ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 10 April 2019 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://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2019/audio/audio-subpro-worktrack5-10apr19-en.mp3.mp3 [gnso.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p6riswmn8ac/**
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/cBVIBg

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

Julie Bisland: Thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub-Team Track 5 Geographic Names at the Top Level call on Wednesday, the 10th of April, 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect Room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now? And I have (inaudible), Vernatius, and (inaudible) already noted. Anyone else?

All right. Well, hearing no other names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

With this, I will turn it back over to Annebeth Lange. You can begin, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Julie. Thank you very much. And this is Annebeth Lange, from Norway, speaking here in a beautiful spring morning. Welcome to this call where we are trying to review all of the comments received about the Supplemental Report on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Work Track 5 on Geographic Names.

Thanks to the staff for the job they have done. And this is a really huge document and it's difficult to guide you through, but we will try the best and hope that you can manage to follow me.

Let's go to the document. I'll just remind you that we are starting on Section e.5. It's number 75, and then we will go to Line 90, where we're trying to start today.

I just want to remind you of the color codes that the staff so great have put together here. Different sections. You can see on the lower part where we have the Questions for Community Input in the bottom of the document. That is what we are talking about now. And the color codes: it's green when it's agreement, when we hope it's agreement; and when it's some concerns, so some warning, it's yellow or orange; disagreement/divergence is red; and new ideas, which is blue. And when it's no color at all, it's different comments and different input on the section.

So, we – remember now also that what we are trying to do is not to start a new discussion on the questions that we have posed. We're trying to review all the comments received and see if they have been properly represented by staff in this summary. Not opening discussions. We are not reviewing all the items for discussion again. So, if you can remember that when we go through, that would be great.

Just a moment. My document just disappeared. I'm sorry. I'm using my husband's screen. It's not my usual one. So, there's (inaudible) for me.

Well, let's start on Line 90. We start with comments from Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. They write (inaudible) in red. "Geographic names or any other domain names with geographical relevance are not protectable under international law unless they fit into a legal category of protection."

They have some concerns. "Also, it is important to note that geographical names shall not be confused by the geographical indication (inaudible) the definition set by the WTO TRIPS agreement. Paragraph 22 of this agreement states that 'geographical indications are, for the purposes of this agreement, indications which identify a good as originating in the territory of a Member, or a region or a locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin.' So, to consider expanding the list of protected names based on simple (inaudible) would eventually create uncertainty and confusion in the domain name space due to the lack of (inaudible) rights applicable to them."

And they have some divergence here. "We do not envision it to be feasible for national law and policies to serve as the basis for the development of policies regarding geographic names, as countries cannot dictate the enforcement of their national laws, particularly with respect to their own protected (inaudible). Permitting the assertion of such rights will complicate the global and transnational nature of ICANN (inaudible)."

"Also note (inaudible) it is rather inaccurate to state that the use of geographical names by a non-governmental (inaudible) would be wrong. With regard to this point, we should bear in mind the importance of allowing non-governmental parties to decide to register a certain name and trust that this will be done, (a), in the (inaudible), and, (b), through the possibility that the geo name can have more than one meaning. Therefore, the NCSG believes that while (inaudible) ICANN's compromise of respecting relevant principles of both international and applicable local law is important, the input provided by the entire community is also relevant. By that, we mean that despite the need to respect applicable local law, (inaudible) geo names are not binding (inaudible) they are only to be considered at a local level."

Are there any comments before I continue? I see no hands.

Okay. Let's go to Line 91. It is coming from RDS-HN, from Honduras. They support. "An agreement though unclear what their present (inaudible) is." That is the comment from staff. So, are there anyone from Honduras here?

No? No hands. No comments.

Okay. Let's go to 92. That is the input from the GAC, and they actually just remind us on the previous GAC advice relevant to this question from the principles regarding new gTLDs from 2007.

The next comment is from Tom Dale, 93. "This depends on what the policy objectives are for the new gTLD program, in general, and geo names, in particular. Is it to enable some GNSO members to make more money than they otherwise would and for ICANN to benefit from that? Is it to encourage innovation with associated consumers, technical, commercial, and other benefits? Is it to encourage decision making under the subsidiary principles?" He has (inaudible) in this comment as an individual.

