

Attendance - 52 Members

Adrian Carballo	Justine Chew
Alan Greenberg	Katrin Ohlmer
Alexander Schubert	Martin Sutton
Ali Hussein Kassim	Maureen Hilyard
Ann-Cathrin Marcussen	Michael Flemming
Ashley Heineman	Neli Marcheva
Bram Fudzulani	Nick Wenban-Smith
Cheryl Langdon-Orr	Olga Cavalli
Chris Casavale	Paul McGrady
Christa Taylor	Pedro Huichalaf Roa
David McAuley	Poncelet Ileleji
Erich Schweighofer	Ricardo Holmquist
Greg Shatan	Robin Gross
Griffin Barnett	Rosalia Morales
GZ Kabir	Sarah Langstone
Jaap Akkerhuis	Sophie Hey
Javier Rúa-Jovet	Susan Anthony
Jeff Neuman	Susan Payne
Jessica Hooper	Svitlana Tkachenko
John Rodriguez	Taylor R.W. Bentley
Jon Nevett	Thiago Jardim
Jorge Cancio	Timo Vöhmar
	Yrjö Länsipuro

Audio only: Dessalegn Yehuala, Juan Manuel Rojas, Ejikeme Egbuogu, Annebeth Lange, Vernatius Ezeama, Christopher Wilkinson, Carlos Guitierrez

Apologies: Marita Moll, Kavouss Arasteh, Kris Seeburn, Darcy Southwell, Sara Bockey, Sanna Sahlman

Staff: Emily Barabas, Andrea Glandon, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

WebEx Chat:

May 9, 2018	8:42:05 AM	from Olga Cavalli to all participants:	hi I want to try my audio
May 9, 2018	8:59:33 AM	from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants:	Sorry for noise
May 9, 2018	8:59:40 AM	from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants:	Hello to all
May 9, 2018	9:00:25 AM	from Jorge Cancio to all participants:	Hi all!
May 9, 2018	9:03:04 AM	from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants:	please mute

May 9, 2018 9:04:20 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Please mute

May 9, 2018 9:05:08 AM from Poncelet Ileleji to all participants: Hello All

May 9, 2018 9:05:22 AM from Poncelet Ileleji to all participants: Hello All

May 9, 2018 9:05:22 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Please mute

May 9, 2018 9:05:34 AM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: Your lines are ONLY muted if the red microphone symbol is completely RED - it is slightly red by default!

May 9, 2018 9:06:06 AM from Justine Chew to all participants: please mute my mic

May 9, 2018 9:06:06 AM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: To mute: Go to "participants" - find yourselves in the list, symbol is to the right!

May 9, 2018 9:07:00 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: I would add to the list the concern for freedom of expression rights relative to other laws.

May 9, 2018 9:07:33 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Thank you Robin, noted.

May 9, 2018 9:07:53 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thanks Robin

May 9, 2018 9:10:18 AM from Poncelet Ileleji to all participants: Thanks Robin

May 9, 2018 9:10:22 AM from Terri Agnew to all participants: @Kristina: I show you've connected to webex but have no audio. If you see the "Communicate" option in the upper left corner you can follow prompts to connect audio, or I can have the operator dial out to you.

May 9, 2018 9:10:24 AM from David McAuley to all participants: Is there a link to these slides?

May 9, 2018 9:10:26 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: hand up

May 9, 2018 9:10:35 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: There is also the perspective of consumers who care about expanding govt power over the Internet are mainly concerned about free expression. They don't fit neatly into any of the three interests listed.

May 9, 2018 9:10:44 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Hand up by Yrijo

May 9, 2018 9:12:07 AM from Ali Kassim to all participants: Should a Multi-Stakeholder Model be something that is embeded into these applications? Or it already a factor in these

applications. Because of the fact that applications and maintaining of registries is not a cheap exercise could we consider this model?

