53 Members

Abdul Saboor Malik	GZ Kabir	Mzia Gogilash
Abdullah Alrubaan	Hadia Elminiawi	Nick Wenban-
Alan Greenberg	Heather Forrest	Olga Cavalli
Alexander Schubert	Hempal Shrestha	Paul McGrady
Alexander Schubert	Jaap Akkeruis	Peter Van Ros
Ann-Cathrin Marcussen	Javier Rua-Jovet	Rahman Khan
Annebeth Lange	Jeff Neuman	Rahul Gosain
Avri Doria	John Rodriguez	Raymond Mar
Aziz Hilali	Jonathan Agmon	Robin Gross
Barrack Otieno	Justine Chew	Sanna Sahlma
Cheryl Langdon-Orr	Katrin Ohlmer	Sara Bockey
Christopher Wilkinson	Kristina Rosette	Sophie Hey
Erich Schweighofer	Liz Williams	Subhash Dhak
Francis Gesora	Martin Sutton	Susan Payne
Greg Shatan	Maureen Hilyard	Svitlana Thkac
	Michael Flemming	Thiago Jardim
		Thongchai Sar
		Tom Dale
		Yrjo Lansipuo

Audio Only:

Bram Fudzulani

Susan Anthony

Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro

Apologies:

Kan Kaili

Jorge Cancio

Staff:

Steve Chan

Mary Wong

Emily Barabas

Michelle DeSn

Julie Bisland

AC Chat transcript Work Track 5 17 January 2018

Michelle DeSmyter:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 5 – Geographic Names at the Top Level on Wednesday, 17 January 2018 at 05:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_eh1yB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=q-NPDSyphIRarmBc3ZF4aB5v8Gl0RL5pn8iFObOwFEE&s=BzdLmcxf345AYyNb1OjmSlB7O_fQMIMoyDyWLLq4azs&e=

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:Hello good morning - evening

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:can i test my audio?

RAHUL GOSAIN:Hello everyone!

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:hello Rahul!!

RAHUL GOSAIN:Hi Olga!

RAHUL GOSAIN:Can I also test my audio please

RAHUL GOSAIN:Yes Please

RAHUL GOSAIN:I can hear you

RAHUL GOSAIN:But Can I be heard?

Julie Bisland:Select the TELEPHONE ICON at the top of the AC toolbar and choose CONNECT MY AUDIO and follow instructions.

RAHUL GOSAIN:Hello!

RAHUL GOSAIN:Yes

RAHUL GOSAIN:So am I audible?

RAHUL GOSAIN:Thank You

Michelle DeSmyter:You are quite welcome

RAHUL GOSAIN:Yes Loud and Clear

RAHUL GOSAIN:Olga

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:thanks!!! for me there is no sound from the ac room

RAHUL GOSAIN:Yes

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):Good morning all

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:Oh we have a timer for speakers!!!

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Good morning

Julie Bisland:loud and clear, Cheryl

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Great :-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Yes we instituted that as an option for use last meeting I beleive, Olga

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Yes Annebeth

Julie Bisland:loud and clear Annebeth

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):good eeeaarrllyy morning!

Jeff Neuman:We hear you olga

GZ Kabir:We can hear you

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:I can hear you, Olga

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Yes we can Olga

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:thanks can I test the AC room? I hear nothing from there

Svitlana Tkachenko:Good morning!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):perhaps you speakers are muted (I leave mine mited when I am on a phone bridge

Michelle DeSmyter:Yes

Steve Chan:Hi Olga, we can hear you loud and clear

Alan Greenberg:I can hear you on AC.

jaap akkerhuis:Morning all. Sounds is fine in the Adobe room

Thongchai Sangsiri:Hello everyone

Maureen Hilyard (ALAC):We can hear you clearly Olga in AC

Julie Bisland:Olga, you're coming through loud and clear. If you'd like, though, we can set up a dialout for you?

Peter Van Roste - CENTR:Yes we can.

Michelle DeSmyter:Yes, we can hear you

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:We can hear you

Mzia Gogilashvili:Good morning/good evening everyone

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:+541148262530

Alexander Schubert:This app is so 2007ish.

Julie Bisland:thank you Olga, an operator will diaolut to you

Sanna Sahlman:Good morning everyone! I can hear you Olga in AC very clear. I'm only connected via AC.

