ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 04 April 2018 at 14:00 UTC
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an

authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-

subsequent-track5-04apr18-en.mp3 Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page:

https://community.icann.org/x/Riy8B

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

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5 Geographic Names at Top Level call taking place on the 4th of April, 2018. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the WebEx room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Hearing no…

Darcy Southwell: This is Darcy Southwell. I'm only on the bridge.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Darcy. Hearing no further names…

Man 1:   This is (unintelligible) on the bridge.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Noted.

Carlos Gutierrez: Carlos Gutierrez only on the bridge.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Noted. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please - oh, go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Sorry. I was on mute. Jim Prendergast also on the bridge only. Thanks.

Terri Agnew: Thanks. No problem at all. Jim. Thank you. I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording and transcription purpose, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to our co-leader, Martin Sutton. Please begin.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Terri and welcome everybody. I know we've had a few little teething problems with trying to get used to WebEx, and I appreciate the time Terri has spent guiding us all on the leadership as well as those attending, on how to use this new facility.

Those that did join early will probably have caught on to some of those conversation pieces and a quick guide around the WebEx system. Let me just point out a couple of things though, just so in case you think I'm ignoring anybody.

The hand up signal is not visible to me. So we all just need to be prompted as we go through the process of discussions as to who's raised their hands, that - do not let that prevent you from stepping forward and commenting during the course of our discussion today.

So thanks again for getting us ready and prepared for using the WebEx tool. So first of all for the norm matter and checks of any interesting changes that may have happened over the last month perhaps that you have updated your statement of interest, I'll give you the opportunity to inform the rest of the group at this time.

So if anybody has anything to advise the group, please come forward now. I'm not seeing any hands raised, but if there are any, please let me know. Or if there are none, please let me know. Okay. I'm not hearing anything.

So for today's agenda that was that circulated yesterday, we will be going through an update from ICANN61 and where we believe we are at this stage. We will then move on to continuing the process of going through the review of existing geographic terms polls as defined in the applicant guide book. So that will be the core part of today coming.

But first of all, we'll proceed to the update from ICANN61. If we could move the slides on. Before we do actually, does anybody have any items that they would wish to add to the agenda before we go further? Hearing none, thank you.

If we move on to the next five slide then. So we did send a brief update after the ICANN61 meeting, which you had receive a couple of days ago. So apologies for the lateness of that coming through prior to this meeting, but hopefully that's provided those that were not in attendance an idea of some of the discussions that were held and also the opportunity to refer to the recordings and feedback from those sessions that were held in ICANN61.

During the Work Track 5 session that we held there, I know it did conflict with some other sessions and I think it was even an extra GDPR session that was added into the agenda that coincided with our meeting. Nevertheless, we still had good attendance and some good discussions going through the work topics.

We did manage to provide a brief summary of progress to the community. And we also presented the timeline to the group. So we could understand how this would fit into the overall PDP working group. So that was the main parts of the sessions that were held in ICANN61. I'll go into a little bit more detail on that shortly in terms of timeline.

As I mentioned earlier, if you've had the chance to - if you didn't have the opportunity to attend that meeting, either remotely or in person, there are the links to the recordings and I'd encourage you to take a look and have a listen to what went on and to bring you up to speed.

There were some practical issues raised, things like the format of the working document that we've got and contained in the spreadsheet. And so in the note that went out, we would welcome any offers of ideas to make it easier and simpler, whilst also being…

Emily Barabas: Hello.

Martin Sutton: Hello.

Emily Barabas: Hi Martin. Sorry to interrupt. This is Emily from staff. It looks like you've got a hand up from Kavouss when you have a moment to pause.

Martin Sutton: Thank you very much. Okay. Well, let me stop there then. Kavouss, please go ahead. Kavouss?

Terri Agnew: Kavouss, this is Terri. We're unable to hear you and I don't see where you're muted.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Let me carry on and when we get Kavouss connected again, we can reply back to his question or comment.

Annebeth Lange: On mute. Mic.

Martin Sutton: Okay. We've got some background conversation occurring. So if you're not speaking, please put yourself on mute. If we could go to the next slide please. So one of the things that did gather quite a lot of conversation during the course of the ICANN 61 meetings, was references to timelines, the

overall PDP working group timeline, but also the Work Track 5, which is obviously lagging somewhat behind the whole PDP working group.

So what was presented is the initial work plan. So we're lots of coughing in the background here. If you are not talking, could you please go on mute?

Annebeth Lange: (Unintelligible) shutdown.

Martin Sutton: We've got a background conversation going. Could you please put your phone on mute please? Thank you. So the timeline that we're working towards, guides us into creating an initial report in July this year. Let me just talk that through.

So we've got, during the course of March, we had continued discussions on the treatment of terms in the 2012 guidebook, something which we'll be continuing today. And by May, if not sooner, we'll be talking about treatment of other terms that were not included within the applicant guidebook, and consider those.

All of this work that we're going through is being documented so that we can start to prepare an initial draft report during the course of June, and then publish that in July. The creation of the initial report, if I could just remind everybody, this is a standard point in terms of the GNSO operating procedures and is at the point at which community input can be gathered and requested.