May 9, 2018 9:12:17 AM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: We also have community / constituent groups in the city - and they want to create the city gTLD! So neither a registry operator nor a city Government - but a stakeholder group in the city! Which is the IDEAL case as they can FUND and MARKET the gTLD much better than anybody else!

May 9, 2018 9:12:47 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: we have a hand up by Jorge after Yrijo

May 9, 2018 9:12:57 AM from Ashley Heineman to all participants: Just to be clear, these are views of *some* governments. Not all governments have these concerns.

May 9, 2018 9:14:28 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thank you Yrijo

May 9, 2018 9:14:30 AM from Ashley Heineman to all participants: Also - not all governments are wanting to maintain consent/non-objection authority on important strings.

May 9, 2018 9:14:52 AM from Taylor Bentley to all participants: +1 Ashley, the possibility for a government to support, and view an expansion as a positive contribution to national identity and economic activity (via tourism, local branding etc.)

May 9, 2018 9:14:54 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Thank you Kristina, noted

May 9, 2018 9:14:54 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Thanks Ashley.

May 9, 2018 9:15:38 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: could someone enable by audio?

May 9, 2018 9:15:41 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Robin after Ashley

May 9, 2018 9:15:57 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thanks you Ashley

May 9, 2018 9:16:11 AM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: noted Ashley...

May 9, 2018 9:16:49 AM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: Governments act FOR their citizens - if the Governments do NOT act: that doesn't imply that the people do NOT have concerns!

May 9, 2018 9:17:02 AM from Andrea Glandon to all participants: @Jorge, your line is open, we will have them go back to you

May 9, 2018 9:17:44 AM from Poncelet Ileleji to all participants: I share the same observations with Robin also

May 9, 2018 9:17:53 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thanks Robin. Noted

May 9, 2018 9:18:53 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Olga, we have Jorge next on audio, after Ali.

May 9, 2018 9:18:58 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: hand up...

May 9, 2018 9:19:10 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Noted Jorge

May 9, 2018 9:19:15 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: You are nexy

May 9, 2018 9:19:18 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: next

May 9, 2018 9:20:57 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: yes

May 9, 2018 9:21:18 AM from Nick Wenban-Smith to all participants: I think the point about freedom of expression is a good one to add to the record. Of course once a particular term is registered as a gTLD by a private body for it's exclusive use then it will be blocked in perpetuity for use by any communities to which it might relate. Difficult balancing required!

May 9, 2018 9:25:01 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Jorge - for terms not in the AGB, and not intended to be used in conjunction with the potential geographic significance of the term, that there is agreement that a letter of non-objection is needed

May 9, 2018 9:25:22 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Sorry, I meant to say that I am not sure there is agreement on that

May 9, 2018 9:25:36 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: new keyboard deleted some words

May 9, 2018 9:26:01 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Ali, is that an old hand?

May 9, 2018 9:26:28 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Also, end users might be confused if some geo names are "real" geoTLDs and some are not.; e.g. .berlin is a GeoTLD where they are able to participate in, and .munic is a BrandTLD where only the Munic LLC Company can register domain names.

May 9, 2018 9:27:25 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: +1 to @Jorge on how great participation has been on the list

May 9, 2018 9:27:41 AM from Ann-Cathrin Marcussen to all participants: Support to Jorge from me.

May 9, 2018 9:27:44 AM from Justine Chew to all participants: agree with the jorge. I found the conversations in the lists useful. I am now somewhat persuaded with on the need for non-objection letters.

May 9, 2018 9:28:45 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Important to remember that people have a legal right to use a word that refers to a geographic term. We can comment on and say things about geo terms. We just don't have the right to misrepresent our connection to that term.

May 9, 2018 9:28:57 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: please mute

May 9, 2018 9:30:15 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Can we establish whether there is general agreement on the principle that if an applicant desires to use a string that has geographic significance (whether on a list or not) in a manner that corresponds to the geographic significance, then they need a letter of non-objection or consent.

