

Adobe Connect: 33 members

Adrian Carballo	Dev Anand Teelucksingh	Liz Williams ccnso
Alan Greenberg	Ejikeme Egbuogu	Marita Moll
Alexander Schubert	Greg Shatan	Maureen Hilyard
Annebeth Lange, ccNSO	Griffin Barnett	Olga Cavalli
Barrack Otieno	Jaap Akkerhuis	Paul McGrady
Bonnie Mtengwa	Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC)	Robin Gross
Bruna Santos	Jess Hooper	Sophie Hey
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair)	John Rodriguez	Susan Anthony
Chris Casavale - IPC	Juan Manuel Rojas	Taylor Bentley
Christa Taylor	Kavouss Arasteh	Timothy Asiedu
David McAuley	Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry)	Yrjö Länsipuro

On Audio only:

Bram Fudzualani

Apologies:

Christopher Wilkinson	Luca Barbero	Ann-Cathrin Marcussen
Susan Payne	Justine Chew	Jim Prendergast
Mohamed Aslam	Barrack Otieno	

Staff:

Emily Barabas	Steve Chan
Julie Hedlund	Berry Cobb
	Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 5 – Geographic Names at the Top Level on Wednesday, 11 July 2018 at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_yoNHbQ&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=oQ3DeUwmxKVQ2GQ_bqG3DX3OcjkJD9Pwy4uetDxqp4&s=QO69LbXMM5rgkArSDDBjEg1QGQ1ExqFnNyars7Uy4b4&e=

Terri Agnew:Please call into the telephone bridge information below for this call today as we are having issues with Adobe Connect audio. Join information located in the agenda pod.

Terri Agnew:Update: Adobe Connect audio is working at this time, however, you may still want to join via telephone for best connection.

Paul McGrady:Hi Terri! Hi Olga!

Olga Cavalli:Hi Paul welcome!

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Hi all

Ejikeme Egbuogu:so what do I do now?

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):Hello Alo

Adrian Carballo:Hello everyone

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:Hello everyone

David McAuley:Will dial in now

Ejikeme Egbuogu:I cannot hear a thing

kavouss Arasteh:Hi every body

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):Hi All

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):Excellent Olga

Paul McGrady:Hi CLO!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):Hey Paul

Paul McGrady:I'm so glad to be on a call that is not about the ePDP!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):LOL

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):yep is tied!

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):Hi to all, Hola a todos!

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:Well this is my first call as a member now formally joining at ICANN62 ; my SOI is at

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_kYFZAg&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=oQ3DeUwmxKVQ2GQ_bqG3DX3OcjkJD9Pwy4uetDxqp4&s=ceYA4urG_yOuwuVJnJMGRREp2gW8kepow4ml67zN2RQ&e=

Juan Manuel Rojas:Hi everyone! Hola a todos!

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):Welcome @Dev!

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Hi Olga

Maureen Hilyard:Great to have you back @Dev. Hi all

Liz ccnsO:Could I please include in AOB how we capture comments on the working document...is there a way to add comments on a google doc or should we submit to ICANN staff.

Emily Barabas:you should be able to insert comments

Emily Barabas:if you are not able to do so, you can insert comments in the Word extract and staff will insert them in the Google Doc

Emily Barabas:the document is available here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_1BRzHr2FxSTYHX1I8F3FHSt6Bo1cvJsKyWX8WZXRUXAo_edit&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=oQ3DeUwmxKVQ2GQ_bqG3DX3OcjkJD9Pwy4uetDxqp4&s=kgvMPAjrTvo79ElGui12ic5npxZ5XQw1-Loc_yTUxlg&e=

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):Thanks Emily @Liz we encourage you to submit comments in the Working Doc directly or via a written submission.

Emily Barabas:Most recent extracts in Word and PDF can be found here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_YASbAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=oQ3DeUwmxKVQ2GQ_bqG3DX3OcjkJD9Pwy4uetDxqp4&s=hNBi6i4VghcB2INapX74UsAzr_N_-D9J5GgZs-9N4&e=

Paul McGrady:There many who thought that there should not be any such lists. Can they get their own bullet point on that slide?

