

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Barcelona
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures - Work Track 5 – Session 2
Saturday, 20 October 2018 at 10:30 CEST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Martin Sutton: Yes all if we can start in like 30 seconds. And please to start the recording for the continuation of the session. Thank you. So where were we?

Woman 1: We were – we had some people requesting the floor in the previous sessions then we break for coffee. So maybe they want to express their – and it was Carlos and (Jim) and Paul so maybe we let people sit in and we start?

Martin Sutton: So Carlos did you have any comments that - okay. Let's go.

Carlos Gutierrez: Okay thank you very much, Carlos Gutierrez for the record. I wanted to comment to Jorge Cancio's last statement that we should agree on the facts. I think we cannot forget the framework of the last round. The framework of the last round was not to collect fact. The framework of the last round was to promote competition, to promote consumer choice and consumer trust and we finally produced a review on that.

And I think that the last round was very successful in terms of geo terms. I mean there are more successes than failures and I agree we should look at the facts as compared with the objectives that we said in the last round to promote choice and competition. And we should not forget that this is the aim of the whole PDP to see if we failed and we should fix it. And if we were successful that we should promote it for the next round. And I don't think that promoting special rights for governments to create more restrictive geo terms

or keep reserve lists is a good idea and there are many examples of new geo terms that are really open and open to the people.

And of course there are geo terms that are obviously against competition. And if some Swiss companies wanted to keep Swiss they should have bid in an auction against the Lufthansa group for this. I don't see the need for governments to intervene and protect a group of companies against another company without offering more choice for consumers. So I don't think I agree with your first statement at all. Thank you very much.

Woman 1: And we had other Jeff in the queue, Paul there was (Jim) over here but no Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thank you this is Paul McGrady and just a reminder to Jeff deferred and so I think I jumped ahead of Jeff. So I just I've lost the string. This is my comment. I don't know what we're talking about. We had one conversation going on about currency codes and Annabeth thank you for your comments about that. And then (Greg) didn't talk about currency codes but he did talk about geographic indicators but there wasn't a reaction to that. And then Jorge took us to 35,000 feet and now we've got another comment about, you know, at the philosophical level right?

So I'm wondering can we sort of break this into little chunks and say does anybody else have anything to say about currency codes that have not been said, for example those need to be in a different track and we just lay that one to bed here in Worktrack 5 and we just move on? Does anybody else have anything to say about geographic indications? If not we can lay that to bed, if so then let's talk about it.

I appreciate the 35,000 foot stuff but I think that if we're going to get through this particular question we need to focus on so far we've got two things that have been proposed that might be additional kinds of terms and we need to figure out whether or not there's any support beyond one or two people for

those things. If not great, if yes let's talk and rather than going back up to the 35,000 foot level. Thanks.

Woman 1: Okay. I think it's a good suggestion. The idea was exactly this one that the audience could come not only with the four or what was it, the suggestion that we wanted to exchange ideas with you but with other topics the perhaps colleagues want to give your comments about. So for the moment we were talking about geographic terms not included in the first round of in the Applicant Guidebook in 2012. We stopped for coffee so that was the focus of that conversation.

We had some hands up that we couldn't take because we went for coffee. I think Jeff was in that list and maybe someone else that I cannot recall right now. So maybe we can finish with that comments and then perhaps we can go to currency codes and geographic indicators in more detail if the audience wants. Jeff you want to make your comment? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. This is Jeff Neuman, one of the overall subsequent procedures PDP co-chairs. And I – my first comment was really just to clarify a little bit of what Jorge was saying on the factual analysis. So I just wanted to make sure that so he and I talked a little bit off-line so I understood exactly what he was asking for. So when we take back this item and meet afterwards we can kind of discuss that just to make sure that we don't lose that as a deliverable.

On the issue of whether it's currency codes or geographic indicators or anything else that people want to discuss or add on I would just encourage as part of the conversations to bring it if we could as I think Paul said bring it down to the practical pragmatic level. And if you've seen issues in the 2012 round from whether it's geographic indicators, currency codes whatever else you want to talk about then let's make sure that those are aired as well because one of our focuses is to try to address issues that came up in the 2012 round and resolve those issues if we can, not to just kind of come up with things that potentially could be issues from a philosophical standpoint.

So to the extent we can tie things down to actual problems that we've seen the better it will be for us as a group to try to move forward. Thanks.

Woman 1: Thank you Jeff. Any other comments what we were talking before the coffee? Just to summarize a little bit I think Jeff made an important point about resolving issues from the first round and I think this is where several comments in the audience were focused to. And yes there are different perspective governments, companies, trademarks and the challenge is to try to find a way.

I see value in trying to avoid conflict for the next round. I see value for the communities, value for the applicant, I see value for the governments and also for ICANN not getting involved in long conflicts that are costly. And it takes a lot of time and energy from all the parties so that's my personal view. So I find value in this exchange.

I like Paul's suggestion about going to concrete issues and talk in more detail. Colleagues think that that's okay. Martin, Annabeth, have you perhaps more comments about currency codes and more comments about geographic indicators?

Woman: One at a time.

Woman 1: One at a time. Let's start with the currency code. Is that okay? I see - I don't see nodding but I don't see someone saying no, no, no. (Ilia) you want to talk about that? You're welcome. The floor is yours.

(Ilia Angipro): Yes (Ilia Angipro). I have a lot of sympathy to this area of protecting currency codes somehow because first of all because they have great potential for abuse if they are free for anybody to register. And the second I mean one could argue that they are geographical terms because the link between the currency of a country and the geography is quite strong. Historically the issuing of currency within the arm as a legal tender has been very much a

geographical thing. That legal tender stops at the border and it and of course a (unintelligible) is a sort of a different thing. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you (Ilia). Yes please. I have - I don't have your name but Nick. Sorry Nick welcome.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Nick Wenban-Smith for the record. (Kristin) and I exchanged some messages on list about currency codes. And I put the country proposition that it's a derivative of the 3166. And derivative's a degree of separation away from what we should be discussing here as a geographic term. And I think to the second point which has come up which is just in fact a solution looking for a problem because as far as I'm aware there were no issues in the 2012 round in writing to this area.

Woman 1: Thank you Nick. Christopher next. The floor is yours Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you. Regarding Christopher Wilkinson again. Regarding the currency codes I leave it to a higher authority to determine how to proceed. I would just say that I have no – I am in Worktrack 5. So I tell you what I know and what I think. If you think you want to put it into work track to so be it. But on the basis of reaching a conclusion that protects these codes because I have no, actually know knowledge about Worktrack 2 accept a severe suspicion that they may be even less sympathetic to geographical terms than Worktrack 5. Maybe I do them and injustice.

