ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Thursday 15, August 2019 at 2000 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://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/I71DbXETOsoIxn7pPV5cwqk-CtRV_pE3bU_Rbr8a66OVkA2ZGORJJ8fd5FS4_UAV

Zoom Recording: https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/ATTBvTM-Axo6tW2fvQfgI09dsR71LPwfaqK3FeqXigstAC_SEuyCISWW8qsnaWRx

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/UqujBg

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

JULIE HEDLUND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Thursday, the 15th of August, 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

I would like to remind all participants to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Please also state your name before speaking for the recording.

With that, I will turn it over to Jeff Neuman. You can begin, Jeff.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN:	Thank you, Julie. Welcome, everyone. It seems like people are in a good mood from the chat. I was just asking if Christopher was on the call because I think we'll get to one of his proposals that he's been talking about for a while. If he's not, we'll still have to make do, but hopefully he is. I'm just looking at the participant list, and he's not. Okay.

On today's agenda, the first topic is to talk about reserve names and then, if we have time, get into the registrant protections. If there are any changes to statements of interest, please speak now or please put it into the chat.

Okay. Before we get started, we're starting discussions now on the predictability framework in the smaller group, so please make sure, if you want to participate and have not already been added to the list, you let one of us know so we can get you added. The list is on the wiki. Just look at the e-mail I sent yesterday. Hopefully you all have that. So that's one note.

Once I get confirmation from ICANN that the mailing list has been set up for the small group on the RSP pre-approval technical discussion, then I'll set that up as well and a reminder for people to participate on that one as well.

Now onto reserve names. If we can just give a minute here for Julie to change over to that link. Also, if you can bear with us again, this week happens to be a popular vacation or time-off week for people from ICANN. So, if we're a little bit slower than normal, it's just because we have one person doing it. Again, not a comment about Julie Hedlund but a comment on that usually we have multiple people helping out. So there we go.

EN

With reserve names – it's up on the screen right now – the only thing I've done with this is … You'll notice from the version that was sent out – it's a Google Doc. Maybe someone could put the link in there. If you went to it yesterday, it may look a little bit different today for reasons I'll make clear in a minute. But – oops … There we go. Okay, Julie is getting the link.

So, when we talk about reserve names, we're actually talking about two types of reserve names. Unfortunately, it all gets looped into the same category. The first area of reserve names are those that are reserved at the top level. That could be for a whole variety of reasons, which we'll talk about in a few minutes.

Then there's also reserve names at the second level. Oftentimes, we confuse the two or we mix the two up in conversations. When you have comments and when you're making a point in the chat, if you have a specific point about a reserve name or a group of names, please let us know whether this is comments for reserving them on the top or the second level or, potentially I guess, both.

I reorganized some of the places where some of the things appear just to make it clear what we're talking about in those comments. Also, I added a reference – I see Christopher is online – to the currency codes that we are going to talk about as well.

Some background documents, not any different than the other ones you've seen. We actually started this discussion in Community Comment #2. We put some material on this in the initial report. We then analyzed the comments we got back in Subgroup B, and then here we are.

Our policy goal. Essentially what we came out with, we believe, is that the existing policies we have now at the top level are ones that are appropriate to maintain. There were a number of discussions in Work Track 2, I want to say, that went on for months about reserve names. Ultimately, that's how we ended up with the recommendations in the initial report, which essentially, with a couple exceptions, as we'll talk about, state that the existing policy, which was Recommendations 2 and 5 in the GNSO final report in 2007 … were that strings must not be a reserved word and they must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level string. So we're not going to talk about a couple things in here. Before those topics come up, I just want to make sure that we all know we're not going to talk about them.

If you scroll down to the last three items in the – sorry. Scroll down one page. Keep going. There you go – those last three. Stop – oh, too far. Yeah, there you go. So the three items that we're not going to talk about on this call because they are either work going on elsewhere or work was completed elsewhere. Geographic names is being talked about in Work Track 5, so please no discussion today about the geographic names. The IGO/INGO reserve names – I can't exactly remember where that [PP] is. I think it's completed, and I think they're just waiting for implementation of that. So we won't talk about the IGO/INGO names set up in reserve at the top level, nor will we talk about the Red Cross/Red Crescent names, which I believe the work [on] was completed as well. So those three we're just going to leave to the results at this point. Well, the last two we're just going to make reference to and then, with the geographic names when Work Track 5 is completed, they'll come back to us and that's when we'll

incorporate that stuff. As Heather said, the Red Cross/Red Crescent is winding up implementation, so that should be close to being done anyway.

We'll go back up and then I'll take a question from Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Good evening, everybody. Jeff, I don't want to take your time at this stage in the proceedings, but just to recall the PDP, I have several reservations about the 2007 and 2012 policy recommendations. Therefore, fundamentally I do not accept that these are a default in any sense. I don't want to enlarge on this because I think some of you know perfectly well what my reservations are. But I don't really accept that the PDP should proceed on that basis.

That being said, I welcome that we finally get around to discussing reserve names at the top level. I think that's a completely different subject from reserved levels at the second level, but that's to be discussed.

Finally, in light of this extraordinary thread that we have witnessed in the last few hours, under Any Other Business, I would like to make a short comment regarding trademarks and Specification 13. I thank Heather for advising me to read that. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. I believe Spec 13 and other areas of the legal agreement are covered elsewhere. So, at this point, I would ask that we keep the discussions on the list and wait until we get

to that area. I think to introduce it now is just – whoever's got that call, say hello. I think – well, let's talk about that under Any Other Business, but I prefer to keep this call related to reserve names since I know we are addressing Spec 13 [and] other legal agreements elsewhere or at a later time.

