
BARCELONA –GAC: Geographic Names WG/WT5 Discussion Meeting
Sunday, October 21, 2018 –17:00 to 17:45 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

OLGA CAVALLI:

Hello. Buenas tardes a todos. I will kindly ask delegates, to sit. Or friends, or colleagues to sit so we can start. We only have 45 minutes and we want to give you on update of our work in Work Track 5 and also give you some sense of the report that you may comment. So, if you can get into the room, and sit, and stop talking, shut up! Stop talking. SHHHHHH. Oh that worked. SHHHH, that worked. Funciono. So, those lovely colleagues from, let's see, Switzerland, Brazil, Portugal. I don't want to put you in the spot. Thank you so much, thank you. So we -- thank you very much. The idea -- and thank you very much from my dear co-leads in Work Track 5. All of us are here.

Martin Sutton from the GNSO. Javier Rua –Jovet from ALAC, Annebeth Lange from ccNSO and Olga from GAC. So, we work together and leading this working group with the fantastic help of ICANN staff. I see Steve there, and I don't know if others are here. Emily -- they are fantastic. Emily, yeah. And they are lovely people that have helped us through this work that is intense [inaudible]. So, we will share with you which is the purpose of the working group. I know there are a lot of new colleagues in the room so this is an update, and then we have summarized briefly the main parts of the document that it's -- we want to get feedback from you, from your comments. We had very good feedback yesterday. Some good ideas yesterday morning, in the session we had in this room. And the document will be open for

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

comments for up to mid November, and then we will go through the regular ICANN comment, public comment process. So it's important that you get the sense of the document. It's a large document. I know it's long, but we want to help you finding the relevant parts of it, and understanding it.

So I will start with the first part, which is, “What is the Work Track 5?” We had a meeting with the GNSO a while ago. Just some minutes before, the GNSO is the supporting of an organization within ICANN that works preparing policy about new gTLDs. The TLD is the last part of the domain name and there was a first round some years ago in 2012, and 2013, there will be a new one in the next future. So, within this group there is a special Work Track 5, which is what we do there, and we are focused on geographic names and I will go in the next slide, it's more specifically, which is the scope of our work.

So the beauty of this working group is that it has four co-leads from -- we don't have one leader. We have four co-leads from different SOs and ACs within ICANN, so I find this quite new, at least I had no -- this experience before, and it's very rewarding and good for our multistakeholder model. You all can be a member. You all can be observers or members. It's very easy. Just send an e-mail and we will get into the mailing list and then be prepared for a lot of comments and work, so -- and you can just listen there, the e-mail list and that's okay as well.

So, if we can go to the next slide. I have no control over that. Ladies, ladies. Gulden, can we go to the next one or can I do that? Oh, sorry.

So, what is the scope of this Work Track 5? We will review the how to handle geographic names in the new round of new gTLDs? But what does it mean for the purpose of this Work Track 5? So it's two character ASCII letter combinations. For you to know, for example [inaudible] country and territory names. Alpha 3 on 3166/1 short and long form of in ISO 3166/1 additional category seen blah, blah, blah, are the sections of the applicant guide book. What does it mean? Country and territory names? Complete names, right? Like Argentina, Norway.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Complete names and some countries have short names --

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay.

ANNEBETH LANGE: -- so that will be included as well. And it's important to say that this is on top-level.

OLGA CAVALLI: Toplevel.

OLGA CAVALLI: Dot, dot to the right.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Not to be mixed up with second level.

OLGA CAVALLI: So, two characters, the name of the country. Capital cities. So, the capital cities. These categories come from the previous applicant guide book, which was the book that all the new applicants used as a reference for making their applications. UNESCO regions and names appear in the combination of macro geographical -- continental regions, geographic subregions and selected economical other groupings. So you can check this list online. And other geographic names such as geographic features, rivers, mountains, valleys, lakes, I think this is the most difficult category because they are not included in lists that are agreed internationally, like ISO list, or UNESCO, or United Nations list. In this category, what we call internally non-AGB names, non-applicant guide book geographic names. So the ones that were not included in any lists.

So this is the scope of the work. Other things that are not listed in this 6 bullets are not part of our work. So we are not talking about second level for example. We had a session today about second level. That's not the scope of our work.

