

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the CPWG SubPro single-issue call on geographic names taking place on Tuesday, 25th of February 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English Channel we have Jonathan Zuck, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gordon Chillcott, Alfredo Calderon, Vrikson Acosta, Eduardo Diaz, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Bill Jouris, Priyatosh Jana, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, Javier Rúa-Jovet, Pierre Jean-Darres, Yrjö Lansipuro, Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, Avri Doria, Justine Chew, Bastian Goslings, Dave Kissoondoyal, and Alan Greenberg, as well as Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Maureen Hilyard.

On the Spanish channel, we currently don't have anyone listed, and on the French channel, we have Michel Tchonang Linze. We have received apologies from Marita Moll, Roberto Gaetano, and from Sébastien Bachollet.

From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, myself, Yeşim Nazlar, and I'll also be doing call management for today's call. As you know, we have Spanish and French interpretation. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and Paula, and our French interpreters are Aurélie and Jacques.

And before we start just a reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now I would like to leave the floor over to Jonathan Zuck. Thanks so much, Jonathan.

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.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks a lot. Welcome everyone to the single-issue call on Geographic Names. This is an issue that continues to come up—Alan, you may need to mute your line—in At-Large discussions because we're very concerned about indigenous interests. And so, we will probably continue to discuss for some time to figure out how to reach consensus and move forward.

As far as the agenda, we're going to see a brief presentation on the Work Track 5 report from Javier, followed by a discussion on the geo names scorecard from Justine and the small team, and then we'll discuss next steps, and then any other business.

Is there anything that anybody wants to add to the agenda that's not currently there? All right. Well, then we will consider the agenda adopted and I'll pass the microphone to Javier to give us a brief presentation on Work Track 5.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Thanks, Jonathan. Hi to all. So quickly, and to thank Justine for these great slides, because she was the one that worked on them, so thanks, Justine, let's just go to the first slide in the interest of time.

So, for those who don't know, and probably you all know, but Work Track 5 is Work Track 5 of the Subsequent Procedures GNSO PDP for our next round of TLDs, and Work Track 5 is the fifth track of work in that PDP and has to do with geographic names at the top-level, right of the dot.

Not in this slide, but I like to point out that Work Track 5—which actually ended its work in ICANN66 when the Work Track basically presented its report to the PDP plenary—was a real good experiment in multi-stakeholder [instrument] and cross-community PDP policy-making. It's structured with leadership from GNSO, from ALAC, from ccNSO and GAC. And that, in itself, was an interesting experiment. I think it also a good message in terms of how we can do PDPs for the future.

It had very good participation from different communities. I think we had over 168 members, and around 100 observers represented the whole breadth of diversity in ICANN; many, many, many members from a large community that did great work there.

So, generally from this slide, what you can see is that we had a bit of a contradiction — or not contradiction, actually binding policy, or established policy, from 2007, from the GNSO, had a set of policies and those policies were not exactly reflected in the implementation and the Applicant Guidebook, the AGB, the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, which was a document by which you would apply for new gTLDs in the first round, or in the only round so far. That was a bit of an issue.

I think we can jump just to slide eight, and then we'll work back from there. Where are we? So, I told you that we submitted our final report. The main consensus achieved by Work Track 5, by the Work Track 5 members, was a general ratification of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook's recommendations, or guidelines, to adopt those as binding consensus policy for the future round.

And working backwards from that, basically, as you can see in this slide, number one, the first norm that will become consensus policy once it's ratified by the plenary and adopted in the final PDP document that should be done by this year, 2020.

Number one, "Continue to reserve old two-character letter ASCII combination to the top level." So, all two-character codes continue to be reserved, and that's no change from 2007, so that was maintained. There was no innovation there.

In the number two section here, the first big consensus is to maintain the treatment of country and territory names in the AGB. So, for example, permutations and transpositions of strings are reserved and unavailable for delegation.

