

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 23 May 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/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-23may18-en.mp3>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/4hcFBQ>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Thank you, (Tarif). Thank you, everyone for joining us in this very nice quiet 2:00 am night in Buenos Aires, very cold; it's winter here but it's very, very quiet so I'm so happy to be with you with some colleagues, Alexander, Barrack, Christopher, David, Jorge, Justine, Katrin, Kavouss, Liz, Martin, Nick Raul, (unintelligible) Robin and Yrjö. Welcome to our call. You know, we have this call every Wednesday - early Wednesday for me. And it's for one hour.

And the idea of today call is to keep on working with the PowerPoint that we've started to review in the previous call. And the idea of those flow charts is to review what was done in 2012 in respect with what was outlined in the Applicant Guidebook of that time and try to figure out what can be enhanced, what parts of the flow chart can be improved or what is missing there.

And I couldn't participate in the last call because it (collapsed) with another meeting I had but I listened to the recording and I also read the transcribing. And I would like to go and do some comments to the slides in relation with some experience that we have been going through from my perspective of

the experience that we had in the GAC from the government participation perspective in this process and some other comments that came to my mind when I saw the slides.

Before starting, do we have any updates of statements of interest? Okay, I hear none. Can you hear me well?

Julie Bisland: Yes, very well.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. And I will try to follow the chat and, Annebeth will help with telling me if there are hands that I don't see or any comment that I don't see. One thing that came in the other call, and it's a concern that I personally or also felt and had was how to follow up with all the very, very interesting comments and debates that we had in the email list. I tried to copy paste them, make my own recollection of all the comments, tried to comment when it was appropriate from my perspective, but I think it has been challenging for all of us in trying to follow that.

So it was mentioned in the other call that the staff is preparing a very, very good document. It's just a compilation of comments and ideas, it doesn't - it's not a position paper or anything like that. We coleads are going to review it. I personally have seen it. I had no time to go in depth into the document. I know that Annebeth has done that but she's always very active (unintelligible) and but the idea is to share that document with a broad audience of this Work Track 5 when the time comes so the document is in the preparation.

I heard also concerns about going to different places like the - a PDF, an online document and other documents too in the same comment. I know it's challenging, we will try to summarize all the contributions in that document, but well we have the email list and we have these calls and so we tried to capture all the ideas and all the inputs because we think - for me the big outcome of this exercise would be that we can define a new process that leads to less conflict and all the parts of being more happy with the outcome.

So this will be only done if we can explain our concerns but we are really open to think about new ways of doing the process, of improving it, of being a little bit more flexible in each of the parties involved and so we can get a new outcome perhaps much better for all of us, all the parties involved and more and more success stories and less conflict. So this is my general comment.

Do we have comments in the chat? I haven't seen them. Yes, we have some.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...Kavouss, we are not sharing this document so far; we are working on it.
Annebeth, you want to say something?

Annebeth Lange: No, just that I was - I answered Kavouss about the compilation so that's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, thank you so much.

Annebeth Lange: It will be sent out later.

Olga Cavalli: And, yes, that's the idea but just to bring you some a little bit that we are trying to put all the comments together. I know it's extremely challenging to follow all the comments in the email list because then it's nested and it's very difficult to follow for all of us and for you also, for us that we are following closely all the process.

So I would like to make a comment about one of the slides because I think - I don't think it was really mentioned in the previous call and because of the experience we had in the GAC I would like to mention that. Could we go to the next slide please, one of the first flow charts. And another one. Another one. The previous one.

That box in the upper part - left upper part, which is light blue, it's - it refers that if the applicant consider if the string is a geographic name or not. I would like to share with you my conversations with most of the applicants that applied for strings that for some governments were considered geographic names and for the companies who were not considered a geographic name.

So the explanation that they gave me is that they just followed the guidelines and these names were not in any of the lists that are described in the next slide. So I think this is something to have in mind that we - if we - we stick to those lists only that (unintelligible) we may have the same problems that we had in the first round and I think it was not mentioned in the previous call. So we had - we should have that in mind.

And I would like also to comment about a comment made by our colleague, Jorge Cancio, about having an advisory panel that could be independent and I think this, Jorge, links to the idea that we have also mentioned several times of having a list, a repository or a way for the applicant to check if the name is - it has some relevance for a community for the government of some part of the community outside the applicant itself.

