

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 07 November 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/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-07nov18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p9243d2bsrv/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/xhm8BQ>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Michelle: Fantastic. Thanks, Ashley. Well, welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub-Team Track 5, Geographic Names at the Top-Level call on the 7th of November 2018. In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call, as we have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So, if you happen to be only on the audio bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now? Okay. As a reminder to all participants, if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will hand the meeting back over to Annebeth Lange. You may begin.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Michelle, and welcome to the first Work Track 5 meeting after Barcelona. It was nice to see so many of you there, and I think we had good discussions in the different fora. And a special thanks now to those attending at hours not very convenient. In half of Europe, at least, we've gone back to one hour because of the wintertime/summertime thing. It's quite early for many.

Before we go to the initial report, which will be the main (inaudible) today, are there any statements of interest updates? I hear none. Okay, then we go on to the initial report and go through that. I see that you've got it up on the screen. I can see the annex now. What I want to do today is you have all received the draft initial report before Barcelona, and there are several suggestions and comments that were raised during different meetings, which we have tried to include in the updated version of the report which you received yesterday.

The report is a supplemental report to the initial report of the GNSO new gTLD SubPro Working Group and will be included in this when we have finished our work and after public comments. The structure of the report is still the same - executive summary, deliberations of the working group with preliminary recommendations and questions to be considered by the community, conclusions and accept (ph) background for the work and the approach taken by the working group. The community input has a chapter of its own.

I would like to highlight the updates to see if we have got them all in. If there are suggestions raised in Barcelona that we have not covered, let us address that after going through those changes and additions that we have caught. Staff have added page numbers and line numbers to make it easier to refer possible corrections and comments to the right place. We do show the different pages with updates as we go through them (inaudible). When we start with the first thing you have included is on page five. Let us see if we get the report up on-screen. There we are. Could we move it to page five?

There, it has been added, a summary of the recommendations. It's added to the executive summary, so it's easier just to read the summary to get the feeling of the recommendations. We hope that will help you when you go through the report.

Can we move to page 12, please? There has been added data about geographical applications and names (ph) delegated in the 2012 round, which was (inaudible). This will hopefully give a better picture of what happened in 2012. Then, we go to page 21, and E-8 (ph). There exists an uncertainty about the exceptional reserve list (ph). We are trying to do some additional data gathering here to clarify the status of the list and will then update it according to the information we receive.

On page 30, footnote 17, let us refer to ICANN's articles of incorporation. Let's take a little break there and see if there are any comments to the few issues we went through now. Any hands up? I can't see anyone, and we go on.

On page 63 is an additional proposal added in relation to the treatment of city names that are not capital city names regarding intended use provision, based on a suggestion provided by Katherine (inaudible). And then, on page 73, additional text is added regarding currency codes. And on page 74, additional text regarding geographical indications has been added. These are the added comments we have got into the report. So, are there any comments to this? Anyone? Is there anything that we have forgotten to get in that some of the members now have noted that we should have got in and haven't? Christopher, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Good morning. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. First of all, may I thank the co-leads and the staff for the efforts they have made to accommodate the physical comments and suggestions that they have

received. I can't say (inaudible) of whether every detail that I have noticed in the past has been taken up, but I understand that there is a willingness to bring this into line with the comments that we've received, and I thank you all for that. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. I think that what we should do now is to go back and really read it again and see if there is anything that we have forgotten to get in. Marita, you have your hand up.

Marita Moll: Yes, good morning. I'm probably just not finding it, but I don't know where in the document you're reflecting the discussion around city names over a million, setting them aside. Is that anywhere in the document?

Annebeth Lange: I'm not quite sure. Emily, could you help out? Emily?

Emily Barabas: Hi, Annebeth, this is Emily Barabas from staff. It is, in fact, included. I don't know the page number offhand, but I can look it up and I will put it in chat. Thanks.

Marita Moll: Yes, thank you very much.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Thank you. Christopher, is that a new hand, or -- no, it seems like he's muted. Okay, then are there any comments at all about the initial report as it is now that we want to take up and discuss? Awfully quiet today.

Christopher Wilkinson: Still half asleep at 6:00 in the morning.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Well, we can get back to it. And in the meantime, I would like to take up a few things that we discussed in Barcelona or that was raised in Barcelona. One thing was that it was raised by Paul McGrady, that we should have a one- to two-page short summary of the initial report for Work Track 5 people so that they could use this with their respective communities to help them explain Work Track 5. And the report to those that were new to the process, or those that didn't have the requisite time to read the entire report, and that would be in addition to the executive summary and in addition to the appendix that receive all of the recommendations and questions for comment.

It seems now that several persons have volunteered for this group, and we have had quite a discussion on the list among the co-chairs and among some of those who have listed. And we -- this was actually meant to be a help for you and to make it manageable and balanced. There should be -- we think that there should be one from each of the four stakeholder groups, and we will get back to you as soon as the four persons have been chosen, if this idea flies at all. If it makes more hurt than use, then we'll just skip it, because the staff is working now with the executive summary to make that also something that we can use in the same way.

