ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Work Track 5

Wednesday 08, May 2019 at 1400 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sub-pro-track5-geo-names-top-level-08may19-en.mp3

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/dq8sOYAD72b4hzT5HvcZk_oLchrcfykcZTU26S3M4F8OLUgfm_GN
UyvhAnfILoxR?startTime=1557324202000

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

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

MICHELLE DESMYTER: I'd like to welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Subteam Work Track 5 call on the 8th of May 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. So if you're only on the phone bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now for attendance purposes?

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

Alright, thank you. Hearing no names. As a reminder to all participants, if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Also, as a friendly reminder, to view the documents being shared during the meeting today, please direct yourself to the top of the shared screen. You will see an option that says, "view options." Please click on the dropdown arrow, and you will then direct yourself between Julie Hedlund and Steve Chan's documents that are being shared. At this time, I'll hand the meeting back over to Javier Rua-Jovet. Please begin.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Michelle, and hello to all. This is Javier Rua-Jovet from ALAC, I'll be your chair today. So the agenda, I believe, is on the screen. I'm just on my phone, so I don't know if the agenda is on screen, but Michelle has explained the agenda.

We're continuing today to review public comments on the options, proposals, country and territory names, section F 2.2.2 of the document. Before we start, any SOI updates that anybody wants to flag, to report?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hi, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: For the record, it's Nick Wenban-Smith from Nominet, and I just wanted to point out in terms of SOIs that Nominet recently started working with Amazon as a backend registry, and I've updated my statement of interest, but for the record, I'm also pointing it out on this call since I'm here.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you very much, Nick. So with that, and if there's no other SOI updates, we shall continue. Just to explain again to myself and to all Work Track members, we're looking at these comments to make sure that these comments are characterized correctly by our working group response and framed as whether there's agreement, disagreement, etc., divergence, that they reflect the intent of the commenters regarding each item.

In terms of [inaudible] and efficiency, we've been thinking about maybe instead of just – given the fact that these are non-substantive in many ways, this is just going through to make sure the fidelity of the comment is well gathered, perhaps group similar comments to move as quick as possible to next sections. Is there any objection to that procedure? Of course, every Work Track member, we hope, has already read through this will have a chance to raise their hand or comment at any moment.

Hearing no objections – and I want to flag that I cannot easily see hands because I'm on my phone and I have the document on my computer, so any hands that are in the system, you can do it

EN

orally, also just mention. We also have in the call – and I welcome – Cheryl Langdon-Orr, our overall group coleader. Welcome, and also staff.

So going to the document, we're starting on line eight, but going a bit back to line five, the item that begins the section is item 11, which reads, "Delegate alpha three codes on the ISO 3166 part one standard as gTLDs with the requirement of government support nonobjection until a future process is designed specifically for the delegation of three-character codes."

We start here today in line eight, so we skipped six, seven. So beginning in line eight with Brand Registry Group comment to line 15, ending like [15] with a group of registries, Uniregistry and others' comments, the general comments here are flagged as divergence in the sense that strings should be made generally available. Any objection to the way this has been characterized?

Hearing none, we shall continue. So from line 15, starting with a comment from group of registries, Uniregistry and others, to line 21, with a comment from the Portuguese government, the general characterization there by the working group is divergence.

Actually, up to line 22, 23, 24, and 25 is divergence. So the last comment there, communications and information technology commission, all these are grouped as divergence.

So any comment in terms of these few lines that we have browsed over? Anybody that wants to make a comment in terms of fidelity or nonfidelity? Hearing none, hearing no comments or objections, we'll keep on moving following this procedure.

EN

So in line 26, which reads – 12, "Delegate alpha three codes on the ISO 3166 part one standard as gTLDs with the requirement of government support nonobjection only in cases where the applicant intends to use the TLD as it relates to the geographic meaning of the term. For all other cases, the TLD should be available with no letter of support, nonobjection."

So line 27, beginning with a comment from Registrar Stakeholder Group – well, I'm just going to take that one, line 27 is flagged as agreement. Any comment? Hearing none, shall continue.

Line 28, a comment by IPC to line 31 with a comment from group of registries, Uniregistry, etc., that is flagged by the working group as agreement qualified. Divergence in the sense that the strings should be made generally available. We'll pause there. Any comments by any Work Track member regarding the fidelity or nonfidelity of this characterization? Hearing no comments, objections, shall continue with this procedure. And please stop me at any moment, either Work Track members or co-lead, Cheryl, or staff.

So line 32, which is a comment from Brand Registry Group to line 35, ending with a comment from NCSG, this set of comments are flagged as divergence in the sense that the string should be made generally available. Any comment, objection or any other statement regarding these past few lines and how the Work Track has characterized them?

Hearing none, we'll move now to line 36. Line 36 begins with a comment from the government of Spain and others to the end of

the section, to line 46, with a comment from the ALAC. All these commenters have been flagged as divergence.

We'll pause there. Any statement from Work Track participants? I see in these past few comments there were some governmental entities. Don't know if – I see Jorge in the Work Track, he might have a statement regarding some of these.