May 9, 2018 9:30:52 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: If that is the case, then we can address all other situations?

May 9, 2018 9:31:07 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Jeff, no that seems way to broad. It ignores that people have a right to discuss geo terms.

May 9, 2018 9:31:13 AM from Thiago Jardim to all participants:@Jeff, no.

May 9, 2018 9:31:41 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Robin - can we narrow that down that to make t less broad?

May 9, 2018 9:31:57 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Just trying to see where we have agreement and where there is none

May 9, 2018 9:32:09 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: I don't think there is any agreement on the notion of letter of non-objection as proposed by Jorge. But in any event, I question how this could be in any event be practical - what about multiple different towns/cities of the same name? which get's priority? what about some village/town/city in a county that you aren't aware of - how do you even know about it, let alone get non-objection? what about names that have multiple meanings - why does Bar (the place) get some priority/veto over use of that term to identify a drinking establishment?

May 9, 2018 9:32:30 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Yes, we shouldn't be able to use such terms in a way that is misleading or that causes consumer confusion. But a blanket requirement of always requiring such a letter goes too far. Thanks.

May 9, 2018 9:33:15 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: But I would also agree with Susan that the letter isn't agreed to as a concept (ever was). It was just imposed on the community after the fact.

May 9, 2018 9:33:16 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Robin - ok, taking that a step farther, what activities would cause such confusion?

May 9, 2018 9:33:49 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan Payne: pursuant the 2012 AGB if there are multiple cities with the exact same name, the letter is required for all

May 9, 2018 9:35:05 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Jorge maybe so (although I take issue with it), but we're also talking about terms here that people don't intend to use in a geographic sense, where there's no such reqt in the AGB.

May 9, 2018 9:36:29 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan: the problem is that TLDs are unique. Once delegated it is gone. That is why it is important to get at a table with the public authorities. This avoids IMHO a lot of trouble when investments have been made etc.

May 9, 2018 9:37:12 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Also, contacts to national/local governments would be helpful.

May 9, 2018 9:37:24 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Maybe the GAC can help there?

May 9, 2018 9:37:48 AM from Thiago Jardim to all participants: The difficulty with that is that, once an applicant says that it is going to use the geoname not for any purpose related to the geographic sense of the term, the meaning and impact of this is that the use of that geoterm for geographical-related purposes will be precluded, including for the benefit of the communities associated with that geoname.

May 9, 2018 9:37:50 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Kathrin: sure, also ICANN who have contacts all around the globe

May 9, 2018 9:38:22 AM from Nick Wenban-Smith to all participants: Just following on from Jorge's last point I do think that there should be more flexibility in the application process to amend the string applied for so as to avoid contention/ confusion etc. So if Paris (texas) had applied for .Paris in the last round they would have been able to amend their application to .paristx or similar

May 9, 2018 9:38:32 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Jorge and Susan Antony are in the queue

May 9, 2018 9:38:58 AM from Thiago Jardim to all participants: @Jeff, hence find it difficult to agree with your point - your point could be read to mean that no-letter of objection is required for the other cases, ignoring all the nuances that exist in the other cases.

May 9, 2018 9:39:19 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thx Martin. Jorge, and Susan next.

May 9, 2018 9:39:29 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: I think we need a solution which is permissive rather than one which is non-permissive (as a consent/non-objection is). In other words, if you want to run your TLD in a non-geo sense, for example as a brand or because it has an other dictionary meaning then that should be allowed. But the registry operator needs to find ways to operate, to ensure that it does not mislead and imply it operates as an official city (or whatever) TLD. For example making commitments as to how the registry will operate; terms for the allocation of names; a willingness to cancel names perhaps which are used in a manner outside the way the registry operator intended. Of course, with a brand TLD there is little risk because the registry operator has control over how the 2nd level names get used

May 9, 2018 9:40:12 AM from Timo Vöhmar to all participants: @Jeff the requirement of letter of non objection is already a compromise from 2012 AGB, so its a bit going too far to call it extreme now. Extreme here is list of reserved list of geographic terms that are not available to private sector at all.