So these are some general comments I wanted to share with you. I don't know, Martin, if you want to join now or you want me to go from Slide 17, which was where we stopped our call last Wednesday?

Okay, I don't hear Martin so I will follow to 17. Can we go to Slide 17 please? Do we have any comments.

Martin Sutton: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Martin, yes, sorry, I didn't see your hand up.

Martin Sutton: I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: No, no.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: I'm struggling with the system here. And I am in a public environment so I've managed to...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: You sound very well. You sound very good. You sound very, very clear.

Martin Sutton: So we may have background music which will help us guide us through...

Olga Cavalli: Which is nice.

Martin Sutton: ...the session I hope.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: So I'm happy to take up the case from now on, but...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Martin Sutton: Now apologies because I missed the last meeting, I couldn't do that, but what I do understand is that there was good progress in terms of trying to illustrate that we had created as a sort of set of process slides which depicted what 2012 did. Now we had tried to convey that in other methods beforehand so that was worthwhile, but it was apparent from a lot of the conversations that we were still seeing and hearing is that there was some unknowns about the way 2012 round was treated. So we thought we would try and make it easier to see and represent it through the slides that you've been presented with the last meeting and today we'll continue to go through those, so I'm happy to do that.

In terms of some of the points that Olga's raised, this is - we've seen a lot of conversations going on and we really appreciate the email exchanges that have occurred. And we'll encourage you to do that because what we are trying to do is to try and eek out some of the best ways to go forward. We have seen a number of ideas presented, we have seen a number of concerns that are raised that have been repeated often, so when we are trying to analyze all of the information that's come across on the email exchanges, we are trying to pick out the things that are new, that are reinforced through some of the conversations so please bear with us; there is a lot of context that has been provided.

There is a number of ideas on the whole there is a lot of repeats so we have to wade through that and staff have helped us considerably to do that so that we can actually come to a reasonable assumption as to where we are directing ourselves. So if you feel that your issues and concerns have not been included, addressed, you know, you have the opportunity to put that forward, but we're trying to look at this on a very holistic basis as to what we've seen and heard over the number of months that we've had this particular issue in our space to address.

Now with the geo names process that's been presented here, I'm trying to make sure I can see what's on the chart, but I have a very limited screen here. So Olga, would you mind at least...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Martin Sutton: ...just for now just taking over and addressing where we are on the slides because I have a very small screen, I cannot see it.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes, you're right. I requested to review Slide Number 9 because I wanted to make a comment. If you recall in the last call you reviewed, I was not in the call but I heard the transcribing and other - and the recordings until

17 so you want us to go to 17 or the 16 maybe? So we are in 17 now, Preventing Protections, certain types of geographic names, always required governmental support or non-objection. Is that okay?

Martin Sutton: That's great, thank you. So where we found ourselves in a couple of meetings ago was the point that we opened it up to the conversation of beyond what was in the Applicant Guidebook. And there was silence until we actually opened it up and said, start conversations on the email list. And there was an abundance so I've got email chains of 200 plus conversations and multitudes of that that we've all had to start working through.

Please continue that; that's worth encouraging and certainly to try and pick up any new ideas and concerns that are raised along the way. What we have here is the scenario where we have the cities beyond the capital cities and how they were addressed in the 2012 round. This seems to have caused a lot of interaction, which was helpful. And what we need to try and work through is how reasonable it is to try and make any new and helpful rules in the next round of applicants.

So where we have some concerns, probably, is rights protections where there is limited rights protections and limited rights that have been discussed and pushed forward in terms of the email exchanges, but also the intent to do the right thing in terms of public interest which is very difficult also to define and so we heard a number of things put forward in that respect.

So this apparently to the rest of the coleads, we've discussed an awful lot, seems to be the hinge point which is, you know, how do we progress from here? There are a number of suggestions but there are a number of push backs on this. And we would really like to open up the discussion today just to see how we can get through this where there are interests from a rights protection perspective, there is a requirement of openness and encouraging new entries to the marketplace, there is also the indication that those that do not have a particular strength in going forward for the application may have a

vested interest so it's the people of a place, location, that could benefit in the long term from such an application but may not drive the application.

So we've seen and heard a lot of this discussion. What we'd like to do today is probably open that up and see how we can look at the process flows that we've already got and inherited from the 2012 round and see if there is any ways to improve that to accommodate some of the different interests that we've highlighted through the email exchanges.