Steve Chan:@Liz, all, if the comment you would like to make would seem to be beneficial for others to see, it may be good to raise on the list instead (or in addition to making the comment in the document).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):@Paul, there is no reference to any "lists" on the slide ;-)

Steve Chan:@Paul, good point. I think in preparing the slides, I believe there was an assumption that for those who do not support universal protections for non-capital city names, a list would not necessarily be relevant.

Susan Anthony:Agree that the work in the session involving development of principles was a good start - but we need to continue that work to develop further principles that will help guide our discussions.

Liz ccso:@Steve...I have been through the document in great detail and want to input comments in the most efficient way possible. I'll follow Emily's direction...

Robin Gross:QUESTION: >> To what use will the working document ultimately be put? Is it the beginnings of an official document of the working group or is it only some kind of brainstorming document? Thanks

Paul McGrady:@Steve - correct, but I think it is important to note that as part of their non-support of universal protections for non-capital city names, those folks believe that lists are not only unnecessary if their position was adopted, but they are a bad idea in general. Would be nice for the slides to reflect there was a significant "no lists" crowd. Otherwise, those who were not in the public session and just looking at the slides may come to the wrong conclusion that there was universal support for the concept of lists.

Steve Chan:@Liz, no problem. The point I was trying to make is that if the comment is made only in the document, not all may see your comment.

Emily Barabas:The document is intended to capture ideas, arguments, and proposals to support future discussion and eventually assist in the development of the WT's outputs

Emily Barabas:Many ideas have been raised, and it attempts to help ensure that no threads of the conversation are lost

Robin Gross:+1 Paul. Several people were in the "no lists" camp. That view should be reflected.

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):@Robin Hi! the Working Document is just that. A Workin Doc to reflect the several views of the WT5 members. Its very useful to read it it and chip in. It could be used as a tool to fish out " middle ground " solutions that could help us move forward.

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):(excuse typos)

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:It is obvious that we have "two camps" - and we hope that we can find some place in the middle as a compromise to move forward

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):All: please remember slides in call are not an authoritative record of WT5 thinking, and simply points to talk on the issues.

Liz ccnsO:@Annebeth...I don't think we have immutable "camps" on all issues. We have issues upon which some people sit on one side and there are other issues upon which those people may agree. For example, I think we can move forward on some statements of principle; I think we can move forward on agreeing on two letter codes; less so on three; even less so on non-city names and so on...this list is not exhaustive but just as examples.

Griffin Barnett:Agree with Greg - I also favor challenge/objection based approaches versus prescriptive approaches

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:@Liz, I am now talking about the non-capitol cities, sorry to not being clear.

Robin Gross:I agree that we must consider what the appropriate remedy is and not take for granted that the no-objection letter (which was never approved of by the community) should be the appropriate remedy going forward.

Liz Williams ccnsO:@Olga...I think we should add in predictability of time frames...time is the killer for applicants waiting for decisions....

Paul McGrady:No Objection letters are an unweildy method for solving a problem that not everyone agrees even exists. Cleveland - WisconsinCleveland - West VirginiaCleveland - WashingtonCleveland - VirginiaCleveland - UtahCleveland - TexasCleveland - TennesseeCleveland - South CarolinaCleveland - OregonCleveland - OklahomaCleveland - OhioCleveland - North DakotaCleveland - North CarolinaCleveland - New YorkCleveland - New MexicoCleveland - MontanaCleveland - MissouriCleveland - MississippiCleveland - MinnesotaCleveland - MaineCleveland - KansasCleveland - IndianaCleveland - IllinoisCleveland - IdahoCleveland - GeorgiaCleveland - FloridaCleveland - ArkansasCleveland - Alabama (and that is just the ones in the US).

Robin Gross:What does "allow for new non-capital city gTLDs"? Does it mean should govts be allowed to exclusively own words referring to cities? A clarification of meaning would be helpful.