May 9, 2018 9:40:53 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Thiago - ok, so what is a potential solution other than requiring a letter or non-objection or consent. Is there a potential solution that does not give all of the power to one side

May 9, 2018 9:41:31 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Timo (Personal opinion), teh letter of non-objection was a compromise between the governments and ICANN staff

May 9, 2018 9:41:42 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Jeff, to your good question about how to determine confusion, I think it is similar to how the legal concept of fair use is determined - by weighing a series of factors and always circumstance dependent. So panelists could look at the specific facts of the situation and weigh the competing legitimate interests. But a bright line rule would fail to capture it adequately. Like fair use in copyright.

May 9, 2018 9:41:47 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: That was a result of the Brussels scorecard consultations in 2011

May 9, 2018 9:41:49 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Interesting comment Ali. Thanks

May 9, 2018 9:42:18 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Neither the GNSO, ALAC, Applicants or the rest of the Internet community was invited to actively participate in those discussions

May 9, 2018 9:43:14 AM from Yrjo Lansipuro to all participants: Asking for a letter of non-objection is a way of informing the city of the applicant's interest in the name of the city. Very few

cities can maintain a constant scan of the new gTLD scene and would be totally ignorant that someone has designs related to their name

May 9, 2018 9:43:16 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Robin - Thanks.....but what are we measuring confusion against? IN trademark law you measure confusion with the source of the goods/services.

May 9, 2018 9:43:31 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Here, what are we measuring confusion against?

May 9, 2018 9:43:46 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: +1 Yrjo

May 9, 2018 9:44:18 AM from Thiago Jardim to all participants:@Jorge, +1

May 9, 2018 9:44:19 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: confusion as to the connection between the applicant and the geo term. or confusion as to the authority of the applicant with respect to the term, for example.

May 9, 2018 9:44:48 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: That above reply was meant to answer Jeff. sorry I forgot his name at the beginning.

May 9, 2018 9:44:58 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Jorge - but these terms are not unique to a city, in a large number of cases. Think of any city name, it's frequently sharing its name with multiple other places. And with other meanings too

May 9, 2018 9:45:03 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @RObin - I am easily forgettable

May 9, 2018 9:45:11 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: :-)

May 9, 2018 9:46:16 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: time is getting short, please sum up

May 9, 2018 9:47:26 AM from Rosalía Morales to all participants: Adding to Jorge's current comments please take into account many countries do not participate in ICANN so a letter of objection allows them to learn about this process and be informed about the decision making process. We cannot assume all communities and governments are represented in all SO and ACs.

May 9, 2018 9:47:44 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: noted Rosalia, gracias

May 9, 2018 9:47:49 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: +1 Jorge

May 9, 2018 9:48:45 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Govts are not unique in not participating at ICANN or knowing what is happening at ICANN. Not sure why that gives govts priority over others, who are also unaware.

May 9, 2018 9:48:46 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: what do you even mean by "city" Jorge? How large does the place need to be before you think they need to have a say and be consulted? Or is it everywhere, no matter how small? How would you have us deal with this?

May 9, 2018 9:49:25 AM from Ann-Cathrin Marcussen to all participants: Jorges point about delegtation on the top level can be given only to one - to bring the relevant government to the table is in my view a compromise and as Yrjo says a letter of non-objection is a way of informing the city of the applicants intended use. So + 1 to Jorge again.

May 9, 2018 9:49:28 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Jorge - is that just relating to use as a geo term? If an organisation has a legitimate use case for the same term as a city name, tipping-off local government(s) could be a huge risk to those applicants. Particularly if the local authority uses the information to encourage another party to apply at the same time to compete with the application. How could this scenario be avoided?