So do not please consider this as an end point. This is part of the process and we're a long way off an endpoint with regards to Work Track 5, but this is a meaningful checkpoint that we have set into the operating procedures for GNSO policy that enables us to go out to the community, provide information towards what the group may be considering as recommendations or options that they would like to gather feedback from the community, and that then is fed back into the process so that we can review the comments back from all

parts of the community and continue our work on the basis that we have managed to obtain further valuable information to instruct us towards a final report.

All going well, if we can coincide the final report with that of the broader GNSO PDP, then we would hope that occurs by the end of this year. But our initial focus is to reach this initial report stage in July, okay? So just wanted to make that clear. Before we go any further, does anybody have any comments or questions? And Kavouss, if you are able to talk yet, happy to take your comment or question from earlier.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Do you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Yes, Kavouss. Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I'm sorry. So at beginning I'm not very well acquainted with these things. With - or the justice, I'm sorry I was a little bit behind what you have said. Was there any suggestion for the presentation on the spreadsheet because it not very convenient nor is it very or no friendly user - or user friendly. Have you received any suggestion to improve that? I don't have any myself, but I'm asking a question. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Kavouss. I don't believe I've seen anything come back with reference to the actual document. So do please, if there is any ideas to simplify and make it easier for users, we'll happily consider those. At this stage, it's a catch all I suppose of work being undertaken and trying to put the comments and information that we gather into one place. But we look forward to any suggestions. Thanks, Kavouss.

Okay. So thanks. Annebeth has just written in the chat there that we could also look at converting this to Word documents so that that might be easier in terms of printing out the document and formatting it easy - more easily. So

that's one option that we can have a look at, okay? Okay, thank you. Any questions or comments on the work plan schedule?

Terri Agnew: Martin, this is Terri from staff. I do apologize for interrupting. I did receive a report from one member who is just having difficulty hearing you. Are you able to speak just a little bit louder for that member?

Martin Sutton: Yes. Does that help?

Terri Agnew: For me, yes.

Martin Sutton: Okay. I'm right next to the microphone now. So let's see how that goes. Right. So if we can move on to the next slide. So in the summary note that was issued earlier to the working - work track members, we wanted to summarize where we felt the conversations had been heading up to and including ICANN61 for the terms - geographic terms that we had covered, which were these three, the two character country codes, three character country codes, and the long and short form country and territory names.

So what we wanted to put to you today is drawing on those conversations, is a proposal for everybody's consideration in terms of these specific terms before we move on to consider the others in the list. For the two character country codes, we feel that there is a strong support for maintaining what we consider a status quo whereby all two letter/letter ASCII combinations would be reserved for existing and potential future country codes. (Unintelligible)

Terri Agnew: And we're trying to find the line quickly.

Martin Sutton: Okay. So I'm still here, am I?

Terri Agnew: You certainly are.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So the first one was the two character country codes as I say and maintaining the current situation for the two letter/letter combinations. The second one is with regard to…

Annebeth Lange: Martin, could I just step in a little moment? It's Annebeth here.

Martin Sutton: You may. Yes, please do.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. For the two character country codes, just to be quite specific, their status quo is reserving all two character ASCII combinations, not two letter/letter. So it's a little change from what we had put in as the status quo. So I think that is worth saying something about it since it has been where you spoke in the comments and about someone suggesting that one letter, one digit should be moved over to work track two since they were not being geographical terms.

But others have suggested that even if we have two ASCII signs or characters, it could be confusing compared with a two letter in ASCII ccTLDs. So I think it's worth mentioning since a lot of people have commented on it. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Annebeth. So we probably need to include that as a separate item whereby we consider that the letter number combination was not a geographic term and hence that that would be taken over by work track two I believe for their review and consideration.

And what we were saying here is that the actual two character country codes, which would be a two letter/letter combination for existing and future country codes would be reserved.

Man 2:   So can I make…

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Man 2: Can I ask one question?

Martin Sutton: You're very, very quiet on the line. If you could speak up please.

Man 2: Okay. I have heard that the possibility of making a combination of letters and digits is for country code. But I don't think the existing label generation rules for the roots laws allows that. We have - I mean there are restrictions that only letters are allowed.

Martin Sutton: So it's a very good point, but the whole discussion really centered on the point that as a letter number combination would not be referring to a geographic term, that that would be outside of the scope of this work track, and hence it would be reviewed and considered by work track two. And they would obviously consider any of the restrictions that may apply more on a technical basis than a geographic reference. Does that make sense?

Man 2: Okay. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Okay. So I don't think I've got - no notification or hand so I'll move on then to three character country codes. Again, this was to maintain the status quo whereby the existing list of ISO 31663 character country codes would not be available.

So the discussions relating to this, and I'll tie this again with the long and short form of coverless in both same time here because the output is the same essentially, which is to not make these available. The reason behind that was that it was considered that it is a limited number of strings that we're talking about here.

And also the consideration of whether it should be under the terms of a gTLD, which is covered by GNSO, a ccTLD, which would be the ccNSO, or

something completely different. So those discussions were had and then raised during ICANN61 session.

So in terms of where it says status quo, be a matter of saying for now, these would be unavailable, but that could quite be easily taken up by another route of discussions broader than GNSO as to how they would be allocated, treated in the future. Okay. So that's…

Carlos Gutierrez: Martin, do you - Carlos Gutierrez please, Martin.