So, do you think that this is something we should do at all? We do not want to be distracted from our main task now, to get the initial report ready for public comment as soon as possible and within the timeframe we have set. So, I would like to have your comments on that now. I see there are some comments on the chat here. David McCauley says that the summary of pages five and six are quite helpful additions. And Jean says I found the Excel spreadsheet that was prepared for the (inaudible) that called out the key -- then it disappeared from me in the chat, sorry. Here we are -- in close to the community, a useful tool for helping organize comment. Okay. Cheryl (ph), or Marita?

Cheryl: Perhaps Marita should go first. Marita, please go.

Marita Moll: Good morning, Marita Moll for the record. Let me see, what -- I was trying to remember what my point was. Yes. Yes, I'm kind of wondering why the executive summary isn't the two-page document that you're talking about. And if individual groups really need another document, maybe they should prepare documents from their own perspective. That was my comment on -- I mean, I'm happy to help work on another two-page document, but isn't that what an executive summary is supposed to do?

Annebeth Lange: Marita, it's Annebeth here. Could I comment on that? Yes, I agree, that's what it should be. And leading (ph) with this two-pager anyway was that it should be prepared by the staff, and then have it for people perhaps then to comment on it and help to make it cover everything that we have talked about. But, I think we will discuss this a little further, as David [12:40] to do it at all, and the main thing now is to get ready the initial report in a way that everyone can read it. So, we'll see how this takes us. Cheryl?

Cheryl: Thank you, Annebeth, and I'm glad I let Marita go first. I'm going to suggest that you don't even bother coming back to this later. I think you should probably settle this now from my very biased point of view as trying to assist you all in managing the whole process. I think the (inaudible) of having a very small, very narrowly focused, tiny group that came out of Barcelona was fine for that exercise. And in fact, Marita, you were one of the people who put their name forward of it, so thank you for that. It was, as Annebeth said, only effort to be designed to be a very limited issue, trying to ensure that GAC and at-large and GNSO had their own flavor specific taken care of in the executive summary.

I can assure you, from my point of view and that of my fellow co-lead of the whole PDP process, it has become far more trouble than it's worth. We are not willing to give in to thrill-packed and exciting definitions of what affiliated or unaffiliated mean. We were taking statements of interest from the GNSO statements of interest as read, and if we are to waste our time debating on balance versus just a simple one of each to give a hand, neither Jeff or I think it's worth it. So, we will be discouraging any such action item to be continued, and we could suggest to put an end

to it in the section items marked as complete, no longer relevant. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Cheryl. Javier?

Javier Rojas: Yes, this is Javier Rojas (ph) for the record. I'd like to support (inaudible) just to simplify things. And it's become more of a occasion (ph) unnecessarily. So, I think we have the resources to keep on going, and we need to keep on going without losing ourselves in the way. So, yes, we have to push it (ph), just keep on without the idea of the group. It just became kind of like a job (inaudible) to -- like it seems to me like a (inaudible) to get in. And that's not the idea. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Javier. I actually agree that what the last week has shown is that it will be more trouble than it's being used, and as Cheryl said, the executive summary will be updated as we go, and it will be a document that you can use the same way. So, if we don't have any strong opposition about skipping the whole idea, we will go that way. No hands up as far as I can see. And also, as Marita said, everyone's free to make their own two-pager to take, and Marita's too, if they want to, then they have read the document.

Okay. One other thing that came up in Barcelona was a wish for additional data gathering. And we have to discuss that if we want this to happen prior to the publication of the initial report, which is planned for 20 November, you must -- will be aware that this would likely push out the timeline and the scope of the project, which is (inaudible) determine how much. It will take time. So, my initial suggestion would be that we get out the initial report as planned, and then we can, in parallel, try to get more data collected. It will come common (ph) from the community afterwards. That should be included, as well.

So, it shouldn't be a problem to wait with the data collection. Please let me hear what you think about it. No hands. Does anyone have a view on it? And another issue is that if it wants, as Emily says, if you want to do a national data gathering, it will be important to define what do we really need. And that is up to the Work Track 5. Emily?

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth. I think you said what I wanted to cover, so nothing further from me.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Anyone else? No? Up (ph) here, I see David McCauley agrees with Emily that some recognition around data collection is needed. Yes. Okay. One thing that we -- it seems like we don't have any more comments to the report at the moment, so I would like to then start to go through the comments already received in writing to the report. And Emily has kindly highlighted some of them for us. So, if we could go through the report again, Emily, and start with page 17 to take a look at the comment included there?

Emily Barabas: Hi, Annebeth, this is Emily from staff, and apologies for the delay. I was just responding to a message from Marita with a question.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, sure.

Emily Barabas: Let me pull up page 17 for us. So, there are a few items here that are highlighted that we're going to run through, and those are comments that came up previously, so way before -- if we can all remember back before Barcelona, there were some comments submitted over the mailing list and questions, concerns, et cetera. And to the extent that those were things that were easy to edit and incorporate, staff went ahead and did that and suggested changes. And those are included with explanatory comments throughout the document, but there were a few cases where it wasn't exactly clear what needs to be updated yet.

So, those are highlighted here, and I'm just going to run through them and ask everyone to think a little bit more about what needs to change, if anything, in response to those comments. So, the first one is regarding preliminary recommendation 11 on page 17. And we got two comments, one from Robin Gross (ph) and one from Jorge Canseo, both saying that they disagreed with recommendation 11, and that is regarding the -- essentially keeping the existing provisions for city names, non-capital city names.

