities? And I think that's mainly the general issue of the first five comments. Let me check if I have missed something.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I don't know...

Woman: Olga Cavalli, you do have a queue. You've had people have had their hands up for a little while, so make sure you check...

Olga Cavalli: What I like to go is go in pieces of document. So, this is the kind of big part. And I will open the floor for each of the part (unintelligible).

Woman: It's your movie.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you. So, I have Paul and (Heather). Paul, go ahead please.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady, for the record. Thank you, Olga Cavalli.

I guess I'm confused about what we're doing on this call. I thought that the agenda was going to be about defining what a geographic name is. We seemed to have launched into a chart opposing various fixes to a problem that I don't think's been identified yet. And then, we started talking about exceptions to the problems and exceptions to the fixes that - for a problems that's not been identified yet.

I guess my question really is what are we doing on this call? Are we going to try to define geographic name? That's what the agenda says. If we're not doing that, then what are we doing?

I just feel like we're jumping way ahead and not doing what we thought we would be doing tonight. If I misunderstood what the agenda item meant when

it said definition of a geographic name, then I apologize. But, maybe we could just get some clarity on what this evening's about. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you, Paul. We are just reviewing comments from the community because we requested them ... the idea of what we are doing now on this call. The idea is to define what is a geographic name for a (unintelligible).

But, other co-leads and co-chairs (unintelligible) I see Jeff. Can I give the phone to Jeff, (Heather) if you don't mind? Maybe he can add comments to my comments?

Jeff Neuman: Hi, this is Jeff. I just wanted to thanks, (unintelligible). Paul, yes about a week ago or so, I sent out an email about the definitions and asking for comments.
And what we're reading right now are the comments that we go to those definitions. Now, were not - none of the co-leads are making any kind of judgement as to what should or shouldn't be in a definition. We're really just reading and summarizing the comments we got back and that was on the agenda.

So, hopefully you had time to review it and we're not saying any of this is going into the definition. We're just, kind of, going over what the team received back when it sent this about a week ago, thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jeff. And thank you (Heather) for allowing Jeff going ahead of you in the queue. (Heather), go ahead please.

(Heather): (Unintelligible) thank you, Jeff for that helpful (unintelligible). It might be helpful if (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: (Heather), I can barely hear you. I don't know if other colleagues can hear you. You sound very distant, very low. Hello?

Okay, (Heather) is fixing audio. Do we have any other comments in the meantime?

Jeff is saying that (unintelligible) definition that was in the guidebook. But, we are trying to summarize the comments we received from the community. So, if there are no more comments, I will – because this is more or less what part of the comments were related with.

What happens when there has to be (unintelligible) to doubt – sorry, part of the applicant guidebook. I know there are interesting comments in the chat. From (Alexander), Wikipedia (unintelligible). Wikipedia as a reference mandatory check Wikipedia, very interesting. Okay, (Heather), when you're okay let me know and I will give the floor to you. Greg wants to say something. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan (unintelligible) for the record...

Olga Cavalli: ((Foreign Language Spoken 21:28.68-21:40.83))

Greg Shatan:Somebody's (unintelligible). Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: One second. Can you give me one second please? I have a small emergency at home.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Greg, this is Jeff. If you could keep going I'll just ask ICANN staff to cut the sound of Olga's line temporarily.

Greg Shatan: Okay (unintelligible) in the background.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I'm back, sorry, small emergency at home.

Greg Shatan: Okay, I think (Alexander), in his comment, kind of, raises an issue here, which is what is the effect of this whole concept of defining a geographic name? (Alexander) seems to assume that if something is defined as the geographic name, then it somehow becomes off limits or requires a certain task to be undertaken. And I don't think that's the case.

I think that also, as Paul said, is jumping many steps ahead of where we are. And the assumption that the (unintelligible) group -- which is well known in dozens if not hundreds of countries -- should have consulted Wikipedia and then decided that because there's a province in Morocco by that name with a population of, what, 50,000 people?

