
YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the fourth webinar of the 2018 At-Large Capacity Building Program on the topic of new gTLDs Generic Names Work Track 5 on Wednesday, 23rd of May, 2018 at 13:00 UTC.

Our presenters are Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Javier Rua-Jovet for this webinar. If we can please mute that line. We will not be doing a roll call since it's a webinar. We have French and Spanish interpretation. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channels and for transcription purposes as well. Please also speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

Could I kindly remind all participants on the phone bridge as well as on the WebX to please mute your speakers and microphones when not speaking? We'll also mute all lines on the phone bridge during the presentation.

Thank you all for joining. Before I turn the floor back to Tijani Ben Jemaa, one final reminder to use *6 to mute your lines on the bridge and *7 to unmute your lines, please. Thank you all for joining. Over to you, Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Yesim. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is, as Yesim said, the fourth webinar for this year, 2018, of the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group. Each webinar is done

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.

... We are doing those webinars to make our community members informed and perhaps also educated in some kind of education about subjects and about subjects that are discussed in ICANN, are hot in ICANN.

We try to do that [inaudible] means that we try to find the good times to address those topics. This topic, the geographic names, which is the topic of the work track 5 of the PDP Working Group of the new gTLD subsequent procedures, this topic is very important because it has always been more or less controversial. We did it now because we are expecting the work track 5 to issue their initial report soon to be put for comment and we need our committee to make that comment on this initial report.

So, before trying to do that, we need to understand better the topic, the issue. That's why we invited to day two persons with large [inaudible]. Let's start with the largest [inaudible], Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who is the co-chair of the whole PDP Working Group on new gTLD subsequent procedures with five work tracks. So, Cheryl is really the best person here to speak about the subject. We invited also Javier who is one of the co-leads of the work track 5 addressing the geographic names. So, that's why today we tried to address this particular topic this time, so that you'll be more informed and I am sure you will be more informed as we have the best speakers on this particular topic.

So, without any delay, I will give the floor to our speakers and I think Javier will start.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yes, thank you, Tijani. Thank you, all. Good morning, good afternoon, goodnight. Buenos Dias, Buenos Aires, [inaudible]. Thank you, Tijani, for that great introduction. [inaudible].

My name is Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. As you kindly said, I'm here with Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is the most capable person.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Javier, I don't hear you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Javier, we cannot hear you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: You can't hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Now yes.

YESIM NAZLER: Yes, we can. Please go ahead.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I don't know how much ... Anyhow. So, thanks again, Tijani, for that great introduction and [inaudible]. So, my name is Javier Rua-Jovet, for the record. I'm one of the co-leads of this work track 5 and I'm joined in this seminar by Cheryl who, as I said and you didn't hear me, is one of

the most capable persons I know in ICANN and in non-ICANN related stuff. She is, as we all know, an incredible person all around and a great resource in this topic and other topics.

So, as we can see from the agenda today we're going to give At-Large members here, welcome you all, a feeling of where we're at in work track 5, so as Tijani said, we can have great participation in this process prior to the initial work that will come out and also after the initial report.

Going to agenda item one, which is the [inaudible] given, one of the things that [inaudible] as Tijani mentioned [inaudible]. Work track 5 focuses exclusively on geographic names at the top level, including [inaudible] forms.

Work track 5 is tasked to determine what if any changes may need to be made to existing policy. That includes 2007 GNSO policy recommendations and the introduction of new gTLDs and relevant rules contained in the 2012 [inaudible], such as the geographic names [inaudible] procedure, geographic names extended evaluation and objection procedure. We will look at some slides and [inaudible] on these processes.

So, as Tijani said, the work track 5 of the PDP Working Group on new gTLDs has co-leaders from different [inaudible]. As you can see, we have Annebeth Lang from ccNSO. We have Olga Cavalli from the GAC. We have [inaudible] from the GNSO; and myself ...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I please ask the staff to give the control of the slides to Javier? Because he is speaking about something and the slides are not [inaudible].

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay. I'll [inaudible]. Sorry for that. So, let's go to – I was on slide 6. I just said what [inaudible] all about, which is geographic names at the top level, ASCII and IDN forms. We will discuss further along what geographic names are in the ICANN sense. [inaudible] to see what changes, if any, have to happen on relevant policy and on the Applicant Guidebook of 2012. We will see in slides further along the procedures that are actually in place today under the guidebook, the Applicant Guidebook. We will see them in a graphical form that's easy to understand. So, I'll change myself here.

As Tijani said, the work track 5 of the new gTLD GNSO PDP has structured leadership positions that in many ways can be described as cross-community. It's [inaudible] GNSO PDP. We have a co-leadership group of incredible people that I have [inaudible] work along with. It's Annebeth Lang from ccNSO, Olga Cavalli from GAC, [inaudible] from GNSO, and myself from ALAC.

Of course, on the main PDP Working Group on top of all the work tracks, we have of course Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is with us here. She's awesome, of course. And Jeff Neuman, which I didn't know before and he's been an incredible, incredible resource.

Before we get into the nitty-gritty of this, I want to stress that this seminar gives me the opportunity to carry out one of my duties under the work track [inaudible] to keep the people informed of what's going on, keep the At-Large group informed, the At-Large community informed, and to engage community members on this task.

The way that work track 5 is set up is really open to participation. All that are truly interested are welcome to participate. We encourage it, either as a member or [inaudible] member in the sense of participating in meetings and sending out messages, etc., being an active participant. Or just an observer. All that's required is an SOI. No main PDP Working Group membership is required. So, just drop in the SOI. I guess you can see there the link where all the information is there. Not only information to join, but information on the status of work track 5 and basic documents, etc.

As Tijani said, we need these types of engagement, like this incredibly important seminar and I thank Tijani for getting this together and having such an important track, setting up these seminars.

To really participate in a way that's educated, this seminar helps out in this direction. It also helps, allows me to carry out responsibilities that I officially have under the work track.

So, we're on slide 9. We're going to start looking where we are now. So, work track 5 adopted its Terms of Reference. I shared a slide there. You'll want to go through it. But, generally, the Terms of Reference of the work track defines, sets out the [inaudible] statement, the goals, the objectives, the scope of the work track, the deliverables, the reporting. What we're doing right now is part of that reporting. I'm on slide 9. I hope you all see it.