Robin Gross:What does "allow for new non-capital city gTLDs" mean? Does it mean should govts be allowed to exclusively own words referring to cities? A clarification of meaning would be helpful.

Robin Gross:"Allowed" by anyone?

Emily Barabas:Essentially, the principle is to allow these strings to be delegated

Emily Barabas:as opposed, for example, to being reserved

Robin Gross:Delegated to which applicants?

Emily Barabas:It is not that specific at this stage

Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC):Thanks @Liz for your point of view regarding ways forward.

Liz Williams ccnsO:So -- it looks like Part A: Principles; Part B: Policy (pretty empty just yet) and Part C: Ideal Implementation...we then think about how to match our principles with ideal implementation in each case and then the policy will fall from it...then we ditch the Implementation text and put that somewhere in a Best Practices Guideline...just thinking about how to structure a practical document.

John Rodriguez: The third principle regarding "conflict" assumes that there is agreement a "conflict" exists but I understand there are divergent views as to whether there is or isn't a conflict.

Paul McGrady: As we point out problems from the last round, we should be careful to distinguish between problems caused by someone being delegated a non-capital city name vs. problems that were caused by the flawed ICANN objection process itself. We don't want to fix a problem caused by the ICANN process by doubling down on the problem and just doing even more of the same that caused the problems in the first place.

Robin Gross: When there are competing legitimate interests, it is appropriate that those interests be given an opportunity to apply, so assuming "reducing conflict" is not necessarily a bad thing, because it is a process that allows for competing legitimate interests to be resolved fairly.

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO: @John, what we meant with that was that it is in the interest of all that there will be no court cases, a lot of objections etc. after the application round. It would reflect badly on ICANN and the multistakeholder model if we cannot manage to find a policy reducing conflicts as much as possible.

Olga Cavalli: im back sorry connectivity lost thanks Javier

Alexander Schubert: Robin: You favour capitalist interests over freedom of expression. which constituency you are in?

Greg Shatan: In the US, the alt+right has weaponized freedom of expression against non-commercial interests. It would be unfortunate if that happened here as well.

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO: Berlin is one of the most successful

Emily Barabas: Regarding bottlenecks or other problems encountered, Greg started a list of cases:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1jPa4jdBgo8P2aC6G4pzLoFTfyocleon8qVD7Q9mlM5A_edit-23gid-3D0&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=oQ3DeUwmxKVQ2GQ_bqG3DX3OcjkJD9Pwy4uetDxqp4&s=K9Q-XikrzaUxbwvkB_baCujSU7oZHmW2PMIOEvdhxS4&e=

kavouss Arasteh: I wish to ask for a statistics for the cases of capital city as requested and systematically was or were rejected ? and what is the statistics of successful application?

Marita Moll: We seem to have dropped this issue of size -- which I think adds to predictability and simplicity

Olga cavalli 2: Can Terry disconnect Olga 2 my mobile? I cannot :(

Marita Moll: Just to clarify -- I think we should not discard size as one of the issues

kavouss Arasteh: Is there a statistic indicating the cases of unsuccessful and successful cases ?

Paul McGrady: BINGO! Bingo is an example of a TLD from the first round that also corresponds to a non-capital city names. 15 places it turns out. See https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_us.geotarget.com_called.php-3Fqcity-3DBingo&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=oQ3DeUwmxKVQ2GQ_bqG3DX3OcjkJD9Pwy4uetDxqp4&s=FoiQgfUnsGkMLE0jOcl9JqKhWJKT0EtsWF0UC-ky9Dg&e=

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO: @Greg - I think this is well formulated.

Juan Manuel Rojas: offtopic: Croatia to Final

Olga cavalli 2: Congrats Croatia!!

kavouss Arasteh:Please provide the cases that request for capital cities were rejected and the reasons for rejection?

