

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the
top-level)**

Wednesday, 27 March 2019 at 14:00 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-sub-pro-track5-geo-names-top-level-27mar19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p9ndr8521ca/>

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/VYs2Bg>

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

Operator: Recording has started.

Terri: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. And welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5, Geographic Names at Top Levels, taking place on the 27th of March, 2019. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call, as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine Dorrain.

Terri: Thank you, Kristine. Hearing no one further, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription and recording purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to Javier Rua. Please begin.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all. Yes, this is Javier Rua-Jovet. I'm going to be the chair at this call today. I'm joined by co-leads Annebeth Lange and Martin Sutton. And we also have overall PDP Chair, Cheryl Langdon-Orr on the line. So welcome to all. This is the first call after Kobe. I couldn't make it to Kobe. I missed you all. I couldn't go because of work

commitments. I was substituted in a great way by Ms. Justine Chew. So it was great.

So today we're going to continue looking at the document. Let's start with the agenda. So welcome to all. The agenda is there in the screen. We're going to continue reviewing the comments, specifically the questions for community input part. And in the end, we are going to check for any other business. Any objections to this agenda?

Hearing none, I see that Jeff is here as well, PDP Chair. So welcome. So if no other comments right now, if we can get the document on the screen. We will read up on these questions and of course listen to your comments there. So I have to like expand this, so maybe I won't see the Adobe Connect all the time when I expand this in order to be able to read it. So please, if any questions can be flagged by co-leads and stop me in my tracks any time if I'm speaking too low or too fast, which is something that I tend to do.

So starting with the first question here, I could read it as a whole or we could just jump into comments. Does anybody object that I read the question as a whole? Because there's a lot of text and many questions. So any objections that I read it as a whole or would we rather jump into discussions of the topics? Any comments on this by the co-leads?

Should we just read it?

Martin Sutton: Hi, Javier. This is Martin. Sorry, you might not see the Adobe Connect. So I think it might be worth a refresher just to read through the questions to put it into context as to what we're doing. And as a reminder, we've gone through some of the general comments. We've gone through comments from the preliminary recommendations in (inaudible). We also entertained discussions around the languages, which will come onto at a later stage. But these are to help us to see whether there are any adjustments that will be needed to the preliminary recommendations that were put forward. So we're looking at these with that in mind, and just trying to assess whether we've captured the essence of the comments correctly. So if anybody has got any particular points to raise in that context, please do so as we go through the document. Thanks, Javier.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Very good. Thank you. So first we have a general comment. Thank you for that background, Martin. So the first general comment on the above, on the green text here, it has to do with positive or negative experiences, including lessons learned and areas for improvement in subsequent procedures. Please see deliberations f.1.2.5 on pages 36 to 41 for context.

So the general comment, this one goes, quote, "The rules applicable to geo names as TLDs in the 2012 applicant guidebook worked general well and struck and appropriate balance between the different interests at stake. Therefore, they should be maintained, subject to the comments below. The exclusion of country names and variations thereof is consistent with the fact that such names are not

'generic' TLDs, and should be under the policy authority of the respective national communities in analogy to ccTLDs (ph)."

Martin Sutton: Sorry.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Sorry, go ahead.

Martin Sutton: Sorry to interrupt. It's Martin again. So what I mentioned earlier was I think -- do you just want to go through the question as a reminder, which is in the green box. What we've got in the Google doc is in column D. We've got a sort of summary of what the full text relates to. So we might, I think for speed, it might be helpful to read the summary, just check if anybody's got any alternative comments to raise in respect to how we've interpreted it. And then I think also in column E there's some notes as well that can be used. But as sort of a generalization is in column D for each of the comments. We've obviously got in column C the parties that provided those comments, so where it's repeated by a number of parties that's included. So we can see that as we go through. And just a reminder to everyone that they can click on the link, it's probably easier to see the document outside of the Adobe Connect. I hope that helps, Javier.

