

**Attendance:**

Abdulkarim Oloyede	John Rodriguez
Alexander Schubert	Jorge Cancio
Ashley Heineman	Justine Chew
Bernd Neujahr	Kavouss Arasteh
Cheryl Langdon-Orr	Kristina Rosette
Chris Casavale	Kristine Dorrain
Christopher Wilkinson	Marita Moll
Colin O'Brien	Martin Sutton
David McAuley	Matt Johnson
	Nick Wenban-Smith
Dev Anand Teelucksingh	Paul McGrady
Ejikeme Egbuogu	Sophie Hey
Erich Schweighofer	Susan Anthony
Greg Shatan	Susan Payne
GZ Kabir	Svitlana Tkachenko
Javier Rúa Jovet (ALAC co-lead)	Timothy Asiedu
Jess Hooper	Vernatius Ezeama

Apologies:

Flip Petillion  
Katrín Ohlmer  
Jim Prendergast  
Annebeth Lange  
Jaap Akkerhuis  
Yrjö Lansipuro  
Luca Barbero

Staff:

Steve Chan  
Julie Hedlund  
Berry Cobb  
Michelle DeSmyter

**Zoom chat:**

00:30:32 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Nick

00:30:41 PMcGrady: I'm pretty sure I already updated by SOI with this group, but just in case, my SOI reflects my new firm Taft Law

00:30:58 David McAuley: sorry to be a bit late

00:31:06 christopher wilkinson:@Nick - Which Amazon?

00:31:41 David McAuley: I am phone number ending in 4154

00:31:54 Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): And I'm the 1354 phone number.

00:31:59 Jorge Cancio : I guess it goes withoutsaying that in case of doubt the comment itself "commands" - and in case of serious doubts te commenter would be contacted...

00:32:10 martinsutton: Please note that we will be reviewing the comments to ensure they are categorised and summarised appropriately. Substantive review will follow as soon as we have completed this task.

00:32:34 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Happy t9 assist

00:32:36 PMcGrady: @Martin, thank you.

00:32:38 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: to

00:33:22 Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet: @christopher Amazon Registry - some of their gTLDs

00:43:27 David McAuley: good suggestion, Martin

00:43:44 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We do read out the Question Number and details

00:44:53 Jorge Cancio : as said before, just for th record: I guess it goes withoutsaying that in case of doubt the comment itself "commands" - and in case of serious doubts te commenter would be contacted...

00:45:21 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed this is the oportunity to go back to a commenter for any clarifications

00:45:42 Justine Chew: Line 49: Should CITC comment be divergence? Because it says "ISO should not be the only source ..."

00:46:35 Justine Chew: So doesn't that mean they think ISO should be ONE source ...?

00:47:07 Alexander: "..... not be the singular source....."

00:47:32 Justine Chew: Greg is raising exactly the question I raised.

00:48:43 Justine Chew: @Greg: Unfortunately we have been going on the basis that if the answer does not support the question then it's marked as divergence.

00:49:09 Kristine Dorrain: we've been using the word divergence to indicate disagreement all along. let's not change it now.

00:50:59 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: @MArtin perhaps we just note that clarification now in Notes

00:51:23 Greg Shatan: If we continue to use "divergence" to mean "non-support, disagreement, objection" we'll just have to keep that in mind. We are not using the term "Divergence" for its common meaning in PDP-land.

00:51:28 Steve Chan: @Martin, it seems in line with many of the others, based on your description: Divergence (in the sense that the strings should be made generally available)

00:51:48 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct @Greg and we can of course do just that

00:52:03 martinsutton: @Steve, agree and that emphasis the main theme of BRG comments

00:52:16 Steve Chan: @Martin, done

00:54:09 Christopher Wilkinson: there letter currenc

00:54:23 Kristine Dorrain: I agree that the question is confusing but I think peoples Jews are Lear and notes capture them adequately.