That, you know, they shouldn't register their worldwide brand. I don't think we're anywhere close to deciding whether that was right, wrong, good, bad. I think we probably have some very significant differences in opinion on that.

And so, I don't think we can really discuss definitions of geographic names until we understand what use the definitions will be put to. Or, I think as (Heather), or maybe Susan Payne said earlier, we have to understand that not all things that we call -- quote unquote -- geographic names will be treated the same. And the fact that a string may be identified both as the geographic name and perhaps as a surname, and perhaps as a brand name, and perhaps as

something else yet again, that we have not discussed whether there should be any kind of primacy of those various categories.

So, we just have to – the discussion we have here is obviously preliminary in nature. We're not going to end up defining geographic names on this call. But, I do think at some point we should engage in more dialogue unless review of comments that went to the mailing list, if I had known that that was what was going to be happening, I would have sent my comments to the mailing list, maybe gone to sleep.

But, let's go ahead. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Greg. (Heather), are you okay with your audio?

(Heather): Thank you, Olga, indeed I am. I believe with much thanks to staff for their help. Look, at a number of comments that have been made in the chat in the interim while we were fixing the audio. I think are very helpful and capture some of what I was trying to say. I think it makes sense. It's helpful to see the summary of comments here on the screen. But, ultimately the comments we need to not lose sight of the fact the comments are about the existing definition of geographic names. And our focus really needs to be – as a starting point – on the definition.

And I'm afraid that in reviewing the comments and seeing the individual points within these comments that we're going down a path of focusing on this as Jeff says -- I agree with this language – the impact of the definition. And I think, really, we need to understand what the definition is before we can explore some of these comments. So, I think perhaps it's the case that my Adobe was not functioning properly, as well as the audio.

But, I haven't seen that we put the language of two point two point one point four point one on the screen. That is the starting point. And I think it's helpful to remind everyone in this group that it's the language of the definition that we're working with.

And we're here -- I think if I interpret (Paul's) comment -- we're here to look at the definition. And I think we're just straying a bit away from the definition in talking about the effects of the definition on a particular group, or a particular type of names. And we should be, perhaps, pulling that back in. So, thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you, Heather. And there are comments in the chat saying that they agree... So, I don't have that text at hand now, but I don't know if we can do that during the call.

So, how many hands, do you want me to keep on reviewing the document? It's not long, it's only two pages, so it's another page from what I have already reviewed. And if we are okay, we can review that and if not, we can try to find the definition and read it for the audience. I have Greg. This is a new hand? It's an old hand Greg? It's a new hand?

Greg Shatan: Just want to point out that the definition has now - I'm just pointing out the...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...definition has now been pasted into the chat.

Olga Cavalli: I couldn't hear. It's scattered. Can you repeat please?

Greg Shatan: I said that the definition has now been pasted...

Olga Cavalli: It's in the chat?

Greg Shatan: ...into the chat.

Olga Cavalli: Let me check. Maybe I can read it. It says an application for a name will be subject to geographic names requirements; for example, will require documentation support or non-objection from the relevant governments of - I cannot read it.

Can we put it somehow in the - because it's difficult for me to read the chat?
And - okay. Are we okay finally move forward with the document? Give me some okay or not. I can live with a no if you don't like it. Okay. I see no comments.

Let me - give me a short summary of other comments. One thing that was requested by a (sea) of the comments was more clarity, which I think it's important especially for those of us not native speakers of English and so the text is too difficult to read.

The wording in general is a bit of a nightmare to read. And clarity in the terminology in the text (avoiding these things) that in different words could be relevant. And also references to the more defined like relevant government or public authority should be better defined. So the fact of request of clarity I think I found quite important.

The other part of the document is related with (things of) IDNs or things, which are not written in Latin alphabet. And so the two applications (you think) different scripts may be the same; variant codes should be considered.

Take account of the national, sub-national culture and linguistic indigenous group interest should be taken in consideration. And what else in that - in the section? Translation of names should be (reviewed) if we are going to allow one name or translation of it.