Regarding geographical indications let me be quite clear. I have no interest in this. I don't own the vineyard. But I do know that in 2012 we had a serious problem was geographical indications. If you don't do anything about it now here ICANN will get this problem ten times larger in the next round than in the previous round because everybody has been (unintelligible) and a lot of people who've have never heard of geographical indications suddenly realize that these are of great value and that is a geographical term. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you Christopher. Before given the floor to other colleagues and focusing on the currency list could colleagues from the general PDP tell that, tell the audience which could be the right place for discussing this because it seems that there is interest in the room about the issue?

Jeff Neuman: Yes hi. This is Jeff Neuman from one of the overall co-chairs. And I'm actually sitting next to Mike Flemming who was – Michael was one of the colleagues of Worktrack 2. And that Worktrack should the discussion - this discussion would've fallen under the topic of reserve names in general. And the group as you can see in the initial report other than referring out geographic terms to the Worktrack 5 and other than a couple limited exceptions like names that are special use cases I think or something like that is the term that was used by the IETF for certain terms that they feel like you need to be reserved.

Other than those limited ones the Worktrack 2 concluded that there was no need for additional categories of reservations. So obviously that report, the initial report came out, there are comments that have been submitted so there's a big caveat that we have not reviewed those comments yet and we'll be reviewing those comments. But just to kind of bring you up to speed that, that Worktrack did not feel like any other categories of reservations needed to be made up other than referring to geographic terms to Worktrack 5.

Also the IGO INGO debate that's going on within the ICANN community kind of also said, you know, we'll incorporate whatever comes out of that but not create additional categories including things like currencies or anything else. But on the currency issue again I just want to bring us back because there have been some conclusionary statements made that if we allow this to go forward we're going to have problems. And I'm trying to just, because we didn't have those problems in 2000, we didn't have them in 2005, we didn't have them in 2012. Now it could be because nobody – it's possible nobody applied for a three character TLD that corresponded to a currency code. I haven't done the check.

Man: Dot Top.

Jeff Neuman: But sorry I just I think that we need to point to concrete problems. And if it's something that has not I think to use I think something Greg said, if it's something that hasn't been a problem then we need to consider whether it's something that we need a preventative solution for or whether it's a remedial solution after the fact or after or after the application not after the fact. And that as long as we have a predictable process that the applicant knows about and a potential objector knows about that's what we're striving towards. We're just as from – put a personal hat on just to address something that Olga said, Olga said that she prefers to avoid conflict. I think that's – I think we all prefer to avoid conflict but we also need to realize that there's going to be conflict. No matter what we try, no matter what we do there's always going to be a conflict of some sort. And if we have a predictable process to deal with those conflicts that's what we should strive towards. Thanks.

Woman 1: Thanks to you Jeff. Just a clarification. What I said is that there - I personally find value in trying to refine rules and try to avoid conflicts. And I didn't say that there should not be conflicts. Javier please.

Javier Rua: Yes to continue on this point Javier Rua for the record. So I'm hearing people from my community, you know, from At-Large a lot on currencies. Following your point Jeff - or and the rest of the group do we think as a group that, you know, current objection, you know, like a posterior, you know, not anti, but current objection procedures that are in place would be good to deal with potential conflicts, you know, on currency codes? Is that something that's in place now? What do you think about that Jeff for example?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Jeff Neuman. There's – if we went back to the 2012 round there's no process right now there would, no formal kind of objection process. Obviously the GAC could always provide advice and that's one always that's one mechanism. There is an independent objector and assuming that's retained there's certain grounds for that. But for a very specific case of

something like currency codes I don't – if this group were to want to protect those, I'm not saying they should or shouldn't, but if they do and they do want it to be subject to a dispute then that should be something addressed by whether it's this group or the overall group creating that process. But I don't think that there's one right now that could – this could fit into at the moment.

Martin Sutton: I think those that - in the queue there was (Jab) in the chat I don't know if it's somebody before?

Woman 1: In the Adobe Connect room requesting the floor or no?

Martin Sutton: I encourage, we encourage everybody that even those who are here please try to log into the Adobe Connect so we can also take, you know, be more aware of the queue. Thanks.

Woman 1: And we have kind of (unintelligible). Sorry I can't...

Edmon Chung: No worries, Edmon Chung here. So on the topic of currency I understand that the origins obviously comes from geographic. But I guess in the future potential, you know, crypto currencies might be non-geographically related. So I think the concern in relation to geography may be something that is like it's a confusingly similar string to a geographic region. That is something that is not included today I think. Perhaps (Jab) that – not - in addition to not punting but referring to Worktrack 2 we need to think about the both the string similarity stuff and similarity against reserve names if you will or similarity against geographic names. That might be something that is interesting to think about and how the objection processes might work because right now I think there's a string similarity objection process but the standing you can't be - it can't be a reserve names to lodge that objection. So maybe that's the place where these things – this particular thing can be handled.

Woman 1: Thank you Edmon. (Jab) the floor is yours. Yes but (unintelligible) around 56 in this case. What (Kristof) is referring to is the ISO-4127 which is actually

standard by ISO for (unintelligible) and symbols and this term speed character or the alpha (unintelligible) of that standard is composed about the alpha-2 code plus another letter. So we have the USD for US dollar, the AUD for Australian dollar, stuff like that. I want to point out that however not all (Faluta) are following this pattern. There are quite traditional ones that do stop following this pattern. And just another thing is that it's that things actually change, you know, when translate in whatever it is on the moment changes again because the inflation, you know. It's pretty dynamic stuff. Every two, three months I get a list of updates.

And now that makes it really hard to and especially since not complete either. And it's just an application of the 3166 just like a TLD an application is a 3166 code. I mean it's up till now I cannot see how anybody can mix - can problem using this or taking the dollar for American geographic region but that's just me. I sort of was actually generic computability procedure and things getting out of hand. So if people feel very strong probably that's a matter to do that. Thanks. But that's sort of the explanation of how these codes work would be useful since as such (unintelligible) referring to it.

Woman 1: Thank you Jeff. Paul you're next.

Paul McGrady: Thank you. Paul McGrady here. So I think this is the quintessential ICANN solution that's in search of a problem. I don't understand what the problem is here. Are we concerned that top level domain names will somehow be confused with high band and swift codes and money will go to the wrong account? That doesn't seem likely to me but I'm not a banking expert. Is that the issue? Are we concerned that the United States and Panama both of which, you know, share USD will go to war over who gets a USD? That seems to me and issue that Panama the United States can work out. What are we trying to solve here other than these seem to feel a little bit like other things we're talking about because if it's just that they feel like other things we're talking about then great, Worktrack 2 knock yourself out.

Even if there is a real problem here that nobody has yet identified I still think Worktrack 2, not Worktrack 5 because no matter how much, you know, even if we can identify a problem it doesn't make them geographic terms and Worktrack 5 was meant to be narrow. But hopefully somebody can identify a problem. If not we can just maybe refer this one to Worktrack 2 and then deal with whatever was next. Thank you.