Jeff Neuman:All - a few technical glitches we are sorting out

Jeff Neuman:sorry for the delay

Jeff Neuman:We will get started shortly

Alexander Schubert:now you have an echo

Katrin Ohlmer:Good morning!

Paul McGrady:Good evening all!

Jeff Neuman:For the record: The call is being recorded. Attendence will be taken off of the Adobe connect.

Jeff Neuman:We will ask later if anyone is just on the call (of course, they cannot see this if they are only on the phone)

Jeff Neuman:No updates on SOI

Justine Chew:HI sorry I'm a bit late, lost track of the time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):NP Justine

Jeff Neuman:No one has hand raised

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we started late anyway due to technical glitches with Olga's sound from AC

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):Ok with agenda

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:OK with the agenda

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Hi Olga

RAHUL GOSAIN:Ok with the agenda

Jeff Neuman:For those just joining - FYI Olga is leading the call. We can hear her, but she cannot hear us

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):yess

RAHUL GOSAIN:Yes

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Yes

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):We can hear you Olga

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):YES

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:I have not seen any further comments to ToR since we last talked

Jeff Neuman:To clarify, as the Working Group, we are the ones to approve the Terms of Reference. We can ask for comments, but at end of day we approve the ToR

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Exactly Jeff they are our ToRs

Steve Chan:Would we like the terms of reference displayed in the AC room?

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, thanks. I was concerned when I heard Olga say it was going out to SO & Acs for approval.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):As was I Paul

Justine Chew:Uh huh, she also read Jeff's comment as "...we are not the ones to approve..." :-)

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:We are only sending it to our supporting organization for information - as Jeff said

Jeff Neuman:i will repeat my comment with my hand raised.

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):Thank you Jeff

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):The ToR have already been out for comment, this is the version to approve by the WT5 members

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):No comments have been received since we revised the TOR following the WT5 input at the last meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):We do not actually require the AC/SO to do more than note them from our polite FYI to them

Jeff Neuman:We cant hear Annebeth either

Martin Sutton (WT5 co-leader):We should move ahead to approve these today as there have been no objections or further comments received.

Julie Bisland 2:Annebeth, we cannot hear you

Alexander Schubert:Silence

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:I am not. OK,

Sanna Sahlman:Can not hear Annebeth either.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):I like the sound of that proposal Martin

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Just wanted to say the same as Jeff - we have got the mandate to approve - I will only send to ccNSO for information. We have to move on now

Justine Chew:I have read the TOR draft circulated by Steve on 4 Jan and I am happy with it. Let's get to work hereon?

Katrin Ohlmer:Yes, please go ahead.

Michelle DeSmyter:We have an operator dialing her now

Jeff Neuman:If not, I can cover

Alexander Schubert:Annabeth: Log out and go in again. might help.

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:I wait for the call, but I hear nothing

Hadia Elminiawi: Good morning from egypt, apologies for joining a bit late

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Welcome Hadia

Raymond Mamattah (Ghana):Is early morning from Ghana. Good morning

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Yes we can :-)

Emily Barabas:we are now on slide 6

Heather Forrest:Thanks you to the staff and co-leads for providing links to the documents and reports on this presentation - it is important to review the documents themselves

Steve Chan:the slides are unsynced

Emily Barabas:The slides are unsynced

Steve Chan:everyone has control of their own slides

Heather Forrest:It is particularly important to have an understanding of the rationales for the recommendations in these reports

Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):very clear, thanks Annebeth

Jeff Neuman:2 letter ASCI characters being reserved was also recommended in 2017 in the final report by the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names

Greg Shatan:What are you defining as "the gap"?

Robin Gross:Worth pointing out that the GNSO's "principle G" (which was approved by the GNSO and ICANN board) setting forth the new gtld program stated" The string evaluation process must not infringe the applicant's freedom of expression rights that are protected under internationally recognized principles of law".

Robin Gross:So this principle is still the approved policy

Paul McGrady:@Annabeth, what gap are you indicating you believe exists that you believe we need to close? Apologies for not catching it when you were speaking.

Jeff Neuman:The gap is the differential between the 2007 GNSO Policy vs what was implemented in 2012

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, thanks.

Liz Williams:And these gaps should be what we identify in a simple schematic that helps us all quickly review what we are talking about.