Hearing none – dan please stop me at any time – shall continue. Line 47 reads as follows: "13, the ISO should not be the source of three-character strings used by ICANN to identify geographic names."

So line 48 and line 49 – line 48 is a comment by Brand Registry and line 49 is a comment by CITC. These comments have been characterized by the Work Track as could be construed as support. Does anybody have any statement regarding that characterization, any comment on lines 48 and 49 as construed as qualified support? I hear no comments. Please stop me at any time if you have any questions, comments.

MARTIN SUTTON: Sorry, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Martin, welcome. I didn't see you. I hope you're feeling okay.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks. I just wasn't able to get my hand raised. Sorry about that. I was just going to say on those where we haven't applied it,

certainly for the BRG one, I think that's fine to construe that as support in the way that it was presented. So I just wanted to make that clear.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you for that and thank you for the lift of – we know you're not feeling well.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Javier.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Christopher, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Sorry, two or three procedural points. First of all, I've completely lost the Zoom screen, though somehow or other I'm still on audio. Secondly, as I've pointed out before, the lines that you're referring to in the document are not in the saved document. We cannot see them most of the time. I have no idea where you are in the document that is in front of me, which is a printout of the saved version of the document. So I'll just put a general caveat.

Also, just for the record, I recall that myself among others are totally opposed to some of the proposals that have been [inumbrated,] notably the matter of prior authorization of geographical names. There are others, but just as a working method this afternoon, I shall log off and log back on again and try to find Zoom again, but I really encourage you and the staff not to use those line numbers. We don't find them. Where the hell are they? Thank you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Christopher, for that concern. Maybe Steve or Michelle or Martin, have we seen this concern before in terms of not having the line number on some document? Steve, maybe? I'm seeing the line number fine, but I'm online directly in the document.

STEVE CHAN: Hi, Javier. Yes, I think when you're referring to the line in the Google sheet, that indeed does not get printed out if you indeed print out the document.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I see.

STEVE CHAN: I think ideally, if Christopher is able to get back into the Zoom room and he follows along with the screen share, that's probably the easiest way to make sure that as you're following along, you're able to keep track of where we're at in the document. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: So as I'm reading, you're moving in the Zoom exactly where we're at. Perfect. Okay.

STEVE CHAN: Exactly.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Very good. Thank you, Steve. Go head, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Just to mention a couple of points there is that – let's make sure when we read the green boxes, which are the question numbers, we can read those out so Christopher can at least follow which question or suggestion we are reviewing at that stage.

The other point I really want to emphasize is that he started to mention that he doesn't agree with the substance of the comments. That is not what we are trying to do. We've explained that time and time again. This is about making sure we've classified it appropriately, summarized it appropriately, and if anybody's got any comments or changes that they would recommend or questions that if they're unsure what it means, then we can stop for those.

Assuming that Christopher and others have been reading through the prepared documents, and if they have spotted anything that they are either unsure about or think it should be classified differently, then it'll be great to hold on for those particularly

EN

particular points to raise those at the time, but if there is difficulties viewing that on the screen at that particular point, we'll always be happy to seek the comments in the chat, so please put them in there, or send them to the list. So that would be really appreciated if we focus on the challenge of getting through the documents, making sure we've classified them, before we start any substantive discussion. Thank you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Martin. Yes, and we have made the explanation, and it's always important to reiterate. Thank you. And we have been reading also the green parts. And actually, I think I will read it again, going back to line 47 in my document, the question is, "The ISO should not be the source of three-character strings used by ICANN to identify geographic names" as the proposal, and now we jump to line 50 in the Google doc.

So line 50 in the Google doc –

STEVE CHAN: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Before you start it again, Greg has his hand up.

EN

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Concerning the process and whether [inaudible] summarizing these correctly, the way I read the blurb that came out of the BRG comment – and far be it from me to disagree with Martin Sutton about something coming out of the BRG, but it seems to me based on the last line that this is more or less an "I don't care," so it's neither support nor nonsupport. It doesn't disagree with the idea that the – it neither agrees nor disagrees with the idea that's in section 13. So I'm wary of scoring that as support for the proposition that the ISO should affirmatively not be the source of three-character strings. And that goes for line – let's call it 13 2 here using the numbers that are visible within the document. "The ISO should not be the only source, however, ISO codes shall continue to be reserved" certainly seems to mean that ISO should be "a" source. Maybe not the sole source, but "a" source.

So neither of these – if the proposition is that the ASO should not be – that's one of the problems with these types of questions. Is the question the ISO should not be the only source, or the ISO should not be a source at all? Which one is question 13 asking? I don't know. But assuming that we should not longer look to the ISO list, then neither of these two first ones would support that proposition.

If the proposition is that the ISO should not be the exclusive source of three-character strings and they could be grabbed from

other places too, then these, I think, are neither support nor object.