Martin Sutton: Yes. Please go ahead.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, Martin. When I read the document, and I'm sorry, I'm only on the bridge, I was surprised to see that it was written consensus, but now that you rephrased it this way, I feel much better. I don't want to go into my comments. I just want to mention that the CWG of the ccNSO and the GNSO could not agree on any consensus position over two years, and that I think it's worthwhile discussing apart from my comments. Thank you very much.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. I appreciate that. Okay.

Emily Barabas: Martin, this is Emily from staff. We also have a hand up from Alexander Schubert and one from Kavouss, although I'm not sure if that one's an old hand. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Okay. So Alexander?

Alexander Schubert: Yes. Hello. This is Alexander. Can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Yes, we can.

Alexander Schubert: Okay, great. So when we defined the scope of this working track five, we explicitly included those names, and I haven't seen really much discussion

about how they could be applied for or not. And now to go the same route like the cross constituency working group and say oh, we don't find an easy solution.

So we cannot make a recommendation, and we handed over to the next group. That is Work Track 5 and now the Work Track 5, without even really discussing it, there's the same. Oh, we don't find any of the solution so we handed over to some group somewhere in the future.

Maybe we first start to discuss it because I haven't seen any discussion or real policy recommendations, how to apply for either three character country code or a country name.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Alexander. If I may reply as best as possible to that before we move on is one, there were some discussions during the ICANN61, plus also the points raised when we were analyzing the pros and cons for the existing treatment in the applicant guidebook, whereby there was a restrictive nature on these, which meant that nobody could apply for them.

So does everybody want to, you know, just limit it to that point where okay, we'll never know how these could have been used in whichever way possible. So it was annotated. There were still some concerns with nobody being able to actually apply for these.

The conversation moved on at ICANN61 whereby it was thought from a few of the commentators that this should sit outside of GTLD land. So outside of GNSO. And within our terms of reference, if I can go back to that particular point, well that's where we find difficulties in rooting anything further because what we did say was that we would not be looking at a scope that steps us outside of the GNSO.

And that's no sort of reasoning for the output from ICANN61 for these particular geographic terms. Happy to have any other conversations that

people want to input to on this. Okay. So Kavouss, I understand you had your hand up?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I have my hand up for one question and now after Alexander, I have a comment to make. Now, for my question. In both cases in bullet two and bullet three, there is a qualified mention they have not qualified the convenience that defer for broader discussion, or defer broader questions.

What we mean by defer broader questions, that means we don't address this issue yet? What do you mean by that? This is one. And the question raised by Alexander again, there is no procedure how to apply for the three character. What procedure and would apply?

And what he said that I agreed that we should not ping-pong issues between two groups. Either we should deploy that or we should put it aside and come back to that. But passing from one to the other is not a very efficient way. So this is my comment. So the first one is, what do we mean by defer broader questions? Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Kavouss. So if I just reference back to my points regarding the conversations at ICANN61, these related to points raised through members from within the GAC and potentially others, but I think it was mainly from within the GAC, that there was a concern if there was any attempt to release these, whereby they were tied to a GTLD/ICANN related contract.

So the point here is, in view of the limited number of strings that are referred to within these lists, particularly the three characters, that it was considered appropriate and relevant on these discussions to keep these particular strings as unavailable for the time being and to defer the broader questions because they are outside of scope for Work Track 5 based on the fact that it wanted - that there were requests to take this outside of a GNSO scope.

I hope I'm making myself understood, but if there is anybody else that has points to add to that…

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I understand you quite well, yes. I understand. I'm satisfied. I have no more questions. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. Okay. So what we would like to do then is by putting forward these proposals and perhaps with the leadership team, we'll articulate the rationale in more substantive writing based on the conversations that we've had today as well, is to circulate that for members to review.

And we will revisit this at our next meeting in the hope that we can actually come to a way forward for these three particular items so far. And as we progress, we can then add these into the initial report as to what our findings are, or potential recommendations may be heading in a particular way just to signal that, or if we want to ask any particular questions out to the community, we can add those into the initial report.

So that will be the next step. So I appreciate the questions and comments at this stage. Do please consider these as we go into our next meeting so that we can make sure that at that stage, we come to an acceptable way forward on those particular terms.

Emily Barabas: And Martin, this is Emily from staff. Sorry to interrupt. You have Annebeth with her hand up. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Annebeth, please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Thank you. This is Annebeth speaking. I just wanted to feel out for a little on what you're saying now. and I think that is important, what we heard in San Juan was that even if some countries wanted to create the codes especially, that did not want it as a GTLD, and since it cannot be a ccTLD, it's

not a ccTLD and the only thing that Work Track 5 has been its scope as far as vacancy is to decide whether a name is a GTLD or not or available or the GTLD new round or not.

And then the only solution then as far as we can see now is that we - either we give all of us the system which we had in the last round for capitals who support a non-objection. But then it will still be a GTLD. And as we understood it, it was not satisfactory for a lot of the participants in the meeting to have it that way.

That's why we try to formulate it the way in the text here as we did, but it could be written in a better way perhaps to try really to get forward what we understood from the meeting. But we would be interested in getting comments after this meeting. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Annebeth. And I notice there's a number of comments that we'll capture from the chat as well. So appreciate you putting those in. We will be - I know we're on the new system et cetera with WebEx, but we'll still be able to capture the chat and send that out to members after the meeting.