Can we go to the next slide? Next slide? Thank you. So we have been meeting in face to face in ICANN meetings since I don't remember when. Like one year. And then we had calls every week and then every 2 weeks and so now there is an initial draft report that it's important that you take a look at it and make comments. We still have some time to make comments. So the idea is to publish the initial

report by late in November so there is still time to get your input. Some of you have been making comments. Some GAC members have been very active into the working group, and then there will be a public comment period as usual of 40 days, and that's for the whole community.

Next slide. Next slide, thank you. So now I will go into some recommendations that are included in the report. So what we will try do with this short presentation is give you a flavor of the content of the report so you can have an idea of the things that you can find there and if you're interested in commenting or not. It is in any way representing the full text of the report, we have tried just to summarize the most important parts that we think are worth to mention, but it's 89 pages, so in 3 or 4 slides that's really challenging, but we have first included what we call recommendations, okay? So we will go to that now.

I know that you can all read that. It's a joke, but I will go one by one. Which is similar to what we have, some names that we have been using. So the preliminary recommendations if you go to the report, they have numbers 1, 2, 3, up to I think 11 or 12. They are more detailed there, and you can find there more information, but this initial report is expected to include the following preliminary recommendations. There is no consensus so far, and there will be no consensus calls taken on these recommendations prior to publishing the report. So it's important that you have them in mind in the case that you want to comment.

So there was in the first round, there were some reservations for some names or strings included in some lists. So the idea, the recommendation included in this report, but as I said, there is no consensus so far, is to continue to reserve as unavailable at the top level the following strings included in these lists; all the two-character letter ASCII combinations. This means two letters, some of them are used by ccTLDs and some others are not. In the 3166 there are some two-letter codes that are not used.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

That's true. Some of them are already in the ISO 3166 but has not been delegated to a country and then the suggestion is also to reserve all two-letter combinations in case there will be new countries in the future so they will not risk to not have their combination when that happens.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. So if there are some two letter codes not already assigned to a ccTLD, that may happen in the future, so the idea is to have them reserved. Same with alpha three code listed in the 3166/1 standard. This is three codes, not two letter codes. For Argentina would be ARG and some others. You can check this list online.

There is another reservation for short or long form name listed in the ISO 3166/1 standard and there's a code there. For these items translations in any language were reserved in the Applicant Guidebook in the first round. The work track has not yet agreed on

whether translations should be reserved in the future, and if so, in which languages. Annebeth, can you help me with an example of that short and long form name listed in that list? Sorry to put you on the spot.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

No, no, that's okay. Short and long form was what we talked about like Argentina, Norway. Norway, should it be translated in many languages or not? One of the suggestions that's been on the list that's been different options that's been suggested all languages, just the country's name, or should it be the U.N. languages plus the country name etc.? And that you can find in the initial report.

Norway does not have a short form for our country, and perhaps not Argentina as well, but some countries have a short name for their country. And you can also say that if you shorten up the name of a country, it could easily be confusable anyway. So you have to be a little aware of that.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay, so that's the recommendation for keep it reserved. Short or long form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency. Any example?

ANNEBETH LANGE: A little comment on that is that we have discussed that with Jaap, which is our ISO expert and it's very few names there, and I think it will be a little change in the initial report there before it's published.

OLGA CAVALLI: It's a small list.

ANNEBETH LANGE: But it's interesting for the codes in the exceptional reserve, that's an interesting list because it's both that are no longer countries like .SU has been placed there. And we have also U.K. which of course it's a country, but their official ISO code on the other list is GB, which they don't use.

OLGA CAVALLI: Great Britain.

ANNEBETH LANGE: For Great Britain, yeah.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Separable component of a country name designated on the “Separable Country Names List”. Permutations and transpositions recommendation suggests clarifying that permutations and transpositions of the following are reserved. This is an adjustment to the Applicant Guidebook long-form name listed in the ISO list/ short-

form name listed in the ISO list / short- and long-form name. I won't go into details.

I suggest that if you really want to check all these lists, you can check them online and in the report. What we want you to have in mind is that there are some categories of strings comprised in these lists that as a recommendation could be reserved for the next round at the top level. And finally, that's an easy one. Name by which a country is commonly known.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Like Holland, or the Netherlands.

OLGA CAVALLI:

For the Netherlands, yeah. These is a preliminary recommendation for being reserved. Can we go to the next one? Next one. Hello. Oh thank you. Following with the recommendations the initial report is expected to include the following preliminary recommendations, and again, no consensus calls will be done before publishing the initial report. Sorry for the translator. I will go slower now. I know you must be thinking I'm too fast.