So, from a staff perspective, we can certainly remove this recommendation and put it as a question for community input, although then we don't have a recommendation to include in the initial report on non-capital city names. So perhaps some additional input would be useful if there are others who feel like at this point a recommendation is inappropriate on this topic. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Emily, it's Annebeth here. And the discussion has been very vivid among -- about intended use or not, so that's the main thing here, should it be dependent on intended use if you need support, non-objection (ph) for a city, non-capital city name. And it would be kind of (ph) that if we can't give a recommendation, but if it needs some more discussion, we could always put in the question there to ask the community what they think as well. Marita, you have your hand up.

Marita Moll: Thank you, Marita Moll for the record. I really think that we need to reflect in this report the discussion -- some of the discussion that's been going on around this. It's one of the hotter topics, and the community really needs to have an input on this. So, my opinion would be that we put it out as a question. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Marita. I think that in the report, all of the discussions, the deliberations of the Work Track, that we have caught them, so they are in the report. But, the question now is should we have a preliminary recommendation at all -- at (inaudible) for non-capital city names as well.

Marita Moll: I think I'm saying no, not at this point.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Thank you, Marita. Anyone else want to comment on this? Christopher Wilkinson agreed with Sasha (ph) and Marita. Okay. Justine, summarize deliberations from Work Track 5 on -- in city names intended use, then pose questions. Okay. That would help. Anyone else that want to comment on this? Martin?

Martin Sutton: Hi, hopefully you can hear me. I just want to suggest, due to the numbers that we have on the call here, and many absentees, that perhaps we put that as a specific question at group (ph) so that we can get some feedback during the course of this week. And then, I think that will steer us better as to whether this is a -- remains as a recommendation, the questions, or we adjust it to be a question and type content.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Martin. That is a good idea. We need to do that, because it's not that many people on the call today. That means some of the regulars are not here. So, I agree, we should do that. That would be kind of -- as Marita said, fair to hear (ph) the others and (inaudible) before we decide. No more hands here. Should we go on to the next comment? And that was on page -- let us see --.

Emily Barabas: --Thanks, Annebeth, this is Emily from staff, yes. I was just going to say we're next going to page 40, so we'll take that as an action item from the staff side to follow up with the group regarding preliminary recommendation 11. And just wanted to note that the summary of deliberations, the whole deliberation section, which is F, I believe, section F, includes a summary of all of the different positions, the proposals and so forth. So that's all in the document, and we can add a question under the question section for community input reference all of that discussion and asking for additional input on the perspective of the community members on that. So, if that's where we land, then that's certainly something we can do.

We're next going to page--.

Annebeth Lange: --Yes, just to comment on what Cheryl said in the chat as well, that we should take such things over at least two meetings, or a meeting and to the list. So, we have to do that. Agreed.

Emily Barabas: Okay. So, on page 40, it's line number five. We had a comment from Jorge Canseo. This was a proposal that, at this stage, it's -- I'm not sure who put forward the proposal, but it was a proposal regarding reducing the existing protections or restrictions included in the guidebook. And it said that, once a gTLD is registered with intended use, that it's geographic in nature, although there are variations in translations of this term are unconditionally available for registration. And the comment from Jorge was the meaning of the first bullet -- well, the meaning is unclear, what means unconditionally available and to whom. And from a staff side, that sounds like a request for clarification from the person who put the proposal forward. So, I don't know if anyone recognizes this proposal

that's on the call. Otherwise, that's something we can put out to the mailing list.

And actually, digging back into my brain, I think it may have been a proposal that was put forward by Greg Shatan, but I'm not 100% certain of that.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, but I think we can put that on the mailing list together with the other thing about the intended use and the recommendation 11, because it in many ways ties together here. So, we should have that verification on that. Marita, please?

Marita Moll: Marita Moll for the record. I'm vaguely remembering a discussion about what variations of a name should still be available, and we talked about translations of a name, and translations in official languages. Is that the discussion we're talking about, which official language and which languages to use of that name? Because there was such a discussion early on. That's all I have to offer.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Marita. It ties together in many ways because we have a special section in the initial report about the translation, as well. So, I think it has to do with that. If we decide on language, which language will be protected, that the rest of the different versions of non-capital city name then will -- yes, then will be available and without any restrictions. But, I'm not quite sure what (inaudible). Let us go back to it and (inaudible) it in the mailing list. Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, Christopher Wilkinson again. Yes, this would unconditionally -- is potentially a can of worms. I don't want to take your time now, but reflect on the fact that several countries, many countries, have more than one official language, which -- and other countries use English or French as a surrogate. It would be very important to clarify what is meant by unconditional, and I think the outcome would be -- not be unconditional. But I agree with the procedure that Annebeth and the staff have proposed.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. As Emily says in the chat, that didn't -- translation discussion was a little different one, but they're linked, and the two concepts -- yes. So, we have to think about that and ask it in the mailing list. Thank you. Anyone else on that issue?

Emily Barabas: Hey, Annebeth, it's Emily Barabas from staff. Do you mind if I just make one additional comment about that?

Annebeth Lange: Sure, sure. Go ahead.