So I'm going to stop now. I would love to hear from others and open this up to a conversation with Work Track 5 members. I don't see a queue at this stage, maybe I do...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Actually I see Alexander.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, and there is a comment in the chat...

Alexander Schubert: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...I think it maybe needs clarification before giving the floor to Alexander. Sorry, Alexander. It's a question from Greg about what "always" means in this slide because it's highlighted.

Martin Sutton: So...

Olga Cavalli: And it's from Greg - Greg Shatan.

Martin Sutton: I'm trying to whiz through the chat here and I've got a very...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: ...silly little box to wade through. Let me come back to that. If there's anybody in the queue let them go first and I'll try and do that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it's Alexander and then Steve Chan.

Martin Sutton: Okay, Alexander and Steve, if we can go to you first and I'll read through the chat, thanks.

Alexander Schubert: Okay, hello. This is Alexander Schubert from (Riga), it's early morning here. I have probably been one of the more active participants in the email exchange and I don't want to bring forward my ideas again on the call because I did so in the email. What I wanted to say is that indeed I have the impression that right now we are stuck at a general question which is not so much should rights holders have rights or not; that's kind of an independent thing, but it seems to me that we have to clarify whether ICANN - whether it's the mandate of ICANN and our work track to make sure that public benefits is part of the new rules or the rulemaking process.

So there seems to be people who say, well, it's just not ICANN's mandate, we make basic rules and then people apply and let the market decide, and there seem to be other people, and I am one of those obviously, who say, well, no, it's not just about rights or laws or basic rules, we have to make sure that we create rules that benefit the general Internet user and certain communities.

And I think we have to come to a conclusion within the work track or maybe we have to bring it even out of the work track and ask the community, are we as a work track and as ICANN mandated to align the rulemaking with public benefit etcetera? That's what I wanted to say.

Martin Sutton: Yes, thank you for that. So, Alexander, how do you interpret that? Because there are many interpretations from the people that we have on the calls and in the Work Track 5 overall which is that, you know, you have a very strong

perspective and an experience within this field, there are others that also have a strong experience in other areas of this field which says that there are good benefits elsewhere to be derived from top level domains whether they are a place name or correspond to a place name but can be interpreted as meaning something completely different.

So we've got a point where we have been struggling with the cities beyond the capital cities where it's prescribed as a need to do something proactive and gain acceptance for that application, versus those that are more abstract that have multiple meanings, how do we deal with those, Alexander, because I love your ideas, I absolutely love to entertain those sorts of things, but there is a different audience all around here that have a strong perspective which says that this is very much more open and should be more open to applications that could have a very positive benefit beyond the city or place meaning. So how can we start to resolve that situation, because that seems to be the crux of the email exchanges that we've had for the last few weeks.

Alexander Schubert: And so it's again Alexander because you asked me, I'm trying to not talk too much on those calls because I'm already emailing so much. But and I'm not going to repeat my positions because I have done this so many times. But what I would say is we are seemingly working off the 2012 AGB and in the 2012 AGB there seemed to be a very clear thought that certain strings are protected; some of them, for example, the country names were overprotected, they were so much protected you couldn't even apply at all. And then there were a bunch of other strings that you could apply for but you needed the government support.

And in that batch of names where you needed the government support, it was partly a few lists but in my opinion...

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: ...for example, the UN regions, I mean, nobody is really applying for UN regions, or the geographic sub regions, I'm not even sure that anyone applied for one of those in order to represent them. There were a few applications like dotTata by brands who did not target them but got stopped. So the - I think the general question is if we protect cities or sub regions should we not try to protect just a few of them or not too many in order like you said, to not make it impossible for generic applications or prevent applications to go forward.

Because every protection that you are creating is obviously harming others, like the protection of the country names that now will lead probably to a situation where if Spain or Israel, whoever would like to apply for their own geo TLD to promote e-government and tourism, they just couldn't do it. So I'm completely on the side of, for example, Greg to say, no, we cannot overprotect everything, it's too much, we are harming brands and generic terms.

So I think our main business should be to look at the protections of the 2012 AGB and find out where we can maybe release some of the restriction and restrict others because right now we have only protected cities really outside of the few lists that I named, there are just cities protected, but there is still a lot of geographic entities that are not protected.

Martin Sutton: Yes, I appreciate that, Alexander, but then we encroach on the fact that these have very different meanings in the very - they coincide with a lot of generic terms and that's probably where it gets more and more difficult to influence how - if there needs to be protection how that should be applied. So I fully value your input to this. I notice that we have also Kavouss and Liz in the queue, so thank you, I will come back to you.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Martin? Martin...