Javier Rua-Jovet: That makes sense. We would never finish if I did it this other way. You're right. So in general, the first comment has to do with support for most of the 2012 rules, concerns about non-objection for city names and any extension of provisions. It's comments made by several governments that we can all see there in the Google doc, if anybody has any comment over this. The following comment also is general support for most of the 2012 rules, issues from experience referred to applicants for a term which matched a geographic term and to the applicants who applied for a term who did not match or resemble a geographic term. That was dotBerlin GmbH and others.

Martin Sutton: Javier, we've got a hand from Steve in Adobe Connect. And Jorge's (ph) put some comments in regarding comment one, which he didn't think is a summary -- he just says, I don't think the summary of comment one is okay. The concerns are on the intended use rule and any extension of it. Concerns do not affect the non-objection rule. So perhaps if we go to Steve first of all, and then we'll pick up comments from Jorge.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Yes. Thank you for that. Go ahead, Steve. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Javier. Thanks, Martin. This is Steve Chan from staff. And just as I said in the AC room, just hopefully a couple of comments for some additional context. So in general when we've gone through all of the public comments, the intention is to try to pull out agreement, concerns, new ideas and divergence. So the section we're going through today is questions for community input. And because they're open-ended questions, they're not really conducive to that sort of structure, those four set of labels.

And so when we go through these comments, what you're going to see is text highlighted rather than color-coded by those four categories. What staff has tried to do is highlight the relevant text in the comment that relates to the question at hand. And as you'll have seen already of course and what has been mentioned by Martin and Javier, is that there are some very, very high-level notes and themes attempted to be captured in column E under notes. And then again, as Jorge noted, we got this one a little bit wrong. So we'll correct that in a moment. But the idea indeed is to try to pull out the high level notes and themes in E and then sort the comments accordingly to try to make these -- if you'll look in the AC room, you'll see that the set of comments extends to 43 (ph) pages. So the idea was to try to organize things and make them a little more organized and able to be digested by everyone.

But of course in doing so, high level notes are not the same as the full comments. And of course we'll lose some context in doing so. So that needs to be taken into account. But hopefully that is helpful context, as we review these questions and comments. Thanks.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you, Steve. Yes, and great work by you and the rest of staff on organizing these comments in a very useful way. So noted Jorge's comment again. Thanks for that, and that will be cleared up. So yeah, so we continue these general comments. In the beginning are the next one by dot Zone (ph) GmbH. It's also generally support for most 2012 rules. We continue with a general comment also by Business Constituency. It has to do with dot Amazon and dot Indians, and objections to those processes in the past, a comment there. Any comments so far on these? If co-leads can flag any questions, I can't see that screen right now.

I guess not, so--

Martin Sutton: Javier?

Javier Rua-Jovet: Yeah, go ahead. Go ahead. Martin?

Martin Sutton: Christopher has got his hand up. So Christopher, please go ahead.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Go ahead, Christopher. Christopher, your mic might be off? I see Christopher hit a plus one to Jorge. So I don't know if he wanted to speak on that.

Terri: This is Terri from staff. Christopher, it looks like your mic is activated and it is unmuted on our side. So you may just want to check the mute on your side. Of course, always let us know the (inaudible) --

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello?

Terri: -- on the telephone. Oh, there you are. Welcome.

Javier Rua-Jovet: We can hear you. Go ahead, Christopher. We heard you for--

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello?

Javier Rua-Jovet: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead. We can hear you, Christopher. Go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello?

Javier Rua-Jovet: It seems you can't hear us. Hmm. Christopher, I see you -- Christopher is typing (inaudible). Yes, maybe we can --

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello?