So continue to require a letter of support. This is something that we have been discussing a lot in the calls and in the email list and also here in the face to face meeting. Require a letter of support on non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities for the following strings at the top level. So could be the case that if it's

agreed there is the recommendation of having a letter of support and non-objection for these categories.

Capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. For example Buenos Aires or Oslo. Oslo you pronounce it like that?

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Oslo, and Oslo is quite easy because it's Oslo all over the world, so translation is not a problem.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Buenos Aires is hard, has many translations, but nobody would translate it, I hope. City name, there is a code there. For this item translations in any language were reserved in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, so in the first round. The work track has not yet agreed on whether translation should require support or non-objection in the future, and if so, in which languages. Let's think of an example. Buenos Aires, good air; so good air would not be reserved perhaps. Nobody names the city like that. But it's an example that has a different meaning in other languages.

An application for any string that it's an exact match of a subnational place name such as country, province or state listed in the ISO 3166/2 standard. In my country for example, or our provinces, Argentina is a country, we have provinces or the name of the provinces are in the list with 3 letters. An application -- not subregions; for example,

Patagonia is not in the list but all the provinces. Patagonia is 6 provinces together of the south.

Application of a string listed in a UNESCO region or appearing in a composition of macro regional Continental regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic or other groupings list. Any comments up to now about this list? No. Okay, can we go to the next one?

So these are recommendations that you can find in the draft report, so what we would like if we have time, some feedback from you here in the meeting or perhaps in the email list if you are in the Work Track 5 email list is comments about alpha three codes listed in the ISO 3166 standard, so 3 letters, non capital city names that were an important discussion what is a city. If it's related with the people that live in that city. The size of the city. The relevance for the country. They are small countries and the cities are not so big just because the whole country is not so big. So it was difficult to define what is a city. Capital city is easy. You know which is the capital city.

Terms not included in the 2012 Applicant Guide-book. Those are the names of rivers, sub-regions, mountains, relevant names for the culture and heritage of the country, and so that is a much larger category that is not included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook.

So what I will show you now is some input that you can give us during this session or after. Can we go to the next slide? Thank you; so about the 3 letter codes, different alternatives could be available for delegation to specific parties. Could be available for delegation with

support or non-objection of the relevant governments for example if the 3 letters for Argentina do the applicant need a letter from the country, or not? Or available for delegation to any applicant? If available for delegation would a special process be needed, and under what circumstances, or should these strings be -- CCs would be .ARG be like .AR like ccTLD or it's gTLD. The rules are different and the contractual relationship with ICANN is totally different if you're gTLD or a ccTLD. Any comments?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Or something else.

OLGA CAVALLI: Or something else, yeah. This is for the 3 letter code. Some points that may be interesting to discuss. Non-capital city names. This was largely discussed. An application for a city name could be subject to the geographic names requirements; for example it is clear from the applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name. You know some city names are also generic names, or have different meanings. Buenos Aires is good air or something like that.

The applied-for string is a city name as listed on an official document. The city is in an official document.

The proposals to put forward by work track members, benefits and drawbacks; I will show you that in a minute. What are the ideas around these names? And the important issue, intended use. You

request the name of a city to be used as the city name, or it has another meaning and you want to use it as a gTLD. I cannot think of an example now. A generic that it's also a city name. Bath. It's Bath and it's a city.

ANNEBETH LANGE: We had spa in the last round.

OLGA CAVALLI: Spa, so you have city, it has a generic name, so it's the city TLD, it's gTLD; it will be used as a reference to the city or as a generic. In the case that it's a generic, do they need the letter of agreement from the city or not? So that's something to get input from you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Don't forget, it can also be a brand.

OLGA CAVALLI: It can also be a brand. I remember Delta was a province in Nigeria, I think. It's a company and it's a generic name. That was one of the examples of the first round.

Next slide, please. Finally, I think this is the most challenging category. Those terms not included in the Applicant Guide-book, there were conflicts in the first round still going on. And I will show you now some ideas that have been provided by members of the working group, so I will not read all these details.

Let's go to the next slide. So we have some time for interaction with you. So this is a selection of proposals that have been provided by members of the work track. In any way, it's the full list of proposals. It is just a short part of it. And it is not text that it's agreed. It's just proposals that have to be reviewed, discussed and some day some outcome will come.