Martin Sutton: Yes, I will.

Olga Cavalli: Apologies, there is Steve that wants to make a clarification...

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...about the presentation and then we have a queue. And I would also once you tell me I would like to read some comments in the chat which I think are relevant.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Olga. No, appreciate that. And certainly I appreciate Kavouss and Liz are in the queue and Alexander's comments. What we would encourage during this call is beyond the exchanges that we've seen on the email is anybody that has got input to this conversation to come forward on this call. We would put you to the front of the queue actually so that we hear from others that haven't often been heard. So do please feel free to raise your hand and we'll put you in the queue accordingly. Steve, if I can refer to you first and then we'll go to Kavouss and to Liz. Thank you.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Martin. Thanks, Olga. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I just wanted to provide a little bit of context and hopefully some clarification about what these slides are intended to present. They are intended to capture the 2012 process as it was designed and implemented in the 2012 round. And what they are not intended to do is to pass judgment or to try to determine whether or not they were appropriate, as an implementation. So it's really intended to be a factual presentation of how the process was captured.

And so that extent when it says - actually if I can just take us back a couple slides, the intention was to show that all of the applications - every single name went through the geographic names review process, whether or not you designated your name as a geographic name or not. It was up to the Geographic Name Panel to make a determination based on the criteria in the Applicant Guidebook.

And so beyond that, what was also tried to be - or attempted to be illustrated here was that there's different treatments for different types of geographic names within the process. So for something like geographic - or sorry, country and territory names, which is circled in red on this present slide, none of these names were available for applicants or for any party at all so they were completely disallowed for any applicant whatsoever, and so that's what this slide shows right here.

The other slide that some people - some of the work track members commented on in the chat about certain types of geographic names that always require governmental support or non-objection, based on my understanding, at least, these terms - these specific terms in the Applicant Guidebook they did actually in fact require governmental support or non-objection under any circumstance, independent of usage or not. So that was the second type of geographic name.

And then so the third category is the non capita city names and that's where usage came into play. So here it emphasizes that governmental support or non-objection was required depending on intended usage. And so apologies if the language might have been misleading but the intention was to capture the process as it was presented in the 2012 round so which is why things like "always" are underlined just to emphasize that that was actually how it took place and then in this case for non-capital city names it's emphasizing that it's only required governmental support depending on the intended usage.

So hopefully that helped provide some context and understanding of why the slides are presented this way. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Steve.

Olga Cavalli: Martin.

Martin Sutton: Thanks. Olga, can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, can I make a comment?

Martin Sutton: Yes, please do.

Olga Cavalli: I would like to read some comments in the chat before you give the floor to Kavouss and to Liz. Sorry for interrupting but I think it's relevant. It's a comment from Heather Forrest. She says, "What basis are we requiring government support or non-objection if public interest - how do define this explicitly so applicants understand why they are required to provide this information?"

And then there are comments from Jorge Cancio, "Policy has to," oh it rolls up, sorry. It rolls up and down. "Policy has to pursue the global public interest," this is Jorge, "through a multistakeholder process, considering the interests of all parties involved, and also of the communities most affected." So I just - there are other comments which are very relevant but I think these are important to highlight. And then over to you, Martin, and in the queue you have Kavouss and Liz.

Martin Sutton: Thank you for that, Olga. And, Steve, great reminder as to the starting point of this call which I'd overlooked, which was we still have not validated the process flow. And so what I would ask is if any members have any objections to - or concerns with the process flow as it's mapped out for the 2012 scenarios, please - we'll prioritize those in terms of comments. What we would like to do is to park that and be able then to use that process flow to be able to amend and adjust or test play any scenarios that we come to - that come to mind as we progress our work.

So bearing that in mind I'll move to Kavouss and then - who else?

Olga Cavalli: Liz.

Martin Sutton: Liz. Kavouss, please and then Liz. Thanks.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, do you hear me, please?

Martin Sutton: Yes, we hear you.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, yes, thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. I think we could not resolve all the issues and open the subject more and more which may be difficult to wrap it up. I heard some of the new terms, public benefits, what is public benefits? We have the public interest in the mission, in the bylaw and so on, and now we are trying public benefit. What is public benefit? Who decides on the public benefit and so on so forth?