Javier Rua-Jovet: We can hear you, Christopher. Can you hear us? Christopher? Let's -- yes, go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello? Okay. Sorry to create a lot of delay. The document in Adobe killed the Adobe Connect and I had to re-logon. Just in relation to the first comment from CCNSO with which I generally agree, let us be quite clear that CCNSO is addressing those protections of geographic names that were included in 2012 in the AGB. Most of our issues in Work Track 5 related to categories of names, geographical terms and geographical names that were not included in the 2012 AGB, and consequently I think we should not take the CCNSO agreement with the protections in 2012 as an overall position concerning all geographical names in the top level. Thank you.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you, Christopher, for that comment, noted. Any other comments? I see no hands. Let's carry on. So there's a general comment here by the governments of Argentina, Chile, Colombia and (inaudible); it's a general comment on issues from experience. Government ability to file objections in complete scope of protections for geo names is the general comment there. Any comment over this comment? I see no hands.

I expand and un-expand these -- I go to (inaudible). In terms of the next commentary here, it's a comment by Mr. Tom Dale, an individual. He suggests input from the side of ICANN would be helpful. Any comments on this? Seeing none, I see no hands. So I'll continue.

Comment from my community, ALAC, in general geo terms in AGB and not in AGB need more predictability. Any comments over this general comment? Any hands? I see none. We'll keep on flying through.

Next general comment by the nation of the United States. It does not identify experiences. But in general it's a comment that has to do with the United States' view on lack of inherent rights of nations to geo terms and its approach regarding curative measures to deal with conflicts. Any comments by community members, by Work Track 5? I see a hand by Christopher. Christopher, go ahead, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, thank you. I would just say in this context that the United States' position is a bit outlier (ph). It's not the only position sector the United States is an

outlier at the present. And we know from the debates in several ICANN meetings and in the Work Track 5 that the issue is more political than legal. Where it is legal, fair enough. It will be names can be protected. But we are arguing for recognizing the rights of people to priority the use of their own geographical terms. And I think the United States needs to have another think about this, because the practical consequences of their position might be rather far-reaching and very controversial, even in the United States itself. Thank you.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you, Christopher. I see a hand by Martin. Thanks, Martin. Go ahead.

Martin Sutton: Yeah. Thanks, Javier. I think it's worthwhile just to remember what we're trying to do here again. We're not trying to dissect every comment. What we're trying to do is to make sure to read it effectively. And if we've summarized it or pulled out the salient points from that comment, that's what we want to achieve here. So we're not going to dispute whether we agree with it or not, or whether it's an outlier. So let's not get bogged down with that. Let's move on. Make sure that we understand what's being stated. If we need to ask questions and go back to particular commenters, then we can capture that. But the real important job of the work track at this stage is to go through and check that we've captured the comments clearly and accurately.

So as we saw in the first one, we've amended that in terms of trying to make sure that we've captured the summary and captured the essence of that set of comments. So let's please focus on that as we go through. Because that will make sure that we can go through this at a reasonable pace. Thanks, everyone.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you for that, Martin. But I will point out a statement here in the chat by John Rodriguez, just based on the US stance, my comments appreciate the opportunity to share its perspective in the process, comment by the US rep at GAC. Thank you.

Continuing here, we have a general comment by the International Trademark Association that does not identify experiences. That comment that I'll read it. It's short. "While the questions may be applicable to some INTA members, INTA as an association did not apply for nor object to any new gTLD applications. Therefore we no substantive comments to contribute. We'll continue on.

We have a general comment by the Intellectual Property Constituency, IPC. It does not identify experiences. The general comment has to do generally with saying that this question is addressed to "applicants and other shareholders" -- maybe stakeholders. Maybe there's a typo there --who were involved in the 2012 round. I think we can keep on going here, unless anybody has a comment.

We'll continue. There is a general comment by the APTLD. You can see here that it's copied from general comments, although staff notes, we believe this is in reference to a question in the initial report. It has to do with RFC 1591. Any comments over this? Co-leads? Or shall we continue onwards with the next category here?

I see Steve and Martin are typing. I see no hands. Let's see what -- oh, very good. So we shall continue. I see Annebeth also posted a comment. Thank you.

