Adobe Connect: 28 Members

Alexander Schubert .berlin Mobile

Avri Doria

Barrack Otieno (AFTLD -ccNSO)

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

Christopher Wilkinson

Dave Kissoondoyal

David McAuley

Ejikeme Egbuogu

Gnanajeyaraman Rajaram

Greg Shatan

Jaap Akkerhuis

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC)

John Rodriguez

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland)

Justine Chew

Katrin Ohlmer

Liz Williams

Martin Sutton, WT5 Co-Lead

Maureen Hilyard

Nick Wenban-Smith,

Nominet

Rahul Gosain

Sara Bockey

Sophie Hey

Susan Anthony

Susan Payne

Thongchai Sangsiri

Tom Dale

Yrjö Länsipuro

On Audio only:

Bram Fudzulani

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro

Apologies:

Marita Moll

Jonathan Agmon

Darcy Southwell

Alan Greenberg

Annebeth Lange

Staff:

Emily Barabas

Julie Hedlund

Steve Chan

Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 5 – Geographic Names at the Top Level on Wednesday, 13 June 2018 at 05:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_MycFBQ&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=mCdIzmisB_K4Ek3MjrWNBy8p4K-11ggrKwvKgyIHTSA&s=WpWQ19qvaEW3QTafa_eOVl8LchnQVz5YeEPvu5bmAKE&e=

GNANAJEYARAMAN RAJARAM:HELLO TO ALL

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Hi all

Maureen Hilyard:Hi there..

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Hi to all!

Christopher Wilkinson:Good morning. CW

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):You sound great CLO.

Maureen Hilyard:Clear as, Cheryl

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

Dave Kissoondoyal:Hi all

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):question to staff: the idea mentioned at last call and then on list that the definition of cities should be left to national legislation/policies , has not yet been included in the working doc, right?

Steve Chan:It should be two minutes!

Emily Barabas:@Jorge, it is added on page 28

Emily Barabas:actually, page 28 in the Google doc, but page 29 in the word version

Emily Barabas:you can also zoom the document to view in larger format

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Emily: thx, is that in the circulated version? I cannot see it really...

Emily Barabas:Jorge, yes, circulated with the agenda yesterday

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):now, on p.28 of the word...

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):but more than a country "decision" it is to defer to their legislation/policies...

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):no change needed, capital cities are a limited list and it worked well...

Emily Barabas:Jorge, please do feel free to suggest adjustments to the language either in in chat or on the mailing list.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Please state name for record. (I think its @Liz)

Emily Barabas:@Jorge, sorry, correct. I was initally looking at the "preview" mode of the Word version on the wiki, where the pages are slightly different. Your proposal is on page 28 for all three versions.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):let's stick to capital cities now...

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Hand up by Christopher Wilkinson.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):we have to review 2012 AGB categories: hence "cities" - we cannot change that now...

Steve Chan:We are trying to limit responses to 1 minute

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Hands by Christopher Wilkinson and then Greg Shatan

Barrack Otieno (AFTLD -ccNSO):Hi all, joining Adobe requires a manual

Barrack Otieno (AFTLD -ccNSO)::-(

Katrin Ohlmer:What would be an alternative wording for "capital cities" which is clearly identifiable and which issues arose in the last round with the word "capital cities"?

David McAuley:also had hard time getting into adobe but glad to do so, still better than alternatives

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):capital cities was clear, worked well according to the record and treatment should be kept

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thanks Christopher the points in advance were received and noted

John Rodriguez:It would be interesting to understand why the 2007 Policy didn't suggest any special requirements and did not mention a provision requiring support/non-objection.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@John: those were clearly different times, when SO/ACs worked in silos...

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):There seems to be some convergence, with exceptions, of not abandoning the concept of "Capitals".

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet:The working document seems to cover capitals nicely; seems to be the right thing to stick with 2012 treatment

Katrin Ohlmer:+1 Javier

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Anybody wants to speak on these great commments being made in chat?

Greg Shatan:Jorge, GNSO Working Groups have generally been open to all, then and now.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: I was around in 2007 and the silos existed... and not blaming anyone :-)

Greg Shatan:So was I, and some were in silos..

Steve Chan:20 seconds remaining

Liz Williams:@ Martin Let's see if we can make a distinction between pre-emptive conditions going into a process which discounts potential applications/applicants and then conditions in an evaluation process. I don't think any one is arguing for open slather. I think we're looking for clarity in an open proces and then sensible measurses to evaluatoe applications.

Liz Williams:@ I will try to reconnect the audio.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):On cities I feel we could work on parameters or requirements that would serve to meet all the different interests at stake, e.g. having clarity/predictability on what is a city, on the need of prior/early contact between all interested parties, possible means of resolving "conflicts", etc.

Liz Williams:I can see the Adobe but the sound isn't working nicely.

Katrin Ohlmer: how should we take into accout that many cities have been out there for much longer than brands and quite some brand names derived from a city name (rather than the opposite)?