With that said, let me go – Kavouss has his hand raised, and then we'll get started.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello, Jeff. Do you hear me, please?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes I do.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have one question. Is there any difference in the degree of protection at the top level and the second level? Or they are exactly the same level or same degree of protections? This is first the question.

Second a comment that I don't understand the meaning in the second line, which mentions, "to avoid confusion with corresponding country-codes adopted by the ICANN Board on the 8th of November, 2016, to which several but not all [inaudible] has a problem with those decisions." I don't want to get into decisions because this is outside the mandate of this group, but what do you mean by "to avoid confusion"? What confusion would there be with second-level with the country codes? With country codes

there are also two-letter characters. So what is the letter-letter and two-letter characters? What confusion? What type of confusion? Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'll take the … Well, we'll get to that, Kavouss. The only thing I'll say on the confusion … oops.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I lost your voice. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Whoops. Sorry. I put myself on mute. So the second point on the confusion element we'll get to in a minute. That was the title of the document that ICANN put out that was adopted. So don't look at that as anything more than a title. We'll obviously get to discuss that in a few minutes.

But I want to come to your first question, which was, is there a different scope of protection? Well, if it's something that's reserved at the top level, what it means is it's reserved from applications, so you can't apply for it. I see Jim's comment there: "Should be clear on distinguishing between ineligible strings and reserve for other parties?" I don't think that's a bad idea, so that's actually helpful because some you just can't apply for because there's a technical limitation in – oh, thanks, Jim. It's Alexander's comment. The others, at least one we get to the top level, are all ineligible to even submit an application for.

If we look at the high-level agreements with respect to reserve names at the top level, the comments generally supported the existing names that were listed in – I just pulled up the guidebook – 2.2.1.2.1. The section is called Reserve Names. In that section, there's a list of [inaudible] eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve … about 35 or so strings that are ineligible to be applied for. Taking a point that was made about a difference between something being reserved for someone else and being ineligible here, we're using the term interchangeably. By saying "reserved at the top level," we mean no one could apply for those. That included things like GNSO, ICANN, ccNSO, GAC, example, TLD, test (which also happens to be on another list), WHOIS, www, etc.

The group discussed that and – again, this is a year or more ago – decided that we should also put those abbreviations and names for the public technical identifiers organization in there as well. That would include PTI, .publictechindentifiers, and .publictechidentifier (singular). Again, this is at the top level. So this is not a second-level reservation but only at the top level.

Because it was a year ago or so or more than this was initially discussed, one might want to think about also, since we have WHOIS on there, including – I'll throw it out to the group – RDAP and RDDS. I don't know what other abbreviations are used in that context. So this is on the first sub-bullet point.

The second sub-bullet point are the comments that we got that also supported reserving what's known as special-use domain names through the process described in IETF RFC 6761. That included things like .onion. I'll look up some other examples while I take a comment from Kavouss.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello?

JEFF NEUMAN: Kavouss, you're up and then Christopher. Sorry. Kavouss, please?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Your explanation, unless you specify, was not helpful. Is there any difference or not? If yes, what's the difference? No? There's no difference. As simple as that. I don't want to bother you to explain for ten minutes what is [inaudible]. Is there any difference? If yes, what is the difference? [inaudible]. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. It's hard to answer that in the aggregate as a general principle because I'm not 100% sure. I know, when we talk about something being reserved at the top level, it means that it cannot be applied for. There are names that are reserved at the second level, however. Some of those nobody may have. Some of those are reserved for use by the registry operator. Some of those are reserved for other people's use. So there's no one answer to that question, other than to say, when we talk about reserved at the top level, which we're talking about now, it means that no one can apply for it.

EN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. For the top level, no one could apply for it. For the second level, it depends on circumstances/situations. There are several categories. Thank you very much.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. Christopher, please?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. I think we need to change the language. There are ineligible strings at the top level. Ask IETF. Ask SSAC. Somebody will provide us with the technically ineligible domains. By the way, I think they're also ineligible at the second level, but that's not for now.

Reserved means something very different. Reserved means that it's reserved for someone. At the top level, we're increasingly getting into domains/areas where we may allow applications for certain strings but only from qualified applicants. That's what I mean by reserved.

Since I've got the floor momentarily, at the second level, there will be many, many reserved names, and they will be different from one top-level domain to another. I'm not sure to what extent ICANN wants to regulate that. In the ccTLD domain, my experience is that the registry and its owners had very strong views about reserved names. There were many, but ICANN did not intervene at all. I'm also quite sure that the same reserved names for one registry will be quite different from reserved names for another registry. So I think we need to look at the language.

EN

You cannot use the word "reserved" for what you have described as ineligible names. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I understand your definition, Christopher. If you look at the guidebook currently, the "reserved" term is what ICANN uses. At this point, let's just think about these as names that are unavailable at the top level for now. We can make a note in the language that some members of the working group feel that the language is not descriptive of what we're doing. We could say it a lot better. So, at this point, just think of what we're saying are reserved names as unavailable names at the top level.

There are 35 of them listed in the guidebook that we're paying attention to at this moment, and the comments seem supportive of the recommendation that we had in the initial report, which said we should also reserve those labels for the PTI organization and those that are in the special-use domains RFC, which is RFC 6761, on the IETF, which includes things like example, which is already on the list, invalid, local host, onion, and test. Those are the only ones that are currently on the list, but there is a process for the IETF to put new ones on the list.