Also, rules of engagement, the rules of decision-making in this work track, which generally are consensus-based. It's not a strict voting procedure in any way. We're trying to get ... Part of the cross-community type of co-leadership and the low barriers to entry in this work track is what we want is that the community gets involved and [inaudible] participate and a true conversation, a true multi-stakeholder conversation takes place and it's really consensus-based.

So, on the Terms of Reference and the goals of this group, one thing that sticks out from the Terms of Reference is the strong interest in the geo-names topic that the different communities have. All the communities including ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO.

As I mentioned in the prior slide, one of our missions is to be really, really inclusive so that people are comfortable and people participate in this process. Really, in order to try and not fall into pitfalls that might have happened before where little progress was made and maybe entrenched positions kept things from moving along.

As I mentioned, the decision-making is consensus-driven. Even though consensus calls are only for work track members, of course, not observers.

The levels of consensus report for different decisions are part of the co-leads' duties. As you know, it could be either a focus [inaudible] type of position, [inaudible] support [inaudible] position, the consensus, minority [inaudible]. But, right now, [inaudible] certain topics and looking at where things are in the community and trying to track progress.

So, the Terms of Reference – and I mentioned this before – really sets out what we're supposed to do and what our scope is and what our scope is not.

Work track 5 is geographic names at the top level only, so right of the dot geo-names. And under the [inaudible] under the Applicant Guidebook and really in ICANN common knowledge, but under the Applicant Guidebook when we speak about geographic names, we're talking about country and territory names in the ISO list. We're talking about short and long form forms of those strings. We have two-letter codes, we have three-letter codes. We have the long forms of those names, the short forms or the long forms. A long form would be for dot-us, it would be The United States of America, but maybe a short form is America maybe, after we look at the list.

But, the good thing about the ISO is you go to the list as reference and [inaudible]. We also speak about different [inaudible] of those country names, permutations [inaudible]. We'll go into this a bit later on. It's

basically different ways to organize or express a country or territory name that are all really set out in ISOs.

All these are currently unavailable as gTLDs as per current policy and [inaudible]. Also, when we speak about country – geographic names, sorry – at the top level, we’re also speaking about [inaudible]. We will go into this further along later in the presentation. [inaudible]. We also speak about city names that are not the capital city. We speak about sub-national [inaudible] names. So, county levels, province, states that are mentioned in the ISO [31662].

As per current policy, current [inaudible], these types of geographic names currently require support or non-objection letters or communicate from the pertinent public authorities or governments. We will get into that further along in the presentation in detail.

When we speak about geographic names at the top level also we’re talking about [inaudible] regions. So, the United Nations, [inaudible] has a list called the Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings. I don’t have the link there, but if you go to the prior link that I shared, those links are in there. If you just Google that, it will come up.

So, current policy and current [inaudible] basically for these geo-names it’s [GNSO] regions geo-names. Currently, it requires support or non-objection from us from at least six people [inaudible] national governments in that region.

So, part of our scope also is geographic names that are not in the AGB, in the Applicant Guidebook. This type of geographic names, it’s

geographic features, rivers, any type of TLD that has a geographic connotation or maybe culturally significant that is related to the [inaudible]. Each one of the opportunities, the big opportunities, to innovate in this work track. We will see further along in the presentation this is also one of the most ... I don't want to say controversial, but it would be the category where things like dot-patagonia or dot-amazon are. Geographic names that are not in the AGB, so what would be the policy for that in the future? This is very important to focus on this.

One thing I haven't mentioned in the prior slides, and I think this has to do with the cross-community feeling and the co-leadership structure of work track 5 is that I think particularly in the At-Large community we're so varied and so diverse, [inaudible] good feeling for the different interests that come into play in this conversation and I'm going to move to another slide here.

With that interest and objectives of work track 5, these are important slides to focus on to think about geographic names a bit out of the box and to try to understand what's at play here.

From the different meanings, even prior to San Juan and then the calls that we've been having, in general we've had some of the objections and interests that are at play in terms of the geographic names discussions.

So, you have governments. We can say GAC. The governments, they express concerns regarding protection of national identity and important sub-national place names. That's very easy to ... A very easy

governmental perspective to understand. Sometimes I call them sovereign interests. And governments also express the need to avoid confusion between ... I put it between quotes – government national TLDs and gTLDs.

So, that's something to discuss. As you know, some TLDs that are related to governmental functions or can be, like city names, or for example even the three-letter, the alpha three-characters that are used, for example, in Olympic competitions, the alpha three characters that are in the ISO 3166. These are, in many ways, interests that countries and nations, sovereign nations, and also territories have a stake on and mention as an important interest here. That's very easy to understand. And avoid confusion between that and TLDs that would be used as brands for other purposes, gTLDs.

Another governmental concern that has been expressed repeatedly is, of course, the current authority or the current policy or the current procedures that are in place that have to do with consent or non-objection by these public authorities on strings that they might have objections to, strings that would be applied for that they have objections to in terms of these interests, the interests that are governmental interests.

And similar interests – for example, the ccNSO, which of course the ccNSO has country and territory codes that are sometimes managed publicly, but also are sometimes managed privately. Sometimes they have concerns that are similar to governments. Sometimes not, but the truth is that these are ... There are some concerns that have to do with maintaining the character ccTLDs as they are today, as the current

policy, which is [inaudible] look into this in the future for [inaudible], for country and territory codes and not open that up.

And also avoiding confusion between ccTLDs and gTLDs. So, there's even a discussion on the nature. We've seen discussion on the nature of TLDs, even jurisdictional discussions that are in many ways out of scope of the work track that we have to control.

The third type of grouping, I would say new gTLD applicants are the interests that are really pushing for reform and change in current policy or even maintaining the policies that are perceived as being aligned with their interests, [inaudible] interest [inaudible] the strings that are available. So, delegate more, put more strings out there. This [inaudible] interest can be shared by [inaudible] which is to ensure a clear, fair, predictable, timely [inaudible] decision-making process. So, [inaudible]. We will do that a little bit later on in the slides on process.