So, for example, a long-form name listed in the ISO 3166 in the—as you guys know—the ISO, the International Standards Organization, ICANN uses the ISO 3166 list there to determine what are the countries and territories that have codes. And so that list, which is very stable, is a third party—it's not ICANN making up what's a country and what's a territory—that actually feeds itself from some UN standards, etc.

So, if there's a name in there in the long-form—let's say, for example, United States of America—that's reserved. So, .unitedstatesofamerica cannot be delegated. The short form, maybe .unitedstates, cannot be delegated because it's also in that list.

Exceptionally reserved names in the ISO list are a few names or strings. For example, .UK. .UK has been reserved by the United Kingdom of Great Britain for it to be reserved, and to be not delegable. So, in that

list of exceptionally reserved there are other strings there requested by international, intergovernmental organizations, and those are there.

So, we'll have to make reference to that list to see what those are. But generally, those two that I mentioned are examples.

Also, there's a list, the separable country names list, we can easily find that just in the Internet. Just Google it. There's a GAC list on separable country names, ICANN list, and it's similar to ... So, for example, you take United States of America. I would have to double-check, but probably "America" is protected there.

Or if you have official name, the name of Russia is "Russian Federation," or maybe "Russia" is protected, so we will have to make a reference to that list to see what are the separable components that are protected or reserved that cannot be requested by an applicant and therefore also not delegated.

And permutations, transpositions. If you have a name, again, like United States of America, permutations and transposition of that, "America, United States of," or "United States of America, the," that type of string—and I'm talking about TLDs, so right of the dot—are also reserved and cannot be applied for. So, that's a flavor of that number two section, there.

Number three. There is, also, a practice or a guideline under the 2012 AGB of certain strings that required a letter of support or non-objection from an official entity, a governmental official entity. Here, it's mentioning the composition of macro-geographical regions. Those are the so-called M49 regions.

So, for example, something like .latinamerica, which is an M49 region ... Or I think the region is actually “Latin America, Caribbean,” so .latinamericacaribbean would require under this norm, here, in order to be applied for and delegated, the minimum is it would require 60% of all the countries in that region to grant some sort of support or non-objection.

So, pretty steep to get that there. It's not completely reserved, but it's steep to apply for it. Next slide, please. Hopefully, the next slide. Yeah. No. Well, I mean no.

So, other strings that require a letter of support from a government or non-objection is capital cities. I forget where the slide on capital cities is. But generally, if you are a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166, if some entity wants to apply for a string that is basically that capital city of—thank you, Justine, slide four. Please go back—a country or territory listed in ISO 3166, there's an intention to apply for that as a string, as a geographic name at the top level right of the dot, you will require some sort of letter of support or non-objection from the relevant official authority.

So, as you can see in this slide, “capital city” means any string that is a representation in any language—that's very important—of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166.

Here listed is also a test for non-capital city names. Any name, A, “it is clear from applicants statements within the application that the applicant will use a TLD primarily for purposes associated with that city

name,” and B, “the applied-for string is a city name is listed on official city documents.”

So, let's go back to eight, and then come continue to nine, and then quickly open for questions. I'm sure some questions, some answers I won't know and others will.

So as I told you, Work Track 5 sent its over to the plenary, and even though Work Track 5 is not dissolved, legally or officially, it's really in a form of, I would say ... It's there and members are participating but the Work Track 5 in itself has already finished its work and our members, including leadership, are still engaging in the main PDP and also in leadership calls etc., and planning. And Work Track 5 members, many of them are members of, also, the main PDP, so that discussion keeps on going. Next slide.

So, yeah. Important are the things that we did not achieve. So, multi-stakeholderism is hard, and Work Track 5 really represented, in some cases very, very, very distinct points of view, but many that just couldn't meet in the middle.

I would say one very relevant one has to do with the so-called non-AGB geo names, or the elephant in the room is things like Amazon, or .amazon, so no consensus was achieved on something like a .amazon, a .patagonia, which are names that, to some, especially sovereign interest countries and others, represent national interest—excuse the redundancy—versus other interests, maybe more commercial or .brands, see them as completely open and then there are no norms, or international law, or policy to limit the delegation of those.