Jeff Neuman:@Liz - yes we will do that ...though nothing is ever a simple schematic :)

Paul McGrady:+1 Liz. We need to know all of the perceived gaps. For example,, Robin's eample above.

Jeff Neuman:To sum it up: All protections given to geographic names in the APplicant Guidebook other than the reservation of 2 letter ASCII strings at the top level is the gap

Liz Williams:This is what I offered to put together, along with anyone else who'd like to help, as we need it now.

Liz Williams:@Jeff...joking about simple...

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):+1 Webinar

Svitlana Tkachenko:webinar +1

Hempal Shrestha-Nepal:+1 Webinar

Jeff Neuman:We have heard the call for a webinar and will try to arrange for that in the

next few weeks

  Hadia Elminiawi:+1 webinar

  Jeff Neuman:Probably 2 of them so that we can have a convenient time for all time zones

  Emily Barabas:List of background resources:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-
3A__docs.google.com_document_d_1JnqiUKHd9-
5FaTLFMFQ0Rmft8GRUL7JSvGF7qS2xj7CAw_edit&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3m
SVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iH
WGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=q-
NPDSyphIRarmBc3ZF4aB5v8Gl0RL5pn8iFObOwFEE&s=p0CiFm0TO1tf_BoiXoV0LUZZTLab
6bILwLVzwgOweQE&e=

  Heather Forrest:Good idea re timezone repeats, Jeff

  Hadia Elminiawi:good idea

  Liz Williams:I think the webinar could be a Q & A session...any one who wants to participate can submit a question, we can pull all the answers together and then have a discussion. Really so that we can understand where there are "memory lapses".

  Liz Williams:@Alan +1 that is where the true gap is...application to evaluation to implementation.

  Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:I agree, Alan

  Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):yup

  Hadia Elminiawi:+1 Alan

  Liz Williams:I think the analysis will include board "interference" in evaluation...there was certainly significant input from the BGC on numerous applications that needs examination.

  Jeff Neuman:yes, Emily sent it out earlier

  Emily Barabas:We are now on slide 9

  Paul McGrady:Slides aren't expressing themselves. Can the AGB definition be put in chat?

  Paul McGrady:I logged out and back in to Ac and now I can see the slides.

  Jeff Neuman:FYI -- Martin sent out all of this via email a week or so ago

  Jeff Neuman:And the comments Olga is going to review are those from e-mails and from those that sent in comments on the google doc

  Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:Definitions are very important. We do need to be clear as we define, however, that not all geo names will necessarily be treated in the same way. This was also the case under the AGB (although as a number of people have commented it woul benefit from better and clearer drafting)

  Paul McGrady:+1 Susan.

  Emily Barabas:The Google Doc with 2012 AGB definition and feedback is available here:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-
3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1ooKmb576MQJvpHyDYOlJE3M2-2DSsnv-
2DSSgVfroT3D7Fc_edit-3Fusp-3Ddrive-
5Fweb&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPq
sLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=q-

Maureen Hilyard (ALAC):Can we have important information (for example, the agreed TOR and definitions, etc) put onto a workspace so that we don't have to trawl through emails looking for

Liz Williams:One thing to remember is the purpose of a definition. It is designed to give clear guidance to potential applicants about what is "worth" applying for; it is then for evaluators to measure an application against; it is also for supporters and objectors to measure their input. We mustn't complicate the definition as that is antithetical to the purpose of ICANN to encourage competition ...and so on...

Heather Forrest:I don't understand: I thought we are talking about the definition of 'geographic name' - the 'in the avoidance of doubt' language is not a definition

Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):we hear you perfectly Olga!

Paul McGrady:Will there be a queue on this call for comments? I am completely lost since it does not appear we are talking about the definition of "geographic name" but rather ideas of how to fix a problem that has not even been identified yer.

Heather Forrest:It does not make sense to discuss exceptions to the definition before crafting the definition...

Liz Williams:@Olga...you are making an assumption that national and regional governments are the "pre-approvers" of any application. I think that notion needs further examination...so that we can avoid the problems of 2012 and previously...

Jeff Neuman:@Heather - perhaps you can make this statement

Liz Williams:@Heather +1

Sara Bockey:Agree with Susan and Liz. In an effort to avoid conflicts, I would like the following be considered: a geographic name is a term/string that is associated with a geographic area and cannot be reasonably confused with any other geographic area or term.