Then we're saying that the certain - what do we mean by certain unless we try to not open it too much and no close it too much, because now I see that there is a lot of things going all around and we have to be careful that not open it in a way that could not be closed at all. At some time we have to have some convergence. So I think this should be in the hand of the management team or the group of the five leadership to look into the compilation, to look into the conversation and try to find some way.

I heard the term like overprotected, I do not know what does it mean overprotected? I heard the name under - the term under-protected, not sufficiently protected, so these are the things that we need some clarification. So in summary, Applicant Guidebook 2012 seems a good basis. The only thing we have to see whether there are deficiencies, problems and improve that, but not expand it in a way that would be uncontrollable and unmanageable. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Kavouss. When you refer to that, is there any ideas you've got in terms of what these means? Because largely they come from a - from a government source so it would be helpful if we could understand these terms even better in particular in the public interests.

Kavouss Arasteh: Public interest we had a lot of discussion when we had the ICANN mission and we had the bylaws, we didn't have any general agreement but we put what there was already there and it just was more than 1.5 or 2 lines, but we can't get into the new subject, the public benefit, because I don't know who defines that what is public benefit and what are the criteria that something is public benefit or is not public benefit. This is...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: It doesn't come from the government, it's an idea of the participants. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: All right. Thanks, Kavouss. Where is that please? Because I'll refer back to that and see if we can - we can expand on it.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I heard Alexander referring to public benefit. What is a public benefit?

Martin Sutton: Oh sorry, okay I thought it was in some of the documents that we had sent out and that we were discussing now in terms of the model.

Kavouss Arasteh: No, maybe some of the - yes.

Martin Sutton: Okay, okay. Thanks.

Kavouss Arasteh: I appreciate very much Alexander's contribution, he's really very, very active on the list. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Kavouss. And so Liz, please go ahead.

Liz Williams: Yes, good morning, Martin. Liz Williams speaking. Would you mind if we just went to Slide 17, the one that referred to the city names and not to 19 and then I just want to - yes, that's it, thank you.

Martin Sutton: Excellent, yes, thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: So I just wondered if we're getting a little hung up about something that I've been struggling with. The title of the slide is Preventive Protections for - in short term - Geographic Names. I wonder if part of our challenge is that we're muddling up these two quite important things? So the first thing is understanding what we are protecting and why; and then that list 1, 2 and 3 are quite important reasons for protecting particular kinds of geographic names.

And then we need to then say, and what are we preventing? We are preventing the application from an applicant to apply for a couple of city names that is listed on the ISO 3166. We indeed don't want them to do that. So I'd like us to think a little more broadly about what we're protecting, and why we're doing it, and the correct mechanism for doing it so being clear about what an applicant's responsibilities to understand what the process is.

And then think about whether we've got the right language around prevention, which is essentially stopping an application for anything, and then I think we can go from this slide, which is again Slide 17 for anyone who can't see it, can't see it on the WebEx, so we've got pretty clear reasons for protecting the capital city names, we've got clear reasons for protecting an ISO 3166-2, and then we've got clear reasons for protecting UNESCO reasons - UNESCO regions.

So I'd like us to separate those two things out. And I can't do it on the fly, I have to think about it a bit more, but when we're going through this process, if we're explicit about what we're protecting and why, then we can make an understanding about what kinds of things are appropriate in particular situations. Thank you, Martin.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Liz. And I think we've gone through the stages initially of the Applicant Guidebook where we had treated every particular category that we had listed already in the Applicant Guidebook, and tried to reaffirm whether that was relevant, appropriate and we had I think come to some degree of agreement amongst the group that the specified two characters, three characters, country names, those were - those are reasonable to carry forward and then to put into policy where they were not already embedded in policy. So that was a good progress that we had.

Now we've come to the more expansive area of cities and capital cities, I think again judging from the comments that we'd had over the list and through the meeting, that there was reasonable comfort that we should carry forward the idea that the Applicant Guidebook had already assumed and they deserved reasonable levels of protection.

Where it seems to have got to a more - a discursive stage is with the - anything beyond capital cities where there is so many so the volume is high, the mixture of strings can be interpreted in many different ways and where therefore does there really need to be that restriction applied at the front end or whether the restrictions should be applied through other controls that may already exist within the process or perhaps we may need to introduce into the process but are not front end blockages.