And even though a lot of work was put into that and some proposals were made, actually, it seemed like some sort of innovation was going to be achieved. In the end it was kind of tough, and it was not achieved.

And some others here, the concept of any language in the AGB. So, as I mentioned, the notion of reservations of names and different strengths in any language seemed to many in the Work Track to be quite overbroad. It would lack certainty in many ways, and hard to implement, and some proposals regarding some, maybe, UN languages or UN language-plus expanded list could have been used. But in the end, it stayed in the “any language” current status of things.

Also, no agreement, even though many [pushed were reached] on non-capital city names, so generally the Work Track 5 propose a policy on capital cities only.

Some other norms, here. Next slide, please. Yeah. So, this is just deeper dives into what we were talking about. I think I'll leave it there for a while, and maybe open it up if there are questions, etc. I think this is still alive in the sense that the PDP is alive and the main sub pro PDP won't end before the end of 2020. I heard Jonathan mention some At-Large concerns on, maybe, names which seem to be of some value to indigenous communities and others.

There was some discussion in the Work Track 5 on those. Nothing was achieved there, but it's not over till it's over. So, I would encourage At-Large members with these concerns to keep bringing it up and I'll leave it there for a while. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Javier. There's some questions that seem to be coming up in the chat. Do you folks want to raise your hands and ask some questions verbally? There's some confusion. I guess capital names are protected, while non-capital city names are subject to a two-limb test in order to qualify for protection. Justine, do you want to clarify that?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Justine, if you want to jump in there. But generally, capital city names are protected so they cannot be delegated unless there's a letter of support or a non-objection letter, versus non-capital city names. No agreement was reached there, so there was some proposal, some tests to get that, but nothing was achieved there. Please go to slide four. Justine, if you want to jump in there and add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe tell people what a two-limb test is?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. Just go to slide four and you understand what we're talking about. Where we say "protection" we're talking about preventive protection, meaning that the applicant will require a letter of support or non-objection from the relevant government or local government/local authority. Okay.

So, when it comes to capital city names there is no test required as long as it appears on the list of capital city names, then the applicant will automatically be required to get a letter of support or non-objection from the relevant government.

If it's a non-capital city name, then it would need to satisfy the two-limb test before this preventive protection comes into play, and the two-limb test is that the applicant must state clearly in the application that they're using the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name, and the string is a city name as listed on official city documents. So that's the two-limb test. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Bill, please go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: Is there consideration given to the fact that some city names are not particularly unique? For example, I can think of at least three or four cities named San Jose, none of which are capital cities. Just because you have a letter from the mayor of one of them doesn't mean that the rest of them are going to be relaxed about having their name used. Thank you.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: Yeah, exactly. That's why in the case of, if you take San Jose, the capital of Costa Rica, well, that one would require – that's the capital city name, because it's a capital of a country listed in the ISO 3166.

But if you take, I don't know, a San Jose, California, a non-capital city name, then it would be subject to this two limb test here. And, yeah, and during the discussions that was what you mentioned was one of the issues.

There are many repeated names out there and if you were going to protect all sorts of cities it was highly restrictive. So, yeah. Your concern was a very important point of this question during Work Track 5 deliberations. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Javier. I think that Bill meant to try and come up with an example that wasn't a capital city but that there were several of, and I guess nobody's thinking off the top of their head what that would be. But if there's a city that's not a capital of anywhere, but it exists in multiple places, is it sufficient to get permission from just one of them even though there are other cities involved? I think that's the question Bill was trying to ask.

BILL JOURIS:

Yes, it was.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Yeah. I mean, I don't remember but my sense from all deliberations is yes, there are some names that are very, very common out there, and that is a consideration. When you get a TLD, you're basically getting a little monopoly on something, and when something is extremely widespread, it's not a good policy to allow that. I can't recall the exact policy out there, but it's basically this slide.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT:

Sorry. I recall the policy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Okay. So, this is Alexander Schubert. I'm the co-founder of .berlin. We worked on .berlin since 2005. I'm currently working on five US cities for the next round. So, anything I do all day is thinking about city top-level domains since about 15 years, so I pay very close attention to Work Track 5.