00:54:31 Kristine Dorrain: peoples views  
00:54:38 Kristine Dorrain: not Jews are Lear  
00:54:52 Greg Shatan: It's getting Shakespearean in here.  
00:54:56 Kristine Dorrain: (apparently my iPad autocorrects things oddly  
00:55:07 David McAuley: verily  
00:55:10 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: indeed it seems an interesting auto correct style  
00:55:15 Susan Payne: I agree that because the question is unclear, the categorisation of the comments is also unclear and a little unhelpful  
00:55:15 Christopher Wilkinson: Three letter country codes are the competence of CCNSO. The ISO4217 currency codes are - apparently - the competence of the PDP only. They have to be reserved and protected- CW  
00:55:25 Steve Chan: Indeed, staff tried to parse out the reasons for divergence, which are different as Greg noted.  
00:55:51 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Steve well noted  
00:56:39 Greg Shatan: Two letter country codes are the competence of ccNSO. Three letter codes are not. Currency codes are not geographic terms.  
00:57:01 Justine Chew: Just going back to f.2.2.2, Line 51 BC's comment: I actually think that their comment is agreement rather than divergence.  
00:57:38 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do we need the to clarify then @Justine?  
00:58:02 Susan Payne: Can we just go through comments on one screen? we cannot scroll, so we cannot follow in the zoom if it's across multiple screens  
00:58:07 Justine Chew: I think that would be wise, unless I am the only one who's reading it incorrectly.  
00:58:38 Justine Chew: in reply to @Cheryl  
00:58:43 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OK Staff can we reach out to the BC  
00:59:04 Christopher Wilkinson: Can't read the text on screen. Font too small.  
00:59:25 Marita Moll: Totally driving my crazy!!!  
00:59:36 Abdulkarim Oloyede: correct  
00:59:48 Steve Chan: If you want to follow along in the doc itself, you can do so here: [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1WKSC\\_pPBviCnbHxW171Zlp4CzuhQXRCV1NR2ruagxs/edit#gid=1817602734](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1WKSC_pPBviCnbHxW171Zlp4CzuhQXRCV1NR2ruagxs/edit#gid=1817602734)  
00:59:50 Greg Shatan: You should be able to "zoom" in on Zoom.  
01:00:30 Christopher Wilkinson: I would enter a general reserve on all this context. The presentation of the document is totally unworkable. CW  
01:00:35 PMcGrady: I feel lost whenever we lose Cheryl!  
01:00:35 Kristine Dorrain: @ Steve, that doesn't work for me on iPad - normally I have my laptop but not today  
01:00:49 Susan Payne: @Greg can you though?  
01:00:54 Dev Anand Teelucksingh: indeed on mobile - we can pinch to zoom the screen  
01:01:41 Kristine Dorrain: yes, I'm finding the one advantage to iPad is the zooming function  
01:01:50 Justine Chew: I can totally understand people getting lost. I have the luxury of using 2 screens :)

01:01:59 Kristine Dorrain: (autocorrect notwithstanding)

01:02:16 Susan Payne: @Steve, I understand it's possible to go to another screen, but toggling back and forward is not a quick process

01:03:12 Jorge Cancio : to add to confusion: I can only use the browser-based zoom, which may have differences to the fully-fledged version...

01:03:29 julie.hedlund: @Justine: Staff read the comment from BC in line 51 of f2.2.2 and to us it seems to be divergence in that it suggests that strings should generally be made available. But please let us know what we may have missed — thanks!

01:04:03 Jorge Cancio : to Kobe? (just kidding...)

01:04:29 Susan Payne: Thanks you!!!

01:05:04 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: @Steve has done quite well at moving the screen along in synch though ;-)

01:05:33 Justine Chew: @Julie: Let me think about it....

01:06:13 Jorge Cancio : hand up

01:06:41 David McAuley: yes

01:08:58 Steve Chan: @Jorge, how does it look now? Qualified agreement and a New Idea?

01:09:41 Steve Chan: @Jorge, others, please let us know if that works.

01:10:06 Justine Chew: @Julie: I agree with the assessment that BC's comment translates to "strings should be made generally available" .... although I'm still not entirely sure that it should be marked as divergence. I guess what's key is the assessment of "strings should be made generally available".

01:12:34 julie.hedlund: @Justine: Thanks for that. As Steve noted above, we've tried to parse the reasons for divergence and we'll note that the use of the term "divergence" is perhaps not ideal, but that's the categorizations we've been using.

01:12:46 Kristine Dorrain: @Justine, as I recall the BC comment was the same as IPC, Group of Registries and BRG at least... I can't see it any longer but that's my recollection.

01:13:14 Jorge Cancio : @Steve: on 15, I would say it is more "concerns&new idea"

01:14:01 PMcGrady: +1 Susan

01:14:57 Justine Chew: @Kristine, IPC's comment expressly says "The ISO is an objective standard of geo terms..." I can't seem to interpret that from BC's comment.

01:17:36 Kristine Dorrain: @Justine, I wish I could go back and look. :) Staff, did we flag it for review?

01:19:55 julie.hedlund: @All: Staff is noting where there have been requests to go back and recategorize comments and we'll capture those as actions to do so.

01:20:48 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Julie for confirming that

01:23:32 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Martin

01:25:23 julie.hedlund: @Kristine: So we should change to "Agreement (Qualified)"?