May 9, 2018 9:49:32 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: It's not an enhancement of a project if you aren't running the TLD in a geo context

May 9, 2018 9:49:45 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Jorge - There was at least one example of a TLD that was NOT on any list, was generic in nature, and where the government demanded a certain percentage of the revenue of the TLD revenue in order for them to issue an letter or non-objection.

May 9, 2018 9:50:01 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: I will try to get them to make the facts public

May 9, 2018 9:50:10 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Jeff - that's an "enhancement." :-)

May 9, 2018 9:50:12 AM from Rosalía Morales to all participants: +1 Jorge and +1 Ann-Catherin

May 9, 2018 9:50:24 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: But they are afraid of retribution by the government

May 9, 2018 9:50:39 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: +1 Susan A

May 9, 2018 9:50:43 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: If we can all agree that that type of behaviour is abusive, then that would be progress

May 9, 2018 9:50:52 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: +1 Susan

May 9, 2018 9:51:41 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan Anthony: the problem is that this is a unique resource - even if the intended use is non-geo, the opportunity to use that name afterwards is taken away.

May 9, 2018 9:51:42 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Jeff: That's how "enhancements" work. You get a business partner whether you like it or not.

May 9, 2018 9:52:17 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Paul on the list

May 9, 2018 9:52:28 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Jorge - it is precisely because it is a unique resource that requiring a letter of non-objection is unfairly balanced

May 9, 2018 9:52:49 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Maybe a WW2 history buff wants a TLD referring to Berlin to discuss WW2. I don't think she needs permission from the city of Berlin, Germany to use that word in that way.

May 9, 2018 9:52:56 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: The fact that any string is a unique resource doesn't demonstrate who if anyone should have priority /blocking rights

May 9, 2018 9:53:40 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: +1 Greg

May 9, 2018 9:54:07 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Hershey, Pennsylvania was named after the company (not the other way around). If the chocolate company Hersheys applies for .Hershey, should the city be required to issue a letter of non-objection?

May 9, 2018 9:54:14 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: hand up

May 9, 2018 9:54:17 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Paul: please have a look at the exchanges onlist, e.g. my emails and Nicks

May 9, 2018 9:54:48 AM from Ann-Cathrin Marcussen to all participants: Just adding to the importance of acknowledging the importance to bring the relevant government to the table - in many areas we see Public - Private initiatives - in a wide range of the broader governance of internet. in my view it is essential that we also acknowledge this in our work here in WT5.

May 9, 2018 9:55:19 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Jorge - "unique resource" presupposes that there's one city for each name too. in fact these names are not unique to the city so whoever gets a TLD term allocated to them is inherently excluding the others - the other towns and cities, the other brands, the other uses in a dictionary context

May 9, 2018 9:55:34 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Hand

May 9, 2018 9:55:40 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Even if we agree that bringing governments to the table is a good idea, why does it have to be by requiring a letter of non-objection.

May 9, 2018 9:55:53 AM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Jorge, to the extent that such laws exist, they need to make it off email list and into slides that show certain governments' views. However, I have yet to see citations to any such laws.

May 9, 2018 9:55:54 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Are there otehr ways to get people together

May 9, 2018 9:56:03 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan payne: all cities have equal say with the non-objection, an incentive for common interest solutions

May 9, 2018 9:56:14 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: I have my hand up too, thx

May 9, 2018 9:56:24 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Is there a mechanism to get people to the table without having a default outcome predetermined prior to the meeting

May 9, 2018 9:57:11 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Paul: I mentioned many times art. 29 of the Swiss civil code... similar laws exist in continental Europe

May 9, 2018 9:57:17 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Jorge - then back to my question - what do you mean by city? how big? how would you locate them all? if my country has the first Bath, why do the other's get to veto?