And the issue that we currently have in Work Track 5 is that if anyone wanted to—let's take as an example Oakland in California—apply for the top-level domain .oakland, and he has in mind Oakland in California, they could simply go to any other Oakland—and there's a number of small Oakland's around the world—to their city mayor, and some of those cities are really tiny, they have just 10,000 people, and he could get a signature of any Oakland city in the world. And then, he is perfectly allowed to apply for Oakland targeting it as a city top-level domain.

But you don't even need to go that far. If you wanted to apply for .shanghai, which is a very large city of, I think, 24 million people, and you don't manage to get a letter of non-objection from the city government of Shanghai, you could simply apply for .shanghai, and just avoid to talk about city names.

You just say, oh, I want .shanghai, and you just don't specify it. Just look at the Donuts applications that did not specify anything. They did not

say why those top-level domains had been applied for. All those applications are very generic and don't talk about a reason why this TLD has been created.

And as long as you do not say, "I want .shanghai or .oakland for the city," you will slip through because you only need a letter of non-objection if you specifically say, "This is for the citizens of that city." And so far, anyone who was a mayor of a city should be very concerned right now, because they can essentially almost not protect that someone is taking their city name as a top-level domain.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alexander. I think that Justine's going to address that very issue in the scorecards, so I think it's been raised. I know Marita raised that issue very early on inside the At-Large. And so, why don't we take this opportunity to switch over to Justine's scorecard discussion?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Jonathan. Can we move to the scorecard, bring it up on the screen, please? I'm mindful of time. It's already 29 minutes into the call. I seriously doubt that we're going to be able to finish everything that we need to in this call, so I'm just putting out there that there's a possibility that we may have to get another session in.

Okay. We just go to the next page, please. Yep. I'm going to just skim through all these introductory notes. I'm hoping that people will be able to just follow as we go along. And I should note that, since Marita Moll

is an apology today, it's going to be up to Christopher Wilkinson and myself to tag-team on the questions that we're going to raise, okay?

So, in terms of the related issues on this topic, you'll see them in the top six bullets, and "key policy issues for At-Large" is another ten-or-so bullets. Key policy goals for At-Large. Christopher, did you want to say a few words on the three bullets under key policy goals for At-Large?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, thank you, Justine. Very, very quickly, because we are short of time. First of all, as a general comment, I'm afraid to say that what we're dealing with is the failure of Work Track 5 to produce almost any significant improvements to the 2012 AGB.

I think all the political and practical risks that we've inherited from that GNSO [position] remain. I think from At-Large point of view, and particularly from the interests of present and future Internet users in geographical areas, At-Large and ICANN must respect the general principle that even if these names are not formally, legally protected, the applicants that we've got in the GNSO have no rights whatsoever to geographical names. So, the first bullet is confirming that, from a user's point of view, they have intrinsic rights in the geographical names.

Secondly, and I think one of you have already pointed this out, we're talking about a global policy which has been implemented and practiced to date almost entirely in English. The policy will have to be consistent across jurisdictions, languages, and scripts. And presently, it's far from that.

Work Track 5 paid lip service to IDNs but there was never any substantive discussion and very, very little participation, unfortunately, from the IDN point of view about how the policy would be implemented.

For example, I can bet my bottom dollar that there are very many large cities who are not capital cities who, when they realize that this is a policy which allows third parties to, in effect, hijack their geographical name, they could very well become very cross with ICANN. I hope I'm not around to see it.

The third point. Why is there so much third-country interest in other people's geographical names? It was a moment of surprise and a moment of truth to me about almost three years ago when I first discussed this with Jeff Neuman. I had no previous conception that they would be ...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hey, Christopher. I'm really sorry. I think that Justine really wants to get through these. So sorry.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Yes, I'm about to finish. You're aware that I think we should have had this exercise two years ago, so I'll leave it at that, but there's plenty of scope to go at without infringing on geographical names. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Christopher. I made a response to Javier's note in chat. Yes, the Work Track 5 report does reflect what was decided in terms of consensus and what wasn't decided because there was no consensus.