One of our missions here is really to ... We don't want to fix what's broken. We want to concentrate upon anything that might be broken and fix it, but the things that are in place are working okay or are working at a level that the community feels should not be changed or that should be changed, and according to these interests.

When the applicants [inaudible] to protect and enable uses that support [inaudible] identity including those that coincidentally [inaudible] for their perspective, coincidentally match geographic strings.

Other interests that are very important here and I think At-Large has a lot to say here. We've seen in the mailings concerns about people in the community associated with a geographic location or feature and

questions like are people or a community associated with a non-AGB geo-name, a geo-name that's not in the Applicant Guidebook has any rights or have rights of [inaudible] people or procedural rights for that string that are new procedures. There's discussion whether that has to do with work track 3, which [inaudible] with community. It's a very interesting [inaudible] community applications, the meaning of community and what is that.

I think At-Large understands these interests from the governments, from individuals [inaudible] particular [inaudible] I can think of [inaudible] communities [inaudible] within our [inaudible] have a lot to say and I hope they start getting involved with work track 5 and other work tracks.

Sometimes their interests could be similar to countries and territories interests. They could be aligned, but they could also be not aligned with those. Maybe there's a country or a public authority that is not aligned with an indigenous group and we have to look into that to see what procedures will be put into place, if any. I really call upon the community to get in and think about this and put their work in.

Other concerns are, of course, freedom of expression and these are a part of the people that push for openness and more and more delegation without too much governmental involvement, etc.

So, where are we now? It's taken a while for me to get here, but I'll be brief. We held ... Things happened before ICANN 61, of course, but I've been since ICANN 61. We had a good meeting at ICANN 61. We've had a

good number of calls after ICANN 61. WebX calls. I hope soon Adobe Connect calls.

As Tijani said, we're in the process of getting the information and the narratives in place in order to deliver a good initial report in July to the main work track, to the main working group [inaudible] to the community itself for public comments.

We have also started some discussions that are really [inaudible]. If you want to look at what happened in San Juan, here are some links. I can tell you that there have been some concerns since San Juan and afterwards in calls regarding ways to efficiently track all the conversations that are taking place. Of course, we have good calls, but we also have very, very active mail lists. We have great conversations there and many people chip in which is a great thing and we want more.

So, we're getting together a narrative document. We have different types of materials that we put out, but a narrative document that really tracks this and tracks the different topics and the different positions and where we're at. This will be shared pretty soon. I don't want to say a day, but very soon.

Just to focus on current status, again, very quickly, slide 15. So, of course, we initiated in March. In May, this included San Juan, discussing the [inaudible] terms not included in the guidebook. We started that. We're still doing that. We're still doing the same things we're doing in March and May. Conversations get more and more refined. We get more and more granularity.

As you can see, we have a very, very aggressive timeline, as Cheryl points out. We, as a work track, we're a bit ... We're not really aligned in speed as the other work tracks because, of course, we started before. But, that's why this schedule is aggressive. We know that. It's a lot of work. We just had a call a few hours ago in my 1:00 AM which was – and Olga chaired it. It was her 2:00 AM. It was a pretty good call. It's tough issues, but we're moving along.

So, we're in the process of getting all this input to be ready to report [inaudible] in July, and of course this seminar and the other activities that we're going to keep on having are important to get us all ready to keep on participating in an intelligent and productive way.

Again, I take the chance to again call upon At-Large to get in here and lets [inaudible] impact this initial report with our very, very, very varied views [inaudible] the universe of different individuals out there with different interests.

Let me go back a bit. So, I'm in slide [15]. I guess one level of consensus that we can see from the different meetings and the mail track and everything has to do a little bit with the idea if it ain't broke, don't fix it. We feel, and we haven't found a lot of controversy on what's on this slide right now, which is basically keeping the status quo on the categories that are expressed in this slide. So, definitely no discussion of changing the current policy and status of two character country and territory codes [inaudible]. As we all know, the [inaudible] that come from ISO 3166.

So, country and territory codes will maintain their status quo. These two-letter ASCII combinations will remain the same in future [inaudible]. That seems to be the consensus right now. The initial report will probably [inaudible].

And [the same with] [inaudible] country and territory codes from the ISO, which is to maintain also a status quo that is not available for delegation, not available as a gTLD.

The next slide [inaudible] questions about which entities can apply for these strings and how they may be treated. For instance, a gTLD, ccTLD, or something else. That line really reflects an overarching discussion – I hinted at it before – that has to do with people that have very, very different opinions, which I don't think personally are favorable right now, that have to do with the nature or even the jurisdictional nature of different types of codes. Some positions, some entrenched positions, express some codes as being completely governmental and sovereign in a sense of even like a GNSO jurisdiction, even [inaudible]. There are some positions there on the conversations that we're having, and other positions that think everything is revisable, so that's why we're here; we're making policy. Everything is revisable and that everything has to be changed [inaudible].

So, given that wide array of views on these topics, so right now the running consensus is also [inaudible] the status quo [inaudible] and not really getting into these jurisdictional discussions. [inaudible] case of work track 5. They're out of the Terms of Reference. They're out of our scope.

Also, maintaining the current policy situation, [inaudible] situation, for the long-form country and territory names. So, very little chance of being changed in this item here. That's what we're seeing right now. So, our countries will have their same long-form names. That will be protected. And the short forms also.

Moving along, let me see [inaudible] here. So, as I mentioned repeatedly throughout the prior slides, and I'm heading here to clarify. I'm almost halfway done.

Focus on 2012 process. The 2012 process [inaudible] Applicant Guidebook. One of the things that the leaders, the co-leaders, we agreed to and we're trying to focus on the process itself, specifically, and on the steps of the geo-names review procedures in the guidebook. Try to focus on [inaudible] to see if the community feels something is wrong with a certain step, something can be improved in a particular step, a particular step works perfectly or should be changed.