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Javier, Paul McGrady has his hand up

Paul McGrady:Even if it were just capital cities, it doesn't get any easier. There are at least 13 places called Paris. 1. Paris, France 2. Paris, Ontario, Canada 3. Paris, Idaho 4. Paris, Maine 5. Paris, Kentucky 6. Paris, New York 7. Paris, Missouri 8. Paris, Yukon, Canada 9. Paris, Kiribati 10. Paris, Tennessee 11. Paris, Texas 12. Paris, Virginia 13. Paris, Arkansas

Marita Moll:@ Paul -- that's why size can help us

Robin Gross:A principle should be that ICANN will follow applicable law in this exercise and not contradict existing applicable law. Surely we can agree to that much.

Timothy Asiedu:Thanks for the opportunity to join you.

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:@Paul - if I remember correctly, the capital had a "first right" in the 2012 round.

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:@Paul, so that Paris, France had a "stronger right" than Paris, Texas. First come?

Greg Shatan:Marita, if the third largest Paris wanted to apply, would it have to ask all of the Parises or only the ones bigger than it? Or would it be easier and fairer to just let them apply and see if any of the other Parises object?

Juan Manuel Rojas:Even with Madrid happens. 23 places named

John Rodriguez:Question: What do we mean by "non-AGB terms" besides non-capital city names? Seems like it could be limitless.

Paul McGrady:B-I-N-G-O!

Marita Moll:@ Greg -- if there 2 places with more than 500,000 people competing for the same name -- there could be a problem. Otherwise.....???

Javier Rua-Jovet (ALAC):John: good question will attempt to answer

kavouss Arasteh:I have asked for the floor and I am at the top of the queue

Emily Barabas:@John Some Work Track members have expressed that there are terms that were not included in the 2012 AGB that should receive special treatment or have special rules in subsequent procedures.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):Excellent Point Susan the tiny tpwn of Paris in Central AU probably has no interest in a gTLD either ;-)

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Kavourss has his hand up

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):especially as we have Geo Names available under .AU

Emily Barabas:For example, geographic features (mountains, rivers, etc), geographic indications

Paul McGrady:@Susan - no interest that I have ever heard that is actually backed by local laws. I have asked for years and years for some sort of legal basis (which is how governments act). I've yet to be shown a single citation.

Greg Shatan:I don't think "confusion" can be so easily assumed.

Robin Gross:There is nothing to prevent a city named Bingo from applying. What we need is a mechanism to resolve competing legitimate interests, not just presume that the govt will always win that conflict.

Paul McGrady:+1 Robin

Susan Anthony:The confusion, if there were any, would be quickly abated by looking at the gTLD.

Griffin Barnett:+1 Robin

Greg Shatan:I don't think confusion can be so easily assumed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):Thanks for the suggestion Greg

Robin Gross:Agree with Greg.

Susan Anthony:@Greg, if we go to "tools" doesn't that assume that there's a conflict to be addressed by a "tool"? Or are you just trying to get us to free up our thinking?

Olga cavalli 2:Many thanks Javier for helping me

Paul McGrady:+1 Susan. Assuming there would be confusion in the first place (which is a big assumption), looking at the use of BINGO being used for the game of bingo would make it clear that the GTLD isn't referring to Bingo - Boulkiemde - Burkina Faso.

Paul McGrady:Thanks Javier and Olga for a good call.

Barrack Otieno:Thanks, i was not sure i would make it for the call

Greg Shatan:Susan, just trying to free our minds. I would not presume that there is a conflict but it would give us a new opportunity to look at those potential "conflicts" as well.

David McAuley:Thanks all, bye, agree with Paul, thanks Olg and Javier

Robin Gross:Thanks Javier and Olga for a good discussion!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP CoChair):Thanks everyone, lots more time next call then :-) Bye for now then...

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Bye all, and thanks for your contribution

Griffin Barnett:Thanks

Greg Shatan:Bye all.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:Thanks all

Maureen Hilyard:Thanks Olga and Javier and all for the great discussion

John Rodriguez:Bye, thanks.

Juan Manuel Rojas:Thanks everyone!