So what I'll do now then is if we proceed to the next part of the agenda, which is starting to - or hopefully moving some way through the remainder of the 2012 AUB terms that we've got. If we could move one slide on and we'll get into the details.

Okay. What we've done so far then is look at the treatment of items one, two and three on the list here that we can see in front of us. All of these, in this particular list, from one to seven, are all one in this guide book that are unavailable. They weren't - you could not apply for them in the last round.

We've already covered one to three in our earlier discussions and we'll continue that through to the next call in terms of a way forward. But for four,

five, six and seven, we might want to just see if that carries forward so that we don't have to do them individually.

These also refer to specific lists. So four is the short or long form main associated with - that's been designated as exceptionally reserved. There is also a separate country name list in the revised that was referred to under item five. The last two may be slightly different where they're referencing permutations.

And we did have some very good discussions on that point previously. So we'll come back to that. But I'm hoping that we might be able to go through these last four in one go. So if we can move to the next slide. I think we've just got to focus on - right, on these four. So this just makes it easy to read for those that are tuned in on WebEx.

So if we carry forward the same assumptions that we've made with the other three cases, I'd be interested to hear from members as to whether the same could apply to the remaining four that refer to unavailable strings. So these are all reserved currently in the applicant guidebook. Or if not, which ones you think might need to deviate from that similar treatment.

So I do open that out to (unintelligible). Wow, that was painful. Okay.

Emily Barabas: And Martin, this is Emily from staff. You have two hands up, Annebeth and Kavouss. I'm not sure if those are old hands. And for folks who do have their hands after they speak, you can click that same button that you use to raise your hand to lower it again and that way we'll know if it's an old hand. So that's Kavouss and Annebeth who currently have hands up. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. And it's all a bit of a learning exercise there. So Kavouss, did you have a comment or question?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I just have a comment that I had this question for many years. When we're talking, it is a name of a country, we are talking of English but not the other languages. All we're talking always of English, Holland and Netherland and so on to vote or. What language we're dealing with all these things, talking the name of the country or so on. Referring that name in English language. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Let's have a quick check. There are some language aspects included in the term. So if you look at for instance two and three was or a translation of in any language. So items two and three were the same there. I'm not sure if we've got the full text in front of us for the - to confirm the rest of that.

Perhaps we could - if somebody could just check on the full text of the guide book as to which ones - which items have a translation.

Emily Barabas: Hi Martin. This is Emily. Jaap just put his hand up and I'm wondering if he may want to speak to that as well. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. This is Jaap speaking if I may.

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Jaap Akkerhuis: As a reaction on Kavouss's remark, I want to say that ISO 3166 names, I mentioned that apart from that 3166 is not authoritative for the names, it also comes in two forms, the names. It comes into an English translation or in French transition of the name. So that's the language being used.

And actually a lot of times they're not really translations, but transliterations. So they are actually - it might be conferred to transliteration. So that's for - at least that's for 3166. For other lists, I wouldn't know at all.

Martin Sutton: Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Martin, it's Annebeth here.

Martin Sutton: Annebeth, please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Actually having in 2012 it was only for the three parts that had written anything about the language and then it was in any language. And so the permutations and all these other things, it's a language and it's not mentioned at all.

But what has been discussed during the time has been this impossibility of having all languages. So it's been always also been discussed as the UN languages and the language of the country. So as for languages, that is a possibility as well.

Could I give another comment as well as for the other things on the list? There's been quite a few good comments on the spreadsheet about what to do with these. And we should go back to them and try to find out how to better - if we keep it the way it is, the language is quite difficult and it's difficult to understand.

And also when we're talking about permutations, it's been mentioned that we should - and transfer decisions should not apply to three other codes. It's difficult. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Annebeth. So point noted on it. So this - the permutation is the third in the list on the screen here. It is strangely written here because it kind of indicates in the last sentence that the transposition is only considered for the long and short form names, but does not apply to three letter codes. But it doesn't sort of specify the permutation. Okay.

So that I think is something that perhaps we want to just open up still because I think this particular area caused a lot of conversations last time as to how confusing it was and perhaps whether or not this was required, and whether or not it needed to have the permutations and transpositions actually reserved and unavailable, or whether there was potentially other mechanisms, including the objection process that would be better equipped to deal with this aspect.

So we did note on the - if you refer to the spreadsheet, there were a number of conversations here on the permutations and transpositions, as to whether how relevant that should be as a reserved status for TLDs.

Emily Barabas: And Martin, this is Emily from staff. You have Dessalegn Yehuala with a hand and Kavouss's hand is still up as well.

Martin Sutton: Sorry. Who was the first?

Emily Barabas: You have Dessalegn Yehuala - oh, and now also Rahul Gosain. Oh, and Rahul's is up down, up again. So Rahul and Dessalegn and Kavouss's hand remains up. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Okay, Emily, I think I got that. So in that order, if you remember, please ask.

Dessalegn Yehuala: Okay. I would like to forward one comment here with respect to the treatment of country and code names. I think - I see here the underlying assumption is that the use of ASCII letters for writing country or territory names, is that possible to extend beyond that? Like the use of (Heli) codes for writing country and code names. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay, thank you. So what we're looking at here is anything that is specified in the current guidebook. So if we feel that there is - that those other terms that you wish to be considered are not captured in the existing terms, then please do feel free to add that to the second table that we have operating

underneath the main spreadsheet, which is about everything else that's not contained within the applicant guidebook, and we can then consider those.