Woman 1: Paul what I - my recollection from the comments is that some colleagues think that there could be a confusion in between geographic terms and some of the codes that are similar to the names of a country or a region. That's my - and also there seems to be - it could be or someone (unintelligible) problems related with the financial and banking industry. I'm not a person that knows about that as you mentioned. So I think these two topics were raised by the audience and I think that's the purpose of this session. And then we see what we do. That's - I don't know if colleagues want to add something about that?

Martin Sutton: I think the valid point is to what are we really trying to solve here? And I hear a lot of could, seem to, may be not sure. We need something a bit more concrete to leverage any discussions on currency codes. That's from listening to those conversations already to date in the room here plus all the conversations on the Worktrack 5 listing as well. So what would be valuable here is if there is a definitive set of issues that could be determined relating to currency codes and we could link that in with geographic terms in a very distinct way then we can consider it. But at the moment I think it's a big struggle trying to part this into Worktrack 5 absent of that sort of information.

Woman 1: Just a procedural point that Worktrack 2 does not longer exist.

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Woman 1: It's Worktrack 1 to 4 they are now included in that full working group. So anything that should be into there - this report that's not there should come

with the comments to that report. And even the date for the first comment period was 26 September wasn't it? But it will be more opportunities to comment so to send it to the full working group would be the right way to do it. Please correct me if I'm wrong. So any other comments about the currency issue? Greg?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What am I chopped liver?

Man: I see Cheryl's hand up in the chat before mine. I don't know if you're following the chat so...

Woman 1: I'm not good at looking at different - especially with jet lag so Cheryl I'm so sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's all right. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm easily overlooked, I understand this. Thank you Annabeth because one of the reasons I originally put my hand up was to ask us to stop talking about Worktrack 2 in particular but 1, 4 in general. And I was going to sort of reiterate that.

But now I'm taking off my co-chair hat and I'm putting on a purely personal perspective on the matter of currency. For the record because as Paul started us off after our coffee break let's see if we can dust this off and, you know, put it into a basket wherever that basket may belong. I firmly believe that the matter of currency because it in my view should be a matter of resolution of dispute or objection is only to be dealt with within the full PDP workgroup. So I just wanted to declare that from a personal perspective. So I think I would be suggesting wrap the basket and put it back to the full PDP. If indeed we were not to look at it that way then we would risk fractionation and more confusion with people not knowing how one does or doesn't object to certain types of names one does or doesn't go through certain parts of dispute resolution.

And again while I'm speaking personally I see the downside of extensive lists not the least of which just about everything (Jab) has already said that the ability to update them, maintain them, keep them fresh and current, even just keep applicants knowledgeable about their existence is more problematic than a resolution or compliance space so thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you Cheryl, (Rex)?

(Rex): Just in the Adobe Room there's a hand by (Jab). (Jab) I don't know if that's an old hand? Yes, it might be (Jab)? Well in any case there's a hand by Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. So far listening to this I don't hear a convincing argument or much of an argument that a code for a currency is a geographic code even if it is often but not always derived from a geographic code. Therefore I'd support referring this back to the full working group. I don't think it belongs here.

And I also don't - haven't heard anything beyond the most hypothetical squishy not even - I don't think anybody's going to hypothesize an actual problem or, you know, put forth a hypothesis. They've only hypothesized that there could be a hypothesis. I think that's too attenuated for us. I didn't fly, you know, seven hours in the middle seat next to a 300 pound 5'4" woman in economy to come here and discuss something that's not within our remit. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you're Greg. I think we can wrap up the currency issue. And do we have comments about the geographic indicators as it was mentioned that we may – yes your name is?

(John Rodriguez): Yes good morning. Again my name is (John)...

Woman 1: (John) welcome.

(John Rodriguez): ... (Rodriguez) with the US. Thank you. Just wanted to provide some general points on the suggestion of including or referring to geographical indications. I would be cautious – caution the Worktrack 5 group to proceed very cautiously on this topic. The issue of GIs which are a form of intellectual property has become a trade issue in many fora. So it is a very sensitive issue, unfortunately has become a politicized issue.

It has been the subject of discussions in other fora. There are different levels of understanding interpretations as to their level or scope or protection what is considered to be an infringement of a geographical indication, ways of protecting GIs, how to protect GIs. All of these questions have been the subject of discussion in other fora including for example at the World Intellectual Property Organization or WIPO. They have a standing committee on the law of trademarks, industrial designs and geographical indications which have been looking at this topic of GIs for many years.

This committee is made up of IP experts from all of our government IP offices. And even there they are having some tension in discussing this topic of geographical indications. So I would just cautiously advise this Worktrack to proceed cautiously on this topic. We already have some important complicated issues before us. And I am concerned that if we were to bring in this topic of geographical indications that I think it would just bog down the Worktrack 5 group even further. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you (John). Any other comments? Yes Annabeth you want to say something?

Annabeth Lange: I think we should go back to the (unintelligible).

Woman 1: Okay. No more comments about geographic indicators, no more comments about currency. We should go back to our list Martin you think?

Martin: Unless there's anything else anybody wants to comment.

Woman 1: Any other comments about this topics? No. We had a list and we went to part of it so can we change the slide please?

Annabeth Lange: (Unintelligible) on AGB and we haven't changed that.

Woman 1: Annabeth makes a very relevant point here by my side. We haven't talk about what happens with names of river, mountains, sub regions, smaller regions within countries. Do we have comments about that that we call internally known AGB geographic names? And so those that are - those names that were not in any list do we have comments about that, things that were not reviewed before, things that were reviewed before that you want to state again? The floors yours.

Annabeth Lange: More comment.

Woman 1: Sure.

Annabeth Lange: Just one comment from me then, Annabeth Lange. These were the names that created some problems in the last round in 2012 like Patagonia, Amazon and some others. So we have to think carefully about what do we do to avoid that kind of conflicts. We know that some of these conflicts has – have created quite a lot of problems for many so what is the best way to avoid that in the future? So it kind of surprises me that no one has anything...

((Crosstalk))

Annabeth Lange: ...to say here. Greg Shatan?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan for the record. Sorry to speak yet again but my view is that this is an area where we should if we are going to try to make a decision ex-ante about how these should be dealt with is I think there's going to be any number of different proposals on this. At one end of the spectrum is to

declare that there is no inherent right in a river, a mountain, stream -- any of these other names to stop a - an unrelated or to stop a non-geographical use of that name and, you know, just to not keep adding to this, you know, idea of more and more reserved names and more and more kind of veto powers and gates. I think it takes us down the wrong path. So I think that, you know, if we do make a decision I would, you know, be in favor of avoiding conflict by deciding these aren't conflicts. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you Greg. Well the idea was to perhaps gather other comments from other colleagues.

((Crosstalk))

Woman 1: Jorge please, do you want to take the floor?