The way we tried to get this idea working is actually drawing out these processes. So, in the next two slides. In slide 18, this is a slide that takes a stab at trying out the geographic names review in initial evaluation, the different elements that have to do with objections by countries and territories by the GAC. These process diagrams have to illustrate how these elements work together and are still working together since the 2012 round. I really invite you to take a good look at this. In the next few slides, Cheryl will go into more detail on the particular steps.

The whole idea here, just looking at the process, to try first to agree that these buckets are what the AGB says. This is a type of thing ... This is in

the spirit of what Göran was doing when ICANN Org was drawing out the different procedures and the different communities so that we can agree on the little box. So, if we can agree on the little boxes, then we can also start thinking about the boxes and we can also start thinking maybe outside of the boxes, that overuse idea, just thinking about the box idea.

So, this is really to ground the conversation objectively and this slide 19 goes into more detail on what happens on the different categories of geo-names in this evaluation procedure.

It's tough in the calls. Even though we've been trying to [inaudible] on these boxes on these slides, this topic is [inaudible] varied positions and viewpoints. It's even as a strong round in a flowchart. It's so easy and really so inviting to veer off track. Even I veer off track because there's so much community interest on this that even the calls on a little triangle for a few minutes is tough. But, I really urge you to take a good look at the slides and we will get into them a bit later on. It's important to understand what the process is to really try and think about what's changed.

What slide is this? 19. I think I'm halfway there. Let me go maybe to slide 20. I think I can leave it here if Cheryl wants to take it onwards. If there's any questions, I can take them now or later, but I'll follow Cheryl's lead on that. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Javier. Hopefully, my audio is okay and Yesim can let me know in chat if that's not the case.

What we might do now apart from see if anyone has any clarifying questions they'd like to raise now from what Javier has covered, I wondered, staff, if we could have a look at our first couple of pop quizzes, so we could look at the pop quiz questions one to three. I'm happy to do that. If not, staff can do it. Whichever. Sounds like I'll do it. That's fine. Thanks for that, Tijani. Audio is good.

I'll just remind you all that in WebX, we need to get you to submit each question separately. If you hit submit and you have more than one question in the list, then you only get to submit one. Let's [inaudible] our first poll question.

This is a true or false question. The question is: is it true or is it false that to participate in work track 5 as a member you need to join the overall Subsequent Procedures for New gTLD Working Group? Is that a true or false question? You can select that and hit submit. We'll see how you go. We have five minutes on that timer. We won't leave that much time. We'll stop it at about one-and-a-half minutes and see how we go.

With that, if I can ask staff to move to the next question and I will let you all know that, in fact, that is not a true statement. It is a false statement. You do not need to in fact join the overall working group. You only need to put in a statement of interest and note your expression of interest to join work track 5. This is a little bit of an exceptional rule based on the very wide community interest in geographic names.

Okay, let's put up the next polling question. By the way, I had a little bit of fun on that one in putting an incorrect answer just to stir things up.

This one is also a true or false. Is it true or is it false that work track 5 as a subteam of the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs PDP Working Group operates under GNSO guidelines for probably department process with its own Terms of Reference? Is that a true or a false statement? We'll give you about a minute to select that and push your submit button. I won't try and [inaudible] this time. I'll actually give the correct answer from my polling.

With that, I can ask staff to move onto the next question and tell you that the answer to that last question is in fact true. Yes, as work track 5 members should know that the subsequent procedure works under GNSO guidelines for policy development, as does work track 5, but work track 5 does have its own specific Terms of Reference. Well done, everybody.

The last one before I get into the focus on the 2012 process. Which of the following are within scope for work track 5? Here, you need to select the correct answer. Which are the following are within scope for work track 5? A) Top level geographic names B) UNESCO listed geographic names regions, subregions and selected economy C) Country and territory names as listed in the Applicant Guidebook using 2012 round D) Capital cities as listed in ISO 3166-1 or place names as listed in ISO 3166-2 or finally all of the above.

I'll give you a moment or two to select and submit, and ask staff to close that poll now and let you know that the correct answer to that is, in fact, [inaudible] all of the above. That's a little bit of a break, and hopefully shook up some of your thinking. Thank you, all, for having

done very well on the polling. Perhaps I didn't give you enough time on that last one because we had a very [inaudible] answer.

Now, if we're able to, can I ask ... I don't know if I have control of the slides or not. Hopefully, I do. If not, I will tell you all that we are now on slide 20. With this ... Apparently, you have control of the slides. Great. Sorry, Alan is in chat saying he's muted. He tried to ask staff to post the URL for the presentation. I do believe they sent it out [inaudible] as well, but if [inaudible] could set up, post the URL in the chat, that would be a very good idea.

With this, we are looking at kind of the details of what we're currently reviewing now which is the very important, and in leadership view, and I'm [inaudible] in making sure everyone involved in our discussions is able to fully understand what it was that happened in the 2012 [inaudible].

And if I can just remind people if you are not speaking, please mute. I want to leave plenty of time for our Q&A at the end of this as well.

In the focus on the 2012 process, we need to note the following. All applications and their respective streams were included in the geographic names review procedure, regardless of if they were designated as such in the application.

So, let's get clear on what that means. Applications were designated by the applicant as a geographic name could be determined to be not a geographic name based on the criteria in the Applicant Guidebook.

Applications that were not designated by the applicant as a geographic name could in fact be determined to be a geographic name based on the criteria of the Applicant Guidebook.

So, there was a review. A geographic names review procedure. That is what happened in 2012.

If I may now move to the next slide, which should be slide 21 for those of you who are following along separately, let's see what else happened.

Country and territory names, as defined by the Applicant Guidebook, were completely unavailable for registration by any party. Country and territory names, as defined in the AGB, were simply not available.

Examples of this is the alpha three characters, long and short form. Examples here were The Islamic Republic of Afghanistan as a long form, and the short form Afghanistan. You also could not have exceptionally [inaudible] names, such as [inaudible] Island. That's an example. [inaudible] components – for example, Antigua, where we would look for Antigua and Barbuda. And a permutation. Permutations and [inaudible] were also not available.

Also, commonly known. For example, the use of Holland for The Netherlands. These were not available in the 2012 process.

We now move to slide 22. [inaudible] for geographic names required government support or non-objection. This is very important and an awful lot of work, and [inaudible].