I have made a recommendation or a proposal – sorry, it's not even a recommendation. It is something to consider: Should we add, since it's got WHOIS on this list, the new terms that we use for WHOIS, like RDAP, RDDS, etc.? Any thoughts on that?

Kavouss, your hand is still raised? I don't know if that's old or new.

EN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: My hand is up to reply to Christopher. Perhaps one way to fix it would be that we, instead of immediately talking about the reserve names, we say they're unavailable names and then, in brackets or in some other way, refer to "in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook as reserve names." So we maintain both. But in fact, Christopher is right. When you say "reserved" that means it's there for XYZ. In fact, they are not reserved for any specific and particular user or applicant. They are unavailable to you. So, if you want to maintain both, mention both. If not, I am happy to refer to them as unavailable names at the top level. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. I think we take your points. We'll certainly reflect the meanings in the report when we come out with it. Does anyone have thoughts one way or the other on adding RDDS or RDAP? People don't care? Doesn't matter? Thoughts?

Okay. I am – Martin, please?

MARTIN SUTTON: Hello, Jeff. I think we should flag. It would be sensible, given that, at the last ICANN meeting, there was a kickoff discussion, wasn't there, across the community on all of the policies that would be affected by the changes that were coming along with RDAP. So personally I feel it's sensible to flag it at least at this stage and make sure that we consider [that] as that other piece of work is progressed. Thanks.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Martin and Christopher, for weighing in. Justine, that's my thinking, too. It's good to have some positive reinforcement on that idea.

Again, we're going to talk about more specifics. We're right now in the high-level agreements that came in the report and from comments. We will talk about some more things at the top level in just a few minutes.

At the second level, it seemed like, for reserve names, there seemed to be a high-level of agreement – whoops. Someone … Greg, I think – there. Thanks. At the second level, it seemed like there was high-level agreement on supporting and updating Schedule 5 of the ICANN registry agreement, which contains the list of reserved names at the second level in the registry agreement. The only other comments made on that– this is where we'll get to talk about what Kavouss just mentioned before – since Schedule 5 came out, there was amendment that was called – the title of the amendment or the title of what's now in the agreement – "The letter-letter two-character ACSII labels to avoid confusion with corresponding country codes adopted by the ICANN Board on November 8th, 2016."

Let's not focus on then title but on the concept of putting that into the agreement. Now, we obviously know that there's still some discussion between the GAC and the ICANN Board on that proposal that was adopted by the Board and implemented in the current registry agreements. I don't think we should necessarily rehash that here but perhaps put a footnote stating that we understand there's discussion going on and, if anything changes, we'd like to be in the discussion or we'd like to help provide input

or something like that. Because nothing has changed at this point. It's just discussions and I'm not sure how else to handle it because the existing rule right now is that two-characters are subject to the couple restrictions in that letter or in that memo. That's what registries are currently allowed to do.

Kavouss, please?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think that one way to settle that or to fix that would be, as you mentioned, a footnote saying, "It is to be noted that currently there is some discussion between some of the GAC members and the ICANN Board relating to the resolution adopted in November 2016. Subject to the outcome of that, this issue is pending." So we just have to give a footnote for that one. I don't think, as you mentioned, we can [inaudible] very substantial discussions. It took three of four GAC meetings, and we don't want to spend time here and waste your valuable time. The footnote would be useful to say there is currently some sort of discussions or disagreements between some GAC members, not all, and the ICANN Board relating to the appropriateness of the resolution of November 2016. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. That makes a lot of sense. I think we'll do that in then next version. I think you're getting some support from others in the group. Martin has just agreed with you. So I think that that's a good add.

EN

There are some ideas that we still need to talk about. If we scroll down on that document, the first one is related to the general requirements for reserve names at the top level. We had a comment … Well, I guess the Valideus/Neustar one just supports all the existing reservations. The Registry Stakeholder Group and the BRG think that only those names where there is a security and stability risk is what we should have. There was a new idea presented which basically says that, if ICANN knows a label will not be delegated, it should not be possible to apply for that label. Similarly, if a name is not reserved, it should not be added to the list after ICANN receives applications absent a material change in circumstances.

So what the registries are saying there is we should have this list locked prior to accepting applications. If ICANN believes there's going to be an issue, then it needs to be on that list. The registries are saying, if it's not on that list, absent something extraordinary, ICANN should not block the string from being delegated, except in accordance with all the other rules in the Applicant Guidebook. So that's one comment, I think, which is relatively in line with all of the conversations we're having anyway. But I think we should spend – Trang, please?

TRANG NGUYEN: Hi, Jeff. Can you hear me okay?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, Trang. Please.

TRANG NGUYEN:	With regards to that comment, I just had a quick question, more of a clarifying question. I understand and that makes sense for each round. I guess my question is, as a matter of an ongoing process, do we envision that the reserve name list and do-not-apply list, if they do end up being two separate lists, would not change in perpetuity, or is there a mechanism for when and where and how those lists would be reviewed? Thanks.
JEFF NEUMAN:	I believe that those lists would be, just like everything else, subject to the normal GNSO review processes, etc. Let's say, for example – I'm making this up, so I don't know if this could actually or would actually happen – like in the last round, ICANN determined that .corp could not be delegated for the name collision reasons. Since ICANN knows that right now, rather than have people apply for it again, perhaps that should be put on an ineligible list because it was determined that that presented too much of a risk. Or something like that. if you know about it in advance, you should make sure that you don't allow applications for it. I think that's the point.