Jorge Cancio: Thank you. I will defer to anyone else because this would be my third time speaking so I don't know.

Woman 1: (Jacomio).

(Jacomio Stern): Yes, (Jacomio Stern) from DBU for the record. I think that what Greg says is fundamentally wrong because we had problems there already. We are discussing about this problem and not address the issue doesn't mean that we solve the issue. We simply are hiding ourselves from taking responsibility.

I think that we need to apply this criteria similar to the other geographic names. And I think that as I suggest in some of the meetings of the group on the conference call that we need also to try to incentive for cooperation because I don't (unintelligible) that cooperation is possible between different interests, geo names and trademarks and, et cetera, when they share something. And it's very difficult to say that there is not a direct relation with the geo names because for instance Patagonia of course the name or the brand came from the region. It doesn't come out of the blue. If not nobody will

be interested in having that name. Was it a particular choice that two – and iconic name of a region to identify a certain kind of brand and one to be associated with the idea that that region keeps – and the same for Amazon I think. So we need to address this kinds of issues and we cannot hide to address.

Woman 1: Thank you (Jacomo). Jorge you're in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Woman 1: Okay I'm confused. I see hands from Jorge, Carlos. Who else?

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: And I have a question as well.

Woman 1: Greg again okay.

Woman: And I have a question.

Greg Shatan: I just raised my hand because I was told I was fundamentally wrong so I wanted to disagree with that. I don't think I'm fundamentally wrong. I think the issue was that we left the field open and to be dealt with in the way that anybody saw fit. That's what maybe is fundamentally wrong. And therefore, you know, various methods were invented. Patagonia got chased away earlier because it wasn't worth the years of money and toil to protect their interest in that domain. Whether that was the right result or not I don't know. I don't think it was personally but, you know, I think that we should come up with some greater clarity but that doesn't necessarily mean coming up with a system where basically people, companies - countries or public authorities who are not involved, not monitoring not, you know, part of this part of looking at top-level domains kind of have a blocking right or need to be, you know, contacted and have their stamp of approval.

If you're TATA, if you're Amazon, I don't think Amazon took his name from the river. And anyway the river took its name from a mythological band of female warriors, et cetera, so if we want to start talking about first principles we can - we should talk about first principles and that second principles.

And so I think I – my point is that we do need greater clarity. I don't want to leave it for exactly where we had it before because then it's just another free-for-all. But I don't think the solution is a thumb on the scales and certainly not a preventative one. Thanks.

Woman 1: Thank you Greg. I have Jorge, (Raul) and I forgot your name. I'm very jetlagged.

Man: Susan.

Woman 1: Susan sorry. So Jorge the floors yours.

Jorge Cancio: Thank you. Thank you very much Jorge Cancio for the record. I think that if we were to talk about proposed measures for this framework for avoiding conflict maybe we would see that this is not black or white but that there is a scale of gray and that perhaps we even may agree more or less on some of the measures. On some we may have a bit of divergence and on others especially if you conceive of them as veto power or as giving prior rights to somebody, we won't agree at all. But I think we are not in a – we're in a digital environment but this is not binary. We should look at to the - at the measures that have been proposed and probably we would find that in the scale of gray we can agree at least on some of the measures. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you Jorge. I have (Raul) in the queue but I'll give the floor to Susan because you haven't spoken before and then I would like to give the floor after her to Liz that she has been making comments in the chat room and then to (Raul) of course if he wants. Susan the floors yours.

Susan Payne: Hi, thank you. I'm Susan Payne. I just wanted to respond to something that my colleague further along the table and I'm sorry, I don't know the name of the gentleman sitting next to Jorge but it seemed to me that he was talking about the challenges of what perhaps one might term or he might be terming misappropriation of names to take on in terms of geographic as brand names.

And I just wanted to really caution us that, you know, that principle of whether or not a brand name can be used and can be adopted as a trademark is something that is entirely outside the remit of this group. It's dealt with in special trademark law and then treaties that are already in place and is regularly discussed in other fora. And so it's fine for us to try to decide, you know, how we will deal with the notion of the different groups have legitimate calls and legitimate expectations of being able to use particular terms but we can't start trying to form judgments on whether a company should or shouldn't be using a brand name which in a different forum is - has been accepted as being something that can be done.

Woman 1: Thank you Susan. Liz is here. Okay Carlos go ahead.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much, for Carlos for the record. This is a request for the chairs to get us a statistic on successful geo names before the AGB and through the AGB because my feeling, my account is that the expansion of the geo names has been successful. It was successful before the AGB. I mean we're sitting in Catalonia that got a three letter code magic for linguistic and cultural reasons for the AGB.

My statistic of the last round is positive. I want the numbers, the exact numbers of geo names that were approved in the last round and I want to dispel the sense of failure or conflict during the last round. I think Patagonia was a success in the last round because the system worked. I mean thanks to the excellent work of (Olga) it was solved in the sense of AGB. So the system works.

So the reason I am sitting here is because I hope there will be chances in the future for other geographic communities based on language and culture to get an opportunity. I want the numbers, not the feeling that it was a disaster that it was terrible because one company didn't get it. I mean let's put the numbers on the table. It was a successful part of the expansion with positive successes and maybe negative successes but I think Patagonia was a success. The system worked. Okay it didn't work for other companies.

Okay please let's stop this whining that it was a disaster and conflict. There were conflicts but the numbers show that the expansion of geo names has been positive before and thanks to the AGB. Please put the numbers in the document. Thank you.

Woman 1: Thank you Carlos. One clarification question. The three letter codes you refer about Catalonia, you refer .cut or .vcn? .cut?

((Crosstalk))

Woman 1: That was before.

Annabeth Lange: But Carlos that was three letters but it was not on the ISO code. And it's 17,000 combinations for three letters out there.

Carlos Gutierrez: It works. Give the people...

Annabeth Lange: Sure it works.

Carlos Gutierrez: ...I mean I said before, Annabeth, the objective was not to have a perfect AGB. The objective was to get competition and consumer choice. If we forget this framework we get lost in these three hours of discussions without any results.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Carlos. I agree actually. I think that even with that – with the 2012 restrictions that were in place it was a success. It's a lot of good geographical names out there. And it, what we don't know is that if we didn't have the rule in 2012 if it had been the 2007 policy nothing else would have been the result for geographical names at the time. We don't know.

Woman 1: A comment from the floor. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here and I guess another example is hopefully .Asia as well. But my point is I guess the – building on what Jorge was saying I think we are looking at something that's less black and white. And maybe the mechanisms that we deal with it, it doesn't quite handle it yet. And I think we have the preventive mechanism where you can't even apply and then we have a curative mechanism which objection process which essentially it's an all or nothing thing right, meaning you object and the guy goes away right?