Then at the end there was one comment that especially talked about what should not be changed, which was this reference of the list. I think we all agree that the lists were quite well defined. And they give an example of what went well with (ways) application and the London application.

And there is another comment, which refers to 2.1.4.1 of the applicant guidebook, which makes reference of (someone said it) but evidence that the country is a recognized by that name in an intergovernmental or treaty organization. The comment says that it is a contradiction with the Montevideo Convention.

So this is a summary of the comments that we have received. And we open the floor now for your input of ideas on how we can move forward from now on. I see (Heather) in the queue and Annebeth. (Heather), go ahead please.

(Heather): Thank you Olga. Look. I think this summary of comments is helpful. One thing that I would suggest that we do to make this document more workable and more usable in terms of these discussions is to summarize - distill down into high level short statements what the nature of the concerns are.

So for example, I think that second point there on the first page, clarity of what is, I think we could summarize that and say clarity of the definition is an issue. Geographic support is an issue. Objection is an issue.

If we were to summarize those key discussion points, I think that would give us something more workable than the existing document because while I appreciate what you're trying to do here is look at each of the individual statements and what's been said, I'm just afraid that again that pulls us back into a particular piece of input and a distinct aspect of what is in fact a very complex problem.

So I personally would like to see, you know, identify the key topics, the key issues, the key concerns that people have and then work from there. So that's my suggestion. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: (Heather), I fully agree with you. I had no time to do that because the comments were received until Monday evening. And I had some time this afternoon and I made summary. But I agree with you that that could be a good idea. And if others think it's a good idea, we can do - we can prepare that. Thank you very much for that. Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Thank you. Annebeth here. It was a question about the definition that was in the applicant guidebook and what is the geographical name and (really goes out). Then the definition that today and that it's only cover the things that needed their support and non-objections from. If we see here, it's at 2.2.1.4.1. That is the treatment of country and territory names.

And since they in the first round were not allowed to be applied for, they are not put in the 2.2.1.4.2 where it is the definition of geographic names. So of course when we start now at scratch again, we should consider all these names as geographical names and take it from there because as has been said here, we should decide what to do with them afterwards.

First we have to decide what is the geographical name. And then that of course also covers country and territory names and what's in 2.2.1.4.1. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Annebeth. More comments? Should I read all this text or are we okay just reviewing the text and - in for us?

Annebeth Lange: Olga, I think it's not necessary to read the text.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...to read it. Yes.

Annebeth Lange: And (Heather)'s idea is a good idea. So we have to figure out how to go forward with it.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with it. And do a more concise summary of the document - of the comments received. Oh, I cannot go to the Adobe Connect room (Norma). How can I go back from the big document? I'm so bad with that. Can someone help me? No.

Woman: Jeff tried to send a - (can you speak) Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thank you Annebeth. This is Jeff. I want to just kind of - since I made the comments in the chat, I might as well just say them as well. I think - sorry. I'm hearing an echo. Someone else has their line open.

What I said in the chat was - and Greg I think repeated it in a way that this is - we're trying to do this as kind of an iterative process meaning that we should put aside the impact of being classified a geographic name for now and just

decide the simple question -- not so simple but -- the question what is a geographic name and evaluate the definition that was in the guidebook.

Then Step 2 was the next step would be to decide what is the impact of being classified as a geographic name. And then Step 3 are there any exceptions to that. And, you know, Step 4, okay. Well, you get the point that we should do this as an iterative process.

And then I also wanted to address kind of another comment that was raised that said well, if we're working on a new definition, where do we - essentially where do we start.

And I want to just clarify that we may come out of this process with a new definition. But the real goal first is to review the existing one that's now up on the screen that may result in a new definition; it may not. People may say that that's great. So I just wanted to help try to make this kind of an iterative process. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jeff. I think you're having support to your idea in the chat room. (Alan), go ahead please. Your hand is up.

(Alan): Thank you very much. As we go forward and try to come up with a definition, it's quite clear that at least in some people's mind the definition may end up being very wide.