So let's go to the next one. And these are two or three slides and I will finish. So this is a selection of these proposals, and again as it says there, the level of support for the following proposals has not yet been evaluated. Additional proposals are in the documents so you can go to the document and find them. So for the most challenging category, which is those names which are not included in any list, and there is no way to define that universe of names, so one idea has been going around. Develop an online tool for prospective applicants. Applicants go and check the online if the name is a part of a country, river, mountain.

GAC members could assist applicants in identifying which government and or public authorities would be applicable in case that the applicant needs some authorization or letter of support. Sometimes within governments we are not monolithic inside the governments. There are different ministries, different agencies; sometimes it's not easy which part of the government the applicant should go and get that letter. So the GAC could be helping in that regard.

If governments support non-objection is required for an application, provide mediation services. Establish a program to heighten the

awareness of governments and others regarding the gTLD. We saw this in the first round. You remember that applications from Latin America and Africa were very low for different reasons. Part of it was the awareness of the whole process. Not only that, but was one of it.

Establish a deadline by which the government must respond to the request. So that can be challenging sometimes. The governments take some time to deliver documents.

An applicant for a string with geographic meaning must provide notice to each relevant government or public authority that the applicant is applying for the string. Again, this is just a proposal made by some members of the group.

Can we go to the next one, please? Following with proposals, if an applicant applies for a string that is confusingly similar to a geographic term that requires a letter of government support or non-objection, the applicant should they require to obtain a letter of government support or non-objection. Again, this is just a proposal.

The end of the registry contact period say it was delegated and finally the contract ends; a government entity has the option of becoming engaged and can add provisions to the contract that specifies conditions rather than there being an assumption that the contract will be renewed. And a TLD associated with geography should be incorporated within the jurisdiction of the relevant government, and subject to local law. The relevance of local law, it has been also largely discussed if it's relevant for the global ICANN PDP's, so that's something to discuss.

Can we go to the next one? I think we are almost done. So this is a very very brief summary of the content in the draft report, and the scope of our working group. Your input is very valued so we have like 15 minutes to get your comments, questions, and I will be happy to have the assistance of my colleagues here. Maybe some questions they are more able to respond than myself. And, of course, we have members of the staff here with us, so any comment, any input?

Some input that we had yesterday morning that I found very useful was that we could produce a really good executive summary of this big document which is extremely challenging because you may do mistakes and not include all the comments in a summary, and I suggested also that it could be translated into several languages so you could profit from a shorter version in perhaps your own language or a language more closer to your culture. So that was one idea that came up.

Another idea that came up yesterday was that in order to prepare that shorter report or executive summary, we should build a small team and we were only two volunteering. But that was an idea also, and I don't know if there were other suggestions that is I cannot recall right now.

So, comments? Questions? You are very quiet. It's the end of the afternoon, and end of the long day today. So any comments? Questions? Yes, Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Just Olga, sorry for my limited knowledge on the ISO 3166, but ISO 3166 is kind of an older document and so in the meantime you have new countries and so on applying for ccTLD. What is the approach for new applications of ccTLD if you are not in the ISO 3166? In addition not all of the countries are members of the ISO. Indonesia is a member, but I know there are many countries that are not a member so they do not actually sign the ISO agreement on the use of the standard. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

I can try to respond. Well what we have as a principle here is that it's the U.N. that decides what is a country and what is not. So that from outside ICANN, and therefore we have to rely on the ISO lists, and when new countries have been assigned two letters from ISO, I don't think you have to be a member of ISO to get that because the 2 letter code is used by ICANN. That was what Jon Postel took, it was already there and he used it to create some, what should I say, some tool for the local Internet communities spread over the world.

So I don't think that will be a problem actually but it's important that all the 2 letter combinations will be there so at least when a new country comes, the 2 letters have not been used to something else. Then it will be difficult because we can't decide, ICANN can't decide which 2 letters it will be; it's the U.N. and ISO that decides that, not we. If I've said something wrong here, I'm sure that Jaap will correct me.