Emily Barabas: I just wanted to note that this is -- we're now in the deliberation section of the document. We've scrolled quite a bit downwards. So, just noting that this part of the document really contains all of the proposals and ideas that were put forward. So, this is not a recommendation we're putting forward. It's not a question for community input. It's really the sort of

meat of the paper where we go into a lot of the specifics, and this is just one idea that one person put forward. There are many, many others. It's only being flagged here because a question came up about it. So, it's taken a little bit out of context and may be confusing if you're just reading this one bullet point, but I just wanted to make sure that that was clear.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. That is important to know. And perhaps we should just find out who post that question, or suggested it, and perhaps to solve it that was. Christopher, is that a new hand? No, it was not. Okay. Yes, and it's important when you -- we read all these different comments to have a look on where they are in the document. Are there (ph) under recommendations or under deliberations or background or where else?

So, okay, next one is -- which was -- next one was 41, I think.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth, this is Emily Barabas from staff. This is another question from Jorge, page 41. And again, this is the deliberation section, so there's a lot of material in here that is not necessarily supported by large groups of people in the Work Track. It's just proposals that were put forward by individual members. One of the proposals was for applicants for geographic names, a requirement that they apply to the GAC to receive permission to submit an application for a string. And Jorge asked what is the sense of the proposed solution? What is the scope? And how does it play with other requirements? And from a staff perspective, we don't have any more information about this proposal.

So, this is another one that, unless someone recognizes it as something they put forward, we can put it to the list and see if there's additional clarification we can get there.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. And one question from me, Emily, Annebeth here, is that when we send out the initial report for comments, will all the text in the comments be there when we send it out? Or should they be cleared up before that time?

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth, Emily Barabas from staff. So, I think what you're asking is whether these comments that are appearing on the right-hand side will appear in the published version of the initial report, and the answer is they will not. This is just for the working version now as we resolve some outstanding comments and questions. By the time we publish the report itself, all of that will be stripped out, and it will just be a clean text document. So, I hope that answers your question.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Yes, it does. And that's why it's important now to go through them and see if there is anything there we have to solve before we clean the document up. Thank you so much.

Okay, the next one is 63.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth, Emily Barabas from staff. So, this is a comment from Christopher Wilkinson on page 63. So, we're looking now at a proposal

again in the deliberation section. Again, this is just something that one or a couple of members put forward as an idea, or possibly more. It sort of varies based on the proposal. This one states that it's a proposal to eliminate preventative protections and instead focus on curative protections where all parties may raise issues with an application using objection. And there's a sentence in there that says objectors would analytic to make the objection and submit any objections within appropriate timeframes.

And there was a comment from Christopher that says the sentence is so far off the wall, I'm surprised that it's still being maintained. Note that in any eventual curative regime for nongeographic use, most of the objectors might be private parties. So, I think the question here is is there someone that needs to be adjusted here, noting that, for the most part, unless there is something unclear about another member's proposal, it may be appropriate to submit a public comment kind of responding to a proposal if it's not supported. So, if there's any edits that need to be made there, please let us know. Otherwise, we'll mark that as resolved.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Christopher, do you have any comments there? This is with your input here.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you. Christopher Wilkinson. I maintain my comments of this will -- is this supposed to be revenue? How much of this is going to prepare (ph) -- supposed to display to anybody who is not actually either a government or an applicant from paying? It's -- and for once, I will put on somebody else's coat and so say, in the name of freedom of speech, I think it's wrong.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Anyone else want to comment on this? Martin?

Martin Sutton: Hi. I've just put a comment in the chat, but I'm just reading this through. In the context that this is trying to reflect, is the deliberations, we've captured it. And it's not made it to the recommendation by any means. We're just trying to show and illustrate the deliberations that occurred. And when I see Christopher's comment, I think we've already captured that in sort of benefits and drawbacks table underneath, where it's remarked that it would be a significant burden for others, considering the objection requirement proposed in that particular idea. So, I think my question would be is, no matter what ideas are put forward, what we've done here is try to reflect that in the deliberations, but these have not achieved any attraction to put into any form of recommendation. So, my question, pointing back to Christopher is, does the content of the boxes underneath, the benefits and drawbacks, capture sufficiently his concerns? And therefore, can we remove that, or is it still an issue that we need to address in terms of showing what the deliberations were? Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Martin. I see that Christopher has asked how much did objectors pay in the 2012 round, and a dollar-based charge could be (inaudible) in other currencies. Well, I'm not sure where we should put

this in, but Christopher, have you any more comments after Martin's input?

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Annebeth, Christopher Wilkinson. I haven't taken on board everything that's in the boxes. I think you'll have to give me a little time just to re-read. I would like to have an indication of how people were charged, how much they were charged, and what was the purpose of this charge. But, I'll reread the boxes and come back to you on the list.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Thank you, Christopher. That's fine. Okay, let's go to -- where were we -- 75 is the next one.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth, this is Emily Barabas from staff. We're on page 75 now. And again, these are additional proposals that were put forward by various members, and specifically this was a proposal trying to address the problem that it may be unclear to an applicant if a government, public authority or other party considers a string to be a geographic term, and therefore conflicts may arise later in the process. So, a number of people put forward proposals that sort of addressed this general issue that they saw as a problem. And again, these are deliberations, so these are not proposals that the Work Track is putting forward as a recommendation in the initial report, but simply trying to capture perspectives that were discussed in the group. So, the proposal was to apply a bright line rule that any geographic term that is not explicitly and expressed protected is unprotected. No objection or non-consent can be used to stop its registration. And we have two comments, both requesting essentially clarification of the term "bright line rule" and what is the scope of that. (Inaudible) both comments. So, again, this might be a case where, unless someone wants to speak to it directly on the call today, we can bring that to the mailing list.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Thanks. I see that Justine has a comment in the chat, "To the last point we request about the objection repayment, she would add community groups to public authority, and the (inaudible) financed also clarify objections. Okay. These are the comments and boxes that you have highlighted. Emily, there are several more, but do we think there are any of those two we should go through now? We still have a lot of time left. (Inaudible) anyone here?"