As Greg pointed out, there are all sorts of geographic names, which are all sorts of other things and they're certainly not restricted to, you know, country names and capital cities as was implied by some parts of the old applicant guidebook.

So I think as we go forward when we're trying to come up with a definition, we should not be presuming that all geographic names will be treated differently. So even if we have a very wide definition, it will remain to be seen how we decide to treat those perhaps different classes of geographic names as this overall process evolves.

So I don't think we should presume they're all going to be treated the same just because they're in the same - the original definition. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Alan). I see your comments have responses in the chat. They go very quickly and still have support (several at least) support your comment. Any other comments? Okay. Hearing none, we still have some time to go.

But summarizing, I think we have to perhaps re-draft the summary that I prepared with more time, more concise. We have to look in detail to the original definition in the first applicant guidebook from 2012. And we will review all the comments made in the chat and see - and propose some way forward.

I'm just checking the comments. Jeff says the ultimate goal is to provide guidance to applicants when they ask themselves am I applying for a geographic name. Then we do the next step. If the answer is yes, then - I fully agree with Jeff.

So the goal is to have more clarity to - that our work brings the rules that are more clear for both parties; for the applicant and also for those that the name is of a significance. And then we avoid the conflict.

(Liz) is asking if we can move the discussion to the discussion of definition now, which is the purpose of the call. No problem. If you want to say

something (Liz), you're welcome? (Barry) says (unintelligible). Does someone want to start the debate about the definition of geographic name now? We still have like 15 minutes.

(Heather) says perhaps we should be framing the discussion as what names, if any, require different treatment. That's an idea.

Jeff Neuman: Olga, this is Jeff. I can start something, a topic that we could discuss. Although I don't see it in here as part of the definition because I think it was just agreed in the guidebook and had (popped) all two-character ASCII names for it to be reserved from registration.

I would love to - so there are I guess should be included in the definition of geographic names or at least for our discussion purposes. But then I would ask the question of whether the reservation should continue all two characters.

And I'm talking about a - let's say a letter number combination or a number letter combination. You know, is there a reason that all two characters regardless of what they are should be classified as geographic strings to be reserved or should they be limited to two ASCII letters?

Olga Cavalli: Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth here. Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Good. Well, Jeff, I would say that as far as we are today, also for non-ASCII where we had that discussion when we discussed the IDN that there

might be a lot of situations to make a country with the two letters that we have need more than two signs to express the saying (unintelligible).

So if I remember correctly in non-ASCII it's different. So what we have been talking about all these years of the different discussion and all the recommendations that's been given, that was for ASCII - two letters ASCII. And you asked what if it's one number and one letter, will that be different.

The main reason for in my view is that it should be - we have a two-letter combination in ASCII to identify country codes. And for countries coming in the future, which might be (unintelligible), they should have their two-letter combination (free).

So I think that should be the starting point at least. And for non-ASCII that would be different. And perhaps we should take then the discussion with one number and one letter. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Annebeth. Greg, you have a hand up. Greg, can you hear us?

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...Greg Shatan for the record. Thank you. To answer Jeff's question, which I think Annebeth (talked to this) or a great extent. I would suggest that we first, you know, at a minimum limit the reservation to two ASCII characters.

I think we also need to consider how the decision making process exists and that's outside of our realm but how the decision-making process exists for a new two letter country code or 3166 code to be developed.

It seems that for some names or for some countries at least there are, you know, a number of options and there are also those where there's overlaps. So, you know, a number of different countries that begin with the same two letters at least.

And so therefore they've, you know, been given what might not be the most obvious combination in the abstract but took what was available. I'm not sure how many total combinations there are -- maybe some at least better at math than I -- of two letters from AA to ZZ.

But at least for the purpose of discussion, the question should be considered for two letter combinations that are not currently country codes; should those all be reserved for some possibly never to exist future country, which might have an alternative available to it in the future even if something is - if a name is reserved - rather if a name is delegated for a two letter character - a two letter TLD is delegated as something other than a ccTLD at least for the - I don't know if that's challenging orthodoxies too much or a (C 5091) too much.