So we need something in-between. Last round we only had the GAC early warning probably. That's kind of something in between. But there's nothing to follow-up on that. Perhaps these are things that we need to do with a kind of mediation process rather than a complete, you know, dispute process which just, you know, rejects or, you know, approves. There needs to be a mediation process to deal with these gray areas.

And because it's impossible to actually create lists or pinpoint the exact definition for things. And that might be a missing piece to make this work even better. I agree that previously it's kind of worked but probably we can improve on it. And maybe this something in-between mechanism could work.

Woman 1: Thank you Edmon. And before given the floor to Martin I was thinking about the same. And we have discussed sometimes if there could be a mechanism in mediation you name it or a way to approach parties and try to find a win-win solution for both parties. So that could be also taken into the rules. Martin you wanted to say something.

Martin Sutton: Yes Martin Sutton here. Yes I think Edmon just to sort of pose a question back would you foresee that being something as mandatory or just optional so, you know, a sort of a best practice or good practice to adopt?

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I'm thinking out loud here so it might be immature in terms of thinking but something like the GAC, like a GAC early warning followed – triggers a mandatory process might work. And that mandatory process has an end to it. And it doesn't predetermine a veto right of any sort. Something along those lines my work because even for cases like in the past including like that .spa or .shangri-La or even a little bit I think (Olga) you mentioned about .amazon there was some discussion between the applicant and whoever wants to object and whether or not, you know, how it goes is another matter. But having that process documented provides applicants a kind of way to, a more predictable process to go forward with.

And it's also important I think I want to stress this point. This is done post application because sometimes it's difficult for an applicant to, you know, go to somebody before the application. And some of these preventive measures or requirements speak to, you know, tries to do that. But these are situations where it's more gray area if you will that maybe makes more sense after the applicant puts in the application knowing that, you know, there is a possibility of somebody from the governments might have some problems with it and knowing that there is a mediation process. That might work. So again I'm speaking – I'm just speaking out loud here but this is an idea.

Martin Sutton: How come.

Woman 1: Thanks Edmon. I think that is a good way of thinking how we can solve this and improve the process. It's a question from Liz Williams here in the chat that kind of ties up to this - these thoughts. And she and commented on when I mentioned the problems with Patagonia and Amazon and some others that

Annabeth you're right that it caused problems. And that is correct it's a two-pronged approach.

We need better policy and improved implementation to deal with these kinds of strings and objections to them. It is the objection process that caused the issues because the applicants for those strings would likely argue that they followed the rules of the process and then ran into trouble. So I think that is part of the problem here that we perhaps in the last round didn't manage to make the objection procedures clear enough. So what we are talking about is a predictability and we talked a lot about that so how can we improve the process? That is really important for us.

And what you said Edmon is I think it's good thoughts. And some other things you have said Hadia have to do with it as well just trying to find – to avoid the process or avoid the problems in the beginning instead of having all these long processes.

Javier Rua:

Javier for the record. So to follow on this topic of predictability and process and taking a little bit of what Carlos said on successes and .cat we're here in .cat and linguistic communities. So and I just to encourage the discussion here on this so procedurally .cat I think was something called a sponsored gTLD. And then there's other procedures in place like that seem to be relevant like community applications, I mean the community – a linguistic community or a – so a question for the group could be something, you know, I think about and that we all think about it is so we have these different processes. And are these processes that are in place the optimal things in place to have – for predictability or it's just I mean why isn't – why was .cat a sponsored TLD and not a community TLD and are things okay? Does the group think with the procedures in place are okay for this type of situation like .cat or does the Worktrack have something to offer to enhance these procedures or if are we covered?

So maybe, you know, as I'm talking about a Carlos, what Carlos brought maybe has about an opinion but I'm sure everybody has - many have opinions on this. Are community applications the way to go for linguistic communities or not or is there – should we create a new proceeding I say so or just keep it protected? And in aiming towards predictability and process and that we're all on the same page.

Woman 1: Any new voices out there that haven't spoken? It could be really interesting to hear from people not usually speaking here. If you're here you must be interested in the subject? Please raise your voice. We are not an evil bunch here, just working together to find solutions.

Javier Rua: There's a comment in the chat for example by a person named (Mazzon) or (Mazzone). Any mediation process has to be mandatory. If not, there is no incentive to sit at a table.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Jacomo Stern): (Jacomo) yes.

Woman 1: Greg this is a new hand?

Greg Shatan: Yes. And I put my glasses on so I look like a different person. Just a comment picking up on what Carlos said earlier and his conversation about .cat, we've almost - other than that we've almost completely lost any discussion of actual geographical applicants and of actual of encouraging geographic applications. We've spent most of our time talking about the rights of non-applicants and not even thinking about whether they actually would in fact apply.

Would the province of Tata have applied? What if we had given them a right to come in and apply and put their \$185,000 down and get into a contention said with Tata? But it seems like we spend very little time trying to figure out

how to actually enable geographic applications and much more time, all our time spent on how to protect or privilege those who are not applying for top level domains. I think that's we're – we've losing, we're losing a really significant opportunity to actually talk about we are in the Subsequent Procedures Group, not their Rights Protection Mechanisms Group or rights protection mechanisms. So we should actually think about whether there is actually a positive side to this as opposed to, you know, just creating gates that non-applicants control for applicants to run through. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: If I could just proceed you Carlos just to respond or add to that. There does seem to be a missing point which I think Greg has just alluded to which is, you know, there is the ability for any of these applications -- and I'm assuming were still talking about rivers and mountains -- so just to make sure we're still on that topic is yes that - it is open to anybody to apply in the current Applicant Guidebook. So we may need to think about that.

What may be also a consideration is that given the history of the 2012 round applicants going into the next phases will look at this and consider the risks associated with putting forward an application and their money and all the work that goes behind it before they even attempt to come forward to ICANN. So I think that those are worth acknowledging. Sorry Carlos, over to you.

Carlos Gutierrez: No problem. And I just wanted to remind that another program was developed too late during the 12 - 2012 round. It was the support for applicants. So we can summarize the thoughts in this list of other programs that have yet already mentioned. There was a system and their analysis why this system didn't work. In terms of intermediation and excuse me, Edmon for not having mentioned that Asia I think the system was pretty transparent. I mean Patagonia didn't want to spend more than \$180,000 so they got the money back. So is a success. I mean Lufthansa didn't want to spend more than \$180,000 and got the money back. Some people are offering \$10 million to get their Geo name but there is no solution. So I think it was pretty transparent system to measure risk.

We have the numbers in US dollars on the table so let's please put a list of successes and let's evaluate the cost of failure in terms of time lost. Thank you very much. I mean it should be very easy to put down in one single page. Thank you.

Woman 1: Okay maybe we can move on to another topics after reviewing this river, mountains sub regions that we have done. Thank you for your comments. Martin you want to follow up? Oh...

Woman: Nick (unintelligible).

Woman 1: Nick you want to comment?