Christopher Wilkinson: Have I got the floor or not?

Annebeth Lange: Christopher, what did you say?

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, I just wanted to explain and, to a degree, reinforce the gist of my comment of, first of all, in the English language, I think "bright line" is the crystal (ph) from California and exotica. He will have trouble translating that into other languages. Why not say a red line? That's tongue-in-cheek, but you see what I mean? Many people would not distinguish a bright line from a red line.

And on the substance, it goes too far. This will not be agreed by many governments and public authorities, to use a bit of English exotica. We seem to be leading with our chin.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, noted, Christopher. We have two things for now. I think we could go -- the one thing we could do is to go through the questions that we have tried to post for the public comment. And that would be helpful. So, could you help us out with this, Emily?

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth, this is Emily from staff, and I'm just pulling up the page where the questions start, so just give me one moment. Okay. So, we're now on page 19. And so, this is section E of the paper, is the questions that the Work Track is seeking feedback from the community on as part of the public comment period. And staff tried to pick out some of the topics where it seems like there were -- there was the most discussion or the most outstanding issues where it might be useful to have additional input from community members. So, Annebeth, I'm not sure if you wanted to -- wanted me to go ahead and read those out. It's a few pages worth of material, but it's pretty important from the Work Track's perspective that everyone understands these questions, supports them and agrees that they're the right questions to ask to the community. Noting that the exercise right now is not to try to answer these questions or to provide substantive input, but to simply decide whether these are the right questions to put out to the community for further input.

So, Annebeth, would you like me to try to run through those questions?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I think that's a good idea. We still have quite some time left, and these are important things, as you say. And also, are there any questions that we should pose that we haven't posed yet. So, please go ahead. That would be helpful.

Emily Barabas: Okay, great. Thanks, Annebeth. So, the first question is -- or the first set of questions are about some of the over-arching issues, so that's covered in the first part of the deliberation section in greater depth. But, this is just pulling out questions sort of about the discussion that has happened so far.

So, the first question says that the Work Track encourages feedback from applicants and other stakeholders who were involved in the 2012 round and sort of lays out different roles that people may have played or interacted with the geographic names process in the 2012 round and requests that commenters provide any positive or negative experiences, including lessons learned and areas for improvement in subsequent procedures. So, this is sort of a general question asking for feedback from community members or other respondents about their experiences with the 2012 round, both sort of pro and con. Are there any questions or concerns about that first E-1, question E-1?

Annebeth Lange: Okay, I don't see any hands.

- Emily Barabas: Okay. And I'm going to just wait for one moment because I see that David McCauley's typing.
- Annebeth Lange: Yes, okay. Do you want to (inaudible)?
- Emily Barabas: Good question, yes. Yes.
- Annebeth Lange: Yes, that's a good idea.
- Emily Barabas: Sure. We can add that in. We'll make a note of that as an action item.
- Annebeth Lange: Yes, absolutely, and then Martin Sutton is writing, typing. Yes, he just approved that. Yes, I think that's a good idea, because it could be a lot of organizations or communities that wanted to require a big (inaudible) because of how the rules were at the time. So, that's a really good idea. Thank you.
- Emily Barabas: Okay. Question E-2, this is a pretty broad question, but it's basically asking for input from community members about how the term "geographic names" should be defined in the new gTLD program and requests feedback on whether there should be any special requirements or implications for that term that is considered a geographic name. So again, this is a pretty broad question, but one that's been hotly debated by the group, so inviting additional perspective. Any comments or questions about that question?
- Annebeth Lange: Okay, I don't see (ph) anything.
- Emily Barabas: Question E-3, so this is about principles. So, at several points during the deliberations, Work Track members discuss possible principles that could be used to guide the development of future policies on geographic names. And some of the proposed principles are summarized briefly there. And for all of these questions, once we've pinned down the deliberations text, we can reference the section -- the appropriate sections of the deliberations text to give additional context to these questions. And then says, "Do you support these principles? Why or why not? Are there additional principles that the Work Track should consider? Please explain." And I see there's a comment from Justine that says any reference needed to guidance for geo names panel. Justine, I don't know if you're able to talk, but it would be helpful to just get a little bit more context around that questions, that specifically focus on E-3 or is it speaking to a different question for E-2?
- Annebeth Lange: E-2, guidance for geo name panel.
- Emily Barabas: So, this would potentially -- I'm just guessing here. It sounds like maybe you're asking if community members have suggestions for guidance for the geo names panel. Is that right?
- Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Emily Barabas: Yes. So, I think that this is sort of a higher-level question, but that's much more about sort of the high level of how the definition might exist, and I think that that could be -- as the work track boils it down, that could be applied towards guidance for a geographic names panel. I'm not sure, so I think it could potentially feed into that. Are you thinking that it would be helpful to have a question asking people to provide their own guidance, or their own sort of suggestions for guidance to the panel?