OLGA CAVALLI: I don't know if the Jaap is in the room, but maybe we can consult with him afterwards. I have in the queue Brazil and then Belgium. Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Olga. I would like to thank you personally for your involvement and your resilience in addressing so many issues at the same time, and I think it's something that benefits all of us. As you know, we have been part of this exercise with some concerns, first of all because at the very beginning of the exercise there was a declaration regarding what would be the ultimate objective, which is something that was quite surprising and a matter of concern for us because there was a very clear indication that we were looking for solutions to address to give more flexibility for the registration of names, and delegation of names associated to geographic significance, which seemed to us a little bit inappropriate. And also because of the timing that was, as always most processes that take place within ICANN, very time consuming, and tight, which from the perspective of government is always a problem to participate in the context of a perceived lack of urgency to address and to make a final decision on these since the next round of expansion has not yet been decided.

But having said that, I'd like to thank you for this briefing and to say that we think that in addition to the items that have been addressing by the group, and I understand the motivation was some of the issues that emerged that had to be dealt with in regard to the first round of delegation of new gTLDs, so we think that together with the

examination of those topics, we should look at the experience in addressing some problematic case that came about, not all of them necessarily linked to geographical names. But for example I would like to mention from the top of my head, even not knowing if it is appropriate or not, .HALAL Persian Gulf, .Amazon. I think those issues have been around for a few meetings, and a lot of effort was invested to try to come up with solutions regarding those cases.

So this is something also that could be looked into by the group since it could provide some clues or some precedents on how to address difficult cases that may emerge. My delegation principle is satisfied with the way the issue was addressed in the Applicant Guidebook that guided the delegation of the first round of new gTLDs and, of course, we would like to participate, to contribute, but again, we do not see first of all proper motivation, we still fail to see the urgency in addressing this particular topic.

And the third point we would like to add this element that we should also look into how some problematic cases were addressed and that this might provide some clues on how to go about it. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Benedicto. Be sure that some of us have had that in mind, but that's PDP, this is part of the wider PDP. Maybe my colleagues here can comment on the broader process. And these issues that you had rightly pointed out, they have been present, and also some remedies have been expressed. Some of them were included in the

Powerpoint today, I don't know if other colleagues want to comment about that.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Thank you, Ambassador. Honored to be in the GAC room. Javier Rúa-Jovet for the record. In terms of processes that are outside of the work track, of course the work track is not a closed bubble and in our prior meeting we reviewed the processes that have been going on and have some Board resolutions in the case of .Amazon, .PersianGulf to see if those processes inform our process, we definitely can't block that out. There's lessons learned and that's part of the discussion.

There's other terms; I think, Ambassador, you mentioned HALAL. One of the interesting discussions in the past meeting is whether some terms are more geographical than others to say that. For example one can say, you know,.Patagonia is a region in Argentina but maybe .HALAL would be a cultural notion that is less associated with territory. So that's the type of discussion that we are having, but these are all discussions without clear consensus, but we are definitely aware of the conversations and we have to be aware. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Javier. I have Belgium and China, and I don't think we have much time unless there are other colleagues requesting for the floor. Belgium.

BELGIUM: Thank you, Olga, and thank you for this very clear summary of all these questions. As I mentioned before, it's very difficult for us to follow all the working groups, all the calls, so it's very useful to have a summary. I had a question on the choice or the decision between a geo name or a common name. How will this decision be taken?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Well, that's one of the things that we are discussing of course because especially for some of these geographical names, the further down you come in the hierarchy, the more are the chances that it's both brands, generic names, and geographic, and in the 2012 round, these names were reserved so it was not possible to have them as a gTLD. So that's what we are trying to find now, and one of the suggestions that Olga presented was different options for city names, different options for perhaps three letter codes. Could everyone have them so they could be used for both geographical names, for brands and for generic brands and geographic names?

But the problem is that as opposed to trademarks or brands, the same name can be used in if different parts of the world, in different parts of products, so many organizations can have that as a brand, but as for a TLD, when it is taken, it's only one. So then it's a much more difficult discussion, so we are not there yet but it's important that you go and discuss, and read the report and give us your view on what you think about this, thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Annebeth. And I have China.

CHINA: Thank you, Olga. I would like to appreciate your fruitful work and also thank you for your diligence and your effort put into this process, and the initial report. I think the geographic name, geo name is a public policy issue which attracts attention from many GAC members, so I see the necessity that the update of the geo name policy could be based on the current implemented rules and the practice defined in the Applicant Guidebook.

From reading some paragraphs of the initial report, and also as well as the preliminary recommendations in the initial report, I get to know that due to the time limitation on some issues, the working group members did not reach consensus on some issues in the report, so in this situation, you decide to adopt the approach that making the initial report public and conducting a round of public comments. I think this is a practical way to move forward, to promote the efficiency of your work.