Greg Shatan:why is monitoring not possible for public entities, yet expected for everyone else?

Greg Shatan:Katrin, why is age or etymology relevant?

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: it is a question of resources and specificity of interests - public authorities lack a direct interest in the DNS industry, therefore normally lack these resources and this expertise

Katrin Ohlmer:@Greg - because the first one has a different relevance

Steve Chan:20 seconds remaining

Steve Chan:Time

Greg Shatan:Katrin, in what way? what is a "different relevance"?

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):intended use will not solve the question

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Hi Yrijo!

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Yrijo, could you speak a bit louder?

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):as said intended use is of little help when we are talking about unique resources/strings

Susan Payne:could Yrjo please increase volume, I cannot do so at my end and he's really quiet

Liz Williams:@ Yrjo   very difficult to hear you.

Greg Shatan:Jorge, Why do you assume that others with an interest in a term have a "direct interest in the DNS industry"? That is often not the case.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Could we restate what Yrijo stated, since it was very lo volume?

Katrin Ohlmer:Which issues would be solved with "intended use"?

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):".luzern" for selling food will not avoid the city and canton of Luzern from having a potential issue with that...

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: normally brandholders have a more direct link with the DNS that public authorities, especially large brands, as the Internet is now a primary marketing tool...

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet:did we ever get to the bottom of the spa situation? That was the case of a city name where as I understood it the intended use by the applicants was non geographic

Greg Shatan:They may have a potential issue, but that does not mean they have a superior right to any other use.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Thank you very much Yrijo for clarification.

Katrin Ohlmer:@Nick: If the applicant had to tick a box confirming that a check has been made whether the application euqates a geoname and that he contacted the relevant government, the issues with .spa would have been avoidable.

Greg Shatan:Public authorities and brands both own some relevant domain names, but that hardly makes brandowners as a class more connected to the DNS. The vast majority of brandowners are no more close aligned to the internet than public authorities.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: well that is where our opinions part, at least in Switzerland there is a certain predominance of the city right... although nothing is absolute - but the letter does not preempt the brand from applying, it requires it to get together with the public authority - which in Switzerland is bound by the law in its decision

Greg Shatan:Katrin, Ultimately it was decided that Spa had no grounds for an objection — so why should they (or those similarly situated) be inserted into the process?

Katrin Ohlmer:@Jorge: Also in Germany - pls check all those court rules about "cityname.de" - which regularly are operated by the relevant city.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Some great comments going on in chat.

Susan Payne:disagree Katrin - since Spa is also a dictionary term and this wasn't intended for use in the geo context it would not have helped at all

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: an Internet strategy is today inherent to a brand - including its protection - that is different for public authorities, especially in developing countries

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet:Thanks Katrin! But just wondering how practical that would be for all cities in the world in all languges? I mean suppose I just don't realise or the city authority is unresponsive?

Katrin Ohlmer:@Greg: Because it increases transparency and predictability for applicants and increases the application process and saves ressources on all sides - as I mentioned in my e-mail earlier.

Greg Shatan:There are brands in developing countries, too. And many brands do not view the Internet as the be all and end all of developing their brand.

Steve Chan:20 seconds remaining

Greg Shatan:Katrin, all of those same reasons could be applied to a result where cities had absolutely no capacity or ability to interfere in applications by third parties.

Katrin Ohlmer:@Nick: Ti identify whether it euqates a geoName should be pretty easy with wikipedia.org. Identify the relevant government - if there are issues in doing so, support from the GAC migth help.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):@Liz is that an old hand?

Steve Chan:20 seconds

Liz Williams:@ Susan there are compliance for all registry operators depending on what has been applied for. BUT nothing stops a registry operator from going through an RSEP process to change use perfectly sensibly and easily without too much cost.\

Steve Chan:Time

Greg Shatan:Katrin, you need to justify why the city or relevant government should have a role — the actual basis for giving them a prerogative.

Katrin Ohlmer:@Greg: Of course we won't be able to solve all issues from last round, but why should we not try to?

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):I feel it would be useful to know what would be needed from brands view to reconcile their interests with the framework of the letter of non objection: deadlines for the letter? mediation if public authority is non-responsive? help in identifying the public authority?...

Katrin Ohlmer:@Greg: It is not about a better role for governments, but to increase the apllication process

Greg Shatan:I'm happy to solve problems, but there needs to be a reason to grant a privilege.

Liz Williams:@Greg and Katrin...it is perfectly reasonable for governments and public authorities to have a role...those bodies can always a) apply b) object and c) go through contention set resolution...or work together.

Greg Shatan:Katrin, I'd be interested to see a suggestion that did not have a better role for governments.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: the reasons are there - a different thing is if you do not agree with them...

Liz Williams:@ Martin...any one can do an RSEP process...

Greg Shatan:I'm really not seeing them stated, but merely assumed, Jorge.