Annebeth Lange: She's typing more. Love the question, but (ph) some indication that it will feed into geo names panel, yes.

Emily Barabas: Yes. I think we can maybe add some clarification that, ultimately, the definition of a geographic name could both feed into the rules in the applicant guidebook and also implementation details, such as guidance for the geo names panel. So, I think that's some clarification we can add to the question about why we're asking that question and how it may apply to the work of the work track. Does that make sense?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I think so.

Emily Barabas: Okay, sure. We'll make a note of that, as well. So, coming back to E-3, so basically just running through some of the principles that had previously been proposed to, to guide the work of the group, we'll add a reference to the appropriate page number at the end of the process, and for further -- to point further to the discussion. And this is just asking for feedback on those principles and if additional principles should be considered. Any questions or comments about that?

Annebeth Lange: Okay, no hands. And no one is typing as far as I can see, so go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Okay. So, next is question E-4, and this is about different types of mechanisms that can be used to protect geographic names in the new gTLD program. I'd say (ph) these mechanisms fall broadly into two categories, noting that the categories are not mutually exclusive, and that measures from both categories can be used in combination, and then -- and mentions preventative and curative mechanisms. And then the question is, in your view, what is the right balance, or combination of preventative and curative rights mechanisms in relation to the protection of geographic names in the new gTLD program? So, that's just, again, a general question asking for new perspectives and additional insights about the right mix of different types of protections. And I see a comment from David McCauley saying that it's a good question as written. Justine says it's fine. Okay. Anyone else want to (inaudible) to this question? Okay, great.

Question E-5 is about some of the different ways that -- the different ways -- or sorry, the different bases for the development of policies regarding geographic names. Quite a lot has been discussed about that. It's covered quite extensively in the deliberation section, but the question just tries to boil down a little bit for additional feedback and says that some of the things that have been mentioned as justifications include international

law, national and local law and policy, and other norms and values. And the question asks to what extent should this be the basis for development of the GNSO policies regarding geographic names or ICANN policies. So, I see a few people typing, and I see Christopher's hand up. Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Christopher Wilkinson. Thank you for introducing this question. I would just put the three bullets in the opposite order. I think the vast majority of the problems that we will encounter are of norms and values. And we know that there's hardly any international law, and we don't need it to protect geographic names. So, I would put them in the opposite order, please; one, norms and values; two, applicable local law; and three, international law, if any. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. That's noted. Javier?

Javier Rojas: Yes, on this -- Javier for the record. On this point, on norms and values, do we remember -- maybe Christopher can help me -- when this was mentioned in (inaudible) -- when we talk about norms and values, are we referring to opinions or customs? What norms are -- and what type of norms, or what higher (inaudible) what level of norms are we referring to to inform these processes? Maybe that's what I've discussed it -- I don't remember. But, anybody can refresh their memory? Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, Christopher Wilkinson. I would refer to Jorge on this point. He made a statement in Barcelona which very clearly encapsulated a broad definition of the scope of what we have chosen to call in three letters -- in three words, "norms and values." It is clearly very broad, and it will not be uniform worldwide. So, if you want -- I'm sure that in the transcripts of the Barcelona meetings we have Jorge's text. And from my point of view, I would stick with that. Thank you. But, I do maintain that you can't go into very detailed definitions without taking into account substantial variations worldwide. But, the fact is that, in any particular location or country, their feelings about their rights to control the use of geographic names will be felt, and we will hear about them. Thank you.

Javier Rojas: Thanks, Christopher.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. I did some useful suggestions in the chat that I think captured, so there might be some additional work with these questions. So, we'll look into it. Any more comments? No? Yes, Martin? Martin, you have your hand up.

Martin Sutton: Yes, sorry. I was just -- and I can't see the previous questions, but I was just wondering, in terms of the order or some of the questions, whether E-3 and E-5 are closely related in terms of trying to think of ways in the future that policy development around geographic terms are considered. And so, I just wondered whether we want to separately think about just adjusting the order and perhaps putting the four above -- swap it with E-3 so that there is an easier flow. There's just something I think we could take a look at once we've got all the questions organized correctly.