The support or non-objection is required for the following. Representation in any language as the capital city name of any country or territory as it existed in ISO 3166-1.

The exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a country, province, or state and this is listed in ISO 3166-2. Or, listed strings as listed in a UNESCO Region or appearing in the composition of macro geographic and continental regions and subregions, again a UNESCO listing. So, for these names, it was a requirement to have government support or non-objection.

Let's [inaudible] slide 23. In this 2012 process, the following applied. Parties were able to raise concerns about applications by several different mechanisms. These were GAC, Government Advisory Committee, early warning process. GAC, Government Advisory Committee, advice. And also objections. You could have different types of objections lodged. You could have a string confusion objection where it was contended that the applied-for string is confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or another applied-for generic top-level domain in the 2012 round.

You could also raise an objection under legal rights. You could claim that the applied form, the new gTLD strings, infringed on the existing legal rights of an objector. It was possible to object under the banner of limited public interest objections. This would be where the applied-for gTLD string is [inaudible] to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order. These were linked or required to be anchored as recognized and [inaudible] of international law. There are now of course very important reasons [inaudible] to have [inaudible] objections is a

[inaudible] requirement in 2012. In other words, it probably will survive as requirement for future rounds.

There is also, quite importantly, from the At-Large Advisory Committee point of view, community objections. This is where there was substantial opposition to an applied-for gTLD from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. And with that, and the At-Large Advisory Committee, had the potential as an objector on behalf of [inaudible]. That's a very important opportunity for objections.

Let's now move, as we go along for slide 24. Having hopefully made clear to you all what it was that we had as a process within the 2012 round – and I'm not going to get into the beta on the merits of this. We're simply going to make sure everyone understands what did happen, what was applied in process and in assessment of geographic names. I'd like to spend a little bit of time now having a quick look at some of our current discussions on the future treatment of country and territory names. Remember, these were not able to be applied for in the 2012 round.

This [inaudible] the subject to considerable work by a cross-community working group which predated the Subsequent Procedures Working Group for new gTLD and the work track 5. It's important that work track 5 participants, members, and observers understand where the [inaudible] community got to in terms of proposals for country and territory names in the future. Let's look at these.

First of all, short or long form names associated with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved, [inaudible] specific [inaudible] use in ISO 3166 [inaudible] agency [inaudible] for not being available. Examples of this are dot-eu and dot-uk.

Secondly, a separable component of a country name designated on what is known as the separable country names list or translation of a name appearing on that list in any language, and [inaudible] specific [inaudible] listed in that work. Examples here is the term aland which is the acceptable component of Aland Islands.

Next, a permutation or transposition of any of the names included in the [inaudible]. Here, we have a definition which is very important to understand for applicants. Permutation includes removal of spaces, the insertion of punctuation, and any addition or removal of grammatical articles such as the word “the”.

A transposition is considered as a change in the sequence of a long or short form name. For example, Islands Cayman and Cayman Islands are both [inaudible]. Another example would be The Republic Czech instead of The Czech Republic would be considered transposition.

Finally, a name by which a country is commonly known as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization. Here, we maintain the very good example and longstanding example of the geographic term Holland as applied to The Netherlands.

If I can move to the next page, there we go, slide 25.

Additional, but continuing with future treatments of proposals, additional categories of geographic names as specified in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook that require consent or non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities.

Here, we have clearly listed a representation in any language of a capital city name of any country or territory as listed in ISO 3166-1. There are examples here. London and Berlin and their other languages. Examples for both London and Berlin listed.

Here we need to look at two things. First of all was the policy way back in 2007. The policy for the 2007 PDP was that such names would be available, but that there would be a challenge mechanism, governments to initiate an objection [inaudible] applied-for name. Applicants were required to be aware of the GAC principles and applicants had to represent that the use of the proposed string was not in violation of national laws in the country that the applicant was incorporated in.

In the implementation of this policy in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, there was a requirement for support or non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities applicable to these geographic names. And at this stage, we are not proposing changes to that particular treatment. Obviously, there's room to discuss, but let's move now to page 26.

Here we have another example of policy, because of the 2007 PDP process, and how the 2012 Applicant Guidebook was implemented. This is [inaudible] terms, first of all, labeled as city names, and city names used for purposes associated with that city name. In other words, dot-

berlin or dot-newyork for the purposes of promoting the city Berlin or New York.

Here the policy in 2007 was that they would be available, and again, for the challenge mechanism for governments to initiate an objection in the same way would be made available [inaudible] required, but the applicants would be aware of the GAC principles, and if they must represent that they're not in violation of the applicable national laws.

How this was implemented in the 2012 applicant guidebook was that it required – such an application would require the support or non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities, [inaudible] name.

The same thing can be also said for strings coinciding with a city name but used for non-geographical purposes. So, again, the 2007 PDP policy said that such names would be available, but the challenge mechanisms and the awareness as applied in the previous examples would be a mandate for such an applicant.

And here in the implementation in 2012 there was no specific requirements. So, [inaudible] and I'm aware of the time here to future treatment of geographic names, which are the exact match of some national place names, but just country, province, or state. And specifically, this was [inaudible] in ISO list 3166-2.

Here, the policy in 2007 was again that such names would be available, that the challenge mechanism would be available, and also that applicants were aware of that principle, etc.

But here again, the implementation was, in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, that the support or non-objection from governments or relevant authorities would be required.

I just want to follow again. I know this is a lot of work, but it is important you all understand what we are having as a starting point for these conversations and that is that future treatment for the UNESCO list and the composition of the subregions as listed. In that link, you'll find the full list of the macro, geographical, and continental regions list. Here examples are Europe or [inaudible]. Again, in the policy from 2007, these names would be available, but the challenge mechanisms would be applicable, as would the requirement of awareness of GAC principles and non-violation of national laws where the applicant is incorporated.

Here we'd like to point out that in the implementation from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, there is the requirement for support or non-objection from at least 60% of the respective national governments in that region with no more than one written statement of objection or non-support from a relevant government authority within such region. So, it is very important that [inaudible] that was the requirement applied in that circumstance.