So the next green category here is the definition of the term "geographic name" could impact development of policy and implementation guidance as well as program implementation details, such as guidance for the geographic names panel in the new gTLD application process. In your view, how should the term "geographic name" be defined for the purposes of the new gTLD program? Should there be any special requirements or implications for a term that is considered a "geographic name?" Is a "geographic name" the appropriate term to use in this context as opposed to, for example, "term with geographic meaning?" Why or why not? Please see deliberations sections f.1.2.4 on pages 34-36 for context.

So the first general comment here by the Business Constituency, the summary is, definitions should be recommendations 4 to 13. We then have a comment by the group of registries, Uniregistry, Minds + Machines group, Top Level Design, Amazon Registry Services, Employ Media, LLC.; a statement of support for the 2012 AGB. So I'll pause here, any hands? Any comments? Seeing none -- I see there's a comment by overall Chair Cheryl. The points raised regarding 1591 can be well discussed when this goes to the full working group. It is not so much a new idea as such, but rather an important distinction regarding the delegation and management of a TLD as defined by RCF 1591.

Thank you, Cheryl, for that. And I see Jorge and Steve are typing also in the chat. Let's see what their-- please co-chairs, flag any other important comments as they go. I shall continue here with the document.

So next general comment under this category is by a number of governments -- the government of Spain, the Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, Switch (ph), the Icelandic Ministry for Foreign Affairs, German GAC and others. It's a longer comment. In general, it's support for most 2012 rules, concerns about non-objection for city names and any extension of provision. For non-AGB terms extend non-objection provision. Since this is a longer comment, I will pause here to see if there's any comments, any hands. I see Jorge wrote in the chat, I feel that on the definition question, it should be understood that the line of comments coming from Switzerland, et cetera, support the 2012 categories, although with the caveat that additional geo names should be covered. And he requests that a summary should be amended as before, and Steve, thanks; quickly replied. Thank you, Martin, for your comment also.

So in the interest of time, we shall continue here. We have a general comment by RySG, support for definition from 2012 AGB. Provides definition, other RySG members recommend that the geographic names panel to use additional official UN resources to determine what strings should be considered as a "geographic name." It's a long comment here by the IPC. There's some -- again, it's the

comment here, the document flags agreement in green, but also divergence that's in red.

This summary here, if there's no comments or no hands, the summary here expresses support for definition from the 2012 AGB. Does not believe there should be any special requirements or implications for terms which are "geographic names." Does not believe that the discussion, whether "geographic names" is "the appropriate term" to use for terms that are to be considered and titled to requirements of government approval under the applicant guidebook progresses that the work of Work Track 5.

Any comment over this comment? I see no hands. So I'll keep on going. Thank you. Please stop me at any time. Please correct me if I'm speaking too fast or too low. There's a comment here by the INTA, the International Trademark Association. It's flagged in the document as a new idea. Summary, believes the rules in AGB are more important than a definition. Provides definition. One options would be to use the term "geographic name" for any name that requires reservation of the name or an obligation to obtain consent/non-objection irrespective of the proposed manner of use. For example, any name that one, is a UNESCO region; two, a region appearing on the United Nations composition of macro-geographical continental regions, geographical sub-regions and selected economic and other groupings list; and three, names identified as a country and territory names and codes, as set out in ISO 3166-1 to be more specifically delineated when the recommendations are finalized. Conversely "term with geographic meaning" could be used for terms like city names, where restrictions are dependent on the intended use.

Any comments? I see none. I see Christopher with some typing. Please flag, co-leads, if a comment should be read out loud or not.

Continuing onwards, we have a comment here, general comment by dotBerlin GmbH, and others; generally summarized as, identifies lists that could both serve as "definition." If nobody will stop me, I shall continue. There is a next comment by the government of Portugal that is flagged as a new idea. It's generally summarized as UN database and the manual for the National Standardization of Geographical Names by the United Nations group of experts on geographical names.