I think that takes us – Kavouss, sorry. Yes? |
| KAVOUSS ARASTEH: | When you come to Bullet 2 and Bullet 3, I have a comment. I don't know whether you are there or you're still on Bullet 1 currently. So on Bullet 2 and 3 I have one suggestion, in fact. Not comment. One suggestion. Thank you. |

JEFF NEUMAN: We're just about to start on the currency codes proposal. Is that what you're talking about?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: After that. I'm talking about the geographic names. I'm talking about the IGO, but not the currency exchange. That is the Christopher-beloved subject, not mine.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Kavouss. Christopher, why don't you take two minutes to just go over your proposal and the rationale, and then we could take questions and see what we want to do as a group. Christopher, please?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good evening again. Well, I've written quite a lot about this in the last few weeks, and I don't want to take an inordinate amount of time. All I would like to say at this stage is that we are in a world where cryptocurrencies, Bitcoin, and Libra, and I don't what else is going to materialize in the next few years. I'm concerned that the currency codes, which are already widely used and known, as TLDs could provide the ideal platform for financial and foreign exchange transactions, which could very readily escape the transparency and, yes, regulation and, in some cases, taxes but apply to the normal foreign exchange markets.

I think the risks are high, and I don't think ICANN should be taking such risks. I think ICANN should have an open mind as to who

should usefully use these codes as top-level domains. Frankly, we've spent an awful lot of time discussing the protection of the three-letter country codes and, with very few exceptions – [Yrjo] made the exception for Finland, for example – the three-letter country codes carry very little economic weight and they're not often used. So we spend a lot of time protecting the three-letter country codes, but we don't spend any time considering the protection of the currency codes, whereas they are used and very large sums are transacted through those codes on a daily basis.

I don't want them to be open to registration by whoever wants to intervene on those markets, whereas we know very well that the IMF – the Bank for International Settlements (by the way, I don't know whose typo it is; it's probably mine; it's BIS, not BSI – among others, are, by all accounts, quite concerned that these new platforms and currencies could have a very destabilizing effect on the global economy.

So all I'm saying is that the ISO 4217 three-letter codes should, in the first instance, be protected on [par] with the three-letter country codes, which we already protect.

Beyond that, as to how they should be used and by whom, we haven't begun the discussion. But I think ICANN – [with this, not] without other economic advice – should initiate a discussion with the primary regulators of the international financial markets to determine whether or not these codes should be protected or used in any particular way. But I do not want ICANN – and I certainly don't want GNSO and the PDP and the rest of us – to carry the can. We can't possibly allow those codes to be open for

free registration when we have no idea how they would be used and by whom. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. I gave you a couple extra minutes because you're the author of the proposal and I had asked you to present it.

Let me see if there are comments. I know that there's been some discussion on the mailing list. I had put in a few comments as well, but let me see if there are comments from others before I put myself in the queue. Anyone?

Martin, please?

MARTIN SUTTON: I'm still unclear in terms of what it is protecting in terms of some of what Christopher covered there about use cases. I can understand perhaps that the DNS might be used perhaps, say, under .fx, if they were allowed to have a two-character code and all the currency codes were then domain names. They may then create a system on the back of that that makes use of it. But in terms of a top-level domain, I'm really unsure and unclear what risks we're trying to protect there, particularly where, again, there's particular meanings for three-character strings – generic or whatever. So if Christopher can clarify that, that might be helpful for me, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Christopher, can you respond to Martin?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well, Martin, we start from different standpoints. I think categories of names should be released when we do know what they may be used for, whereas the ethos that we have inherited from the GNSO in 2012 is that all the strings that are not in eligible are open for registrations. We've seen the damage that that has done in the 2012 round.

I think that, if there is an objective serious risk, even if it's less than 50%, we should be cautious. We should not throw these domains which are used and which mean a lot under … Their use means a great deal. We should not throw them [open].

Above all, in the future they are abused or if they turn out to be subject to regulation which ICANN has not foreseen in the contract, it would be down to ICANN to be responsible for the mistake. I don't want to be personally associated with that. I would like particularly if there is a strong precedent, for better or worse – some people would like to open up the three-letter country codes, but I don't think we're going to agree about that. We already protect a category of three-letter codes which, with very few exceptions, are hardly ever used, whereas here we're talking about real money.

So my strong advice is that we put these codes in the reserved category, and you only allow applicants after you've decided, with advice, how they're going to be used and by whom. Thank you.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. I'm going to put myself in the queue but from a personal perspective. A few weeks ago we talked about the notion of applicants' freedom of expression. We talked about how important it was to balance any of the restrictions against the freedoms to express oneself through the domain name system.

We agreed as a group that freedom of expression is an important goal. One of the things that – I apologize for this, but I can only draw on U.S.-based legal norms, and someone could tell me from other countries if it's radically different. In the United States, when there is a proposal to restrict some form of speech. The solution always happens to be the most narrowly tailored solution or the least restrictive means to accomplish to protect against what you are afraid of happening.

It seems to me that, at this point – again, personally speaking – there are three-character financial codes that do have other meanings. There's one TLD already in the root – at least one – and that's .top, which is – I put it on my e-mail – a Tongan … I think it's Tongo. I think I'm referring to the same one. It might be a different one. But .top is one of them. [.mad], which is not delegated yet, is another three-letter combination. That was from Morocco, where we all just were.