May 9, 2018 9:57:34 AM from Ann-Cathrin Marcussen to all participants: The good thing about bringing the governments to the table is that it might avoid problems afterwards. Even if the applicant wins in the end, it will mean problems for the applicant if the government objects afterwards.

May 9, 2018 9:57:46 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan Payne: that is a good question - we could talk on...

May 9, 2018 9:58:23 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Anne-Cathrin - See question above; If we agree it is good to bring governments to the table for discussions, is there a way to do that without having a default of a letter of non-objection

May 9, 2018 9:58:27 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Good point, Martin.

May 9, 2018 9:58:36 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: @Jorge, why should ICANN take a law that applies only to Swiss people and extend it to apply to the entire world? How is that far? How does that match what that law actually entitles to the Swiss govt?

May 9, 2018 9:58:52 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: "fair" not "far"

May 9, 2018 9:59:39 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Robin: the law (common in other continental european countries) reflect a political reality, which is the interest of cities in their names

May 9, 2018 9:59:53 AM from jaap akkerhuis to all participants: Please note the time

May 9, 2018 10:00:17 AM from Timo Vöhmar to all participants: @Jeff I disagree, berlin is berlin for a lot of people regardless if the registry is run with intent to promote berlin shoes brand or not. We have to take into account the confusion for internet users. So taking berlin off market for the community saing that the registry has no geo related intentions does not seem to cut it. I personally do not see a way around from approval from the local governments associated with the term.

May 9, 2018 10:00:31 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: @Jorge, the law does not grant world wide rights. That construction is a massive expansion of the law that does NOT comport with reality.

May 9, 2018 10:00:34 AM from Ann-Cathrin Marcussen to all participants: Even if a name of a city is not purposely used as a city name, but something else. that does not prohibit the government to react afterwards and make problems for the applicant.

May 9, 2018 10:00:40 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thank you for your comments, Alan. Great points.

May 9, 2018 10:01:14 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: @Timo: That has been my point earlier.

May 9, 2018 10:01:38 AM from Taylor Bentley to all participants: ITo make progress before continuing on other outstanding elements including 'intended use,' 'mechanism to be discussed,' 'relevant stakeholders,' 'practical implications' etc., perhaps there is use in outlining principles for engagement?

May 9, 2018 10:01:55 AM from Justine Chew to all participants: yes, agree with Alan's comment on non-objection letters

May 9, 2018 10:02:00 AM from Taylor Bentley to all participants: With the ultimate purpose in setting up a framework to avoid abuse

May 9, 2018 10:02:00 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: We are on top of the hour.

May 9, 2018 10:02:44 AM from Justine Chew to all participants: Apologies, I have drop off the call now.

May 9, 2018 10:02:47 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Important point by Jorge - which issues are we trying to solve?

May 9, 2018 10:02:53 AM from Timo Vöhmar to all participants: @Katrin Sorry, I am a bit slow

May 9, 2018 10:02:58 AM from Taylor Bentley to all participants: ...just think as identified by jeff. Need to start somewhere where we can make progress. Starting narrow and building up to the bigger, broader considerations

May 9, 2018 10:03:02 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thanks. We should be ending soon.

May 9, 2018 10:03:09 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: @Timo: No worries ;-)

May 9, 2018 10:03:22 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Jorge - If it is a brand TLD, then it is not true that you cant control how the TLD is used

May 9, 2018 10:03:27 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Jorge - in some TLDs you can strictly contorl who has a domain AND how they are used.

May 9, 2018 10:03:52 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Yesterday I circulated a link to a table I started putting together the information on the geo issues in applications. The link has been circulated.

May 9, 2018 10:04:05 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thanks Greg

May 9, 2018 10:04:12 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Thank you all for your participation today, appreciate the input.

May 9, 2018 10:04:25 AM from Martin Sutton to all participants: I apologise but have to drop for another meeting.