Nick Wenban-Smith: Yes just it's – we are – it's talking about geographic names and it was the same issue we have were talking about city names. And we couldn't even agree on a definition of what was a city in terms of size, geography population. You know when there's one particular connotation which is close to another, are they the same city or different cities? And, you know, when a river is a river and not a stream in mountain classifications in the UK you have to have a certain elevation. And then if there's another mountain next to it, it has a separate mountain provided there's a drop in elevation. It's really complicated and technical. We haven't got anywhere close to giving any prospective applicant in the future any sort of clarity about what is and what isn't allowed. And I think my takeaway from all of this discussion is that we haven't made any progress at all and for good reasons.

And I do think that the successes of the 2012 round and I think I put them in a list at one point about a year ago with the city names which have been successfully launched and amongst the most successful of the new gTLDs but it's London, Tokyo. We've got us subnational places like Wales. And I totally agree with the rules as they were are pretty adequate if not perfect. And I don't think we've made any progress in improving them unfortunately.

Woman 1: Thank you Nick. Martin you want to continue with the city...

Martin Sutton: Well I think it's a nice segue. Thank you for that Nick. So I think if we can rewind this slide...

Woman 1: With the list of...

Martin Sutton: Just to...

Woman 1: ...of four points.

Martin Sutton: ...guide us through this. But I think as Nick alluded to some of the city questions are still hovering. We've had long discussions within Worktrack 5 regarding capital cities but more so noncapital cities. So just as a sort of a refresher for those that haven't been following it the capital city applications needed to get a letter of approval or non-objection from the relevant authority.

Once you start moving to the noncapital city name arena which are more vast in numbers more coincidences of meeting different things and being used in different ways there's a sort of a midway point in the way that, that was treated. So the noncapital city name applicants if they wanted to use it as a geographic related term so it related to that city or cities perhaps if it was more than one, they would seek the letter of approval or non-objection from the relevant authority.

Those that were not going to use it in any way or intended to use it for non-geographic terms so for instance that could be a word, I don't know is there a town a city called boot or something like that but, you know, they were going to use it for that term as an object rather than a city they would not need to pursue any form of approval or non-objection from an authority which could be anywhere in the world.

So the way that the Applicant Guidebook treated it in 2012 is quite distinct between the capital cities on noncapital cities. So if we look at the noncapital cities that encourage a lot of conversations, some ideas and perhaps quite different extremes as well in the way the group was looking at this. So some felt that there was a need to increase the sort of requirement steps for using a city name that coincided with a geographic place. Even if it was for non-geographic purposes they would still need to obtain those approvals or letters of non-objections.

Others thought that it was irrelevant and did not even warrant any requirement for applicants to obtain those letters especially where there was no use case directed – directly for the geographic city name. So where are we? In the current phase of the initial report it's kind of coming towards the moving towards with the same instructions that were used in the Applicant Guidebook in 2012 because it just seems to be that we haven't got a, you know, a strong indication that we should go further forward stronger protection or prevention of use neither the other way. So it tends to be in that middle area albeit with some incremental improvements perhaps to the process and the ability for the applicant to identify the relevant authority and speed up that process and access point so that they can seek the appropriate correspondence to support their application.

There are other ways as well that we could add on to that. But what we wanted to do today was just to give this an airing and see if there is any requirements that we need to consider for the initial reports based on the Worktrack 5 discussions and any other things that we may have amazingly missed out in those deliberations over the last X number of months. So I'm happy to open the floor to anyone that wants to speak up on noncapital city names. Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Just a simple point echoing what Nick has just said of about the fact that we don't have Global agreement as to what is and what is not a city, in such texts I would move the hyphen. It is noncapital city names. The - for

example there are a lot of islands of the world, some of them quite large in population terms who don't have a two letter 3166 code. They completely fall between all the available stores.

I think we need to accept that we will not have a universally applicable definition of what is a city. There are geographical terms which are sub below the national level of and we won't know which ones are important for the purposes of the next round until the applications are made. But we have to make - we have to bear in mind that that is a possible scenario. As you know from the list I've tried to make one specific proposal that would reduce a great deal of the uncertainty and indeed suspicion of this process. That is that a geographical TLD of any kind should be incorporated in the geography and for the jurisdiction concerned.

And the prospect of – there's a clause in the 2012 AGB that says that the registry will respect the rules of the country in which it is incorporated even if that's a tax haven of 5000 miles away from the place that's concerned. Now that wasn't a big issue in 2012 because there were few, relatively few albeit apparently very successful geographical TLDs but in the next round if we're successful when we get a few hundred if not 1000 applications for TLDs with a geographical meeting I think it's important that the registries concern should be incorporated in the geography of the countries of the jurisdictions that relate to those names.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Christopher. I've got (Martia) in the queue and then Jorge. (Martia)?

(Martia Mall): Thank you, (Martia Mall) for the record. There has been a really healthy discussion on the list and I'm just going to bring it up here again because I know everyone has seen it but there are quite a few people who really believe that cities of more than 1 million really ought to be in some kind of protected category in the same way that capital cities are. These cities represent enormous amounts of people and their rights. We simply can't

ignore their rights. We'd be in a huge political situation if the name of a huge city like Shanghai were suddenly, you know, adopted and then they had to buy it back. I just think that I don't see how we can ignore that particular aspect.

There have been other - there's been other discussions around the biggest cities in small places and various ways of articulating that but – and we all would also have to decide, you know, how do we count that million. But to at least come out of this process with a decision that we should be protecting those very large cities that are not capitals I think that we just have to do that.

Martin Sutton: So I've got a queue but Jeff are you just responding directly to that? Okay I'll go with Jeff and then Jorge and Greg.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Just a clarification on the last comment. You said that those cities need to be protected. There are measures in the Applicant Guidebook for cities. So if I could just clarify what is meant or ask for a clarification on what was meant by protect because there's reserved - there's different levels. Capital cities, no matter how you want to use the TLD you need a letter of support or non-objection.

For other cities if you want to use it in its geographic sense then you need a letter of support non-objection. So what are we talking all about just to clarify what is meant by protection or protect?

Woman: I was probably using the wrong but I would - what I'm intending to say is it should be in a category in the same way that capital cities are in a category.

Woman 1: Okay.

Martin Sutton: And so I got Jorge.

Jorge Cancio: Thank you so much Martin. Jorge Cancio for the record. Talking about noncapital cities I think that well there are many, many questions being discussed but maybe there are two basic ones. And the first basic one which has been mentioned by some is what is a city, what is a noncapital city? And what really strikes me in all this endeavor and all this discussion is that we have not looked or at least I'm not aware that we have looked at the precedent because in 2012 in the AGB we had this rule on noncapital cities. And the Geo Names Panel which was included in the valuation stream had to look at all of the applications submitted and look whether they were a geo name under the AGB or not. So they must have had a definition they used of cities. Why don't we have that data before us because we are discussing in general, in abstract about noncapital cities and this was already applied in 2012?