Before we go to Section e.6, are there any comments? Any hands? Any comments in the chat? I don't see anything.

So, let's go to Section e.6. Now we're going to talk about the language questions, which is (inaudible). "In the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, a string was considered unavailable if it was a translation in any language of the following categories of country and territory names: long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard; short-form name listed in the same; separable component of a country name designated on the 'Separable Country List'.

"In developing recommendations for future treatment of country and territory names, Work Track 5 has considered several alternatives related to translation: continue to reserve as unavailable translations in any

language; reserve as unavailable translations in U.N. languages; reserve as unavailable translations in U.N. languages and the official languages of the country; reserve as unavailable translations in official languages of the country; reserve as unavailable translations in official and commonly used languages; reserve as unavailable translations in official and relevant national, regional, and community languages; reserve as unavailable translations in 'principal languages' where the principal languages are the official or de facto national languages and the statutory or de facto provincial languages of that country; a combination of two or more categories above.

"In your view, which alternative is the best option? Please explain. Do you have suggestions for alternatives not included in the list above? Please see deliberations section f.2.2.1.2 on pages 46-48 for context on this question."

So, then we have some input from AT TLD. "Translations from separable components should be unavailable." As to more nuanced recommendations, AT TLD believes that (inaudible) country names designated on the Separable Country Names List should be made unavailable. So should their translations to different languages and separable components of such names." (inaudible) for their input, but in principle they support all languages.

From dotBERLIN GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg Top Level Domain GmbH and geo TLD Group. Also support all languages. Continue to reserve as unavailable.

RDS-HN, Honduras again. All languages. (inaudible)

Next is DOTZON GmbH. All languages.

And the ALAC. All languages. And they have some comments here. "In multilingual countries, there is usually no formal hierarchy of languages. Language (inaudible) of the same geographic names. Thus, all versions of the names (inaudible) local language (inaudible) would have to be (inaudible). In many cases, there will be no basis in local law or (inaudible) any priority to any one language version of a particular name and (inaudible) such limitation would become the (inaudible). Therefore, the ALAC (inaudible) that ICANN should continue to reserve as unavailable all (inaudible)."

Next comment. The comment comes from government of Spain; Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, SFIIP; Icelandic Ministry for Foreign Affairs; the German GAC; Origin I.M.; European Broadcasting Union; government of France; Association of European Regions for Origin Products; Republic of Peru. They have concerns. So, they are writing that, "No evidence of issue (inaudible) official and relevant national, regional, and community languages. No such (inaudible) is contained in

the report that would support the need to reduce the number of languages. If any limitation is made, it should (inaudible) protection to all official and relevant national, regional, and community languages."

Next comment is from Uninett Norid. Their comment is that "all languages should be reserved and, otherwise, U.N. and official languages. (inaudible), our suggestion is to (inaudible) translation in the U.N. languages and the official language of the country (inaudible) in the ISO 3166 standard should remain (inaudible). In this way, we (inaudible). In addition, there should be in place a curative process (inaudible) for commonly used languages in the country in question." So, we have a new idea, some concerns here.

Next one is from ccNSO, the Country Codes Names Supporting Organization. They support all languages and, otherwise, official languages. It's about the same comment as the last one I read. A new idea is, "In addition there should be in place a follow-up process such as an objection procedure for commonly used languages in the country in question." And they are concerned that – they are writing here is that, "(inaudible) possible issues from the 2012 round have been produced and/or shared with the community. And there is no evidence of this issue that is as big a problem in the last round."

Next comment is from CENTR and AFNIC. As far as I can see, it's about the same input as from ccNSO. So, I won't read that. It's the same.

Next is from the Portuguese government. They have some concerns. "No evidence of issue. No factual explanation is contained in the report that would support the need to reduce the number of languages." So, they would like to reserve all languages in the future (inaudible).