After quickly going through the initial report I find that the recommendation, the preliminary recommendations roughly maintained some practice in the AGB, including the reservation of certain strings, and requiring a letter of support, or a non-objection letter from certain government authorities. I think this approach, this practice is still quite necessary to do so.

Taking this opportunity here, I would like to kindly ask a question to you that is: from your point, what is the major difference in the current initial report? I mean, the suggestion you made, and also the recommendations compared to the AGB, is there any significant change from the current Applicant Guidebook. I just wanted to seek further clarification of this, thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

This is a very good question, and I will give my perspective and maybe other colleagues can add theirs. The report as it is, and the recommendations keep the spirit of protecting some names and lists. For all colleagues here in the room, let me remind that it's a group where all the interests are working together, and there is of course some tension in between the different positions. I am there representing the GAC but I'm not alone, there are other colleagues here representing other SOs and ACs and please have that in mind. It's not Olga doing things in the group and then the outcome maybe you don't like it. It's not only my responsibility, so have that in mind.

As far as I can tell, if these recommendations are kept, I think that the essence of the first limitations that had the Applicant Guidebook are in place. I personally cannot say which will be the outcome. What we have been trying to do in our GAC working group for a while, and many of you have participated in that group, and some other colleagues from the community also; we're having ideas for remediation to what Ambassador Benedicto rightly mentioned about what happens with the names like Amazon, Patagonia and many others that have some

sensibilities, are not included on the list but are relevant to the countries, but at the same time are of the interest of some companies. We have been proposing some ideas. They are in the document. They are not adopted. So your comments, your input is very valuable. That's my perspective. I don't know if colleagues want to add something.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Annebeth Lange here. I agree with you, Olga, that we are at a very early stage now. This is the draft initial report, we have not had consensus calls. It's a long way forward, but what we experience since we are 4 stakeholder groups with different views, different perspectives, also within the same stakeholder group, as long as we cannot find a better way to solve it than we did in 2012 in the AGB, because that was also a compromise, we tried to find a balance there, but one of the problems as we see it today is that it is not GNSO policy because the GNSO policy is from 2007, and then we had the Applicant Guidebook, we worked from 2008 until 2012 to try to find a good way that all could agree on, but it's not GNSO policy.

So the challenge now is to make the policy that it will stand for the future. That we all can agree on as good as possible, but it will be a -- to make a consensus there, I'm not sure we can, and then the job will be to make the Applicant Guidebook even better, and try to do some minor adjustments to take away those things that really went bad but it's been a really good output as well and a lot of success stories. So if we can find a way -- as you say, Amazon was not a good case and

HALAL and other words have been mentioned here -- it shouldn't take 6 years from when the application got in until we find some solution. We have to do it better than that. So talk together at an earlier stage. Better mediation, better objection procedures; that's what we have been talking about, and I hope we can find better solutions so we can all agree that okay, this was the best we could do, and it's okay. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Olga. I don't want to repeat all of that. I think that all makes perfect sense and I think all I just wanted to highlight was that we had a list of some of the suggestions which were being considered which are probably what you could call incremental improvements, so even if some of the preliminary recommendations point towards matching the existing guidebook treatment, there is also these other aspects of process that are being looked at to improve for the incoming applicants. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Martin. Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Javier Rua for the record. Again, I agree with [inaudible]. It's, of course, impossible to predict the future. One of the characteristics of

the draft initial report, right now it's a large document because it really shows the different visions that are in the work track, but they're just there for evaluation and further comment, and then that will become the official initial report and it will go to a public official comment from you and from other communities, and then the choices that are made after those democratic processes of participation, well that's going to be the new policy.

So it's impossible to predict, but what colleagues have said is right. It's a document that is very thoughtful, and our processing has been very thoughtful, very inclusive, very democratic and taking into account the sensitivities that are on every side of this issue and that's why progress in any direction has to be slow in some cases because you have to work through the issues, and that's what we are doing. And what Olga mentioned, the different nature of this work track is that it feels like it's cross community because there's co-leadership from different communities and that gives it in my view more legitimacy across the ICANN world in what we do. So, it's a work in progress and it's going to come out and we will see the product after the processes that are to happen.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. Thank you, Martin. Thank you, Javier. Thank you, Annebeth, very much. Thank you all of you for your attention, and we have grabbed like 5 minutes from the other session. Apologies for that. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]