So whether it might be some shortcomings on translations of particular terms, that - if it's not captured in the specific item on the current applicant guide book, we can list that to review after this process. Who was next? Is it Kavouss or Rahul? Rahul?

Rahul Gosain: Yes. This is Rahul. So revisiting the last point in which it says it is a name by which a country is commonly known as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name. Now, I think what it lands on inter-governmental or treaty organization would possibly not be in order. And as long as the country can demonstrate by substantial evidence that the country is recognized by that name, I think it should suffice. So that's my comment. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. And Kavouss? Okay. Not hearing Kavouss…

Emily Barabas: And this is…

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. It is an old hand. I cannot down it. It is old hand, yes.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. Okay. If I could go back then, because it seems that we've got possibly some other conversations on permutations and the last point on commonly known terms for countries. If I can refer to the first two, which are specific to lists, exceptional reserved lists by the ISO 3166, and a list which is a separable component of a country name.

Now that is all contained within the applicant guidebook. So it's not easy to display on here. But I'm sure most of us have printed off reams of paper of the applicant guide book. And at the end of section two, you'll see the separable country names list as it was prepared at that stage for the last round of applications.

So please refer to that if you need to be reminded. It's not a huge list. It's just the three pages here. So perhaps if we could look at those where there are defined lists and it was included in the 2012 round as reserved, does anybody feel that we should treat these differently to the first three items that we spoke of earlier, the two character, three character and short, long names? I'll be interested to hear.

Christopher Wilkerson: Hello. Can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Hello. Yes. Who is this?

Christopher Wilkerson: This is Christopher Wilkerson.

Martin Sutton: Christopher, please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkerson: Emily, I've just spent an hour trying to get onto this call. The WebEx is really not functioning properly. Martin, please summarize where you think you are at because I don't know which strings you're referring to.

Martin Sutton: Of course, Christopher. And we did apologize earlier for the confusion with the WebEx. There were emails issued in advance just to advise that the link had changes. So we're all coming to terms with the new functionality and treatment of WebEx.

Christopher Wilkerson: Yes. From my point of view, this call is a blank. I've already indicated to the secretariat that I maintain formally all the points that I've made in San Juan and in recent emails. So this has got to be sorted out if we're going to continue to work with conference calls.

Martin Sutton: So we have - we will have the recordings available, Christopher afterwards, and we do understand that. We did manage to ensure that over 70 people

could tune into this on time today. So we will obviously have that available for everybody to review post call.

In summary, we have outlined the activities that we had at ICANN61. The output that was summarized and circulated to the members prior to this meeting. And also I think I've responded to some of the correspondence that was exchanged over the last couple of days.

Where we are now is we're looking at future treatment of the remaining country and territory names where the AGB treated them as reserved completely. So there was no application possible for these terms. We've gone through the first three as proposals for the way forward, which were articulated in the emails that were sent out previously.

And now we're going through the terms. If you're into the WebEx screen now, they should be in top view.

Christopher Wilkerson: No. I'm on the bridge. I can't get into the WebEx screen at all. Just observing.

Martin Sutton: Okay. So what we're looking at Christopher…

Christopher Wilkerson: On those other terms, I think we could have resolved this months ago, but the whole of - I don't see why the whole of 3166 should not be available to the public authorities in the countries concerned and who can delegate TLDs to the registries of their choice. There is no reason to reserve absolutely any part of 3166 provided that it is only available for qualified applicants.

Martin Sutton: Okay, Christopher. We did receive your comments. And so, so that's obviously fed into the process, but there are other opinions as well we've heard of and also considered. So that I think has also been included in a reply that was circulated on the list.

So we're proceeding - the working track is proceeding to go through these particular items for future treatment. So feel free to join in and add to those conversations as we proceed. But at this stage, we're talking about two particular items, which is the short or long form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166, for instance dot EU or it is separable component of a country name designated in the separable country names list which was appended to section two of the applicant guide book.

And what we're asking is to the members, could these be treated in the same way that we have referenced or proposed for the two character, three character and - oh, sorry, the three character and long and short form names, which were maintained as status quo, which is not make them available.

And because these discussion start to go outside of a GNSO environment, those broader questions as to who could apply and what priorities would be given, would need to be taken outside of the Work Track 5 and existing PDP. So if anybody has - I've got some hands raised here. So I've got…

Christopher Wilkerson: With that line of argument, the Work Track 5 was taken outside of the GNSO traditional framework.

Martin Sutton: Christopher, I've already answered that. I've got a queue already. Can I just put you at the end of the queue and then we'll just check, because I've got…

Christopher Wilkerson: I can't see the queue. I apologize.

Martin Sutton: I think Rahul, Alexander. Are they old hands?

Emily Barabas: Martin, this is Emily. I believe they're new hands.

Rahul Gosain: This is Rahul for the record. So can I go ahead?

Martin Sutton: Please do.

Rahul Gosain: Yes. So another thing which I noticed is, it is a name by which a country is commonly known. Now, in front of this, we should I suppose add in any language because in order to take care of the names of a country by which it is commonly known in any language. So is that point taken?