01:25:26 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thx @Kristine we can note that

01:25:32 David McAuley: Kristine - can you remind me of what line and question that was about

01:25:47 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Line 5

01:25:50 David McAuley: i cannot seem to find it readily

01:26:03 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: in this section

01:26:08 julie.hedlund: @David: I think Group of Registries, line 5  
01:26:26 julie.hedlund: @Paul: We'll change IPC to "Agreement (Qualified)"  
01:26:29 PMcGrady: Thanks!  
01:26:31 Kristine Dorrain: @David, yes line 5  
01:26:38 David McAuley: thank you  
01:26:51 David McAuley: thanks - now clear, I thought you were referring to RySG  
01:27:01 David McAuley: but see it is a subset of RySG  
01:27:12 Kristine Dorrain: ah ok - yep  
01:31:50 Marita Moll: Looks like simple agreement  
01:32:17 Susan Payne: INTA: I think if you look at other comments referred to it's clear they agree  
01:33:05 Marita Moll: So, now I lost track of where that was, but it should be amended to agree with other decisions  
01:33:07 martinsutton: Thx Susan - was trying to look back to INTAs response  
01:33:46 Steve Chan: @All, for the INTA comment, it is so-called Agreement, but it just has an explanatory note.  
01:34:00 julie.hedlund: @Susan: Do you mean Line 9 under Question 18 for INTA? So are you suggesting we delete the explanatory note?  
01:34:01 Steve Chan: When there is a reference to another comment, it can complicate things  
01:34:19 Steve Chan: We can remove the note for the INTA comment  
01:34:22 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OR move the note to a column for notes  
01:34:54 martinsutton: Good progress everyone, thank you. 20 mins to go so we can try to move on as far as possible  
01:35:11 Steve Chan: Good suggestion Cheryl, we'll do that  
01:38:06 John Rodriguez: Thank you for reflecting "New Idea" with regards to line 7 (US comment).  
01:38:25 martinsutton: Line 15 is BRG comment which does not support any restriction or requirements for approval/non-objection. So this should be "Divergent"  
01:40:21 Steve Chan: As you all may have noted, that RySG overarching comment is referenced by them in a number of proposals. It's therefore been duplicated a number of times.  
01:41:24 Alexander: It's a bit problematic that "not support" doesn't indicate whether the relevant measure is too restrictive or doesn't restrict enough ....  
01:42:22 Jorge Cancio : Alexander has a point...  
01:43:45 Justine Chew: f.2.3.2 Line 4, ALAC's comment: can I have this marked as Agreement (qualified) please?  
01:44:16 julie.hedlund: @Justine: noted!  
01:44:16 Justine Chew: Because there is a proviso  
01:45:15 Justine Chew: @Julie: thanks!  
01:45:41 Steve Chan: Javier, hand up  
01:45:45 julie.hedlund: @Justine: It's been changed :-)  
01:47:12 Marita Moll: @Julie -- thanks for changing that -- it was bothering me too. Just hard to react quickly in this new context

01:48:06 David McAuley: will be interesting to drill down into this rather complex variant (19, variant 1)

01:48:08 Marita Moll: Yes, @ Alexander, we are having some difficulty with this

01:48:37 martinsutton: Thanks Steve

01:48:45 Jorge Cancio : These summaries are just a help-tool, but what Counts are the comments themselves and the reasons behind the positions - e.g. why people diverge, especially when the reasons of disagreement are on opposite poles

01:48:57 Justine Chew: Yes, Steve is correct

01:49:13 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Justine's hand is up

01:52:22 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Time check

01:52:26 Steve Chan: @Javier, time check. Less than 3 minutes remaining.

01:52:34 Steve Chan: Jinx Cheryl :)

01:52:38 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: :-)

01:52:56 Justine Chew: f.2.3.2 Line 26/3, I confirm ALAC's comment is captured completely and yes, there was both support and opposition to Proposal 19 Variant 1 but we only provided explanation to the opposition.

01:53:09 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Justone

01:53:16 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: typo sorry

01:53:30 Justine Chew: I am just one ;)

01:53:34 Michelle DeSmyter: Next meeting: Wednesday, 15 May 2019 20:00 UTC

01:53:45 julie.hedlund: 15 May at 20:00 UTC

01:53:48 martinsutton: Thx Michelle

01:53:49 julie.hedlund: for 90 minutes

01:53:52 Susan Payne: Thanks Javier, good call

01:53:56 Alexander: THAANKS!

01:53:57 martinsutton: Thank you all - well done

01:53:57 David McAuley: thanks Javier and all

01:54:06 Dev Anand Teelucksingh: thanks all

01:54:06 Kristine Dorrain: well done,

01:54:07 David McAuley: bye

01:54:09 Justine Chew: Thanks, got to run

01:54:09 Marita Moll: bye

01:54:09 Ejikeme Egbuogu: bye all

01:54:12 John Rodriguez: Thanks and bye!

01:54:13 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye thanks

01:54:14 Colin O'Brien: bye all