So that seems to have opened up a lot of discussion because we had assumed there was going to be a lot of interest in terms beyond what was in the Applicant Guidebook, but we have seemed to concentrate on this latest point which is cities beyond capital cities where there - where it opens up. So

understanding what the real concerns are, the real risks, and how to treat those risks, is where we appear to be having a lot of conversations without any general agreement as to how we may move forward with those.

Olga Cavalli: Martin?

(Karla): Hi, Martin. Olga, hi.

Olga Cavalli: Hi...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Just trying to check the list. Sorry, hang on.

Olga Cavalli: Martin, I would like to read some comments from the chat that I think are very interesting.

Martin Sutton: Olga, please go ahead. I've got limited access to the screen here. We might be hands up and comments.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...from Annebeth. So someone should mute the mic. I have a comment from Jorge Cancio and another from Barrack Otieno. I will read first the one from Jorge. "I object to the framing of open versus closed or between market and restriction. The issue at stake is to have all interests involved in early stages of the process. As said many times, the non-objection letter allows for many outcomes that are a positive-sum outcome for all applicants and public authorities. The success of the overwhelming majority of geoTLDs shows this is a good framework."

And also, a comment from Barrack, "It is worth noting that most countries in Africa barely understand the reserved name process. In addition the

countries barely have addressing systems and are always caught on the back foot,” and somehow this happens in Latin America.

And this follow on, “We need a balanced process that will ensure the local communities are protected while they can also benefit from the growing domain name industry.”

And you have a hand up from Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: It’s Annebeth Lange here. I think that this discussion shows that we are going somewhat around, around, around each other and talking about the same things too much because we’re repeating ourselves. And it would be a good thing now to get some progress to go on with the slides and then when we have sent out the document where we have taken in all the things that are not repetitions in both from the chat and from the conversations we have had and from the email and then when all have read that carefully, I think that the discussion will take another way forward so we can see where we are.

So that would be my advice now, to move on. We used a lot of time and one hour is not much when we’re discussing these things. Thank you.

(Karla): Hi, Olga and Martin. (Karla) here. If I could just make a quick comment in relation to the process flow?

Martin Sutton: Please go ahead.

(Karla): Thank you. With respect to the discussions, I am - I hear what you're saying, Martin, in relation to there have been substantive discussions already in relation to the Guidebook and the 2012 Guidebook, and I note the concerns raised by Alexander and by Liz, I particularly like the rationale that was recently articulated by Liz on this particular call.

And I'd just like to add in terms of - I know that we've - there have been several discussions in terms of the 2012 Guidebook and that we're now onto cities, but I would suggest that with respect to the process flow, with respect to the different categories, if we - the categories that the 2012 Guidebook has already identified, that if there were additional ones that may not have perhaps made it to that particular list that potentially subject to controversy or subject to potential policy development, maybe those could be discussed in the email or even that we discussed already but at least I'm given to get all that list.

And whilst we are on cities, and still going through the process flow I would say that I'm okay with the existing process flow as long as it doesn't limit our capacity to add a new category and discuss the potential policy treatment on the content. And, you know, that's all from my end. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. It's Martin here again. The process flow is meant to represent what was the 2012 process, so what we are trying to do, and I'm sorry if we've sort of been misrouted again, and it's probably my fault as well, but the intention here is just to clarify with everybody and validate that that process is representative of what was the 2012 process.

If anybody has got any immediate objections...

Olga Cavalli: Martin?

Martin Sutton: ...concerns with that, could we just check to see if that is the case before we move onto the queue? I notice Christopher is in the queue but...

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay.

Martin Sutton: ...but if we can just round this off with the actual process map because that is a basis from which we can work towards any amendments so it's easier to visualize and I know that particularly those that were not around in 2012 may

not be familiar with the process. This was a way of trying to make it easier to understand. And then we can work at ways that we can see of just in those rules and processes could be adapted to help in the future.

But the key point today is can we find out if this is wrong and how do we adjust that? If it is right, great, let's move ahead and just put that down as a good tool for us to base any further conversations on. So...

Olga Cavalli: Thanks, Martin.

Martin Sutton: ...if I could ask anybody to come forward?

Olga Cavalli: Christopher Wilkinson has his hand up. Yes, and then Alexander.

Martin Sutton: Christopher. We can hear you, Christopher.

Olga Cavalli: Christopher, maybe you can go with Alexander.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, yes. Alexander, can you go ahead?