Geographic names should include topo names such as mountains, rivers that by their notoriety and relevance are commonly known, as well as geographical indications based on WIPO and TRIPS agreements. Any comments over this? I see there's a comment by Christopher. The INTA position is too restrictive. And there's a comment by Jorge just written. I feel the lists are interesting and useful for those geo names that are not explicitly covered by the 2012 categories. They could be used by an advisory geographic names panel. Thanks for the comment, Jorge, as always.

I see no hands, so I'll continue with these general comments. So a general comment by the Registrar Stakeholder Group, new idea flagged. Summarized, has provided definition, a term or string that is exclusively associated with a geographic area and cannot be reasonably confused with any other geographic area or term. If nobody stops me, and please do if you want, I shall continue.

General comment by the governments of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, (inaudible). It's a new idea, generally summarized as provides definition, a geographic name for the purpose of the new gTLD program should be any term that has a geographic meaning or connotation according to a government or community associated with that term. Anybody have any objections on how this has been summarized?

I see that Jorge from Switzerland is writing a comment. He expresses that this suggestion mixes definition with intended use and he finds it not very useful. So a general opinion, here. So thank you. We'll continue.

There's a general comment by the government of Brazil. It's summarized as a concern. Does not seek to define, but notes concerns to be taken into consideration in developing a definition. I'll continue onwards.

A comment by my community, the At-Large community and the At-Large Council; it's a new idea. It generally provides definition. So given I will take the privilege of reading this one out, given it's my community. A clear definition of geographic name is certainly lacking in discussion in Work Track 5. Perhaps what is needed is to separate manmade places from natural features. Interesting, and the rest of that is there in blue. Any general comments over this comment? Is it faithfully summarized? I see no hands. I see no writing on the chat. So I'll continue.

There is a general comment here by the GAC. It provides there is no summary here, interesting, in the document. I shall read this comment by GAC. It's the previous GAC advice relevant to this question. It restates it. So ICANN should avoid country, territory or place names in countries where territorial or regional languages or people descriptions, unless in agreement with the relevant government or public authorities and others there, other comments below. So there's a previous GAC advice to this question.

Do we want to delve into this? I see no comments or hands. Thank you. I shall continue. There is a comment here by the nation of the United States. It's flagged as concern. Definition should take into account context of proposed use is the summary of this comment by the United States. Is the representative of the United States in agreement with this general summary? I see no hands. I see no writing in the chat. So I'll continue.

There is a general comment here by the NCSG. It's flagged both as concerns and divergence. Generally summarized as supports that "geographical names" do not deserve special treatment and should be handled as any other string. No hands. I see no comments. I'll continue. Thank you.

There is a comment here by dot Zone, GmbH. It's summarized that states that definition should be provided in AGB, but does not seek to define. So I'll continue.

Brand Registry Group, the summary here, does not appear to address the "definition" aspect. There is a comment here after Brand Registry, a comment by RDS Honduras (ph), summarized as does not appear to address the "definition" aspects. A comment in Spanish. Thank you for commenting in Spanish. So I'll pause here for one second to see if there's any concerns, any hands up, any comments by co-leads or overall chairs? Seeing none. Comments by work track members? I see none. So I'll continue.

So the next category here in the document in green, e.3, Work Track 5 has discussed different types of mechanisms that can be used to protect geographic names in the new gTLD program. These mechanisms fall broadly into two categories, noting that the categories are not mutually exclusive and measures from both categories can be used in combination.

First bullet, preventative, measures in this category include reserving certain strings to make them unavailable for delegation or requiring letters of support/non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities, either in all cases or dependent on intended usage of the TLD.

Second bullet, curative, measures in this category including objection mechanisms, contractual provisions incorporated into a registry agreement, enforcement of those provisions, and post-delegation dispute resolution mechanisms.

The question is, in your view, what is the right balance or combination of preventative and curative rights mechanisms in relation to protection of geographic names in the new gTLD program? Please see deliberation section f.1.2.2 on pages 28-29 for context on this question.