Heather Forrest:@Jeff - there is a queue

Heather Forrest:Go ahead

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):very kind of you @Heather

Greg Shatan:Are we allowed to comment on this call?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Bad audio @Heather

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, understood, but don't we need at least a strawman definition in order to evaulate these comments?

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Very difficult to hear you, Heather

Greg Shatan:Heather are you on a plane

Jeff Neuman:@Greg - Sure, why not

Heather Forrest:I'll have to fix audio

Alan Greenberg:Much background noise.

Jeff Neuman:Paul - That was in the email as well. The strawman is the definition that was in the Guidebook

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we have audio gremlins abound today it seems *sigh*

Greg Shatan:Thanks, Jeff. I thought that was actually the purpose of the call, rather

than reviewing the comments received on the email list.

Alexander Schubert:Obviously WIKIPEDIA is NOT authoritive - but ALL of the 2012 round cases like .bar, .amazon or .tata would have been EASILY identified as geographic name if the applicant had just consulted WIKIPEDIA. So maybe a mandatory consultation of WIKIPEDIA (additionally to the requirement to check other lists) for ALL applicants wou

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, which is what? The AGB talks about how certain names wlll be treated, but does it ever define it? Can you put the definition into chat?

Alexander Schubert:......would make sense

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):star trek!

Jeff Neuman:yes...one sec.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):We can Greg

Michael Flemming:That was a great entrance

Hempal Shrestha - Nepal::)

Michael Flemming:theme music I meant

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Go Ahead Greg

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we can notate

Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:I think the confusion is that the section in the guidebook isn't merely a definition, it also addresses how different types of names are treated - and the comments are focussed on treatment and not definition

Heather Forrest:Thanks for your patience, everyone - just fixing audio now and I'll rejoin the Q

Alexander Schubert:15000 people

Heather Forrest:With sincere thanks to Michelle, I am back on audio and have rejoined the queue

Jeff Neuman:@Greg - if I can reword what I think you are saying.....it may help to come up with a definition of a geographic name without also including the implication or impact of something being defined as such?

Liz Williams:@Greg...and this is the purpose of the schematic I was suggesting...to provide us with a sheet of what happened and then whether we can mitigate a problem or encourage further applications from small communities of 50K in a province of Morocco...

Greg Shatan:@Jeff, that's the opposite of what I've said.

Jeff Neuman:@Greg - Sorry, then I guess I lost you

Paul McGrady:+1 Heather.

Greg Shatan:If small communities don't want to apply that's fine — but if they don't, they shouldn't have a veto right.

Robin Gross:I agree with Heather, we need to start from the existing definition of geo-names. If we can't agree to changes, then that definition stands.

Liz Williams:+1 Heather...

Katrin Ohlmer:+1

Emily Barabas:2.2.1.4.2Geographic Names Requiring Government SupportThe following types of applied-for strings are considered geographic names and must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant

governments or public authorities: 1. An application for any string that is a representation, in any language, of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.   2. An application for a city name, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name.   City names present challenges because city names may also be generic terms or brand names, and in many cases city names are not unique. Unlike other types of geographic names, there are no established lists that can be used as objective references in the evaluation process. Thus, city names are not universally protected. However, the process does provide a means for cities and applicants to work together where desired.

  Heather Forrest:Thanks Emily

  Paul McGrady:Thanks Emily!

  Heather Forrest:We began by discussing the provision "In the event that", which I think got us off track

  Hadia Elminiawi:In my opinion what is required definitely is not an absolute definition but rather maybe an explanation that helps with the initial evaluation process

  Emily Barabas: An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirements (i.e., will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities) if: (a) It is clear from applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name; and   (b) The applied-for string is a city name as listed on official city documents.7   3. An application for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a county, province, or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard.   4. An application for a string listed as a UNESCO region8 or appearing on the "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings" list.9   In the case of an application for a string appearing on either of the lists above, documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national gov

  Jeff Neuman:That is only city names

  Emily Barabas:governments in the region, and there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant governments in the region and/or public authorities associated with the continent or the region.   Where the 60% rule is applied, and there are common regions on both lists, the regional composition contained in the "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings" takes precedence.An applied-for gTLD string that falls into any of 1 through 4 listed above is considered to represent a geographic name. In the event of any doubt, it is in the applicant's interest to consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support or non-objection prior to submission of the application, in order to preclude possible objections and pre-address any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirements.Strings that include but do not match a geographic name (as defined in this sect