Alexander Schubert: Yes, hello. This is Alexander. Obviously the kind of question I wanted to ask is whether we really have followed through the guidelines of 2012 especially regarding to cities, and...

Martin Sutton: So, Alexander.

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: Yes?

Martin Sutton: Yes, sorry, my point there was in terms of the process flow that's been created, is that representational of 2012? So if it's not, let us know, otherwise what we'd like to do is to be able to say, okay, as a Work Track 5 team, we've

been able to say, yes, that's representational and is easy to understand, and going forward we can adapt it to the types of adjustments we might like to consider. But for now is that a - is that a good representation? If not, that's what I need to try and pick out from members.

Alexander Schubert: Okay. Then I rest my case.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thanks, Alexander. Christopher?

Olga Cavalli: I think he has some connectivity problems.

Martin Sutton: Okay, anybody else that - otherwise what we'll do is we'll park that as a representation of the process and we'll use that as a basis to try and work through any scenarios that we consider going forward during the course of this deliberations in Work Track 5, so that's very helpful and thank you. I think - I'm sorry, I've got loads of background noise here. Sorry about this. If there is any questions or follow on questions please put that - forward it to the group before we run out of time and I'll try and block out my noise here.

Olga Cavalli: Christopher is trying to speak now, let's - Christopher, are you there?
Christopher?

Martin Sutton: Okay perhaps we can move onto the next set of slides then because I think we've covered these. I know we've only got a short space of time left but this seems to be the contentious area that we have picked up on a lot of the email exchanges which is - is whether or not it's a geographic term or to be used as a geographic term. Now - sorry, I really can't see the slides on my screen, it's too small.

Olga Cavalli: It's the slide that has the - three references to GAC processes, GAC advice, early warning and something else that I cannot see on my screen.

Martin Sutton: So this is very relevant. If any of the terms that have been put forward as an application are to be used in a reference to a geographic place, geographic term as we have understood it, from the prescription of 2012 Guidebook, let me see if I can see - sorry, I'm struggling to see this.

Olga Cavalli: Christopher is writing his comment. He says, "What are the existing brands, trademarks, which coincide with geo names? There are many but not in relation to the totality of geo names."

Martin Sutton: Well I find that not entirely relevant because what we're talking about here is that terms expanded across millions of place names have a corresponding generic term that is well used, not just brands. So whilst I am certainly from a background that is relevant to brands, what I do understand in this particular space is that there is multiple use cases for terms that are used for place names that are very generic and used in everyday use.

So we have to (unintelligible) as we go down the scale from capital cities, how much protection should be required for these places that have you know, absolutely some strong meanings or use cases that would be very valuable to a community, to people, to end users, that want a trusted environment? So it's a good question.

Olga Cavalli: Martin?

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry for interrupting you. We are running out of time, I think we have like two minutes left. So maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: ...more to AOB.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Martin Sutton: Okay so if hand over to - back to you, Olga, thanks very much and we'll...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: No, thanks to you and apologies for interrupting you. We have many very interesting comments in the chat. A difficult to follow and to scroll up and down. And final comments, we will keep on working on this compiled document with all the relevant comments and ideas that you have shared with us. I'm not sure if we will go back to the slides, I'm asking my colleagues, my cochair colleagues that we keep on working with the slides in the next call (unintelligible) because we still have things to review from this slide on. I think this slide is particularly important and the comments that follow.

So are we - remaining slides in the next call? That's a question to Martin and Annebeth and Javier.

Annebeth Lange: Olga, it's Annebeth here. I think we should discuss that later. And at this stage...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Annebeth Lange: ...I think we would advise all participants to read through the chat when it's sent out by the staff. It was a lot of comments from the staff - in the chat this time, and it's well worth reading it through. It's difficult to read it on the screen in the WebEx unfortunately...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: ...so we haven't been able to repeat everything. So I think we should go from there and then we will discuss what to do next meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, fantastic. We are on the hour and thank you very much to all of you, thank you very much, Martin, for presenting all the slides, thank you all of you for being with us in this call. Let's keep on working through the week and we meet again next Wednesday. Have a very good rest of the week and nice weekend. Thanks, all of you. And thank you, staff, for all your work.

Annebeth Lange: Bye, bye, thank everyone.

Olga Cavalli: Ciao. Ciao. Bye-bye.

Martin Sutton: Thank you.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, everyone. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, can you please stop the recordings and to everyone else you can disconnect your lines and have a good rest of your day.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

END