May 9, 2018 10:04:26 AM from Ann-Cathrin Marcussen to all participants: @Jeff - sorry missed your question. I do think the letter of non-bjection is a way of bringing the relevant parties to the table - from what I recall earlier appicants, f ex Katrin, has stated that from her experience it was not a problem in the former round. And in addition support to Jorges points just now.

May 9, 2018 10:04:58 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Of course a TLD can control what second level domain holders do. Look at .bank for instance.

May 9, 2018 10:05:11 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: when is this call finishing?

May 9, 2018 10:05:12 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Anne - Yes a letter of non-objection works well IF you want to use the TLD in a manner associated with the geographic significance

May 9, 2018 10:05:24 AM from Susan Anthony to all participants: Jorge, are you suggesting that an applicant has to obtain a letter of non-objection from every city in the world with the same name corresponding that gTLD, even though the applicant has no intention to use the gTLD in any way related to any of those cities?

May 9, 2018 10:05:25 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: But does NOT work well in cases where that is not the intended use

May 9, 2018 10:05:51 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Katrin runs a TLD that is used in accordance with its geographic significance

May 9, 2018 10:06:19 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan Anthony: that is what is required under the 2012 AGB. I'm not proposing anything new

May 9, 2018 10:06:22 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: The queue is closed. Christopher shall be last participant.

May 9, 2018 10:06:29 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Jorge - actually it is not

May 9, 2018 10:06:35 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Ann-Cathrin, If a city wants to apply for a TLD, should they bring all relevant parties to the table (e,g, brands)

May 9, 2018 10:06:43 AM from Paul McGrady to all participants: @Christopher, but if the applicable local laws are never identified, how are we supposed to respect them? We really need to see citations of "applicable local law" so that we can at least read them.

May 9, 2018 10:06:43 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: We cannot use that as proof that the letter of non-objection works well in cases where the TLD is not being used in accordance with its potential geographical significance

May 9, 2018 10:06:56 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Local law applies locally. Not globally. To expand local law to the entire planet is a massive expansion of what the law actually grants.

May 9, 2018 10:06:57 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Christopher is misinterpreting the "applicable law" provision.

May 9, 2018 10:06:59 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: We are over 6 minutes in this hour long call.

May 9, 2018 10:07:01 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: @Jeff: Do you have an example, where the letter of non-objection did not work well in cases where that is not the intended use?

May 9, 2018 10:07:08 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: The AGB does not state that you have to get consent from every possible city that has the same name

May 9, 2018 10:07:09 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: If you don't like it, leave ICANN.

May 9, 2018 10:07:13 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: @Katrin - Yes I have examples

May 9, 2018 10:07:27 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: Well...let me take that back

May 9, 2018 10:07:27 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: @Jeff: Can you share them?

May 9, 2018 10:07:42 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: @Susan Payne: the sole exception were cities... and nonetheless as Kathrin has said on list applicants where advised to get in touch with the public authorities even in such cases

May 9, 2018 10:07:44 AM from Javier Rua Jovet to all participants: Thank you all!!!

May 9, 2018 10:07:48 AM from jeff neuman to all participants: There are examples of geo names not on the list that received Early warnings that were not able to get letters

May 9, 2018 10:07:52 AM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: sThanks everyone, excellent discusion Bye for now

May 9, 2018 10:07:54 AM from Greg Shatan to all participants: Katrin - we are putting together a table with this info. Hopefully many will participate.

May 9, 2018 10:08:00 AM from Robin Gross to all participants: Thanks all, bye!

May 9, 2018 10:08:02 AM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Thanks all

May 9, 2018 10:08:03 AM from Terri Agnew to all participants: nexxt call: Wednesday, 16 May 2018 at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

May 9, 2018 10:08:05 AM from Susan Payne to all participants: @Jorge - but not in the AGB

May 9, 2018 10:08:07 AM from Svitlana Tkachenko to all participants: thankx all

May 9, 2018 10:08:09 AM from Jorge Cancio to all participants: Thanks and bye!