And we have the Registry Stakeholder Group, where we start to have some other comments. They have concerns. As explained in the overarching comment they have, "The RSG supports making the following unavailable: long-form name listed in ISO 3166-1 standard; short-form names listed in the same list, except for (inaudible). Some members point out that current restrictions are not based on international law. And so, further extending the reach to translations (inaudible) languages is overly broad. Albeit, some members believe that the scope of (inaudible) is too broad and impractical and that language restrictions should only be limited to the official language of the country. Whereas some other (inaudible) of these names are unavailable (inaudible) translation to U.N. languages and the official languages of the country. And other members support continuing to reserve as unavailable (inaudible) in any language (inaudible) compromise from the 2012 (inaudible) worked well." So, this shows that there are divergences in this group, as well, as (inaudible) in other groups.

Seeing no hands, we are now at Line 106. And the comment is from governments of Argentina, Chile, and Colombia (inaudible).

Martin Sutton: Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: Martin, did you have a comment? Yes? It's a comment from Justine Chew here.

Martin Sutton: Yes. So, I'll give you a break and just (inaudible).

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Yes, good. If you can read that, that would be great. I can take some tea.

Martin Sutton: So, Justine has just commented here "the need to highlight some of the comments, such as the one saying they report some problems for the 2012 round, but I have mixed feelings about them being marked as concerns because they can be read more as justification for their positions (inaudible), given the existing four-color code categorization."

So, I think it's probably important just to point out that because this set of comments was in response to questions rather than proposals, it's sometimes hard to put the color coding aspects in a most efficient manner, I suppose. So, we've done as best as we can to pull out the salient comments for each one. So, I think it's useful still to highlight some of these.

The other point, I suppose, is that we had some good conversations in ICANN 64 on the topic of languages, as well, and that would be good to incorporate when we come to talk about the substance of these comments at a later stage. Thanks, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Martin. I agree that what the staff has done here is to try to extract from the comments here (inaudible). And of course there are always some kind of interpretation involved, but this is the best we can do to try to see where there are some divergence that we want to point out and where there are clear agreement, etc. Well, we have to take it a little (inaudible), but this is the best that we could do, as Martin said.

So, let's keep on. We are coming to the governments of Argentina, Chile, and Colombia (inaudible). And they (inaudible) support (inaudible) all official and relevant national, regional, and community languages.

Next is the Business Constituency. The alternative favored by the BC is "reserve as unavailable translations to official and commonly used languages."

Next comment is from United States, which goes for "U.N. and official languages."

Brand Registry Group. Concerns. "To the extent that any restrictions are continued where geographic terms are reserved, requiring (inaudible) non-objections, the BRG believes the existing language (inaudible) and impractical." They would "favor significantly reducing the language restrictions applied to the geographic terms listed in Question e.6 to the extent that this only covered the official language of the country."

The Registrar Stakeholder Group. Official languages, as well. That's their preference.

The next comment is from the Intellectual Property Constituency, IPC. "Since the compromise was established for the 2012 round which sought to address the concerns of some governments to protect against the use of their country names, the IPC supports the (inaudible) accept matches of the long- and short-form names listed in the ISO 3166 standard. The IPC would also support reserving as unavailable translations in the official language of the country in question, since this would be in accord with the intention of the (inaudible) that countries use to describe themselves."

Concerns are that, "The IPC is of the view that reserving translations of long- and short-form country and territory names in all languages does not accord with the intention of protecting the names such countries use to describe themselves. In view of this (inaudible) the new gTLD program increases the likelihood of conflicts between (inaudible) country names and the other potential (inaudible) which has no connection with the country in question. Further, (inaudible) translations in all languages is contrary to Principle C from the 2007 GNSO recommendation."

Next one is the International Trademark Association. So, also goes for official languages. With respect to the specific categories of names, if they are to continue to be reserved, "They recognize (inaudible) of the official language of the country only. This strikes an appropriate level of balance of protecting (inaudible) associated countries."

The Group of Registries: Uniregistry, Minds and Machines, Top Level Design, Amazon Registry Services, Employ Media LLC. They have concerns that (inaudible) under current restrictions are not based in international law. And so, further extending to the reach of translations in other languages is overly broad." (inaudible) official languages.

The NCSG, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. They have a divergence and say that they do not agree with (inaudible) translations in other languages. "This policy (inaudible) in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook leads to the expansion of (inaudible) and to an arbitrary restriction of consumers' freedom of choice." (inaudible)

So, then we have gone through this question of languages for country and territory names. (inaudible) we have gone through. We are on 114, Line 114. Any hands before we go to the next session?