Martin Sutton: That point is taken if it isn't explicit in the current guide book so that we can put that into what we'll need to consider outside of the existing terms. So that could be packed onto the other page. But if I could just remind everybody, where we are going back to is the first two items on this list, which are both maintained on explicit lists that are, you know, an easy reference and predictable way to designate any reservations.

So the question out to the members is, should we follow the similar treatment that we've discussed for the three current codes and the long and short names and apply that to these first two in the list? Sorry. Do we have others in the list please, because I didn't capture the list of names?

Martin Sutton: Hi Martin. This is Emily. I don't believe there's anyone in the - currently in the queue.

Emily Barabas: Okay. Christopher, please go ahead then.

Christopher Wilkerson: I think I'll pass on this. I'll read the - I'll respond in email to the requests for comments.

Martin Sutton: So does anybody else have any comments or feedback on treatment of the first two in this list?

Emily Barabas: And Martin, this is Emily from staff. You have Annebeth and Alan in the queue.

Martin Sutton: Annebeth, please go ahead. Annebeth, we can't hear you. Okay. We go to Alan and hopefully we'll fix the communications.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I hope you can hear me.

Martin Sutton: Yes, we can, loud and clear.

Alan Greenberg: Good. This is sort of a red herring, but I'm just looking at the phrasing of these country names in any language. How do we manage that, given that there are a very large number of languages and it cannot be a definitive list?

Martin Sutton: Good point.

Christopher Wilkerson: Well, this is Christopher.

Martin Sutton: Go ahead, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkerson: This is not an unfamiliar problem. I would start with the - with any official language in the country or geography concerned by the relevant string. And depending on the request for expanding that, you can go to all the United Nations languages.

I think I would agree with Alan's implicit comment that it is not reasonable to ask for all strings to be treated equally in all global languages. And I would even doubt that our previous I think Indian commentator was actually seeking that. In India it would be quite a lot to cover all official languages in that country and I think would be sufficient with done lists worldwide.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Christopher. Is there anybody else in the queue?

Emily Barabas: Yes. You have Javier in the queue.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Please go ahead, Javier. You may be on mute.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Hello.

Emily Barabas: Javier - there you go.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes. Can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: We can, yes.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: This is Javier for the record. Earlier in the chat, on this issue of any
                   language, I said something regarding the list of UN languages as a good list,
                   but I think Olga replied this might be too short, too little, I mean too few. So I
                   mean I wonder if there's any listing out there that's better than the UN list of
                   languages? If anybody cared to comment. I mean I think Christopher's
                   suggestion is a good place to start on that. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay. So what I would suggest that we look at there is where the guide book
                   is not explicit in terms of which languages or translations, whether there
                   should be or shouldn't be. I think we should take that over to the list of what
                   isn't in the guide book.

                   Here we have got an item which says in any language. So I think we should
                   mark that down as a to-do as to check how that could actually be
                   implemented if we want to proceed on the basis that this is reserved. If we're
                   saying these are reserved, then it would be ideal to have a definitive list is
                   what we're kind of saying here for the different languages.

                   And recommendations to that effect would be, you know, what languages, to
                   what extent and where could we actually obtain that list, if it actually exists?

Annebeth Lange: (Unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: Hello. Did someone want to speak? Okay.

Terri Agnew: Martin, this is Terri from staff. I actually was able to unmute Annebeth. So
                   Annebeth, I don't know if you want to try to speak at this time.

Annebeth Lange: Hello. No. Actually no. I just saw that something happened with my
                   microphone. So I just tested if you could hear me, but now you can, okay?

Martin Sutton: You can, yes?

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Good. No comment.

Rahul Gosain: I just wanted to make a small comment on that point regarding the definitive
                   list and the exhaustiveness of the languages and the overlaps on UN
                   languages. So I personally would be putting my vote with all languages. And
                   by its definition, no list can aspire to be absolutely definitive. And that is a
                   point I think Christopher also made in one of his previous emails, that over
                   reliance on the ISO 3166 list would perhaps not be in order.

Martin Sutton: So in the absence of a 3166 list, where would - what other suggestions would
                   you have instead of, so that there is a definitive list to refer to?

Rahul Gosain: For starters, either we do start towards developing exhaustive repository or - I
                   mean all this discussion around the ISO 3166 list would perhaps risk us at
                   leaving out some names which would be viewed as sensitive and which
                   should ideally be in the result category, as opposed to getting released. So
                   that is the concern I wanted to flag. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Does anybody have any other comments regarding 3166 lists?

Alexander Schubert: Yes. I have. This is Alexander. The - when we talk about all languages,
                   I just did a quick Google search, how many languages are there and it seems

it's about 7,000 languages. And let's say we have about 200 countries and territories, that's roughly - it could be up to 140,000 terms, okay.

In many languages of course, the country has more or less the same name, but this could be tens of thousands of strings that we're going to block here without even having an overview how those look. So maybe before we potentially blocking tens of thousands of strings, we compile, somebody compiles a rough list how those could look like.

Martin Sutton: There's background noise. Somebody is…

Christopher Wilkerson: Martin, this is Christopher again.