- Annebeth Lange: (Inaudible), Martin, thank you. Okay, should we go on now, Emily, with the next section?
- Emily Barabas: Thanks, Annebeth. And Martin just noted, and I just noted in the chat that we can definitely look at ordering the questions and making adjustments so that they flow together a little more logically. So, we'll take a look at that.
- So, now we're looking at some questions regarding specific categories. First, country and territory names. This is on page 20. Question E-6 summarizes the current cases where translations in any language of country and territory names apply for reservations, and then lays out some of the alternatives that were put forward, and then asks for feedback on those alternatives regarding translations of country and territory names. So, the question itself is, in your view, which alternative is the best option? Please explain. Do you have suggestions for alternatives not included in the list above? I'll pause here.
- Annebeth Lange: Anyone have comments to that? David McCauley's is typing. Not sure what "commonly used" means. (Inaudible.)
- Emily Barabas: Thanks, David, this is Emily from staff. So, this was a proposal that was put forward by one of the Work Track members. And I don't think that a specific definition was provided in that discussion, but again, we can put a reference to the deliberation section showing the details of what was proposed and kind of the specifics of that where it's available. But indeed, some of these terms would probably need additional definition if they were to be selected as the option to go forward. (Multiple speakers.)
- Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth here. I seem to remember what, under that discussion, that commonly used language was meant to (ph) some countries, many people speak a language that is not necessarily official as yet, but it's a great percentage of the community or the (inaudible) in the country speaking that language. So, I seem to remember that that was the point when it was raised, but I think with you, Emily, if that is the solution that will be chosen, we have to go much deeper into it.
- Okay. No more hands? Yes.
- Emily Barabas: Yes, and so that will probably draw a comment or two. So, okay. So, E-7, so this is the question about the potential delegation of three-letter codes and/or other country and territory names. So, it says some Work Track members have expressed that there should be a process in place to delegate these strings to specific parties, such as relevant governments and public authorities or other entities. Do you believe that this is an issue on which work share collab (ph) should make a decision?
- Annebeth Lange: Any comments to this? Any hands? Any comments on the chat? Not that I can see. Justine, recommendation instead of decision. Okay.

Emily Barabas: So, I think Justine's suggestion is to change the final sentence to "Do you believe that this is an issue on which Work Track 5 should make a recommendation?"

Annebeth Lange: Agreed.

Emily Barabas: Okay, we can make that change.

Annebeth Lange: And then, (inaudible).

Emily Barabas: And I see Charles says it's important to answer this question.

Annebeth Lange: (Inaudible) raised on the issue. Okay.

Emily Barabas: So, the next question is E-8, the applicant guidebook reserved any string that was a short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency. So just actually to provide a little bit of context for this, this comes out of a couple of comments from Jaap Akkerhuis, that he felt that this category was either maybe not appropriate or should be reformulated. And the question is some Work Track members have stated that this list does not exist under the ISO 3166 standard, and therefore it is unclear what the provision references. Do you agree or disagree? Please explain.

And staff is actually doing some further digging on this to try to get clarification on both the specifics of what's in the ISO list and the intention from the ICANN org side of kind of the formulation of the provision in the 2012 round. So, we're hoping that actually we can just remove this question rather than putting it out to the community, which maybe doesn't make a lot of sense to actually get from the authoritative sources some additional detail and clarification about this provision so that the Work Track can further deliberate and weigh in.

So, we're hoping that actually this is a question that can just be eliminated. And David says, "Looking forward to that." Christopher, please?

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson again for the record. Last time I looked, the exceptionally reserved to list was indeed in the 3166 standard. I'll look again and send you the link. It's quite important because the exceptionally reserved list includes U.K. instead of GB and does EU as the necessary support for the EUR 4217 reservation. So, this list exists. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. And Emily, it was a question here, or a comment from Harold Arka (ph) about 8-7 (ph), that we might read. I think it would be important to answer this question because it seems that what is raised, and this is to is the possible innovation of the Work Track 5. Okay. Yes, noted, thank you.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Harold. This is Emily again from staff. So, just to go back and sort of get to the root of this question, so it's sort of been a hotly debated topic within the Work Track for some time, whether this is within scope for Work Track 5 or whether it's not. So, this is just asking for community input on that issue. And yes, of course, any comments that come in will be considered by the Work Track and will help to scope out if any additional work is needed there. Okay, and Justine says also she's seen reference to exceptionally reserved.

And just in informal conversations, we've gotten some additional clarification recently from Jaap since this question was written, that it may be that the formulation is wrong, and that it's not actually that it doesn't exist, but that it doesn't -- the text of the AGB may not appropriately capture formulation of the list. So, we're working on that to try to see exactly where we need to potentially go next and what additional conversations need to happen. So, we'll come back to the group with that shortly.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Emily. It's several persons writing now, so let's wait a little and see what comes up. Can we see anything more? No. Okay, I think we can go on.

Emily Barabas: Okay. So, question E-9 says that -- well, so now we're going on to questions about geographic names requiring government support in the 2012 application -- applicant guidebook. So, these were capital city names, city names, regions, and so forth. So, question E-9 is similar to the previous question about translations in any language, except it's specifically about the terms any application for a string that is a representation in any language of a capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. And again, it's asking for feedback about the translation issue with the same categories, and asking for feedback about which alternative is the best option, and why.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. David McCauley is typing something. Let's see if that has to do with E-9. No, he stopped. Okay.

Emily Barabas: And David caught a typo. Thanks, David. We'll get that corrected. Nick says, regarding E-8, he understands Jaap's point is quite a technical one, and hopefully we can resolve this and remove this line. Yes, and I think that that's likely the case, so thanks, Nick. Okay. If there are no additional comments on E-9, E-10, and we're almost through the -- this is about the support or non-objection requirement for an application for a city name or the applicant declares that it intends to use the -- sorry, this is just running through the exact text in the 2012 applicant guidebook for city names, and then asks, "Do you think that this requirement should be kept, eliminated, or modified in subsequent procedures? Please explain."

So, actually, if we do decide as a group to remove the recommendation regarding city names, there's actually already a question in here that basically gets to the question of what should happen in subsequent procedures for non-capital city names. I had forgotten that we did have a

question in there. So, this is sort of the call for community input about non-capital city names. Are there any suggestions or questions about this, modifications? And again, here we can cite the page number of the deliberation section that puts forward the different proposals that Work Track members have raised.