So we should have before us that information how did the geo names panel of 2012 define cities, whether they encountered problems when defining cities, what did they do when they encountered problems and so on and so forth. Otherwise we are discussing I think a bit in the cloud. So I strongly suggest that we get that information because it must be out there. And we should have that before us before engaging into hypotheticals on the definition of what a city is.

At least in Switzerland we know what a city is because it's defined by our federal statistics office. They have very clear criteria for defining what a city is. We have the exact number of cities. This might change historically but we have very clear information about that. And I guess that other countries, other country's statistical offices may have the same. So I think this is a serious issue. We look and should look at what the panel of 2012 used for its work regarding noncapital cities and we shouldn't ignore that national statistic offices have their definitions of what a city is in each country. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: So thank you Jorge. I think that's a good point and we'll check to see what if definition was used. I don't think it is actually critical to the conversations

though in terms of in the current format if you are an applicant for a city and you intend to use it for a city purpose, a geographic purpose. You probably do go to your local checklist to see whether it is a city and you will be looking for a letter of approval or non-objection.

If you're not going to be using it for the purpose of a geographic name in the current 2012 guidebook, you didn't not need to pursue that. So whilst if that changes that obviously does mean that we need to try and define the list of applicable cities so that a user has more - or an applicant has better predictability of what they should do. It may not be critical at this stage of the conversation for us to identify the every individual city that would come under that umbrella. I'll go around the list but we'll come back to you now. Okay let's respond to this quick though because we do have others that are new speakers.

Jorge Cancio: Yes thank you Martin but as you are saying that something put forward is not critical I will tell you why it is critical. The use question, the intended use question is the second premise. The first premise is whether we are talking about a city. In the geo names panel had the obligation to look at all string applications and look whether they entered into the definitions of AGB. So the first premise is to look whether it is or not a city so they needed to have that definition.

Second premise which is an exception to the first premise was the intended rule and the intended use rule. So it is critical. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. So I know I've got Greg in the queue next but if I could go to (Katrine) first who's a new speaker and the gentleman afterwards behind (Katrine). So (Katrine) first and then you.

(Katrine Ana): Yes thanks Martin. This is (Katrine Ana) from .one and also representing the gTLD group. I would like to speak about the intended use and some - probably one point we missed in the debates so far, so what the applicant

intends to do with the TLD is one thing but on the other hand side we have the market and the sales channel which is really the one who decides how to market the TLD to end-users right?

So it's not only about the applicant and the registry. And if we were to keep that wording over there I think we missed that although an applicant might say no my TLD is not dedicated to be primarily used for a city the save channel might do something totally different. So my proposal would be to change this wording from an application for a city name will be subject to the geographic name requirements of blah, blah, blah to an application for a city name will not be subject to the geographic names requirement if the applicant is able and will confirm that neither he nor his face channel will use the TLD as geographic identifier. This would solve the issue where we don't have an impact on as the operators, e.g., the sales channel. So this is one thing I would like to put out for discussion. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Okay so if anybody wants to think about some responses to that for a moment thank you (Katrine). Gentleman behind you.

Man: Okay good morning. I'm (unintelligible) from Vietnam. Firstly I (unintelligible) my colleagues earlier that definition about a city name. And I'm not (unintelligible) that in case of this noncapital city than to differ from the old name a new one like a (unintelligible) and Leningrad are in Vietnam. We have Hanoi, (unintelligible) different. I mean so (unintelligible) and another clarification I (unintelligible) to that so is there any exceptional for those cities with historical or control (unintelligible) or some disputed areas? Thank you.

Martin Sutton: I'm aware of the latter point of your question there so don't have that information free to hand. I don't know if anybody else may be able to respond to that.

No okay. Yes okay so we'll move on the. So I've got Greg, (Martia) and then Edmon. Go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan. First in direct response to (Katrina) registries are able to control how registrars sell their names. For instance, you know, .law is reserved to, you know, actual law firms and lawyers and can't be used by, you know, somebody who's running the John Law Saloon or something like that. So, you know, it can be controlled if there's a plan, you know, for it. The same thing with I think that Dr. is another one .bank, .insurance. They're all TLDs that can only be registered at the section level by a particular qualified entities or individuals. So, you know, the idea that there's necessarily a rogue registrar, you know, is I think not an absolute. But I think more fundamentally we need to figure out what it is we're trying to protect against is we've kind of mixed up a bunch of different concepts and we're kind of we thrown all of them into one in terms of, you know, a methodology which is are we trying to protect Shanghai which was the example (Martia) gave from being I hate to say it shanghaied by a third party and then who intends to hold it for ransom by Shanghai or is it do they have some other use for it? Maybe it is their trademark, maybe it's their last name, not saying it's, you know, but there could be other uses.

Are we trying to protect against uses in the city in a way that relates to the city or we trying to protect against any and all uses in saying that, you know, even uses that are completely coincidental like Tata or spa or, you know, are all kind of being thrown into the same bucket? It seems to me that we have a lot more success in if we focused on trying to make sure that those who were going to use it as a city or, you know, in the service of that city in some fashion, you know, had the appropriate permission and not try to, you know, exact permissions on those who were making uses for other purposes.

I think that's where a lot of the problem children of the previous round came in. We're – I don't know if there's an example of any time when somebody actually tried to use a geographic name without permission. I guess maybe GCC but I think then that was decided that wasn't a geographic term. I don't recall but that may have been, you know, the exception.

And so I think if we decide what it is, what harm we're trying to prevent or define the harms of people that they think they're trying to prevent we'd have a better sense of trying to maybe come to an agreement on how to prevent those harms and perhaps maybe or may not agree that those are in fact harms at all such as, you know, if that Patagonia was being used by the Patagonia company is that a harm? That's a discussion we've never actually had and maybe we should, maybe we shouldn't but I think you'd find an interesting spread of opinions here.

If I could go to, you know, jacket that Patagonia and buy myself a nice Patagonia jacket is that a bad thing? Is somebody getting harmed by that? I don't know. I don't think so.

Martin Sutton: Okay Greg thanks. And to (Martia).

(Martia Mall): In the discussion about the definition of cities I don't think you'd need to go very deeply into a definition if the city was more than 1 million people. I don't think anyone's going to argue that that is going to be a city. If you get lower yes the definitions. If you need them it's going to be much more complex and that's why such a large ones can be quite easily set aside in a situation like this.

What are the harms? Well, you know, I really think that the Patagonian people if they don't – if they're not able to use their term to describe their own place and their own people that term belongs single use to a company well I think that's a harm. I'm sorry. I don't agree that this is about governments using words on the Internet. This is about the ability of people large groups of people, even small groups of people being able to have their name without someone else taking it and maybe selling it back to them.