  Hadia Elminiawi:though redefining the term "geographic names" could seem as the best solution however it could prove to be a true challenge an alternative solution could

be not to go down this road and look at the evaluation items and try to expand them in a way that would avoid putting ICANN in a position to judge who has the right to what. Again I am not saying here not to look for workable definitions but I am saying let's explore other sort of solutions as well instead of beating our heads against a wall

  Greg Shatan:Jeff, what I said was that we can't consider the concept of a definition without understanding the effect(s) of the definition(s).

  Alan Greenberg:Perhaps put it in the AGENDA POD so it doesn't scroll

  Heather Forrest:May I make a suggestion for how we deal with all of these comments?

  Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:One problem here is that as long as 2.2.1.4.1 deals with country names - which were not allowed in this round - surely also are geographic names.

  Jeff Neuman:@Greg - And others would say we cannot consider the impacts without understanding the definition......its a circle

  Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Heather, what do you suggest?

  Emily Barabas:(as defined in this section) will not be considered geographic names as defined by section 2.2.1.4.2, and therefore will not require documentation of government support in the evaluation process.

  Heather Forrest:@Annebeth - it would be helpful to speak briefly rather than type it out

  Greg Shatan:Perhaps queue management could be clarified here and for future calls.

  Emily Barabas:@Alan, the text of 2.2.1.4.2 is now included in the Agenda pod

  Peter Van Roste - CENTR:@greg I assumed that the effect of the definition was to limit the types of names that we'll be looking at. If it's not covered by the definitions we agree that we shouldn't cover it.

  Hadia Elminiawi:+1 summarize the issues

  Liz Williams:@ Peter...I think that the definition impact should be that geographic names are allowed unless "prohibited". We need to be open not closed so that we can encourage applications not limit them...

  Greg Shatan:@Peter, "Scoping" is one effect. But what I am getting at is how will the definition(s) be used?

  Jeff Neuman:@Liz - You are talking about the impact of being classified a geographic name

  Maureen Hilyard (ALAC):+1 Heather - as a starting point for looking at a new definition
  Jeff Neuman:I think we need to decide "What is a geographical name"
  Jeff Neuman:And put aside (for now) the impact of being classified as such
  Jeff Neuman:Then we talk about impact, exceptions, etc.
  Emily Barabas:The current text of the AGB is now displayed in the center pod
  Jonathan Agmon:+ Jeff
  Paul McGrady: If we are looking at key concerns, please include 1. Predictability 2. Limitation on Free Speech rights
  Jeff Neuman:@Maureen - Just to clarify - we are not necessarily looking for a new definition. We are looking to evaluate the existing definition
  Greg Shatan:Jeff, that works, if this is an iterative process that works....
  Heather Forrest:It seems to me that we need a clearer methodology or structure for

these discussions, or we risk getting lost in side-issues and losing sight of the ultimate task, the end result of which is a definition of names to receive particular treatment, and what that treatment is. Before we start discussing the treatment, we should be thinking about what names qualify

Hempal Shrestha - Nepal:+Greg

Maureen Hilyard (ALAC):@ Jeff a reviewed definition?

Katrin Ohlmer:@Jeff: Good proposal to go forward!

Maureen Hilyard (ALAC):That is a lot clearer thank you Jeff

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:And we must remember that to arrive at the definition that is there today took a lot of work at the time.

Heather Forrest:@Alan - I think we need to be careful to distinguish what will be proposed from what we will "end up" with

Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:I do think this process needs care. This could lead to assumption that the new definition of geo names is then treated as requiring consent/non objection.

Hadia Elminiawi:+1 Alan

Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:+1 Alan

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):+1 Alan

Paul McGrady:+1 Alan

Jeff Neuman:The ultimate goal (I think) is to provide guidance to applicants when they ask themselves "Am I applying for a geographic name"? Then we do the next step. If the answer is yes, then......

Liz Williams:Can we move to discussion of the definition now...that is the purpose of the call...

Greg Shatan:All hors d'oeuvres and no main course....

Heather Forrest:Perhaps we should be framing this discussion as: What names (if any) deserve/require different treatment?

Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:Would it be helpfulto break out the original definition into a chart so easier to read rather than the current text. for example headings would be type of name, then included in that you would have country and territory name, then a column of how that is currently defined (ie by reference tothe lists) and then,if you like, also acolumn for how currently treated.and so on?

Liz Williams:@Jeff...could we consider the two letters...and then the implications of, say .ba, .hp, .any other two letter combination that looks like a country code...I think it saves a whole lot of trouble to keep the prohibition on all ASCII two letter combinations as those are traditionally country codes.

Jeff Neuman:@Annebeth - true. We should separate ASCII and Non-ascii.

Liz Williams:Then we can open the conversation about letter number, number letter..

Alexander Schubert:RFC 1591!

Liz Williams:And then we also open non-ASCII where there is no chance of confusion with country codes.

Jeff Neuman:@Greg - 2 ASCII Characters or 2 ASCII Letters?

Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):I don't see how number/letter combination would fall under any definition of geo name

Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:letter/number 2-character combinations are not country codes and therefore the original reservation of these terms is not a geo name issue.More like an implementation fault

jaap akkerhuis:Fore IDNs, one should look at what is called the fast-track process

Alexander Schubert:Everything 2 letter is CC. Or we kill RFC 1591.

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:+1 Alexander

Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):2 letter - 676

Jeff Neuman:@Susan - the rationale used by ICANN was all 2 characters......it was intentional

Jeff Neuman:The question is should be narrow it down to what Nick and others recognize on this call

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:And it is UN deciding what is a country, not ICANN

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:2-letters should be left for future countries

Heather Forrest:Question for precision purposes: are we comfortable with interpreting codes as 'names'?

Justine Chew:Are we talking about 2 letters or 2 characters?.

Liz Williams:+1 Annebeth...we mustn't change that external reference to a list which is not "owned" by ICANN.

Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):the fact that a new gTLD had to be at least 3 characters wasn't really a geo issue as I recall

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Heather, it is originally a code-list, but it has been used for identifying countries as TLDs since 1984

Greg Shatan:@Annabeth, why? And is this your personal opinion or are you stating that as a co-lead of this group?

Heather Forrest:As has been noted on the list, ISO 3166-1 is about codes, not about names

Olga Cavalli - Co-chair GAC:Not all the 2 letter codes in the iso list are countries

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Greg, that it has been used as ccTLDs from 1984, this is not a meaning, it is a fact

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, but you noted earlier a "gap" between GNSO Policy and the AGB.

Jeff Neuman:@Greg - Yes. I just wanted to clarify that it was existing GNSO Policy and that it was not an implementation detail.

Greg Shatan:Annabeth, I understand the facts, but the question is whether it should be future policy.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):<Comment> Regarding @Heather's comment (What names (if any) deserve/require different treatment?) I think we must open ourselves to the possibility of a mechanism that could take into account the interests of recognized subnational cultural/linguistic and/or indigenous groups during the process of reserving a geographic name (which presumably is linked to that aboriginal culture or linguistic minority in a substantial way). -A longer version of my comment is included in thegoogle doc.

Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:That should of course be discussed, Greg, but that is actually the one thing all former policy - from all stakeholder groups - agrees on.

Greg Shatan:Can we continue the discussion in the email list that generated the comments on the chart? And will they be included in the future summary?
 Paul McGrady:Let's get a working definition first before we revisit anything?
 Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):I agree Jeff that 2 ascii letters settled as reserved for ccTLDs - open Q though about letter number combinations A1 etc
 Greg Shatan:If we've confirmed one existing policy then we've accomplished something!
 Paul McGrady:Thanks Olga!
 Annebeth Lange, co-lead WT5:Thanks, Olga
 Nick Wenban-Smith (Nominet UK, RySG):thanks Olga!
 Mzia Gogilashvili:Thank you Olga
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Bye for now everyone, talk again soon.
 Barrack Otieno AFTLD:Thank you Olga and everyone
 Katrin Ohlmer:Thank you Olga!
 Susan Payne GNSO/IPC:thanks Olga,
 jaap akkerhuis:bye
 Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Ciao! Its 2:25am in here!
 Greg Shatan:Thank you, Olga! Only 1:30 here...
 Svitlana Tkachenko:thank you all !
 avri doria:bye
 Hadia Elminiawi:thabbks
 Greg Shatan:Bye all!