Just time being against us here, and I also should be on another call right now with the GAC on, surprisingly enough, subsequent procedures PDP processes. I want to take you to slide 29 and that is where we look at the future treatment of non-applicants listed in the Applicant Guidebook in 2012 geo-names.

Here the thinking is that the geographic names that were not in the Applicant Guidebook, these are things such as geographic features, rivers, mountains, valleys, etc., and cultural significance related to geography, whether [inaudible] requirements. We are aware that some issues have arisen in relationship to geo-names as TLDs and these are simply not covered under the 2012 Applicant Guidebook rules and we're very aware of such an example of [inaudible] listed here, dot-amazon so that the future treatment at this stage is that the work track has discussions that's already touched upon creating some form of good mix of incentives for applicants and relevant authorities to arrive at mutually accepted solutions for the delegation of such strings, and early in the application process, if not in advance of the application process. However, we still have very, very strong and deeply held views on these issues and that's another good reason for you all to become involved in these discussions.

Can I beg now, Javier? Because this has taken a little longer in presentation than I had planned and I do need to log into the other call. Can I hand this back to you for the last couple of slides, the last three I think slides, on current discussions while I dial in on my other ear and give my left brain to the Government Advisory Committee and the GNSO Council? Over to you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you. Can you all hear me fine?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Before you leave, Cheryl, I would like first to thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, I'm not leaving. Trust me, I'm not leaving. You still have half my brain.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Go ahead, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Can you hear me fine?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay, perfect. Just to catch up on some current [inaudible] of current discussions. There has been a significant volume on the mailing list with very, very strong opinions in respect to the treatment of city names and of course geo-names more broadly. So, here, we have disagreement [inaudible]. Very often it becomes a discussion on rights on both sides. Some sides asserting rights. Perhaps countries and territories, public authorities have certain rights under perhaps international law or national law, and then other voices that really contradict even the existence of these [inaudible] rights.

From one perspective, any rights granted to the application process should be based on international law, but if no international law exists granting special rights to governments or other parties, no corresponding rights should exist through mechanisms in the new gTLD program.

Same thing. From other perspective, national law, government policy, [history] and public interest considerations provide a basis for granting rights to governments to mechanisms in the new gTLD program. But, also when we get into this discussion [inaudible], we also fall into some problematic [inaudible] issues. When we're talking about public [inaudible] concepts, we have the usual problems that happen on these topics.

There are also different perspectives on the scope and [inaudible] of trademark law in this discussion relative to and in the context of [inaudible]. So, lots of ... We have very, very good people on many sides of different issues with well-researched positions, well thought-out opinions, positions, but [inaudible] to each other.

So, we try to guide everybody to think out of the box, think creatively, and as Cheryl mentioned, we've been thinking about ways of getting people to talk early in processes, so even before [inaudible] start. We're not trying to get them to do that. We're trying to talk through possibilities of creating processes that allow or incentivize that.

So, how might we get GAC and ccNSO interest in regards to their objectives [inaudible], how to get people to talk. Possible elements of protection include other forms of support, non-objection letters,

objection procedures, post-delegation measures. These are things that are in the guidebook right now. They really can be used in other contexts.

Are there proposals for creative solution that might be mutually acceptable, using one or more of these elements [inaudible] discussions we're having, really brainstorming and rallying around ideas [inaudible]? As I said, early conversations.

YESIM NAZLAR: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yes?

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry. Apologies for interrupting, but could you please speak louder and closer to the mic? Our interpreters are having a hard time to understand you speaking.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Sure. Can you hear me now better? Is that better?

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. I'm checking with our interpreters, if you could please keep on speaking.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: One, two, three, four. One, two, three, four. One, two, three, four.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. I think they say it's a little bit better. If you can please speak louder as much as you can.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I'll do my best.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thanks so much.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Sure. In general, these discussions we've been having in terms of that are discussing like 31, 32. It's basically what we've been saying before. We have strongly held views on different sides of positions, discussions that have to do with rights or prerogatives that might be [inaudible] by sovereign or public authorities and other [inaudible] that really deny even the possibility of these rights existing.

Also, the interplay if any with national laws and trademark laws, and of course international law whether there is or isn't international law that's applicable.

So, these discussions are very, very interesting but sometimes they are highly philosophical, and the way we are, the work group leaders are trying to move this forward. We've been saying just having procedures that might incentivize agreements early in processes or even before

[inaudible]. It's not an easy task, but it's one of the conversations that are happening, that is happening.

Another way ... One thing that we've been touching upon is there's some international law mechanisms, mostly in environmental law, that have to do with sharing. I think Maureen made some good comments on that at one point on the mailing list. Anyhow, just sharing arrangements. Maybe there's a possibility of having a gTLD shared by more than one interest. So, that's a conversation that's happening. It's an interesting conversation. Let's see what makes it to the initial report.

So, in terms of non-capital cities, some examples of proposals made in the list and in conversations in phone calls. So, required government support and objection only when used in geographic context. That's really the current. It seems like the current policy. Required government support and objection even when intended use is not related to the other. That would enhance public authority powers in some ways. Create a list of cities, some listing, a list that has to do with size of the cities that might be helpful in terms of creating a hierarchy. These are just topics for discussion. No agreement has come to any of this.

Also, handle all third-party concerns with an application using objection processes like the ones that are in place right now, as Cheryl discussed earlier. So, different objection processes.

And as Cheryl mentioned, just how can we incentivize – and I've said it. How can we incentivize parties to come to the table when intended use is non-geographic? For example, agreement that might allow the use of second-level strings or the reservation of second-level strings where

there is an inherent association with the government, the local community?

So, what these governments are discussing, some objections or some comments on early interactions, some community members have expressed that that could be detrimental to business plans that might require some discretion or even a level of secrecy at some point.

So, there are very, very lively discussions and that's what we're doing now. So, it's really a call-to-action to all of you to come in and chip in.

So, with that said, we're really already in any other business, and in the interest of time, I'm sure we can have a question and answer period now. Anybody have any specific questions they want to say right now?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Javier. Thank you for this presentation and I would like first to thank—

YESIM NAZLER: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes?