I see none. Okay. The next section here is e.7. "Some Work Track members have expressed that there should be a process in place to delegate 3-letter codes and/or other country and territory names to specific parties, such as relevant governments and public authorities or other entities. Do you believe that this is an issue on which Work Track 5 should make a recommendation? Please see deliberations section f.2.2.1.1 on pages 45-46 for context on this question."

The first comment is from Brand Registry Group. They agree. They believe that Work Track 5 should be able to develop policy. Willing to support (inaudible) ISO 3166-1. "Three-character strings may have a variety of (inaudible) purposes beyond simple (inaudible). The BRG believes that these strings should be available for delegation to different parties and not exclusive to country and territory codes. Accordingly, three-character strings should be delegated (inaudible) the new gTLD concept under GNSO policy. Governments should not have the freedom to arbitrarily (inaudible) applications on the basis that they match an existing country code."

I would like to comment a little on this before we go on. When we discussed this question, it was a suggestion from some – I think it was on the meeting in San Juan; you have to correct me, Martin, if I don't have (inaudible). But the discussion there, if I remember it correctly, was that should there be some middle category? Because a lot of members or stakeholders here think that they should be delegated, but not as a gTLD and not as a ccTLD. It's something in between. And what we discussed in San Juan was that should it be a process that we should discuss some other way to do it? And that, the discussion there was, is this possible for Work Track 5 to do that, at all?

As it is today, it is in the GNSO process, but should it be something else? Could you comment on that, Martin, if this is a right way to see it?

Martin? Are you there?

Martin Sutton: Annebeth, (inaudible) the way the question was – yes. Can you hear me?

Annebeth Lange: Yes. It's a little low. Can you try to speak a little louder? It's a little difficult to hear you.

Martin Sutton: Yes, sure. So, yes, I do recall the conversations. But the way the question was presented for comments was more about can Work Track 5, which is obviously part of the GNSO policy process, consider something to do with the three-character country codes. So, in that respect, that's what responses were (inaudible), and that's certainly how the Brand Registry Group reviewed and commented on that particular point. So, that's why it does mention in this particular comment that it sees it under a GNSO policy aspect, with the explanation that you've just read out.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Thank you, Martin.

Martin Sutton: I think you'll find that that's how it's been interpreted by everybody else.

Annebeth Lange: Now, the reason why I raised it is that the way I read the comments through this section, it seems like it's some unclarity of how they have interpreted the question. So, we have to take this a little – we have to look into it.

Okay? I see that Christopher Wilkinson has a question here regarding alpha-three codes. "We still have no resolution as to Article 4217." I can't answer that, Christopher, but we have it in the chat.

Okay. Let's go on. The Business Constituency. Agreement. Does not object to Work Track 5 working on this. "If it believes that it can achieve consensus recommendation on this item, then by all means go ahead."

Then ALAC. Agreement, with a new idea. ALAC (inaudible) this is an issue on which Work Track 5 should make a recommendation and adds a follow-on. "We strongly recommend that ICANN have in place a procedure to prequalify applicants for any ISO 3166-1 alpha-three code prior to launch of the next application window round."

Any hands? Any questions? No?

United States. (inaudible) "The United States believes that the process for delegating three-letter codes and/or country and territory names to specific (inaudible) is not needed and that three-letter codes should be available." I'm not sure that is a agreement (inaudible). Okay.

And NCSG. Agreement. They believe that "three-letter country codes should be delegated upon request as per the gTLD process and go through the normal objection procedure (inaudible)." (inaudible) two-letter codes can be used for the purpose of countries, territories in the form of ccTLDs. Furthermore, many of the regional TLDs (inaudible) three-letter codes, including several in the first round, (inaudible). To change the rules at this point would be inconsistent with policy and (inaudible). The NCSG position is that the Work Track 5 should not issue a recommendation on this issue, but rather allow existing policy to stand."

Just one comment from me here. Actually, it was – it's meant that it should be the three-letter codes on the ISO list. (inaudible). So, of course the three-letter codes not on the ISO list is free anyway.