But that's not to say that the war is lost, as some people have alluded to. It's not accepted as policy yet, per se. We are still going through the motions. The SubPro Working Group hasn't finalized its report, and even if so, there is still scope for At-Large to have its work on geo names, should it decide to.

We're not suggesting that things that we're presenting today should and have to be the case. We are opening it up for discussion, just bringing to people's awareness that these things are happening and if we wanted to do something about it, then we should do something about it. Part of the discussion is, what do we want to do about it?

So, moving on. We can just skip down to the sections with the four columns. Okay. So, the scorecard analyzes things in sections. Basically, what the SubPro PDP Working Group ... Well, to be fair, it should say "Work Track 5" and not "SubPro PDP Working Group," because it's Work Track 5 that has concluded this report. It's meant to get an idea of what is going to be recommended, per se. Okay.

So, the first one. Yes, the first one is something that Christopher brought up in the small team, through the work of the small team. So, I would again invite Christopher to just address this very briefly if you could, please. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Justine. Yes. When I read the report of the GNSO meeting in Montréal, I was very surprised to find that the GNSO accepted the WT 5 report on-block and there was going to be no further discussion. There's a sense there in which WT 5 has done GNSO's dirty work for it.

And I agree with Justine, we need to decide what can be done about this present situation because it's going to give rise to some very awkward situations in the future. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Christopher, thank you. So, I was hoping that you'd cover the position that we're proposing and what needs to be done. Basically, the third and fourth column. Whoever's controlling the screen, please scroll down so that we can see the four columns.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Well, the basic problem has been the structure of the WT 5 terms of reference. If they are enough people from GNSO who don't want to change anything, the combined participation of the three other AC/SOs have been unable to make any progress.

I think there's a lesson here for the ICANN board. As I put it, care must be taken to ensure that the supporting organizations and advisory committees cannot prevent the evolution of a different consensus, and there's a warning to the future. Although I believe that the Amazon—among others—case was germane to the idea to create WT 5.

There is nothing in the WT 5 report that would prevent similar problems evolving in the next round. So, if you really want to correct the situation

and basically protect ICANN from serious political and geographical mistakes, which are presently embodied in the current text, then really we have to do something about it, and it's very late. But I agree with Justine that there is time, and maybe with other external interests these things can still be improved upon.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Thanks, Christopher. If that's all for point number one, then can we move to point number two? Point number two refers to the definition of geographic terms or geographic names. Basically, Work Track 5 didn't come to an agreement to expand the definition.

Again, this portion was written up by Christopher. So, Christopher, would you like to say a few words about column three and column four, and you could just stick to the points that you've raised in the text? Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Yes. The basic fact is that beyond the country codes, ISO 3166 is so strong in some parts of the world and very weak in others, and I think it's a mistake to limit the consideration of geographical terms to ISO 3166. There is a much broader range of issues, smaller geographical areas, and different languages and scripts that should have been addressed, and I fear to say that they were not.

ICANN will need a global database of geographical names. It will be quite large but, frankly, with modern computing it's perfectly possible to manage a very large database. And we would need—and I come back to

the question of plural or duplicate geographical names—a permanent structure of an agreed procedure or a standing committee that would facilitate the arbitration process of difficult names.

Finally, I believe that part of the problem lies elsewhere. There is still a strong move in the GNSO and the PDP to open all the available names all at once in a general land-rush for applicants for geographical names, among others. I believe that was a mistake in 2012 and it would be a mistake if it was repeated. We need to have an arrangement to release names according to agreed criteria, but certainly not to try and do everything at once.

I can't see anything else on this screen, but there is a minor problem with the formatting because some of the comments extend to the next page. But I think you'll get the gist of it, and by all means, read and send Justine and myself and anybody else who's interested your comments and suggestions on these topics.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Thanks, Christopher. Whoever's controlling the screen, I think you can try reducing the size of the theme. We might be able to capture everything on one screen. Or we'll let you figure it out.