And then lastly, I'm concerned about the use of the term "divergence" to describe those that disagree, only because generally, divergence is used to indicate kind of a total score, if you will, of the result of the consensus or lack of consensus of the group as a whole, so no one comment is divergent unless all comments in essence are divergent. So I think it would be better to call those "do not support" or "object" rather than divergence, because divergence is a measure of the level of consensus and it's not a measure of agreement to a particular proposition. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Greg. Any replies or comments to Greg's comments? Hearing none. And if there's any hands, just interject, please.

MARTIN SUTTON: Javier, I did put my hand up.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: So I do understand where Greg's coming through on this. I think the issue was trying to restate the position, which shouldn't exist at all as far as the Brand Registries Group comment was, but then I suppose we could caveat that with the fact that it's saying then –

EN

if it goes ahead, then I suppose it is ISO's fine, I suppose, but I think that we needed to keep restating the point, otherwise it gets lost along the way if we start saying, "Oh, yeah, that's a good idea." But the way that the format of the questions went out kind of led you down this path that, okay, what happens if we open all of this up for three-character country codes? It was reemphasizing the point that it should be just open, and that's the main thread of the BRG's comment. So that just kept being reemphasized so it wasn't lost in the process. So I think that's why there is some confusion with that. If it remains that we have to have some restriction, then a source list like ISO is reasonable. I'm not sure how to summarize that, sorry.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you for that, Martin, and thank you, Greg, for your comments. They are noted. And that's precisely the type of comment that we need here in this process we're going through.

So I see that in line 49, which would be 13 2, comment by CCITC, the working group has flagged this as divergence. Noting Greg's concerns with the term "divergence," but that's the way we're working right now. So line 49, which is 13 2, divergence.

So going to my line 50, which is 13 3 to 13 8, which would be line 55, that's ending with a comment from NCSG, the Work Track has characterized this set of statements and comments as divergence in the sense that the strings should be made generally available. Any comments in terms of the characterization? [Or other comments.] Hearing none I see a hand by Christopher. I don't know if that's an old hand. Is Christopher trying to come in? And I

also see a hand – so I see a hand by Christopher and Greg. Until Christopher can get in, maybe Greg can come in. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. And looking at both the Business Constituency and IPC comments – and all of a sudden, my screen changed. Oh, here we are. So in any case, certainly the INTA one I would not say is divergent from the narrow point of 13, which is that the ISO should not be used if we're talking about three-character codes.

But again, maybe the problem is that the question is unclear. Whether the proposition is that functionally the ISO list is the list to use or that we should be reserving three-character codes and using the ISO list as the tool to identify those codes. So I could say, yes, it's divergent if – I'd say both of these are divergence if the question is not about the use of ISO lists versus other lists, but if the question is about whether the ISO list should have a certain power, then these are divergent.

BC, it says "does not support," so I'm assuming the actual question is not merely which list to use but whether to give this list the power to preclude new TLDs. So maybe some of this is kind of confusion in the sense that these headings are abbreviated versions of the real propositions. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Greg, for your comments. So moving on, if there's no other comments or comments over what Greg just commented, shall continue. Going to line 56 on the Google doc, which would be 13 9 here, a comment which starts by the government of Spain

EN

and others to line 19, which is my 66, line 19, comment from ALAC. These have all been grouped and characterized as divergence. Any comments from the Work Track on this grouping and characterization? I hear none.

The last comment here, line 67 or 13 20 by Group of Registries, Uniregistry and others, basically, they state that a comment is or the proposal is unclear, or difficult to understand or not understandable. Any comments before we move on? Hearing none, I see no hands, so we have to move now to section F.2.2.6 in the shared document.

That would start as number 14 in the page. It will be line five in the Google doc and 14 in another page. So the green comment there or the green proposal, individual governments should be asked which permutations should be reserved in connection with a corresponding country or territory name? So to use [the shared number here,] 14 1, which is a comment by Honduras, 14 1 to 14 5, which is a comment by CITC, have been grouped and characterized as agreement with this proposal. Any comments? No comments by the Work Track. I see no hands. And if there's any hands that I'm not seeing, just interject, please.

So to line 14 6, 14 6 which is a comment by dotBERLIN GmbH and others, to line 20 here, are all flagged – this line 20 is a comment by ccNSO if you can see it. These last few comments have been grouped as divergence. Any comment? Any questions? I will read the proposal again just for everybody's sake, everybody's aid. Individual governments should be asked which permutation should be reserved in connection with a corresponding country or territory name?

So now we are at 21, which is a comment by the government of Spain and other entities, basically unclear what the intent is, no position. That was quick. Any comments, questions before we move on? No hands, no comments. If there's anything happening in the chat, if Martin or staff can just – if it's important, please flag it.

So now, if there's no objections, we're moving to section F.2.2.6.

SUSAN PAYNE: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry, could I interrupt? Just a matter of practice – and I've put this in the chat but then realized that you're not following the chat. Because we can't scroll on Zoom, if we're trying to follow along in the Zoom room rather than flicking backwards and forwards to multiple screens on our laptops, if you go over one screen in the Zoom, the new can't scroll, so when you go through, say, 10 or 20 lines and say any comments on any of these, we can only see what's being displayed on the physical screen at the time you ask that. So it's really difficult to follow along, even if we've read this in advance.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Understood. Any suggestions in terms of that right now? Do you want to go back to any particular section? Does the Work Track want to go back to any particular section?