Next comment, from Group of Registries: Uniregistry, Minds and Machines Group, Top Level Design, Amazon Registry Services, Employ Media LLC. It's a little difficult to see. Oppose comments. They go back to the comments on Recommendation 3. "The Group of Registries does not

support reserving three-letter codes, whether assigned or for use only by specific (inaudible) such as governments and public authorities."

Okay. Next one is a long one. And this is the RySG. Supports in their comment that they in different parts of this document. And Martin, could you do me the favor to read that? I have to have some water.

Martin?

Martin Sutton: Hi, Annebeth. I was just typing in the chat.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I saw your comment.

Martin Sutton: Which line are you on?

Annebeth Lange: The Registry Stakeholder Group. It's 122, Line 122.

Martin Sutton: Got it. Yes. So, they support – "With regards to three-letter codes, Registry Stakeholder Group members have opposed as stated in the 3.0.1.5.3 and 2.0.1.7.4 Registry Stakeholder Group comments."

I don't think we need to read all of this out, but they're basically reiterating the previous position. "There's no basis for country code operators to claim sovereignty or ownership rights over three-character codes. Using three characters or more for gTLDs and reserving two-character TLDs for ccTLDs is consistent with current practice at the Domain Names System." So, I think – "there exist several three-character gTLDs which while there are no examples of three-character strings that are used as a ccTLD and reserving three-character strings to be used by governments, public authorities, and other entities risks creating confusion. Restrictions on the use of particular three-character strings for gTLDs should be allowed only for a limited number of cases where international law or other agreed-upon restrictions dictate the exception."

I'm just trying to pick out the main points. Members can read through the rest of the text, but the highlights are the main points here. "However, some members believe a new solution for the three-character codes should be sought in close cooperation with the GAC."

Okay.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you.

Martin Sutton: And I note there were some comments in the chat, from Susan, just to clarify some of the comments categorization. So, "U.S. and NCSG are not perhaps 'agreement' exactly. They are supporting being available to apply being allocated to a specific party." Okay.

Thanks, Steve, for updating that, as well. Okay.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. I'll go on to 123, Line 123, from...

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thanks, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Thank you, Martin. The RDS-HN, from Honduras. Agreement, although with some – "doesn't seem directly related." That is the comment from the staff. (inaudible).

124, they have a divergence. This is from ccNSO. "The suggestion from some Work Track members to start the process to delegate three-letter codes and/or country and territory names (inaudible), which require a specific policy. It is unclear to us who should develop such a policy. We suggest setting up a process to study the various options to this (inaudible) new gTLD policy for the next round (inaudible)." So, their comment is that Work Track 5 should not make recommendations to delegate (inaudible) ISO 3166 codes (inaudible).

It seems like the same comment is from dotBERLIN GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg Top-Level-Domain GmbH, geo TLD Group. They "support a separate (inaudible) in the future to be able to delegate three-letter strings and/or other country and territory names to specific parties. But they strongly recommend not to tie this to the ongoing (inaudible) outcome of future PDPs."

CENTR and AFNIC. New idea and some divergence. Separate process, not Work Track 5. "This seems like it doesn't belong in Work Track 5 or in a new gTLD process, at all. The only recommendation that could be made is to suggest a change in the bylaws to establish a new category for these strings. They are not ccTLDs, as they are more than two letters, but they should not be gTLDs either, as they have a strong connection with countries. (inaudible) there should be another policy (inaudible) similarly to ccTLDs. A process (inaudible) possibilities here should be left for a later stage, after the new gTLD (inaudible) for the next round has been finished." So, Work Track 5 should not make recommendations to delegate (inaudible) ISO 3166 codes.

Next one is Uninett Norid. It's about the same comment here (inaudible).

Next one is DOTZON GmbH. Divergence. Separate process, not Work Track 5. It should be independent from the ongoing PDP.

Next one is Portuguese government, in Line 129. "Maintaining restrictions, in line with the GAC principles of the new gTLDs from 2007. The current restrictions on (inaudible) three-letter codes and country and territory names (inaudible) on the Applicant Guidebook 2012 should be maintained. The Work Track 5 should not make recommendations.