YESIM NAZLER: Sorry I'm interrupting you, but could you please switch to the phone bridge? Because your audio in WebX is very feint.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Do you hear me now?

YESIM NAZLER: Yes, it's better, but I hear some echo.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And now?

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. It seems it's gone now. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Javier and Cheryl. I would like first to thank our speakers, especially for Cheryl because you know the time, what time is it in her country. It is really a very bad time and she accepted to come and to make the presentation. So, thank you very much. Thank you, Cheryl.

Now I would like to give the floor to our attendees, if there is any question for our speakers. Yesim, can you please help me? I don't see the hands.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sure. Okay. We have a raised hand from Alberto Soto.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, we will start with Alberto and then come back to the last questions or pop quiz and then continue on with questions. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. Good morning from Buenos Aires. Obviously, this topic has [inaudible] topics.

INTERPRETER: I'm getting interference from an audio message. Please stop. Let's please make sure Alberto stops as well. Okay, it seems like it's muted now. Please go ahead and apologies for interrupting.

ALBERTO SOTO: Can you hear me better now?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALBERTO SOTO: I was saying that as what happened with dot-patagonia, this is a regional location within a country. Dot-amazon is a regional location that involves several countries, seven I think. My question is whether this working group, the work track, in addition to allowing us to participate and to work together with GAC, can we use our ALSes to get information from the [inaudible] system because in the case of dot-patagonia, for instance, we can take advantage of the ALSes that we

have here in Argentina that can collect information and we can gather more information. So, this might be my suggestion. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alberto. It was a question to Cheryl. He said can ALSes collect information? But, I don't see how it will help the work track. Okay. No answer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sorry, you couldn't hear me with the headset on. Can you hear me now?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I hear you very good. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. I'm assuming you can hear me. I did put in the chat, Alberto, I'm sure the work track 5 would appreciate any input that can contribute to their discussions that is going to give them some fact and evidence-based work, recognizing of course that in even our future treatment proposals so far we are looking to have substantial support or letters of non-objection from what would be classified under ISO 1531 I think it is, as significantly interested parties applied to these regions or sub-regional names. It is one of those areas in the 2012 round that quite clearly wasn't predicted properly or managed well. But, yes, an At-Large Structure can certainly provide important input and of course you have

Javier as a way to help choreograph and orchestrate that input at the appropriate time. Thank you. Javier, anything you want to say?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Yes. Definitely. Gracias, Alberto. Yes. So, I'm the At-Large, the ALAC, co-leader in this group and I really, really, really encourage ALAC and At-Large community involvement At-Large including the ALSes. So, any type of well thought-out [inaudible] or information that can be channeled through a work track member – maybe, Alberto, you can join – we can definitely help out in channeling those perspectives. Of course. That's what we want at this [inaudible] at this moment. We want [inaudible] to have a good well thought-out and well-documented discussion, and the more information, the merrier before we put out an initial report. And then, after the initial report, also we want more participation.

So, I'm here to help and, Alberto, we can speak offline if you have any specific ideas. I think, as I said in the call, At-Large has a lot to contribute to work track 5. There are already some good, very active At-Large members in work track 5. We want more and there's such a variety of position and such a good level of understanding of interest, and that comes naturally to At-Large because of its diversity. So, yes, Alberto, I'm here to help. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Javier. Yesim, you still have pop quiz questions.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, we do. Yes, we have three more pop quiz questions before we move onto the evaluation and you can now see them displayed.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have a question before. Can we have a little bit more time? Can you ask the interpreters if we can extend a little bit of time because we are almost at the end of this webinar?

YESIM NAZLAR: Let me check with the interpreters and I'll get back to you. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Now you have the next pop quiz question displayed on the screen. True or false. An essential foundation to the work of work track 5 is a clear picture of how geographic names were processed and evaluated in the 2012 round. Yes or no, true or false? So, please go ahead. Make good choice and submit. Okay, Yesim, are you available now?

YESIM NAZLER: Hi, Tijani. Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very good. Javier? Okay.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yes. People that answered had the right answer. Very good. So, we want to know – that’s what we focused on the slides. We want to know, we want to understand, the 2012 process, what happened in 2012, how things are set up. There’s no way we can build if we don’t understand the foundations. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Yesim, go ahead.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. Let’s move onto the next question, question number six.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Read it, please.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes. Just one second please. I’ll try to open it up. Having some issues here on WebX, but now I have it open.

The sixth question is: which of the following statements are true? Work track 5 members will need to reach full or complete consensus on any recommendations it will propose, work track 5 proposals and recommendations will be discussed—

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: That’s not the one that I have on the screen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yesim, this is not what is displayed on the screen.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. Sorry. I was reading it from the e-mail and I thought the sixth question is this one, this is what is right on the e-mail from Cheryl.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I can go ahead and read it, the one on the screen.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay, thank you. And apologies for the issues I have with WebX.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: So, one, true or false. Work track 5 can only report outcome and recommendations that are within scope and that are limited to clarification and improvement to how geographic names were processed and evaluated in the 2012 round. True or false? Vote quickly so we can move on.

Okay. Poll has ended. Let's see the results. So, the answer is true and we had 50/50 here. So, of course we want to stay within the Terms of Reference and not ... We have a very clear set of rules of what we can and we can't do. So, we can't report on things that are not in our mandate.

Next question. I'll read it. Which of the following statements are true?
A) Work track 5 members will need to reach full or complete consensus on any recommendations it will propose B) proposals and

recommendations will be discussed within the overall subsequent procedures for new gTLD working group before being integrated into an overall work product of the PDP C) It is planned to have work track 5 outcomes and any recommendations included within the final report of the PDP D) All of the above. Go ahead and vote.

Okay, the result.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I couldn't vote.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: It's not all of the above because letter A, we're not looking for full consensus. We're looking for consensus. Some positions might be labeled at that, but it's not A. I think it's C. I could be wrong.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: it is C.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Is there a question here or is that the last one?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yesim?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: That's it. I think that's it.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry, Tijani. I'm just checking with my colleagues because I cannot control the polling right now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No problem. Is there any other hand, Yesim?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I think Greg Shatan had a hand.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

YESIM NAZLAR: I don't see any hands right now, but Greg had a hand up.