Annebeth Lange: Doesn't seem to be anything from anyone, so--.

Emily Barabas: --Okay. E-11, so this is about the proposals that Work Track members have put forward in the future -- around the future treatment of non-capital city names. Oh, we already put this in. Sorry. It's been a little while since I read through these questions. What is your view of these proposals? Are there any that you support the Work Track considering further? Do you have alternate proposals you'd like the Work Track to consider? Please explain." So, this -- the different proposals about non-capital city names and asks for feedback about those proposals. And Marita says, "Looks like this gives everybody a chance for input. Right.

Okay. So, the final section of questions is about additional categories of terms. So that includes what we're calling non-AGB terms. And think there are also any other items that are not included in the applicant guidebook, such as geographical indication. So, in the 2012 rounds, this is question E-12, the applicant guidebook listed categories with terms that were considered geographic names that had specific rules. And then just briefly highlights that there are different perspectives on what should happen with those terms in the future.

And then it says, "Work track members who support including additional terms in the applicant guidebook have proposed protecting or restricting the following categories: geographic features, such as rivers, mountains, and other features; names of additional sub-national and regional places not included in the 2012 applicant guidebook; non-(inaudible) geographic terms not included in the 2012 applicant guidebook; any term that can be considered geographic in nature; geographical indications." It also mentions that the issue of ISO currency codes, but also notes that some Work Track members leave us without a scope, and then asks should additional types of strings have special treatment or rules in the applicant guidebook? If so, which ones and on what basis? Can the scope of this category be effectively established and limited? What are the boundaries of the category? If not, why, as opposed to preventative restrictions, would any changes to objections post-delegation mechanisms for contractual provisions mitigate concerns related to these strengths? So, these are some of the questions that the group has considered and debated internally, and it's just asking for broader community input on those questions. I'll pause there.

Annebeth Lange: Any comments here? Javier?

Javier Rojas: Yes, Javier Rojas for the record. I wonder if in this section, maybe it's somewhere else, but is this anywhere in the initial report that reflects the notion that the work is not blind to developments like board resolutions,

like in the (inaudible), et cetera, that are relevant to (inaudible) terms?
Any comment on that from other colleagues or members or staff?

Annebeth Lange: Does anyone have a comment to that? Or think about it. And Christopher, you raised your hand. You can go on.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Annebeth. Christopher Wilkinson. On Javier's last point, there should be a reference, but it should be clear that this is exceptional and not a precedent, and so the more (ph) are not yet agreed how it would be implemented. So, I agree that we need to pay a lot of attention to what is going on outside WT5, but not necessarily regarded as external. It isn't a making (ph).

On geographical indications, I need to re-read what you -- what flashed by the screen earlier this evening in the executive summary and see that that is in line. On currency codes, as I said earlier, I thank you for noting that the issue exists. I would add the ISO 4217 currency codes. If you want to look up your currency codes in Google, it's helpful to use that local code, 4217. It's just a number like 3166, but it's important.

And as I said in the chat, those who feel that this or that issue is out of scope for WT5, including the staff and the co-chairs, must indicate where it is in scope. On currency codes, for example, I know it's sufficiently important, but we will finish up, protecting those coats of -- it's a given. It's a technical, financial, political given.

So, I'm out (ph), but I don't mind if WT5 doesn't deal with it, but it's WT2 has already finished its works, and it has to find a home somewhere. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Christopher. Marita?

Marita Moll: Marita Moll for the record. I think Javier raises a really interesting point. Do we pretend all of this didn't happen? Or with Amazon, or do we recognize it? Do we make any kind of comment on it? Should we say, as Christopher says, that this should not be used as a precedent. Maybe that should be reflected in report somewhere, so I'm hearing this interesting point, and I think we should think about this. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: A non-AGB terms that we have been discussing, when something like this happens with Amazon, which has been an issue for so many years, since 2012, we can't just ignore it. We have to make some comment through some way or other. Any comments from others here? Nothing more. Well then, we have gone through all the questions, so I would ask you to think carefully if there is some questions that we should have put into the report and haven't. So, we still have time to do that, but -- and as Jean writes, "Work Track 2 might not existing in its former form, but there is still a long way to go, including developing recommendations." Absolutely, Jean. I agree. So, even if it was not put into our (inaudible) in the reserved names discussion so far, it may absolutely be possible to put it in now.

Javier is typing. Okay, great call. Good. We still have a few moments left. Do you want us to go through all the other comments in boxes from the beginning? Or would it be better to wait with the rest till next fall? I don't think we will get through them, so perhaps we should just give the boxes to sort until the next call and do them there. Yes, Cheryl says best to hold them till next call.

Okay. Are there any other business? Anything anyone wants to bring up? Marita will go after breakfast. I agree, absolutely. Okay. I think we'll then just finish the call, and you get some 10 minutes, or 7 minutes-plus this morning. That could be good (inaudible). So, everyone have a nice day or evening or wherever you are, and we will send things out, and then we'll continue our discussions. And hopefully, we will get everything in place and get the initial report out in time.

Thank you, everyone, from -- for all your comments. Talk to you later.

Marita Moll: Thank you. Have a nice day.

Annebeth Lange: Bye-bye.