Next one is the government of Spain; Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, SFIIP; Icelandic Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the German GAC; Origin I.M.; European Broadcasting Union; government of France; Association of European Regions for Origin Products; Republic of Peru. They refer to their general comments (inaudible) and then the exclusion and there is divergence. "Support for (inaudible) existing 2012 rules (inaudible) opposition to this question. The exclusion of country names (inaudible), as such names are not generic TLDs and should be under the public authority under respective national community in analogy of the ccTLDs."

Next is the government of Argentina, Chile, and Colombia (inaudible). Divergence (inaudible). "Restrictions to delegate three-letter codes and/or other country and territory names to specific parties should remain and Work Track 5 should not make recommendations (inaudible)."

Then we come to IPC, seeing no hands. They're position is, "The IPC does not support (inaudible) to delegate three-letter codes and/or other country and territory names to (inaudible), such as governments. Offering such names to specific parties such as relevant governments and public authorities or other entities would appear to treat them as akin to ccTLDs. Although Work Track 5 has (inaudible), it would surely be outside the scope of GNSO policy development process to create new forms of ccTLDs. Making recommendations to delegate formerly reserved geographic names to specific entities (inaudible) goes beyond the scope of (inaudible)."

We also have a comment in red at the bottom of their comment. "(inaudible) from the preliminary recommendations, the IPC does not support any restrictions on the use of three-letter codes as gTLDs (inaudible), subject of course to any (inaudible) designed to protect against the infringement of legal rights and the avoidance of string confusion."

134 is the International Trademark Association. Divergence. They "strongly oppose this recommendation as it creates (inaudible) applicants and is contrary to established international and national trademark laws. INTA views this proposal as another example of preventative creep resulting from (inaudible) to an unrealized problem. Any such disputes that may arise are properly addressed through the curative measures already established in the original (inaudible). See also our comment on Preliminary Recommendation 3." So, Work Track 5 should not make recommendations, though they do not support restrictions on the use of three-letter codes as gTLDs.

Then we have the GAC. They refer to (inaudible). And then the GAC (inaudible) June 2016. "The GAC advises the ICANN Board to" – I'll just read the highlighted text – "(inaudible) discussions involving the GAC and (inaudible) in the future."

	The last in this section is the comment from (inaudible). They have concerns about (inaudible). "First of all, we would like to stress that (inaudible) should be used under the authorities of each country, like ccTLDs."
	So, this is (inaudible) section. Any questions? Any hands? You're awfully silent this time. (inaudible)
Martin Sutton:	This is Martin here. We have a comment from Justine, just to look back on (inaudible), just to see if the summary should be tweaked.
Annebeth Lange:	Good.
Martin Sutton:	So, we'll have a look at that, Justine. Thanks for that.
Annebeth Lange:	Yes. That's good. Perhaps you should read it, Martin, since there's people here just on audio. Would you do that?
Martin Sutton:	Yes. So, let me just see which one 130 relates to. So, on Line 130, this is government of Spain, Swiss, Icelandic – so, there's a group of them. Just now somebody is moving the comment. So, "Line 130, I wonder if the summary should be, 'Work Track 5 should not make recommendations to delegate three-letter codes, though they believe that the use of three' – sorry, it's going across – 'three-letter codes should be akin to ccTLDs' or something along these lines." So, I think we'll have a look at that.
Annebeth Lange:	Yes. I notice there's some comments on...
Martin Sutton:	(inaudible) has also put in a comment for Line 135, for the GAC, and to have the text, "Work Track 5 should not make recommendations to delegate three-letter codes." And I think somebody else has come in, as well. Hang on.
	And Susan is just suggesting one characterization for IPC. "It does not say that the codes should not be delegated; it says they should not be allocated to specific parties. And the same applies to the INTA comment." Let's just...
Annebeth Lange:	That's useful comment, Susan. So, I am sure that the staff will look at that. Steve is typing now. And that is actually the meaning of this discussion, as well, that we have got your comment in the right way. So, it's really good to see that if there is something wrong, that you comment on it so we can get it right. Thanks.
	So, then we have another section here about the languages, and this is the language used for the capital city names. And it's actually the same discussion that we had for the country and territory names that we discussed some moments ago. It's the same suggestions for languages

and the different alternatives. So, I don't read that text, but when we come to the comments we are discussing the way the capital city names should be reserved, if at all, and in which languages that should be.