SUSAN PAYNE: I'm not suggesting we go back, I'm just saying, maybe could you try to just keep to what can be displayed in one screen when you're doing multiple lines?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. I think –

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Lost you there, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Apparently, I was muted by control. Well, control has now unmuted me. Thank you, control. I was muting myself via the mute button on my headset, so I had myself muted.

Anyway, what Susan is suggesting is if we can work the blocks of what you're going through to just match what is on Steve's shared screen, that will assist everyone who is going through just using the Zoom screen as a reference point. Steve, of course, has also put in the links for people to go through the Google doc in their own order themselves, and obviously, I think that that's the reference doc you and many of the other Work Track leaders tend to work off.

The double use of numbers, Susan, which I must admit does become a distraction, but it's one that we've battled through this process with the other Work Tracks in, is to facilitate the difference between the numbering on what's on the screen and what's in a Google doc. And yes, it doesn't aid to not being very confused when we're also struggling with a new tool where we can't scroll ourselves. So it's vastly different than previously when we were able to at least scroll up and down and keep within our own document, but we're now using Zoom.

It also does not help at all for those people who are working in hard copy such as Christopher. If it is possible, Javier, for you to try and limit the assumptions and the questions to the blocks that are on the screen, that may solve Susan's problem. But it's one of those products, Susan, of us now not being able to scroll, I think, as much as anything else. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Cheryl. Right now, I'm not in the shared screen. I'm in the Google doc itself. Steve, where are we in the shared screen right now?

STEVE CHAN:

Javier, we're where I think we're supposed to be, which is at the top of section 2.2.7. So unless I'm mistaken, I think this is where we're supposed to pick up. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Okay, but given the concerns of the speed that this has been moving with, the question is, should we go back? And Susan, chime in in terms of maybe where we should go back. Or anybody else.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Javier, I'm not suggesting going back. Not at all. I was just hoping that we could maybe just keep to slightly fewer numbers of individual lines, if you're dealing with them together. But I hadn't appreciated you're not looking at the shared screen, so that makes it complex for you. I'll just try and toggle back and forwards.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

No, but I think your comment is very important [inaudible]. So what I'm going to do is I'm just going to blow up the smaller blocks of what I can actually see on my screen, maybe blocks of three, and then maybe Steve can follow in the shared document accordingly.

Okay, so we're in 15 1 of section F.2.2.7. I'm going to read it again. The comment is, "As long as a country can provide substantial evidence that the country is recognized by a name, the

term should be included under the reserved name category, 'a name by which a country is commonly known.'"

So comments, 15 1 to 15 3, which I can see on my screen, are all characterized and grouped as agreement with this proposal. Any comments to that, any questions? I hope you can follow, and sorry for the prior process.

Hearing none, shall move on. Lines 4 to line 6 have been grouped and characterized as agreement with the proposal. Any comment? Moving on to line 7, which is a comment by the ALAC, line 7 by the ALAC, to line 10, which is a comment by the Business Constituency, these have all been characterized and grouped as agreement.

Pausing there for a second. I see a hand by Jorge. Jorge, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, everyone. I'm also struggling with this table, and if we go back to the table on question 15 or on proposal 15, and the characterization of this large group of countries and organizations, Spain, the Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property and so on, it has been characterized as agreement.

Nonetheless, what the response says is more qualified, because it says the burden should not be on the country alone. So it doesn't really agree with the idea that the country can provide substantial evidence, or it doesn't agree that it should only be the country.

And it says that the determination can be made prima facie by the geographic names panel. So this should be qualified in the summary of the – and agreement, I think, is not really what it is. It's not a complete disagreement, but it's not agreement, it's a different idea, I would say.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Jorge. Right now, that comment is flagged as qualified agreement. I don't know if that's a change that was just made. If it is, I missed that. But it says qualified agreement. Would that closely resemble your position?

JORGE CANCIO: As I said, I don't think this is really an agreement.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay.

JORGE CANCIO: It's a different idea.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you for that. Now it's flagged as a new idea. Comment noted. Thank you, Jorge. Any other comments?

So let's go – I forget, I think it's 15 9. So lines 15 9 to 15 12 have been characterized as agreement. 9 to 12. Any comment? 9 is a

comment by Argentina and other governments, 12 is Honduras. All have been flagged as agreement.

Hearing no comments, we'll move on to lines 13 and 14. Both have been flagged as concerns, lines 13 and 14. In fact, line 14 has been flagged with "concern, needs clarity." Any comments? Hearing none, we'll move to line 15. Line 15 is by DOTZON GmbH. Let's say line 15 to line 17 by RySG have all been flagged or characterized and grouped as divergence.

Any comments, questions, concerns? Please interject. And if there's relevant chat going on, please flag it if possible.

Lines 18 and 19. 18 by NCSG and 19 by Group of Registries and others have been flagged and characterized and grouped as divergence.