GREG SHATAN: Yes, hi. Sorry, there's no way to raise a hand in the tablet version of WebX other than to write "hand".

Two things. On the previous poll, I disagree with the idea that the work track 5 is limited to clarifications and improvements and how geographic terms were processed. While we do have to stay within the scope of geographic terms, that's far too narrow of view of what we can do or how extensive the changes we could make are. Clarifications and improvements sound like a very incremental process and there's no

such limitation to incremental types of work in the group [inaudible] both directions.

Secondly, on the very last poll, I do believe that B is also true as well as C. Correct me if I'm wrong. Is the work of work track 5 not going through the PDP, through the work group as a whole?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

You are correct on both points. The last one is definitely B and C, and the statement regarding ... That you describe is purely an incremental process, you're also right. Our scope is wider than that. We're here to make or [inaudible] quality, make or [inaudible] process. So, thanks for that, Greg.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Javier, I think that B said to be decided on or to be decided on the recommendation should go through the whole PDP Working Group before being decided on. That's why I say B is not correct. That's what I understood from the question anyway.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Well, it's confusing. The report will be given to the full group, definitely.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Define the report, that's the other thing. But, the recommendations themselves. Okay. Thank you very much. Any other hand? If there is not, I have a small remark. It's not a question. When you listed the

interests, you mentioned the interest of governments, the interest of ccTLDs, and the interest of applicants. But, I think this is not well-detailed because the [inaudible] in fact this geographic names are a [fight] between two main interests. One is political interest from governments and the second is commercial interest from the commercial people.

Also, business community have interest in having those strings because those strings are very attractive and registrations are much better with them than with other kinds of strings. This is my point of view. Go ahead, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

So, that's a way of looking at it. But, there's governments that have different positions on the topics and there's private parties that have commercial and non-commercial interests. On the government side, there could be some general views from the government side, but some governments are also very commercial view, some of them.

So, I see, Tijani, your point. Sometimes, the conversations do get very bipolar in that sense. But, there's many, many interests here that sometimes are completely opposed and sometimes have [inaudible] and sometimes are overreaching and are overlapping.

It's a valid view. It's a valid way of saying it, what you're saying. The way we put it on the slides is to try to flesh out the variety of nuances here. For example, this community or peoples or ethnic groups or cultural groups that might be interested in a gTLD for themselves for their identity, that is an interest that could be multi-form. It could be similar

to a country or territory interest in terms of public interest or national identity types of [inaudible], but that community might also have a commercial interest which is not contradictory to that.

So, a bipolar view situation, I think it's less helpful than a multi-polar view of situation. Just a comment. That's my opinion. I think your opinion is just as valid.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Javier. Yesim, if there is a final one hand, we can give the floor. Otherwise, we have to close the webinar. Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: I don't see any raised hands. [inaudible] here, but no hands.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can we go to the evaluation questions?

YESIM NAZLAR: Of course.

GREG SHATAN: I had my hand up in the chat.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Go ahead, Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Sorry. There's no other way to raise a hand in the tablet form of WebX. Not my fault. What I'd like to say is I think that as simplistic and perhaps even unhelpful to try to devolve work track 5 into a binary, I agree with Javier on that point. It's important to consider some of the other points of view and thoughts that are underpinning various views. There's certainly a freedom of expression view, which is opposed to overt large-scale government control of what could be hundreds of thousands of words without any application.

There's also kind of an application-centered view, which is the view that competition, innovation, and the expansion of the DNS are best served by favoring the delegation of the application over blocking and reserving without any applications coming forward. I think even the commercial view can be thought of as well as a consumer view and not merely as a big, bad business view. And whether the geo-centric one is one that puts the power in government hands or in the hands of communities and the people is also something that's debated among those who would like to maximize the power of the geo-meaning to dominate every other meaning.

So, there are a lot of nuances here and I think that the best way forward here is to deal with the nuances rather than to try to steamroll everything into two stacks. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

You are correct, but I wanted only to mention that there is a very big interest that was missing in the slide. That's all. Thank you for saying

that. If you want, we can discuss that later. I have a lot of ideas about what you said, and [inaudible] community is absent here because community may have interests which is not political, which is not commercial, which doesn't have anything to do with ... It is more [inaudible] than other things. So, we can continue with discussing that, but now we have to go to the evaluation questions. Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much, Tijani. If you see where [inaudible] evaluation questions on the WebX room. Just a kind reminder before I start reading all the questions, please don't forget to answer all six questions and then submit your answer. So, it will be slightly different than we're used to on the Adobe Connect. Let me start reading our questions.

The first question is: how was the timing of the webinar? If it's too early, just write or too late.

I'm moving onto the second question. How is the technology used for the webinar? Very good, good, sufficient, bad, or very bad.

Our third question is: did the speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic? Extremely strong, strong, sufficient, weak, or extremely weak.

And our fourth question is: are you satisfied with the webinar? Extremely satisfied, satisfied, moderately satisfied, slightly satisfied, or not satisfied at all.

The fifth question is: what region do you live in at the moment? Africa, Asia, Australia and Pacific Island, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean Islands, or North America?

And our last question is: how many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Is it less than one, one to three, three to five, five to ten, or more than ten years?

I will keep the poll open and we'll give some extra time before closing the poll. Back to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Yesim. This is the evaluation question. Thank you all for coming, for participating in this webinar. I think it was a real interesting topic for our community, especially because we will have the initial report of the work track 5 on which we have to comment, so it is important that we understand and we discuss this topic together. I hope that it was clear for you.

I would like to thank particularly again the two speakers, and more specifically Cheryl because of the time she is dealing there. I would like to thank our staff, our interpreters, and all of you.

I think, Yesim, if the poll is closed now?

YESIM NAZLAR:

It is, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. So, thank you very much, all. This webinar is now adjourned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. Thank you, everybody. Especially thanks to Javier and
bye for now. Always a pleasure.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks, Tijani. Bye, all. Ciao!

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye-bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This webinar is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the
day and thank you all for joining. Bye-bye!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]