In the meantime, I'd like to hear from Dev, because he's put in the chat and he disagrees with what else for number two. So, Dev, would you like to make your point?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Can you hear me?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you. Hello, everyone. I think I do disagree with this idea that ICANN needs to construct a global database of geographical names. I mean, the fact that if there was no well-ready list of geographic names from the geographic profession that was not standardized, and the Work Track 5 couldn't get consensus on which geographic database to standardize on, I don't know how ICANN will be able to standardize that as well because I think this is not ICANN's problem.

Well, [this is not ICANN's permission]. The ISO 3166 is a great way to—how should I put it?—catalog the country and territory names because that has a well-established procedure on how names are added, etc. I think ICANN constructing the database of geographical needs is just not practical. That was my comment on point number two.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Can I speak to that?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Dev. Who's that?

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Can I answer to him?

JUSTINE CHEW: Very briefly, please.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Okay. So, one suggestion how to solve this problem that was just talked about was to say, "Okay, leave it to every country what city names they want to protect, or whether they want to protect." So, essentially not ICANN go out trying to find every city name or geographical name, but every country that feels that it wants to protect their cities or regions, simply submitting a set of strings that they deem as important for their country, and that would constitute the database. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Alexander. Did we have any more comments on this point number two? If not, I would like to move to point number three. Going, going, gone. Okay. Let's move to point number three.

People who want to comment on things can either do so by raising their hands or putting things in chat. Or if you prefer, you can write to myself and Christopher and we can take up the conversation with you bilaterally if you wish, but [inaudible]. Somebody's got their line open, I believe. Thank you.

Okay, point number three. Point number three has got to do with non-AGB terms, non-AGB terms meaning to say "terms which don't currently fall under what are deemed as geographic names under the Applicant Guidebook."

Okay. So, Work Track 5 did not establish strong support for any change, therefore the default goes back to what is in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook at this point in time. Okay. Again, this is Christopher's point, so I'm going to ask him to speak very briefly to columns three and four, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you, Justine. Yes, this is the nub of the problem, isn't it? Because although 3166 is so well standardized it is a very small proportion of what most people would regard as geographical terms.

There are place names and other geographical concepts which, I'm afraid to say, sooner or later people will realize not that they want to use them necessarily immediately, but they certainly don't want them used by third parties who have no relationship with the geographical area concerned.

So, I think we need a forum and a procedure for cooperation and dispute resolution. And the recognition, as I said right at the beginning of this call, by ICANN and the ICANN community that there are intrinsic rights to geographical names which extend well beyond the ISO 3166 lists.

On point four, it's fairly straightforward. I know that Alexander also has a point of view on this but Work Track 5 and the GNSO in general have a vast preference for curative methods. But that means that, ex post facto, if you see something that's going wrong, then you can try and correct it.

I don't think that's feasible for geographical names, especially if there is no agreement as to which ones could be protected and which ones can be used for any other purpose. So, I have a strong preference in this particular area for preventative methods which notably require prior notification and prior authorization of the application for geographical terms because Work Track 5 did not agree with that. Alexander, you may wish to add an add a word on preventative and curative protections.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Let's keep going. We may need to have an overall discussion because, at some point, we're going to need to make a consensus call on these things and these are not points on which we've achieved consensus inside the At-Large.

The one attempt we made in a face-to-face meeting was a complete disaster because no one could agree whether governments should have the last word or it should be communities, and what constituted a protected geographic name.

And so, I think we have to be careful what we're putting out there as an At-Large perspective on things until we've had an opportunity to reach consensus as a group, so we will probably need another call or a consensus call on some of these points. Thanks, Justine. Go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, absolutely. Jonathan, I agree with you. As I said earlier, the scorecard that we've done just highlights some thoughts on the issues that some of us still have concerns over. Not all of us.