Line 20 by the Portuguese government has been characterized as – it's a no position by the Portuguese government. Any comments, questions?

We'll keep on moving. We'll read the following proposal, number 16. It reads, "Add translations 'in any language' to the category of reserved names, 'a name by which ha country is commonly known as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization.'"

So, comments –

MARTIN SUTTON: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yeah, go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Sorry, before you get started again, there's a hand from Susan. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Oh, yes. Go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: I'm so sorry, I didn't get back to the Zoom room quickly enough. So it was on the previous section. And actually, it was regarding the Intellectual Property Constituency's comments, and I'm not sure now which line they were in. Oh, yes. And I'm not sure that this is agreement.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Where are you, Susan, which line?

SUSAN PAYNE: I think it is line 11, because this proposal 15 is about as long as the country can provide substantial evidence that it's recognized by a name, then that is the basis. But the IPC's comment is that the evidence is about the country is recognized in an intergovernmental treaty or organization. And so the IPC is saying they don't object to including the word "substantial" there, but if

this question is asking whether this would be a replacement for the existing language, would be instead of being recognized by an intergovernmental or treaty organization, then instead of that standard, it is just any evidence that the country can provide.

The IPC is not agreeing with that.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay. Thank you for that comment, Susan. Any comments over Susan's comments [we're noting that?] Martin, Steve?

PAUL MCGRADY: Hi there. I don't know how to raise my hand yet in Zoom.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Paul, yeah, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: I just wanted to agree with Susan, I don't think that that's what the IPC meant. And if there's any concerns with that, either Susan or I can take it back. But I don't think they meant to agree with the overall idea. I just think that they were trying to do like a precision word insert there. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Paul. This is precisely the type of comment we're looking for here in this process. Thank you very much, Susan and Paul. So again, if we can move forward, again, proposal 16, I'll

read again, "Add translations in any language [inaudible] the category of reserved names a name by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence In that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental treaty or treaty organization.

Okay, so line 16 1 to 3, 16 1, a comment by the government of Spain and others, to 16 3 by the Nation of Georgia, are flagged and characterized and grouped as agreement. Any comments?

Moving forward, lines 16 4, which is a comment by the CITC, 4 to 6, which is a comment by [CENTR AFNIC,] have been grouped, flagged and characterized as agreement. Any questions, comments? Hearing none, shall keep on moving forward.

Line 7, which is a comment by the Portuguese government, to line 9 by the governments of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, [inaudible] have all been flagged, characterized and grouped as agreement. Any comments, questions, hands, concerns? Stop me please.

Hearing none, shall move forward. Line 10, which is a comment by the ALAC, has also been flagged as agreement. Line 11, which is a comment by RySG, has been flagged as both agreement and divergence, and the text is colored differently in the actual comment to denote which part is agreement and which part is divergence. That's line 11.

Any comments, questions? That's a rather long comment by RySG there. Hearing none, line 12, which is a comment by the United States, its flagged and characterized as both a new idea and concerns, and the different colored text are clear there in the

EN

comment where it's grouped as an idea and where it's grouped and flagged as concerns. Any comments?

Hearing none, lines 13 to 15 – hope the shared document is following this – lien 13 is a comment by Brand Registry group, to line 15, a comment by DOTZON GmbH, they're all flagged, grouped and characterized as divergence. Any comment, question?

Hearing none, move to lines 16, perhaps line 16 to line 18. Line 16 is a comment by Registry Stakeholder Group, to line 18, a comment by INTA. These comments are all flagged, grouped and characterized as divergence. Questions, comments? Please flag or interject, and if there's relevant chat, co-lead, please read it out.

Moving on, if there's no concerns, to line – oh, line 20 is the last one, so let's say lines 19 and 20 again. So line 19 is NCSG, and lien 20 is a comment by Group of Registries, flagged and grouped as divergence. I hope I didn't skip any comments there. The last few comments here from line 14 to 20 are all flagged, grouped and characterized as divergence. Any questions, comments, concerns before we move forward?

Seeing no hands, so we're moving forward. Options, proposals, F.2.3.1. I will read proposal or option 17 in green. "Require support, nonobjection for capital city names only if the applicant intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the capital city name."

So let's take the first two. The first two are line 17 1, 17 2, Business Constituency and Honduras are flagged and characterized as agreement. Any questions, comments?

Line three is a rather long comment by IPC, which has been characterized as agreement. Any comment, questions? I'll move forward to, let's say, lines 4 to 6. Line 4 is NCSG to line 6 by INTA. All these three comments are flagged as agreement and grouped as agreement, characterized as agreement. Any questions, comments? I see no hands, no comments.

Let's move on to lines 7 and 8. Line 7 is United States, line 8, Brand Registry Group. So United States is flagged as qualified agreement. Line 7, United States is flagged as qualified agreement. Any questions on line 7?