I guess my question is, would reserving them, meaning no one could apply under any circumstances for that string, really the least restrictive means to achieve what we're afraid of? Or does something like national law address this anyway? Thanks. My two minutes are up.

EN

I see Martin and Kavouss in the queue but I'm not sure if those are new or old.

MARTIN SUTTON: It's new, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, great. Martin, please?

MARTIN SUTTON: I've put some comments in the chat which I think are self-explanatory in terms of conversations there. I just wanted to not so much pick up on the currency codes, but we've already got highly regulated TLDs that were applied for. In the application, it was made very clear what the purpose would be for .bank. That's got high barriers of entry. It had scrutiny of the GAC. In fact, I think they led the way in terms of making sure that they could illustrate how well it would be operated in that environment on a global basis.

So my hunch still is that, if there was something that was going to leverage the DNS for currencies and currency exchanges, that would be part of the application and scrutinized and, if necessary, objected to if there was insufficient strengths and merit in how they were going to operate. Again, I'm still unclear as to why we would need to put the barriers up straightway, rather than at least allow people to apply with a good intention, good idea, making it clear as to what their intentions are. That can be challenged through the application process. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Martin. I see Kavouss in the queue. Is there anyone – hold on. My – oh, and Alexander Schubert. It there anybody above Alexander? Nope. Okay, Kavouss, please?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm sorry. I apologize for my ignorance. What are we talking about with "currency codes"? Give an example and give how many currency codes we have and to what extent we have to protect them and not protect. We have to reserve them. Now someone said "reserved" is not a good word but maybe "unavailable." How many of these currency codes should put into the unavailable names list and so on and so forth. I don't know whether this issue has been discussed with all community constituencies or not or if it was just in one. I'm sorry. I don't understand. Excuse me, but if I don't understand something, I cannot agree with that. I cannot close my eyes. I have to be quite clear on what we are talking about with currency codes and whether to reserve that for the bank or the owners and the bank does not contact [inaudible]. I don't understand all of these things. It's very, very unclear to me. It may be clear to some, but not too clear for everybody. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure, Kavouss. There's a list. It's ISO 4217, which is the list of currency codes. I'm going to find out in a minute how many there are. The United States use the United States, so that's the usd. Europe uses the euro, so that's the eur. Morocco, which we were

in just before, was mad. China was cny. So those are the codes we're talking about.

There are, Greg is saying, 163. I think there is more of them. There are, I think, 282, but I just exported a list into Excel, so there may be duplications in there. Any, those are the currency codes. Like I said, there's already one for top, which was the Tonga pa'anga. I don't know if I said that right. That's on that list, too. So that's what we're talking about.

Let me go to Alexander.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: As I mentioned initially when we started this discussion, it might be really helpful if we create two lists: one list of names that, under normal circumstances, anybody can have because … Let's say .home because it's just not working. And then a list of names that we are not willing to give up to anybody, to the general public. If you would ever provide the opportunity to provide for them, it would have to be a special use case.

If I look at GNSO, for example, it doesn't really make sense to say, "Nobody in the world can have .gnso," because, obviously, if the GNSO ever decided to want to have .gnso, why shouldn't they have it? Because those are the ones we are protecting here.

So really it's two lists. One of the lists are strings that nobody can have ever, and the other is strings that are not open to the general public. But in theory, somebody could have it. We just have to figure out how those could be assigned. Finished.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Alexander. But with respect to currency codes, are you suggesting that would be in one of those – which one of those categories would you put them in?

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Currency codes, as we hear from the different voices, is a tricky matter because some people seem to suggest that something like .eur, which is euro, which is one of the most important currencies on the globe, or usd for the U.S. dollar, might be useful for some real nifty application that actually helps people – banks or whomever. Others are saying, "Well, it doesn't matter. It's just a code assigned by an organization." It's hard to imagine that there's any scam or spam or whatnot. So, if somebody is going to apply for it and they have some stupid application for it, well, that's a bit pity but okay. So it's really actually a judgement call which I don't know how to solve.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Alexander. Any other thoughts? I'm not seeing … Let's see. Greg. I'm looking at the comments. Some examples cited. Justine says, "Verified at both TL and SL." Sorry, I'm not sure what that was referring to. I don't know if I missed a comment there. Greg was just talking about the number of codes.

Christopher, please?

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, and thank you all for your interest and valuable suggestions. Roughly, Martin, I'm also unsure. I don't know exactly what the risks are, but I am of a prudential frame of mind, and I would risk overcorrecting at least temporarily because I do not want to get ICANN and the GNSO and this whole proceeding into the situation of making serious mistakes.

Jeff, there could very well be foreign exchange transactions conducted across such platforms. As we've seen from cryptocurrencies and from the Facebook proposal for Libra – by the way, [if] somebody would keep an eye for an application from Facebook for .libra – it's quite technically possible that these platforms could result in seriously destabilizing aspects of the international financial system.

So, Martin, I don't really accept the recourse to preventative measures or curative measures in the application process. I've seen that produce serious errors and difficulties, and I don't know why we shouldn't refer obvious cases for caution to the whole [palava] and cost preventive and curative measures.