So first general comment here, the IPC flagged as in agreement. Summarized as, believes existing preventative and curative measures are appropriate. Opposes extending preventative to additional terms. Any comments? I see, thank you, Cheryl, for your guidance here. Thank you. I see no hands, no comments. So I'll continue.

There's a hand by Christopher Wilkinson. Please, Christopher quickly?

Christopher Wilkinson: Actually, Martin's obiter dicta, but if at this stage IPC can still make those kinds of statements, where have they been? Where have they been? That's way out what WT5 has been discussing. Thank you.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you, Christopher. So I'll continue here onwards. A general comment here by the group of registries, Uniregistry, Minds + Machines group, Top Level

Design, Amazon Registry Services, Employ Media, LLC, flagged as agreement. Believes existing preventative and curative measures are appropriate. But if additional measure is needed, emphasis on curative. Any comments over this summary? I see none. I see no hands, I think. We'll continue. Thank you.

So then we have a general comment here by the INTA. It's flagged as agreement, but also a new idea here. Summarized as believes existing preventative and curative measures are appropriate, however, opposes extending to additional terms. Any comment over this summary of this comment by INTA? I see no hands. I see no comments. I shall continue.

General comment here by RySG flagged as agreement, but also divergence and also new idea. Summarized as some believe existing preventative and curative measures are appropriate, but if additional measure is needed, emphasis on curative. Some preference for curative, some preference for preventative. Comments over the comment? Agreement over the summary? I see no hands, no movement in chat. So I'll continue.

There's a comment here by the nation of Singapore. It's summarized that as that nation's preference for preventative measures. We then have a general comment by dotBerlin GmbH and others. It's summarized as preference for preventative, and opposition to curative measures. Then we have a comment by the government of Portugal, summarized as a preference for preventative also. We'll pause there for a second. Any comments? Any chat? Anything that's in the chat or any hands? I see none. Thank you. So I'll continue and please stop me at any time, or if I'm speaking too fast or too low.

There is a comment here by RDS Honduras in Spanish. It has been summarized as preference for preventative. There is a next comment by dot Zone, GmbH, also summarized as preference for preventative measures. The next comment is by Brand Registry Group. It's flagged as concerns. It's summarized as preference for curative. And then it says GEO-PIC. So that is in reference to in addition to BRG would be supportive of developing a specific geographic public interest comment. Any comment over these comments? Any hands? Seeing none, I shall continue. Thank you.

So next comment here in this category is by the Business Constituency. It's flagged as a new idea. Sorry, yes, as a new idea. Also preference for curative and referenced also on this GEO PIC, which is geographic public interest comment. I've never seen this summarization before. I just learned this. Thank you. I shall continue here.

So another comment by the Business Constituency displaying preference for a curative summary. Any comments so far? Any hands? I see none. I see none here. I shall continue.

There is a general comment here by the nation of the United States of America. It's summarized as preference for curative measures. Any comments by the US

representative or by any other work track member? It's correctly summarized? I see no comments or chat. Thank you.

Next general comment here is by the NCSG. It's flagged as concerns. It's summarized as preference for curative measures. It's a rather long comment, so any -- I see Cheryl is writing in the chat and also Steve. Thank you for this guidance for work track members to be on the right page, thank you. I see Steve is also writing something additional in the chat. Please flag out if it should be read out. I shall continue.

There is a comment here by the Registrar Stakeholder Group. It's summarized as preference for curative. Next followed by a comment by the governments of Argentina, Chile, and Colombia; also from (inaudible). It's summarized as support for both preventative and curative measures. We then have a comment by the ALAC, summarized as believes existing preventative and curative measures can coexist.

I see Steve wrote with a -- I'm getting an echo of my microphone here. Should I disconnect and reconnect?

Terri: It's Terri. No, we're locating the line for you. It will be a moment.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you. Thank you, Terri. I think that's better. Thank you. Thank you. I see there is some action in the chat by Marita Moll. Maybe she wants to make a statement of the ALAC summary here and also Martin is writing. So I shall wait for Marita's comments, or maybe if you want to speak, Marita?