Seeing none, hearing none, line 8, which is by Brand Registry Group, is characterized as agreement, and then preference, though open to compromise of existing implementation. That's [a new one.] Any comments, questions on the way line eight by Brand Registry Group was characterized? Agreement. Preference, though open to compromise. Go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Just thinking about that, just for consistency, I just wonder whether we could turn the BRG comment into agreement qualified, because I think if you interpret it all, it's a restatement of position, but willing to compromise with that if it's just capital cities and the use of them as capital cities, then that would be acceptable. I like the term showing as compromise in here, but I

EN

think for consistency, we might just want to list that as agreement [qualified.)

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you for that, Martin. I agree. I think we all agree on that. So the next comment is –

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. Can you hear me?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yes, we can. Loud and clear.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. I had my hand up, I wasn't sure if maybe I was supposed to [inaudible]. Back up on row five – can you scroll, Steve? Where the Group of Registries comment was. I think one thing that's not characterized that might also benefit from that agreement [qualified] is the Group of Registries comment. So those were positioned in the initial report as sort of three variations or gradiations to kind of the same topics. So there was one topic, three different proposals. The way the Group of Registries formulated this is we sort of ranked the three because they were related. So we prefer 18. This proposal is sort of our fallback. So I just want to make sure that we catch that. This isn't like our first choice. So I wanted to make sure we catch that when we go through the final. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you very much for that comment. That's precisely the reason why we're having this meeting. Thank you. So noted. Moving forward, I think we're at line 9, which is 14 in the actual document. Line 9 is a rather long comment by RySG. Let's take a look at it. It's cahracteirzed both as qualified agreement and divergence. The different colored texts are flagged in the comment itself for all our benefit. Any comment? I see a hand by Paul. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hi. So along the lines of clarity – and I hate to do this, but can we go back up to the IPC position on this? Because I think it was put down as agreement, but I think what it really was was nonobjection. In other words, this is sort of a – yeah, qualified is probably better, because it's meant to be like, "Ugh, I guess we could live with that," as opposed to, "Yay, that sounds great." Does that make sense? Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Makes sense. Thanks a lot. That's the whole reason we're having this meeting again. Noted. We just want to keep, as Martin mentioned, for uniformity's sake, let's have a clear set of the way we characterize these things. Great.

so now these comments are so long that my screen, they don't fit, so let me make this smaller.

So line 10, I think, is where we're at. Line 10, which is a comment by the government of Spain and others, has been characterized as divergence. Actually, lines 10 to 12. 11 is a comment by the

Country of Georgia, line 12 is a comment by CITC. Those are all characterized as divergence. Any questions?

Lines 13, 14 and 15, beginning with a comment by DOTBERLIN GmbH and others, line 13, a comment by DOTZON GmbH, also in line 15, these have all been characterize and flagged as divergence. Any comments, questions?

Keep on moving if there's no questions, comments. Line 16 to line 18. Line 16 is a comment by Registrar Stakeholder Group and line 16 by ALAC. Line 17 is by governments of Argentina, Chile, Colombia. All these last three comments before moving to comment 18. Last three comments in 17 are flagged as divergence to proposal 17. Any comments, questions?

Let's keep on moving. I hear some noise there, maybe somebody wants to jump in? Maybe not. Okay. So moving on to the next proposal or option, 18, eliminate support nonobjection requirements for capital city names. So lines 18 1 to line 18 4, if it fits in the screen, or maybe lines 18 1 to 3.

18 1 is Brand Registry Group, 2 is Business Constituency, 3 is United States. Those three first comments are flagged as agreement with this proposal 18. Any questions? Hearing none, shall keep on moving. Line – okay, lines 4 to line 6. Line 4 is NCSG, line 5 is Group of Registries and others. Line 6 is Honduras. All these three comments have been grouped and characterized as agreement with this proposal. Any questions, comments?

EN

We'll keep on moving forward if there's no comment. Let's just take line 7. It's a comment by Registrar Stakeholder Group, which his also characterized, as the previous was, as agreement.

Next comment is a rather long comment by the IPC, which is characterized as agreement . Any questions, comments? Okay.

Line 9 is a comment by INTA. It's characterized as agreement, can be inferred since they refer an intended use provision as a balanced approach. So again, following Martin's suggestion in terms of uniformity – Martin, any anybody else in the Work Track, do we have any concerns regarding uniformity of characterization given the way this has been characterized here in line 9?

Hearing no concerns, please jump in if you wish. Then we shall move on. let me lower the size here so it fits. So line 10 is a rather long comment by the RySG. It's flagged and characterized both as qualified agreement and divergence, and hopefully you can see in the text of the comment itself where the Work Track has characterized it as agreement qualified and which part has been characterized as divergence. Any questions, comments? These are longer comments, so a bit difficult here.

So that was line 10, moving to line 11. Again, a longer comment by government of Spain, Swiss Federal Institute and others. This has been characterized as divergence. Any comments, questions? The next few, let's say, lines 11 to line 13, line 13 is a comment by CITC. All those three have been characterized as divergence. Any questions, comments?

EN

Lines 14 to 16. Line 14 is DOTBERLIN GmbH and others, and 16 is DOTZON GmbH. Lines 14 to 16 have also been described or characterized as divergence. Any questions, comments? Anything in the chat? Please interject.