Kavouss, I understand that you need a better explanation, and I shall try and do this through the list or bilaterally. I think Alex's proposal of two lists is something to work on because you need the excluded list. In the reserved list – by the way, you could put a time limit. For example, you could say that the ISO 4217 codes are in the reserved list for a period of ten years.

JEFF NEUMAN:	Christopher, there's some other people in the queue. I just want to hear from them, and then we do need to move on to the second-level stuff. Greg, you're in the queue?
GREG SHATAN:	Thanks. It occurs to me, after hearing Kavouss' question, that, by and large, currency codes are pretty obscure. We know a few of them. usd is in fairly wide use, and eur. But a lot of the other ones aren't. Frankly, if I were going to put together a currency site based on a currency, I would much more likely look for .peso or .guilder or .dollar or .franc or .renminbi and not for the three-letter codes. I think, if we are going to acknowledge a risk here, that's where I think the risk more likely lies. But of course, there are risks associated with misuse of many other codes or potential strings as well. Even if there is a problem here, the problem is not primarily the codes. Thanks.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Thanks.
CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:	If I may, Jeff, very, very briefly. Greg, thank you for your interest and concern. Basically, I agree. I think today the Argentine peso might be even in a worse state if it was possible to buy and sell them through .peso. But I haven't raise that because there is absolutely no prospect, I think, of agreement to reserve all those country names for those country currencies. Even Work Track 5 didn't really accept that the currency codes are geographical. That's water under the bridge. Here we are in the PDP.

But we have this very specific past history to reserve three-letter country codes, and we have this very specific risk arising from the three-letter currency codes. Why do we protect the three-letter country codes, which by and large are used benignly, if it all, and do not do anything about the three-letter currency codes, which are instrumental for the financial markets?

I don't think the names of the currencies that you have mentioned are actually so critical because, in the context of principally automated computer-based transactions, I think the currency codes carry greater weight and are more widely used than the actual names of the currencies. But I may be wrong. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, everyone. I'll give a last word on this to Greg, and then we need to jump onto the second-level discussions. Greg, please?

GREG SHATAN: It's an old hand. Sorry.

JEFF NEUMAN: Wow. Okay. Excellent last words. Good summary. I'm just kidding.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Greg.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN:	Before we get to the second level, though, I do want to just remember that Kavouss did say he had a comment on the last couple bullets. These last bullets just refer to other work going on. Kavouss, did you want to say a quick something on that?
	No?
JULIE HEDLUND:	Jeff, I think Kavouss [inaudible] his audio.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Okay. Then we'll move on. Maybe if he's got a comment we'll get it by e-mail.

So now we're talking about second-level issues that have come up or from the comment. The first was what we were just talking about before, which was updating Schedule 5 to include the ultimate outcome of that two-letter country code. Again, this is at the second level, not top level. So that was the first set of comments and we've already talked about that.

I'm going to go to the additional suggested changes. There was one comment from the registries and Valideus to also make sure that we update it to allow the letter-number combinations and the letter-letter domains which do not match a country code.

If we can go onto the next one. Valideus expressed a concern. There were five letter-letter two-character ASCII labels that remain reserved because they are IGO acronyms. It should be possible

EN

for a registry to release those names with the consent of the IGO in question, but there's no mechanism currently to allow this.

Any discussion on these, especially the last two items? Allowing the release of letter-number, which is already allowed, or – I'm sorry – modifying the language in Spec 5 to allow those, and the second one about developing a process for the release of IGO acronyms to [inaudible] question, which I think, by the way, is, now that I think of it, part of the IGO/INGO discussion. So I'm not sure we need to or should address that here. But is there anyone who might know that better and wants to comment?

All right. So I'll put a note to ourselves that we just need to look and see if that's covered by the IGO/INGO discussions going on right now. If we skip to the – I'll let Julie have a second here. Sorry, Julie. I know you're all alone today. I'll introduce – thanks – the next part and then let you catch up.

With respect to removing the reservation of letter-number combinations, there were a number of organizations that – sorry, this is a huge list of organizations – opposed the recommendation because they think there might be a confusion with ccTLDs. I think the concern expressed there was that the number 1 looks like the letter L or i. The zero looks like an O and so on. So there was some concern expressed about making sure that we do not cause confusion with a country code by allowing – so, instead of … I don't know. I'm trying to think of an example.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Jeff, sorry to interrupt you, but are we talking second level now or top level?

JEFF NEUMAN: Second level.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Are you sure that anyone has a problem with M1 as a second level domain? I recall this discussion only from top level, but on the second level it really doesn't matter.

JEFF NEUMAN: Actually, you might be right – thank you for bringing that up – on that. You're right. Sorry. That first one should – sorry – still be the top level. You are correct. Sorry about that. I mislabeled that. Could we change that to the top level? Thank you, Alexander. That was appropriately interrupting because I labeled that wrong.

So currently the discussion was, at the top level, to only – again this is being discussed by Work Track 5. I think what they agreed on was that any two-character letter-letter should be … well, they're talking about the letter-letter, but they were not talking in Work Track 5 about the number-letter or letter-number at the top level. All of these groups came out and said they were not in favor of two-character letter-number combinations, whether that's something like l3 for Level 3 or 3m for the company called 3M. So these organizations came out against it.

EN

Because of the risk of the O's and L's looking like numbers, the Registry Stakeholder Group said to require applicants for these TLDs to acknowledge the potential universal acceptance challenges and require applicants to pay for both halves of possible string confusion objections panel fees coming from ccTLD operators.

Justine has pointed out another possible two letter-number top-level domain.