Martin Sutton: Can we just - just wait one moment please, Christopher .is that - okay, great. Thanks. Okay. Christopher, please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkerson: I think it's not practical to speak in terms of all languages I repeat. The - first of all that you'll be doing a great service to internet users worldwide if you recognize all official languages in each country, jurisdiction or region. That would be a great start.

Secondly, as I said just earlier, I'm not particularly in favor of reservation. I'm in favor of allowing registration on the basis of approved - of an approved registry. The problem behind much of this discussion is the implication that if it's not specifically specified in the application guidebook or in 3166, that the string is potentially available for open registration. That is absolutely out of the question.

So what we're talking about are the terms and conditions for registration by approved registries in the jurisdictions applicable to the language and string concerned. But as long as there is this implication that if we don't get it into the 3166 or some other list, that it becomes a candidate for generic TLD, there will be no agreement. We're just walking into a brick wall.

I would also footnote, because there are other - there's far more expertise than I have in this field in ICANN and in the community, but I think we have - as Annebeth hinted earlier on and this afternoon, I think we have not yet addressed the - what these strings would look like in non-Latin languages.

I have just enough contact with the Chinese language to see that there are - there is scope for problems there, including the C.J K Group's work. But beyond that, I'm not a linguist, certainly not in the Indian subcontinent context. And somebody somewhere is going to have to review, discuss and advice on what these strings would look like in the languages and scripts concerned. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. If I could bring us back to this list so that we can at least work through the items so that we can progress through these more clearly. I know that we've got the language issue on the cards to work through. But let's just stick first of all with these two items on the list here. Just wanting to make sure that we have any idea of a suggestion, some way forward with regarding to the 3166 list that we have here for exceptionally reserved names.

So let's just do that one at a time. do we feel that that one itself does not, or does fit perhaps into the same way forward that we looked at for three character codes and the long and short names referenced? This doesn't talk to any language issue on this one. It's just purely that list.

So perhaps if I could just take some comments on that, because I'd like us to work through some of these. I hope that we might be able to group these together, but it's obvious that these have different elements to them, which make it not sensible to do all in one go. So if we just take the first one please.

Emily Barabas: Martin, this is Emily from staff. You have Dessalegn Yehuala. You did have Alan, but it looks like his hand is now down. Then you have Jaap, and you still have hands up from Javier and Kavouss, although I think those might be old hands. So Dessalegn and then Jaap. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Dessalegn, please go ahead.

Dessalegn Yehuala: Okay. Thank you. I'm Dessalegn. I want to go back to the previous, Chris's point that - and this - I mean the treatment of country and territory names, I see both of them as labeled that when - where at the linguist we level, what matters most is the script instead of language. So the script in my opinion should only focus on the inclusiveness of all the scripts instead of language, because…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Sorry. Can I just interrupt please? Are you referencing this particular item on the first listed here, the short long form name association with a code that has been designated exceptionally reserved? I understand your point on IDNs and that that is not contained within here, but as long as you're referring to your comment on this, then please proceed.

Dessalegn Yehuala: Okay. So my comment relates to IDN, so (unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: But we - so please do. We want to capture those in terms of areas that are not represented in the AGB so that would go on the list to consider as we finish this review of the treatment of 2012 guide book.

Dessalegn Yehuala: Okay.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Jaap?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. This is Jaap speaking. And I want to comment the notion of the - I mean exceptional reserved names. And the - I don't know how this ended up in the old guide book, but there is actually no definitions what is an exceptional reserved name in a standard at all. And the whole idea of reserved names is actually something that is being normally kept inside the 3166.

And so this special reference to - from internal workings of Nations agencies is probably something you should not do in a new version of the guide book. Furthermore, for your information, the whole - I don't know - I think echo is gone by now.

Martin Sutton: Yes. Please go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: There's still some echo, but I'll try to finish my answer. I was going to say that the whole standard is up to the five year revision period and it might be that the whole notion of reserved names is going to change as well. What I would suggest is that if you're going to do new guide book, you might consider taking this whole notion of reserved and exceptional reserved names out of the whole guide book.

Martin Sutton: And leave it as a void or what…

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. When it's - because it's - I mean it's - using undefined terms is not a good idea at all. So just don't mention this. But at least that would be my advice for revision of the guidebook.

Martin Sutton: Okay. I think - thank you for that, Jaap. And the - I know Nick's comments as well. So again, we're talking about relatively few in a list and that it's not particularly easy to say what the short or long form name association with these codes even is. So a suggestion there that that would be dropped from the list. So similar to your point, Jaap.

So does anybody else support that notion or not support that notion? It would be useful to know now and we could feed that in.

Christopher Wilkerson: Well, Martin, this is Christopher again. I would support Jaap's notion. I think reading the literature, the ICANN literature on this over the last two years, there's been attempt to cherry pick in ISO 3166. I think ICANN and the community should just accept the international standard as it is as representing the countries and subdivisions concerned.

My main point however is - which I have made in an email to the - suggestion to the leadership group a few weeks ago, and maybe I should repeat it to the list, is that there are many subdivisions of countries which are not included in ISO 3166 at all. There's a strong bias in ISO 3166 for historical and geographical reasons towards islands.

I drew the example from the UK where the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands and even Gibraltar and the Malvinas have their own two letter code, but Scotland, Wales and the English counties do not. In the United States, the US has a code, but as far as I can see, none of the 51 States have a code in ISO 3166.