We shall move forward then. Lines 17 and 18, the last two here. 17 is governments of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, [inaudible] and comment 18 by ALAC. These two last comments have been flagged as divergence. Any questions, comments? Shall we move forward? Any concerns?

So, maybe we'll move forward. So, we're in section F.2.3.2. Hope everybody has that in front of them. Proposal 19, I will read. Let me enhance this size a little bit here. 19, "Maintain provisions included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook that require applicants to obtain letters of support or nonobjection from the relevant governments or public authorities for 'an application for a city name where an applicant dealers that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name.' The requirement applies if, 'A, it is clear from applicant statements with the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name, and B, the applied for string is a city name as listed on official documents.' As with other applications, curative measures available include objections processes, use of public interest commitments, contractual provisions and enforcement, and post delegation and dispute resolution."

Okay, taking the first three here, 19 1 to 19 3, 19 1 is Business Constituency, two is Honduras, three is DOTZONE GmbH, those three have been grouped and characterized as

agreement. If there's no comments, we shall move forward to the next three.

Let's take four. Four is a comment by the ALAC, it's flagged as agreement. Any questions? Hearing none, comments 5 and 6. 5 is Group of Registries and others, and 6 is Intellectual Property Constituency. These two have been grouped and flagged as qualified agreement. Any comments, suggestions, questions?

Hearing none, we'll move forward with the next two, 7 and 8. I hope you have them on your screen. Comment 7 by the United States, Comment 8 by the INTA. They have both been grouped and described as agreement qualified and also as new idea, and you can see the different colored text in the comment itself for your benefit. Any comment, questions?

Yeah, so following the next comment, number nine, is a rather long comment by – who makes this comment? My screen is jumping and I can't see it. Please.

MARTIN SUTTON: This is the Registry Stakeholder Group comment, so this one's got a mixture of agreement, which is qualified, and some divergent views where there's no support. So it's a mixture on that one. But that's Registry Stakeholder Group, and then you can move on to 10.

EN

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Martin. Any comments or questions regarding comment number nine which I couldn't see in my little real estate of screen here? No questions?

We'll move forward to comments number 10 to 12. Comment number 10 by government of Spain and others. Comment 11 by the Country of Georgia. Comment number 12 by CITC. Those three have been grouped and characterized as divergence.

Any questions, comments? Hearing none, moving forward, comments 13 and 14, 13 DOTBERLIN GmbH, comment 14 by the Portuguese government, those two have been grouped and characterized as divergence. Any comment, questions?

Hearing none, shall keep on going. Comment 15, which is a comment by the Brand Registry Group, I see no characterization here.

MARTIN SUTTON: Javier, I've posted a note in the chat which just explains on there that referring back to recommendation 11 and the text that's in here, it's basically saying doesn't agree with any restrictions, therefore no requirements for letters of nonapproval or nonobjection. So I think that's clear divergence. So that's been updated now. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you, Martin. Thank you, staff, for updating or clarifying this number 15 from the Brand Registry Group. The last two comments in this section, line 16 and 17, line 16 by governments

of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and [inaudible] comment 17 by NCSG have been grouped and characterized as divergence. Any questions, comments before we move forward?

Hearing none – and thanks for your patience here – proposal or option number 19, I shall read it out loud when I make this a little bit bigger and readable. Number 19, variant 1, implement provisions to prevent misrepresentation. Applicants who intend to represent a connection to the authority of a noncapital city will need to provide a letter of support nonobjection. However, if the applicant does not intend to represent a connection to the authority of noncapital city names, protections will be enhanced by inserting contractual requirements into the registry agreement that prevent an applicant from misrepresenting their connection or association to the geographic term. This proposal changes the standard for when a letter is need for noncapital city names from usage associated with the city name to usage intended to represent a connection to the authority of the noncapital city name. this proposal increases contractual requirements and therefore enhances protection for geographic places.

So 19 1 is a comment by INTA, which is flagged as agreement. 19 2 is a comment by the United States that is flagged and characterized as qualified agreement as well as concerns and the different colored text show the different qualifications here.

Line 19 3 or section 19 3 I should say, is a comment by ALAC, which is flagged as both agreement and divergence. Any comments, questions, concerns so far? We're up to 19 3.

MARTIN SUTTON: Javier, I'm just seeing in the chat, if Alexander can come on and explain the point saying it's a bit problematic that not support doesn't indicate whether the relevant measure is too restrictive or doesn't restrict enough. Is that referencing a particular point in the chat, or is that – I'm not sure how we link that to anything, Alexander, if you're able to speak to that.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Yes. Hi. That was the previous point where a number of entities objectively measure –

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Which lines, which section?

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: The previous point, so not the one we are on right now. Before 19, variant 1. So what was before 19 variant 1? Was it just 19?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: So 19, yes.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: So someone who does not know the positions of the entities and would look into this Excel spreadsheet, everyone who says they're not agreement doesn't really know, do they not agree because the measure is not restrictive enough or because they want to have more restrictions? And that's kind of a problem when third parties are looking into this Excel spreadsheet. It's probably too late now,

but if the entities that say they do not agree might indicate whether they don't agree because they want something more restrictive or something less restrictive, especially pertaining to number 19.