So there are a substantial number of commenters that were not in favor of just a blanket allowance of number-letter/letter-number, but there were also a number of commenters that supposed allowing it but just taking measures to ensure there's no confusion with a country code.

My question to others is, wouldn't that be picked up in the visual similarity/the confusing similarity test that ICANN does (the string confusion review it does) at the very beginning of its evaluation? So is that something we make note of but say that, if we allow it, it should be picked up in the string confusion analysis?

Let me go to Alexander and Martin.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: So it's me, yeah? Okay. I'm not really sure that we have covered this aspect already, but I think most people, especially outside of the United States, are very well aware that there's roughly two groups of top-level domains: those that have two-letters that are assigned to countries – everyone who's outside of the United States is very used to them because they actually use them – and

EN

then the others (more than two characters). They're kind of another [class]. If we would allow any kind of two-letter top-level domain that is not a ccTLD, then we are really watering down the character of ccTLDs.

I have no reason to talk for a ccTLDs because I have nothing to do with them, but ccTLDs are, outside of the United States, are of extreme importance. That's why I want to actually talk for ccTLDs, saying that, if we allow any kind of two-ASCII-letter gTLD, we are actually watering down the identification [barrier] or whatever you want to call it of ccTLDs. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Alexander. Martin, please?

MARTIN SUTTON: Hi, Jeff. I pick up the recurring theme here, which you mentioned, which is that there's the potential for confusion. Like you, I feel that there could be opportunities here to at least pick any of those similarity checks during the process. So I'm not convinced that users would be confused if there was a clear number and a clear letter that differentiated it from the country codes, which are all letter-letter combinations, with the exception of, say, limiting some of the numbers, like 0 and 1. Others I would say are pretty clear in what you're viewing.

So I think there is potential here to follow through if there is appetite to proceed on the basis that there is caution, and there need to be strong similarity checks taking place or something that

EN

eliminates the use of certain characters because they do not pass that sensible check up front. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Martin. That makes a lot of sense. Just even thinking about, I didn't even realize – maybe everyone else did and I'm just the last one – that you're right: it really is only the numbers 0 and 1 that we're talking about that could pose confusion. I guess maybe 6 could be seen like a b. But yeah, that's an interesting point.

Christopher and then Kavouss.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Just a quick line. I basically agree with what Alexander just said. Historically speaking, with compliments to CentralNic, who got eu.com and for many years was, in effect, pretending that this was the European Union ccTLD, that was one of my motivations in making them sure that, when .eu was delegated, it would be a ccTLD. It was a very successful TLD because, as Alexander has pointed out, a great many people in Europe and elsewhere in the world regard the two-letter codes as their primary front door to the Internet. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I have Kavouss and [inaudible – oh, yeah. Kavouss, please.

EN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry. I apologize to Alexander. When he writes, he writes very clearly and eloquently. When he speaks, it's confusing. I don't understand what he said: U.S., outside U.S., ccTLD, and so on and so forth. Two-characters? I don't know what he said. When he writes, he's very, very clear. I like it and admire him. But he speaks, it's not clear. That's number one.

Number two, someone said two-letter. Someone said letter-letter. What is the difference between two-letter and letter-letter? Is there any difference that I have not understood? Currently, when you discuss the issue after the currency code, there were two other bullets, and I said that I have a comment. [inaudible] you have forgotten to ask me what my comment is.

So these are the three things. So I may ask Alexander to kindly, as you write, clearly mention what you meant by ccTLDs, the United States, outside the United States, and other groups and other peoples. I don't understand this distinction. And then the difference between two-letter and letter-letter. What is the difference between the two? And currently my comment about geographic names and my comment about the IGO. These are the three things. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. I'll let Alexander respond to the points you made. Alexander, please?

EN

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Okay. I'm trying to make it super short because it doesn't make sense to repeat it all. Basically what I want to say is that, if the Internet user sees a domain name, for example, in Google or in an advertisement or anywhere and the domain name is ending with a letter-letter combination, like .de for Germany or .fr for France, then they have a certain feeling about this domain name because it's ending in two letters and they know it's a national domain-ending-based letter.

I mentioned the United States because, in the United States, people never see .us because .us is virtually unknown and unused in the United States. Americans don't use their country-code top-level domain. That's why I mentioned the United States.

But outside of the United States, in most of the countries, people are predominantly using their ccTLDs, so they're very used to two letters and they perceive this as something special. Any other TLD has obviously more than two letters and is something else. It's something more international.

What I wanted to say with my explanation is that currently we have this distinction between country-code top-level domains and everything else. If we start to allow two-character top-level domains, like whatever – M6 or whatever it would be – we would break this distinction between two-letter top-level domains and also have more letters. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Alexander. On the other point, Kavouss, I did stop and I did, a few minutes ago, call out for you to explain the issues, but

for some reason either you didn't have audio or you didn't hear. I can come back to that if you can make your point quickly. What were the points that you wanted to make on the last several bullet points under top level?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The point that I wanted to make is that you have said, for the geographic names, you are waiting from input from Work Track and, for the IGO, waiting for the results of the PDP. I suggest not to forget and put an editor's note based on the outcome of these two inputs. "These sections (or sub-sections or these two bullets) will be updated." That is what I wanted to say – not to forget – [inaudible] report that we're waiting for this. We have to put something. For the end results, we have something for the geographic names, something positive or negative, and, from the PDP relating to the IGO, we would have something. So we would put an editor's note, saying, "Based on the output {or outcome) of these two inputs, this sub-section (or these two bullets) will be updated." That is what I wanted to say with respect to that.