Susan Payne:Jorge I don't believe that anything is going to reconcile the brands to letters of non objection since that would be to cede a veto right to a government or local authority somewhere in the world

Christopher Wilkinson:There is a BIG difference between pre-existing Brands/TMs which benefit from exiting laws and policies, and the option being discussed of no controls of Geo-Names which could lead to a global monopoly on the name as a short cut to protection in the absence of any prior right. CW

Greg Shatan:Liz, I agree that curative rights are a much more fruitful area for exploration.

Liz Williams:Here are the three parts again...A) application B) evaluation C) compliance...we could do a little flow chart on this and we will rapidly see where we have agreement...

Greg Shatan:Brand strings are also unique, even if they are also city strings.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):@Jorge, is that an old hand?

Greg Shatan:Christopher, I think that you are touching on the reasons why context is fruitful to explore, and perhaps beyond a binary city/not-city context.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: exactly - because the string is unique and different interests converge on it - the key is how to best avoid conflict and how best to create positive-sum solutions

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):Javier: vieja mano

Liz Williams:@ Steve...I can provide you a little flow chart from my perspective...I am a visual people and can help draw that up...even it if is rough...

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Gracias @Jorge

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Thanks @Steve

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):We are at :50 in the hour.

Emily Barabas:everyone can scroll and zoom for themselves

Steve Chan:Martin, you can't see it, but Liz has her hand up

Steve Chan:there is a green checkmark covering it :)

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):10 minutes to go until top of hour.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):form follows function :-) and function depends on the interests at stake...

David McAuley:flow maps are very difficult to use in a format like this

Yrjö Länsipuro:If somebody wants to leverage the (positive) image of a city to market something unrelated, should the city be asked for non-objection?

Steve Chan:@David, to the extent it's helpful, you can zoom in on your screen

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Hand up by @Steve

Liz Williams:We need to stop talking about cities. We need to talk about applications...we will get ourselves out of a whole lot of trouble if we don't worry about cities but instead talk about TLD labels...

David McAuley:thanks Steve but that is part of my point - not a big deal at this point

Greg Shatan:Yrjo, as a general matter, that is not required.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):in the attribution to one party of a unique resource the key is at the start of the process (requirements) - later phases (objections/control) are just curative measures, which only will be helpful if the requirements have made sure that all interested parties have had a fair say in the requirements phase

David McAuley:is anyone else having adobe lose connection periodically - my home router is usually quite reliable and wonder if it is other

Greg Shatan:What would be the basis for introducing it in this situation?

Katrin Ohlmer:@Yrjö: We shoudl consider - because it might be used by registrants as a geoname even if it use has been described different.ly by the applicant.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Time check. Five Minutes To Go.

Liz Williams:Thanks Steve...really helpful reminder about scope...

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Thanks for reminder @Steve

Greg Shatan:Jorge, why stop at the public authorities then? We could have a process where all interested parties are identified for each application, and brought into a process for every application?

Barrack Otieno (AFTLD -ccNSO):+ 1 Greg

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Greg: maybe we should investigate that

Terri Agnew:@David, please let us know if a dial out on the telephone would be helpful

Liz Williams:@ Greg...you've identified precisely that all stakeholders can be interested parties...and we can do a bunch of really good work on identifying how to raise the levels of consciousness about when anyone could be interested in an application.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Ideal for inclusion in ICANN 62 meetings

Greg Shatan:So, if a city applies, but there is a brand and a community with interests, they must be contacted and their interests resolved?

Liz Williams:@Greg...that is how we resolve objections...but really people must do their own due diligence...whether that is a geographic community or a brand or a generic applicant....

Katrin Ohlmer:@Liz: Exactly - and this has to be improved!

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):All: How many of you are already travelling to Panama next Wednesday. That is important to plan next call.

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):If that can be objectivized... although, as we know, there are a multiplicity of identical brands within and across jurisdictions (many more than identical cities, for sure...)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):The WT 5 Sessions should be unconflicted

Greg Shatan:Otherwise, we're just picking the "top of the food chain" due to position or expediency.

Terri Agnew:next meeting: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 5 – Geographic Names at the Top Level will take place on Wednesday, 20 June 2018 at 14:00 UTC for 60 minutes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thx Terri

Greg Shatan:Jorge, that's life...

Greg Shatan:Not traveling until Saturday.

Susan Payne:if travelling or if available?

Greg Shatan:traveling

Steve Chan:I'm with Susan, what's the question :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Emily said if travelling

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Top of hour.

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet:I'm travelling sat

David McAuley:traveling saturday also

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):me Fri

Greg Shatan:How many people on this call would be awake but for this call?

Susan Payne:Saturday

avri doria:bye

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Bye all

jaap akkerhuis:bye

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thanks everyone

Barrack Otieno (AFTLD -ccNSO):bye

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

Katrin Ohlmer:Thanks everyone

Alexander.berlin Mobile:bye
John Rodriguez:+1 Greg
GNANAJEYARAMAN RAJARAM:thanks
Rahul Gosain:Thank You All
Greg Shatan:Good night!
Dave Kissoondoyal:thanks and bye
Rahul Gosain:Bye for Now