The dotBERLIN GmbH & Co. KG and Hamburg Top-Level-Domain GmbH and geo TLD Group, their meaning is all languages. They support the existing language. "Recommend keeping an application for any string that is a representation and in which the capital city name of any country or territory listed in 3166. Of course the geographic meaning applies (inaudible) in the U.N., official, or national language.

Then we have the RDS-HN, from Honduras. Agreement. It's not easy to see what they agree on. (inaudible) is being interpreted as all languages.

Next is the DOTZON GmbH. All languages (inaudible).

ALAC. All languages.

Then we come to the government of Spain; Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, SFIIP; Icelandic Ministry of Foreign Affairs; German GAC; Origin I.M.; European Broadcasting Union; government of France; Association of European Regions for Origin Products; and Republic of Peru. And their comment is, "No evidence of issue. In fact, there is an issue (inaudible) official and relevant national, regional, and community languages. No factual explanation is contained in the report that would support the need to reduce the number of languages." But if this – any limitation is made, "It should (inaudible) to all official and relevant national, regional, and community languages." But their preference is all languages.

Next one is the Portuguese government. All languages. Otherwise, official, relevant, national, regional, and community languages. (inaudible) reserve as unavailable translations in official and commonly used languages only.

Government of Argentina, Chile, and Colombia (inaudible). Official and relevant national, regional, and community languages.

Then we come to IPC, the Intellectual Property Constituency. They have concerns. They believe – "The IPC does not object to requiring a letter of support or non-objection. (inaudible) relevant government or public authorities for an application for anything that is an exact match or translation official languages for the country (inaudible) capital city names." However, they would support introducing the same intended-use requirement for capital city names that is in place for non-capital city names. This is a little outside what we're discussing now, but it's an important input anyway. And the IPC believes that "requiring a letter of support or non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities for exact matches or translations of the capital city names

(inaudible) the stability of the new gTLD program. Rather, (inaudible) expands the scope for future conflicts, would have a chilling effect on applications, and cannot be justified as protecting the names of these cities used to describe themselves."

(inaudible)

Martin Sutton: Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: Sorry?

Amrtin Sutton: Annebeth? Hi, it's Martin. Sorry. I put my hand up, but you may not have seen it.

Annebeth Lange: Sorry. Go ahead, Martin.

Martin Sutton: There's been a number of comments from Susan and Katrin about the categorization, where we've got "agreement" for some of these, which doesn't really make sense when we've got a list of options in the question.

I kind of think that we probably just need to tidy that up whereby, for instance, in the first line, 138, we've just got bold in black and the key points of "support existing language." And that's how we've interpreted, say, Honduras. But in there we've highlighted it in green "support" and posted in the adjacent column "agreement." And that's probably not agreement because it's not specified what it's agreeing to, but we've interpreted it as all languages. So, it's a continuation.

So, I think we just need to be consistent in the way that we apply that through this list of comments. So, perhaps we just bold "in support," but take out "agree" – oh, thanks; so, I think Steve is doing that as we're speaking – and just rely on the fact that we've got it captured as "all languages" and to be used.

So, we'll go through those. It's just that there was a number of comments appearing. And rather than just trying to keep tapping away in the chat, I just wanted to clarify that on the call. Thanks, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Martin. Yes, I agree. And I see the comments here. And I think you are right, that when they have written "agreement," it's that they continue with what we have today, with all languages. But this should be much more clear. But all these comments in the chat, Steve and staff will go through it and then we'll try to correct the document.

I see that we have only three minutes left here. So, I think we should wrap up here. And if there is any other business? Are there any more questions here?

Something from the staff? Steve, you have something to add before we wrap up here?

"No, thank you." Thanks, Steve.

Okay. I think that's – instead of going through more comments now, we stopped with Line 146, and take up (inaudible) next time about the languages question for capitals.

So, thank you. And if you have any more comments on this, please let us know when you have read it and the staff will try to correct and use your comments here in the chat to make it better. Thanks, all. And have a wonderful day or evening or morning or whatever is in front of you. Bye, bye.

Julie Bisland: Thank you, Annebeth. And to everyone else, thank you. Today's meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines. And Ashley, please stop the recording. Thank you.