But do we take it as holy writ that two ASCII letters is off the table for anything other than ccTLDs or to be reserved for future use by ccTLDs?
Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Greg. A lot of reaction in the chat. I cannot read them all because there are many. Good interesting issue about the two character codes, letters. (Unintelligible) want to say something.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Olga, this is Jeff. Just to answer Greg's last point. It is existing GNSO policy that two letters were on the ISO list or not are reserved from registration. So at this point we would need to revise GNSO policy if that

were to change. So while it's not off the table, it would be a reversal of GNSO policy at this point.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jeff. More comment? By the way, not all of the...

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. (I'd like) to respond.

Olga Cavalli: ...two letter codes are countries in the - Greg, you want to - you want to add something?

Greg Shatan: Yes. I just wanted to respond briefly to Jeff. So I thought the idea of a police development process was to change - potentially change existing GNSO policy. So I'm throwing that one out there.

Whatever we end up doing, we may well end up changing GNSO policy especially since GNSO policy as such is what was written 11 years ago and which has much mutated in the so-call implementation and other things that happened on the way to the first round. So I think whatever we end up doing we're going to end up revisiting policy. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Greg. A lot of comments in the chat. Comment. Greg, this is a new hand or old hand? I think it's an old hand. Okay. More comments? We have like (unintelligible).

And there was a comment in the chat about making this definition of the geographic name more readable perhaps to be - I think it's a good idea. And we have a lot of comments in the chat and a lot of comments in this call.

I think our next step is to - (unintelligible) of the applicant guidebook in 2012 and try to review the - what has been said. How can it be enhanced? How can - if it needs to be changed.

And I think that I personally would do of course with the okay from my co-leads is to make this comment document more concise and easier to review. And I will share with all of you once our (leads) have approved it.

And any other comments? (Javier) was regarding (Heather)'s comment (would names) require different treatment. I think we must open ours up to the public (group) possibility of mechanisms that could take into account the interest of the (unintelligible) culture, linguistic, minorities, indigenous groups. A longer version of my comment is (unintelligible) Google doc. Yes (Javier), your comment is included in the summary that I made of course.

And Annebeth says that should of course be discussed. Greg, that is actually a form of policy from all stakeholder groups. Agree. Okay. Jeff, you want to add something? Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. One last thing on this point on the two letters. I do want to say that the one agreed upon outcome from the CCWG on the use of country and territory names was that all two letter codes - sorry, all two ASCII letter strings should be reserved or should continue to be reserved from registration.

The GNSO Council approved that in the meeting a few months ago. The ccNSO approved that. I'm not saying we can't revisit things but let's just make sure that we just understand the history and let's not review things that seemingly has buy in already just so that we can make some progress.
Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Greg is saying can we continue the discussion in the email list that generated the comments on the chat. And will they be included in the future summary? Yes. That - of course. And (for a) working definition first before we revisit anything. Okay. That's a good idea. Okay.

I think we have to start from a definition and then try to enhance it. We'd start with the definition of 2012 and inputs that we have in this call. And we'll come up with a summary of the comments received and the original definition and perhaps the possible impact that it will (unintelligible) new definition.

(Nick) says I agree with Jeff to ask (unintelligible) for ccTLDs. (Unintelligible) to avoid letter number combination A1, et cetera. Okay. And more comments? More suggestions?

I think we have a lot of work to do in our small team. And thank you very much for your participation. I (unintelligible) no colleagues are requesting for the floor.

And I want to thank all of you for your participation. We will keep on working with all your input. And that's it for the moment. I will go to sleep because it's 3:30 in the morning in Argentina. Thank you very much to all of you.

Woman: Thank you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you to my dear colleagues in...

Woman: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: ...and the staff. And...

Woman: Thank you (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: ...keep in touch. Bye bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye bye.

Jeff Newman: Thank you. Bye bye.

Woman: Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Thank you everyone.

END