Still my question is, what is the difference between the two-letter and letter-letter. Letter-letter in my view is two-letter. But what is the difference between the two? Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. Those two examples are the same: letter-letter and two-letter. We're trying to distinguish that from two characters, which can be a letter followed by a number, or a number followed by a letter.

EN

As Justine put in the chat, "The O2 Coliseum, for example, may want .o2. The company, Level 3, may want .l3. The company 3M, which is a very large company in the U.S., might want .3m." So that's what we're talking about now.

I think we're going to move on then to the discussion on the voluntary reservation of 100 strings. This was included in the current registry agreement, that registries could reserve up to 100 second-level strings for the – these are the words used in the agreement – operation or the promotion of the top-level domain.

Neustar and some members of the Registry Stakeholder Group said that we should amend the limit to promote innovation – so allow a higher amount – and Jamie Baxter from .gay, LLC had a new idea, which was to add new idea, which was to add flexibility for TLDs where there will be community or public benefit. The geo-TLDs thought that the limit should be higher. They want the limit to be 1,000 for geo-TLDs. The BRG, Registry Stakeholder Group, INTA, and FairWinds think that the limit of 100 names should be for brands – should be abolished. Neustar and [inaudible] for the brands, there should be no limit, or for the Specification 9 top-level domains.

The IPC and [Lamaret] believe that the limit should not be raised. It should be as is. Neustar says, if the limit remains, then you change it from cumulative over the life of the TLD to rolling. In other words, right now the way ICANN says it is you get 100 names. If you use one for five months and then never use it again, you still used your one, whereas what Neustar is saying is that you should be allowed to have up to 100 at every given time, regardless whether you're no longer using one that you previously

used. The IPC says that caution must be taken if these names are released to be registered by someone other than the registry.

So those are the comments. Any thoughts on those? I have Kavouss and Maxim.

Kavouss, are you in the queue?

No? Okay. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, a registry can reserve – not just reserve, but use – up to 100 names. A registry can reserve an unlimited number of strings. It's in the registry agreement. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Maxim. Thanks for the clarification. Right. These are names that it can reserve for itself and its own use. Correct. It can reserve a whole bunch of other names for different purposes, but it may only reserve up to 100 names for itself and use those.

Christopher, please?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Two points. First of all, I lack in this discussion any reference to sunrise. In my experience, the primary mechanism for allocating reserved names was the sunrise. I think that many new registries will find that they need to have a sunrise. I think the definition of the sunrise and the names that are protected temporarily/momentarily by the sunrise are a

EN

matter for the registry and its owners. So I'm not quite sure what the problem is. I think that will do for now.

There will be cases – a large geographical name is obviously one of them … If you have a .ireland – I'm not Irish, so I'm sure [Michel] will correct me at some juncture – if you just look at the map, there will be demands for the reservation of scores of names. But I don't think that's anything to do with ICANN. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Christopher, I think you're talking about the second reservation. So it's the second main bullet. But before we get there, is there any discussion of the 100 names that the registry itself may use?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Sorry. I thought we'd taken that for granted and dealt with it and you had moved on. My apologies.

JEFF NEUMAN: That's okay. We can go there – oh, Maxim has a new hand. Sorry, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: About 100 names. One of the reasons for a request for 100 names for geos was that an average big city has more than 100 names for streets, monuments, fully-owned subsidiaries of the mayor's office, etc., like public services, like firefighters, [inaudible], or police, etc., etc. That's the first thing.

EN

The second is that the geos, due to non-working ALP mechanism, had to reserve names during the sunrise to deliver it to basically the mayor's office or to the local government because mayors offices and local governments actually issued allowing, [due to this], to apply for the strings and, without [site] reservation, it would not be possible. So hypothetically there were methods of [delivering] strings to the mayors offices called ALP, but it didn't work. The single registry who tried to do that, .madrid, spent years doing that, actually. So it wasn't feasible because, if a registry doesn't work, they have to pay lots of bills and effectively they bleed money. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Maxim. Kavouss to end this area and then we'll wrap up the call. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: What is the origin of this 100? Where did this figure come from? Then how will it be used? It will be used like other gTLDs? It will be used on the first come/first serve basis? Any condition, any criteria, for that? I understand [inaudible] innovation and so on, but I would like to know where the 100 comes from and how it will be

used and whether innovation of some has priority over innovation of others. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: That might take a little bit longer to explain, Kavouss. I know we only have two minutes. The short answer is that registries often establish sites either to market their space or to promote their space, and they'll use a second-level name to do that. So you may see something like register.(whatever the TLD is), where you can go to to find the list of registrars for the top-level domain. Or a geo.(something) if you want marketing information about a top-level domain. So it's sites controlled by the registry for its own use to market or promote or operate its own top-level domain.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: But the 100 is with all registries, or 100 is for each registry?

JEFF NEUMAN: Each.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: For each. Okay.

JEFF NEUMAN: I think this is a good place to wrap up. Christopher, your topic that you want to bring up in AOB I'm going to ask you to keep on the list. We will address it when we talk about the legal agreement. All

the specifications are free to discuss, so we will make sure that we add that as an item. If you'd like to discuss it at that point.

The next call is Monday, the 19th of August, at 20:00 UTC for 90 minutes. I hope to get through the rest of this and registrant protections on Monday. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]