Marita Moll: Oh, hello. I've got my hand up here.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Oh, I didn't see that. Sorry.

Marita Moll: Thank you. I just was wondering. Perhaps we could precision that a little more by saying in the summary that there is a preference for preventative under the specific conditions noted.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you. And I think we can do that.

Marita Moll: Thank you.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you for that, Marita. Thank you, all. I shall continue then. Yes, and please flag any hands. I didn't see Marita's because I have to like scroll this list and see that. But, thank you. So after ALAC there's a comment here by the GAC. It's summarized as reminder for work group to consider post-delegation mechanism. Then there's a comment by (inaudible), an individual. There is no summary here. There is no summary here. I shall read it out. It's short. This depends on what the policy objectives are for the new gTLD program in general and in particular, is it to enable some GNSO members to make more money that they otherwise would and for ICANN to benefit from that? Is it to encourage innovation with

(inaudible) consumer, technical, commercial and other benefits? Is it to encourage decision making under the subsidiarity principle?

So I'll continue on. There is a -- unless I see some other comments here. There's some action in the chat. If it shall be read out, please do so. Please flag it to me. I'll continue.

So there is a longer comment here by the government of Spain, the Swiss Institution of Intellectual Property, Switch (ph), Icelandic Ministry for Foreign Affairs, German GAC, and others. It's summarized as support for most of the existing 2012 rules. One assumes that this means the balance between preventative and curative if it's appropriate within the rule set. Response? I see nothing else here.

So before we go to the next category, any comments? I think work track leaders are asking for further clarification by Marita on her comment. I think she maybe disagreed with the way it was summarized that somehow ALAC had expressed preference for one or other mechanism or Marita, if you can clarify? Maybe we'll get clarification along the way. I see Cheryl and Martin typing. Maybe they're trying to follow up on this.

If I see no hands, let me see if I actually do see them or not. Because I have to scroll. I see no hands. So I'll continue here. It's 5 minutes to the hour. So we're really getting close here. So maybe we should, we should stop here and not move to the next category here, the next question. And thanking you all for your patience with me. If anybody has any other business to quickly point out, perhaps also staff on the next meetings, et cetera. Thank you. Go ahead.

I see no hands. Maybe Steve can talk about next meetings, schedule and et cetera. Or maybe --

Steve Chan: Sure. Sure, thanks Javier. I was just waiting for my outlook to unfreeze. So the next call, just as a reminder to all, we'll be moving to a weekly schedule. And hopefully this will work well for members and allow us to make more progress. So in that light, the next call will be on 3 April, Wednesday at 20:00 UTC. And it will be for 60 minutes, as it is this week and ongoing. Thanks.

Javier Rua-Jovet: Thank you, Steve. And thank you all for your patience and your hard work here. We're slowly moving forward. So I see there's some -- a little bit of action in the chat. Thank you. Thank you to all. So glad to be back. Glad to be back -- go ahead, Martin. Go ahead.

Martin Sutton: Javier? Sorry. I put my hand up but you may not see. I just thought it would be worthwhile just pointing out that you've got -- everybody's got the link to the document. So it would be worthwhile where we've already gone through and tried to summarize these points that you continue to go through that document and see if there's anything that you consider is incorrectly summarized or any other points that you'd like to mention out to the Work Track 5. So do feel free to

continue looking through this. It's much easier then to come prepared for the next meeting with any suggestions or even prior to that meeting to call out any suggestions on the mailing list, for instance. So don't think that you have to wait until the next call to further any actions. Many thanks for that.

Javier Rua-Jovet: That makes sense, Martin. Thank you very much. And thank you to all the work track members here, and also Anne welcome back. I'm also getting back into the action, after a little bit of absence. So thank you all and see you and hear from you all in the next call. Bye-bye.

Terri: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day. (Inaudible), if you could please stop all recordings.