So there's an enormous bias in 3166 towards a certain category of subdivisions, ignoring other subdivisions which are economically, socially and demographically as important and sometimes much more important than the subdivisions in 3166. Thank you.

Carlos Gutierrez: This is Carlos, if I may.

Martin Sutton: Please go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: I second Jaap's motion and propose to submit it in written form so it can be discussed in the next meeting. Thank you very much.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Okay. So that helps with the first item on the list. Thank you.
                    So just thinking through your comments there, Christopher, on the different
                    codes that do not exist for certain places like Scotland for instance, I mean so
                    what we're saying there is, I don't - affects that.

                    What we're saying is that there would be other terms and other potential
                    terms that protect a Scotland term for instance, or they have an objection
                    process to follow through.

Christopher Wilkerson: No.

Martin Sutton: But what you're suggesting is that there is a sort of fire away anyway to - and
                    we're assuming the others may even want to apply for these terms, the
                    thousands of different terms.

Christopher Wilkerson: Well, I don't know who these others are and - but my basic point is
                    as we would say in French (French spoken). You have insisted in starting at
                    the bottom in 3166 and trying to move up towards eventual assessments for
                    other lists and codes and countries and regions and what have you, and
                    geographical indications that are not in 3166.

                    I have advocated from the beginning that we should start at the top, the - and
                    work out a policy for the generality of geographical terms. 3166 is a very
                    useful, well codified subset and we should leave it be because it's an
                    international standard. But it's not helpful in terms of deciding who or how
                    geographical terms in general may be delegated.

                    There are hundreds, if not more of geographical terms which are not are not
                    in ISO 3166 at all and they have to be protected. And we've seen the
                    disputes…

Martin Sutton: From what? What are you - so could you - so please just for my benefit here.
                    So what - in terms of all of these different elements that you talk about

beyond what is already protected, what is it that you're saying needs to be protected? As in what do the users or registrants need to be protected from? I'm just trying to grasp why there needs to be excessive reservation or a priority from what you're saying towards a body or a local body or authority.

Christopher Wilkerson: Well, I think it's obviously, but I'll do this in writing. I've written it all up. I'll send it to the list in the next few days before the next meeting.

Martin Sutton: Okay. That would be helpful. Thank you.

Christopher Wilkerson: But basically we must protect ICANN and the DNS from any more Amazons for example. We must ensure that there are no hijacking of country names as we've experienced within my lifetime with quite a few of the ccTLDs. We must ensure that the…

Martin Sutton: So the ccTLDs, when you say that though, that's outside of scope again, isn't it because that's the ccNSO environment. So okay. Please do put - articulate those concerns more clearly in writing then. I'd appreciate that because from what you're saying, there is an expansive need from your point of view to either reserve or prevent others from applying for these and just restrict it to perhaps local authorities or some kind of body.

So it would be useful to understand to the extent that you think that that protection is needed and…

Christopher Wilkerson: Yes, and the authorization process is necessary rather than an objection process.

Martin Sutton: So do we have anybody else on the list - on the queue, because we're just coming up to close this off? Is there anybody on the list in the queue?

Emily Barabas: No. The list is clear.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thanks, Emily. Okay. So given the time, I think we'll move to any other business just to make sure that we can cover that off because we close. And we will unfortunately need to continue going through the remainder of the list. I was hoping to make a bit more progress today. But thank you anyway for the input and comments on the particular elements that we covered today.

So I'll open the floor to any other business that members wish to raise.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Next meeting. Jaap.

Martin Sutton: Okay, Jaap, we'll cover that. And Emily, could you remind me of the time and date? It's not too long to go to the next one.

Emily Barabas: Hi Martin. This is Emily from staff. The next meeting is on Wednesday April `18 at 20 UTC.

Martin Sutton: Thank you very much. Is there any other business people wish to raise? I haven't been able to follow the chat. Does any of the other co-leaders have anything to add that they may have observed through the chat?

Emily Barabas: And Martin, we have a hand up from Annebeth. This is Emily from staff.

Martin Sutton: Please go ahead, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Hi. This is Annebeth speaking. I think it's a lot useful input in the chat. So what we do when we finish this meeting, we practice sort out everything there and put it in the right place, and then the co-chairs have to discuss it and go on to update before we go to the next meeting.

So we didn't get as far as we wanted this time, but the discussions have been interesting. So that's the main thing now. And we'll talk next time. So thank you chairing the meeting, Martin.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Annebeth. So last - final call for any other comments. Otherwise, you'll get a few minutes back and we'll carry on the conversation our next meeting. But do please continue the exchanges via email between now and our next meeting.

Christopher Wilkerson: Martin, it would be very helpful if the staff could just copy paste the chat into an email to the list because I've had no opportunity to get on to any aspect of the WebEx.

Martin Sutton: Yes. Absolutely, Christopher. That will be circulated after the call.

Christopher Wilkerson: Thank you. And I apologize for taking up some of your time in the last part of the call, but I do recall that you had an hour without me before. So you can't blame me for all the lapses.

Martin Sutton: And we missed you. Thank you, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkerson: Thank you very much and goodbye everyone. Bye.

Martin Sutton: All right. Have a good day everybody. We'll close the call. Thank you.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Martin.

                                            END