It proposes to suggest why it's still problematic and what could be done about it. Again, it proposes, so if people disagree, or they think that it should be changed, obviously that's up to discussion, not up for discussion, and that's why we're having this call. It's to try and establish whether there is some kind of consensus within At-Large for us to push certain positions or not push certain positions. Okay. So, where are we now?

Moving to point number five. I suppose we could use this call to just highlight the things that we're grappling with, and we could use another call to properly discuss the issues. Number five has got to do with translations. This one, I think, falls in our favor, if I'm not mistaken, because there was no consensus within Work Track 5 to change the applicability of, in any language, rules to country name, country and territory names, and capital cities.

Currently in the guidebook it talks about maintaining where it says in the second column, we expect the rule in 2012 for AGB to be maintained, which is that the string is unavailable if it's a translation in any language of existing categories of country and territory names, the [setting] ISO standard, and the string would be subject to a letter of support or non-objection requirement—that is the preventive protection—if it's a representation in any language of the capital city name of any country or territory in the ISO 3166 standard.

Good question, Jonathan: “What is the timeframe to finalize formal feedback on this to Sub Pro?” The ultimate deadline would be, I guess, when we are asked to respond to the Subsequent Procedures’ full final report because that's where, I believe, this will Work Track 5 report is going to be incorporated and addressed together anyway.

But the reason why we're going through this exercise now is to see if we can address it before establishing some consensus within At-Large on whether we want to push certain positions or not push certain positions.

It's because, if we feel strongly about something that we want to say, then we could look at working with GAC, for example. So, we're we already working with GAC on the focus group on Sub Pro to see if we have common positions that we can take forward and, both ALAC and GAC being advisory committees, we have that extra option to provide advice to the board if we need to. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. I guess there are multiple points of entry for us even though it's late. One is responding as part of the public comment period, and the other is advice. But let's figure out what the deadline is for the very ... I just don't want to remember. For the first ... When does the Subsequent Procedures public comment end?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Can I answer that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You can sure, Cheryl. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: It's not open yet. The final report isn't out yet. Yeah, sorry, Cheryl. Go ahead. Cheryl, you take it, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, that's all right. We have published a new timeline that we would be looking at having a final report in the hands of the GNSO Council by the end of this calendar year. So, we'd be looking at having it as a yet-unconfirmed public comment document going out conservatively, I suppose, in the September, fall/October period. Then you'll have November as a public comment, so you're work in the CPWG would be in the October/November period. And then, of course, ALAC has its right to advise the board at any time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. We're coming up to three minutes to the top of the hour. Jonathan, did you want to take over and do a close, and perhaps try to get another call going, or ...?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Justine. Thanks a lot. We are going to need another call on this and really need to do some work. So, I really appreciate all the work that the

small team have done to raise these issues and identify them. We really need to have another call and then work on forming some consensus inside of the At-Large so that we could figure out the best ways to evangelize that consensus once we've formed it.

I think our biggest problem right now is not even having consensus, so staff please take it as an action item to organize another single-focus call on this topic. It's important to a lot of people inside the At-Large. I will kibbitz with Justine as the best way to manage that call effectively and, hopefully, incorporate some kind of, at least, rough consensus-building into that call. Alan, go ahead. We can't hear you is you're speaking. There you go, now we can.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Now you can hear me? Thank you. I know there's a lot of angst, and I share some of it over the fact that the GNSO PDP process is not perfect, and certainly not perfect from our point of view, but let's not spend time on these calls agonizing over the fact that, if there are disagreements, we couldn't come to closure.

At this point, we need to make statements on what we believe as a group, not just one individual, and there's no point in wringing our hands and saying that the process was faulted, therefore there's no way we can come up with the right answer. We are where we are, and let's proceed forward based on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right, Alan. Thanks. So, we will schedule another call, we'll work on how best to structure it for efficiency. Thanks everyone for being on this call, and we're learning how to handle these things a little bit better every time we do it so I appreciate everyone's participation. Thanks, everyone, and have a good day.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]