MARTIN SUTTON: Javier, if you don't mind me just interjecting, I think Alexander, good point. I think this is the benefit for us as a group to be able to drill down on some of the comments, but these are indicators of what the response contains. So I know we're trying to minimize some of the sort of classifications so that there's some consistency, but at any stage, we can drill down further onto the comments and appreciate which side they were moving towards, towards they don't like it and they want less restrictions, or they don't like it because they want more restrictions.

I think we'll probably know that from all the stuff that we've read through in terms of the comments. I think as we've tried to summarize it here, you're right, it sometimes isn't very clear, but I think we can actually then drill down to the document, to the links wherever we're unsure. But thanks for [inaudible].

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: And while I'm already speaking, if we can go to 19 variant 1 and the ALAC comment, we are flagging this as agreement divergence, but I actually don't see any support or agreement here. They're saying they don't like it and they're saying why they don't like it or what is their main course as to why they diverge, but how do you flag this as an agreement?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Good point. Why did we flag this as an agreement? I'm reading it through. Any comments on this?

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Maybe because of the word "mainly due." That sounds like "That's actually nice but mainly due to those things we don't like it." But I don't see any support in their response.

STEVE CHAN: Hey, Javier, if you don't mind.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Don't mind.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. So just a couple points. So moving back up to the top section, 19, no variance, to Alexander's point, I think this section and some of these comments could benefit from some of the language we'd already used in some areas versus divergence in the sense that the string should be made generally available. I think that hopefully provides some clarity about whether or not they expect or prefer more or less restrictions.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Good. Yeah.

STEVE CHAN:	Hopefully that's helpful, and as I think Martin said, this is consistent language used in other parts of this document. So we'll take another look at this section again after this call to make sure that that language is reflected in any of the comments where it's relevant.
	And to your question about line three from the ALAC here, it's just from this first line here where it says there's [balance] support for and opposition to. So it doesn't explain why there's support for it but it does note that there is support, hence we've highlighted the support in green and classified it as agreement and divergence.
ALEXANDER SCHUBERT:	So there is support somewhere in the response, you have just not reflected it on the screen.
JAVIER RUA-JOVET:	Yeah. So it seems that the ALAC comment itself expressed that the ALAC has some balanced support and that's what shows in the comment itself.
ALEXANDER SCHUBERT:	Okay.
JAVIER RUA-JOVET:	Okay, so thank you very much for these comments. This is the reason why we're here. Thanks, Martin and Steve also. So moving forward, I think we're in line 4 of variant 1. So line 4, comment by the IPC has been qualified as –

JUSTINE CHEW: Javier, I had my hand up. I don't think you're looking a the hand up thingy.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Go ahead. Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, just in relation to the ALAC comment in line 3, I can go back and check whether it's complete. I can't imagine it not being complete, I think staff has been quite diligent when they pick up stuff. But yeah, just reacting to Steve's point, I think there was support and opposition, so it's as balanced position, that's why there's agreement and divergence. But I can go back and double check that and put it on the list as a disagreement. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thanks a lot for that, Justine. We definitely want to make sure that the community's sentiments are clearly gathered here, and it's my community, so I wanted to make sure it's also the right one. So thank you all for that.

Moving forward, I think line 4 was divergence qualified from the IPC. Any questions, comments? I see none. Line 5, RySG is qualified as divergence. Line 6, comment by the group of registries and others, also qualified as divergence. Line 7 and 8, 7 is brand registry group and 8 is NCSG. Those two are qualified and described as divergence. The group has divergence.

Lines 9 to 11, 9 is the government of Spain and other entities, line 10 is the Nation of Georgia, line 11 is CITC. Those three are characterized and described as divergence. Any questions, comments?

And the last few, 12, 13, 14 and 15, if you can see them on your screen, hopefully, 12 is DOTBERLIN GmbH, 13 is Portuguese government, 14 is DOTZON GmbH, 15 is governments of Argentina and others, these past four comments are flagged as divergence. Any comments, questions?

We're at like three minutes to the top of the hour or the half hour. I don't know if the working group wants to keep on going or we should stop here. Martin, group, what do you think?

MARTIN SUTTON: I think that's excellent progress. Well done, Javier, and thanks everybody. I would suggest just if there's Any Other Business that anybody wants to raise and close it off. Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Any Other Business, people? Okay. Hearing none, maybe Steve, if you want to speak about next meetings and other housekeeping, if possible.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. the next call, I would imagine being on the 15th of May, but let me make sure. Indeed, it's on the 15th of May, 20:00 UTC. And again, it's for 90 minutes. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Excellent, Steve. So with a minute and a half to spare, thanks to all. Thanks for your patience. Sorry for the haste in the beginning. I'll make it better next time. So with that, bye.

MARTIN SUTTON: Bye, Javier. Bye, everyone. Thank you.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you so much, everyone. Meeting is adjourned. Have a great remainder of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]