I don't think - I don't - the freedom of expression here is the freedom of expression that's being taken away from people in my mind. So I'd like to say

that but also Greg I deliberately didn't use that Shanghai being shanghaied but thank you for using it.

Martin Sutton: Thank you (Martia). Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Edmon Chung here. So back to a little bit about the what Jorge said I think I've actually quite supportive of looking into that. I – my feeling though is that what we might find is that a geographic panel didn't do it or didn't do their job if you will and only looked at the primary use, intended use which is not the right way to do it.

But and one of the case in point I think is .spa right? I mean both of the GAC and, you know, that was discussed quite a bit. The problem with that is it's obviously a city name and however it's also used as a general purpose thing by now. How – what is interesting about .spa is that spa the word itself means a certain thing, there's springs and stuff which originated from the city of spa so that connection cannot be ignored.

However what is interesting is that we have two applications last round one of which decided that it is completely not associated with the city and will ignore the city. And the other is, you know, the other one in their application actually identified the yes this came from the city and therefore we need to deal with the city. But it is not primarily used for the city and therefore it's not a city TLD.

That nuance is missing in the process. And I think, you know, that's something that needs to be dealt with. And it needs to be somewhat mandatory I think this we have discussed like more than intentional use, but accidental inclusion and applicants need to identify that. And that might be, you know, I think for non-capital city names that, you know, that those criteria should apply. So is not just about primary use, intended use but also, you know, people from that city may be using it for that purpose or how are you mitigating against that?

Martin Sutton: And I'm not sure how to dissect that last bit there. But one thing I probably would make sure that we don't lose sight of is the fact that they can still apply. So, you know, if the city finds that there is a good use case and they would like to do that then there is obviously the freedom to apply that we have at the moment. In terms of any controls and misuse there are things that you can put in play that already exist from application process through objections and certain controls in there through to post delegation that can control and make sure that, you know, something works as it said it was supposed to work. So do you put heavier preventative measures at the front end of the process to minimize who can apply for things or do you rely on a suite of controls and processes that can manage this particular area noncapital city name segments?

Edmon Chung: Edmon here responding briefly. So just I guess just like what Jorge said I doubt that the - like I think the original process like there is a geographic evaluation panel is useful. Unfortunately I don't think they did their job. The problem is the policy is there and the process is there. And we don't have data on how well they did their job. And if we do have symptoms of them not doing the job like .spa as I explained. But we don't have the data and that's why I think why Jorge's suggesting that we try to get that data from ICANN to guide us forward.

And in terms of going forward I think the intended use part needs to be a little bit more nuanced. What I meant is that I think this has been discussed before that the applicant should do some research. And it's not preventative. People can still apply but they are obligated to do a little bit of research whether it, you know, it conflicts with a city name even if that's not your primary purpose for the TLD. That's sort of my suggestion.

Martin Sutton: Any others? Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady. So this is essentially a rehash of what's been on the list. I usually most ICANN lists are a great substitute for sleeping pills but this particular list has been really interesting. And so we've basically for those of you who are not on the list or perhaps not in this working group you see the two camps right? And on one hand we have the what Martin was talking about which is take a look at the current safeguards already in place, cities being able to apply as communities, build in other obligations, perhaps obligations in the RAA that compliance could, you know, ICANN compliance could deal with. They're all kinds of mechanisms that are in place.

And on the other hand we have folks who want to add more names to more lists. And what I, you know, I'm going to pejoratively call out this what I think it is. And this is an American attitude and I, you know, I'll admit that I think it's sweeping censorship up front. And so those are basically the two camps. If we go with the add more things to more lists that's where get bogged down into what's a city right?

So for example there's a wide spot in the road in Illinois called Naperville and it has a population of 147,000. There is a world known city called Geneva and it has 198,000 right? It's a \$50,000 difference. One place is a place that you drive through and you think to yourself should I stop at McDonald's here. Another place is a place where you land and reconnect all kinds of other places in the world and if you're lucky you get three or four days to look around right? And so if we are going to go down the sweeping censorship route we've got a lot of work to do.

I think our time - at some point though we do have to sort of decide are we doing sweeping censorship or are we going to take a look at the actual mechanisms that are in place? And there are a lot and Martin mentioned a few and see if they're, see if they need enhancement, see if they need, you know, maybe they're overworking. Maybe they're doing too much. But at some point the working group has to make a decision. Are we adding names to the list, hope we're not or are we going to take a look at the actual

mechanisms that are in place to make sure that nobody runs amok and, you know, becomes the TLD operator for .rockford and registers police.rockford and pretends to be the police department of this wide spot in Illinois right?

So we can, you know, we can either look at the mechanisms in place to keep things safe or we can keep talking endlessly about adding names to list. I think we should look at the mechanisms. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks Paul. So I've got Edmon is that an old hand? Old hand and (Martia)?

(Martia Mall): Yes just wanted to object to the idea that adding a list of what's maximum 500 or 600 names of extremely large cities can be called sweeping censorship. I really think that's wrong.

Annabeth Lange: Just a comment on what we should say is a city. I think that one, it differs from country to country what they consider a city. It's different systems what is a city? The other thing are we - when we talk about numbers coming from a small country as I am 5 million people in the country the largest city is 500,000, that's the capital. And Iceland for example if we said (Ruth) for 200,000, 300,000 whatever they won't have any name that is a city. So we have to be really careful about going down that road, just a warning, talked about the Icelandic people and the say, "what we don't have any city at all if we do that." So at least to making lists of cities, really difficult. We have to have that in mind.

Martin Sutton: So Christopher's got to be really quick because now you are stopping everybody from going out and getting refreshments, lunch so it's got to be quick.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay just on Annabeth's last point I thought there was a proposal to ask the government to produce a basic list of what they thought were sensitive and relevant geographical terms. And I believe that was perhaps optimistically I believe that was retained by WT5 as a way forward.

Annabeth Lange: At least that was one of the suggestions Christopher. Yes I agree.

Martin Sutton: Right. Thank you very much everyone for participation. Be back for more in an hour and we'll continue the final part. Oh and Emily I'm sorry, have I jumped in?

Emily Barabas: No.

Martin Sutton: Before you go.

Emily Barabas: Before you go this is Emily Barabas from staff, just going to make a quick announcement. So we're going to break now until 12:30. There should be box lunches arriving in this room for Worktrack members. We'd rather not police it. Please be respectful. There is a limited number so please let people who are members of the Worktrack go first to get their box lunches. And if there are leftovers others are welcome to help themselves. They're not here just yet but they should be here any minute so I believe on that table right over there.

So we'll break for 15 minutes. If it happens that lunch comes late please do come back anyway at 12:30 and then we'll just let people filter in and out so we do have time to do the last session because that will end at 1:15 and we want to make sure there's enough time for everyone to talk through the things in the third session that are going to be interesting. So 15 minute break lunch for members only please at first and we'll see you in 15 minutes. And you can stop the recording. Thanks.

END