
PANAMA – Cross-Community Session: Geographic Names at the Top-Level (2 of 2)

Thursday, June 28, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:45 EST

ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

MARTIN SUTTON:

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. If we could get seated down, we will begin our session today.

Notwithstanding it's sort of the last afternoon for a long week for everybody, I know, and there's been some distraction with some football going on as well, but hopefully you are all joining us very shortly.

So let me just introduce the session today. so this is Work Track 5 which is looking at the geographic terms at the top level and our second cross-community session of the week. And I'm joined -- myself, I'm Martin Sutton, as one of the co-leads of the Work Track 5. And as I run through my colleagues here that have joined me, Olga Cavalli, who's the GAC co-lead, Annebeth Lange is the ccNSO lead, and Javier Rua-Jovet, the ALAC co-lead. In the middle, obviously are leaders from the overall PDP working group. We have Jeff -- I presume we've actually introduced you so many times, you two. Do I really feed to?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

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.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Cheryl and Jeff, the co-leads of the overall PDP working group. Please, everybody, do come in and sit down and we'll move ahead with the session today.

So on the agenda, what we're doing today is really a follow-on from our session at that we held on Monday afternoon. So just very quickly before I go through a recap, I'd just like to see a show of hands as to who was here on the session on Monday afternoon. So not all of you. Okay.

So I will just make sure that I cover a little bit more detail than as to the recap of that session, but I'll do that next. But following that, we'll be looking at seeking some convergence on principles of how to move forward. And the particular topic that we were working on, on the Monday afternoon session is in relation to noncapital city names. So that's going to continue to be our focus today and push forward with some further discussions on that. And then we'll be looking at wrap-up and next steps to wrap up this session today.

So I'm going to go back to -- for the benefit of those that didn't join us on the Monday session, this particular topic of noncapital city names has gained a lot of discussion and conversations going within the Work Track 5 and its members for a number of weeks. And what we wanted to do is take the opportunity to

engage with the wider community and provide an opportunity for us to hear different views, other perspectives, and some other ideas as to how to focus in on this particular area.

And one of the things that's helped us to try and break this down is looking at the overall end-to-end process of this sort of applicant -- the treatment of these particular terms from the 2012 guidebook.

And this is really split into three separate sections where we look at the sort of preapplication phase if you'd like, which is looking at the eligibility requirements and the evaluation procedures that applicants can review, consider, what are all the risks they would face in terms of putting through an application to make sure they are informed and understand the requirements of them as they proceed with an application or may even decide not to.

The second component of this is really built into the evaluation/challenge processes that are within the application phase. That's where there are a number of evaluations that occur. So numerous checks that that would relate to, including things where there is potential objections, there's public comment periods. There could be GAC early warnings flagged up. To the extent there could even be GAC advice that follows.

There could also be other evaluation mechanisms which include string contention sets. So there's a number of different components that fit in with that particular second phase.

And then there's a third element to this where there's other controls that can be applied through contractual arrangements and compliance requirements. So that's more of a post-delegation phase where there's still the ability to make sure that a TLD is controlled effectively and meets with its obligations in the contracts and ongoing compliance requirements.

So we discussed these elements on Monday afternoon. And we went through a number of questions that we posed and got a really good level of engagement from the audience. And the questions that we were concerned about were: Should there be universal protections for noncapital city names? Currently there's not. So there's ability to look at different use cases that could be used for a term which may match a city name but has other meanings and usage available to it.

In terms of when you need to actually go and seek a letter of approval or nonobjection, as is the case if in the current guidebook you wish to use it as a geographical representation, then how do you make sure you're going to the right and relevant authority to seek those letters to support your application or at least show that there's no objection.

And we also then discussed: Does the intended use of the string matter? So at the moment, if it's not going to be intended to be used as a geographic term, there's no requirement to seek approval or nonobjection from any public authority.

Whereas, if you do intend to use it for a geographical usage to represent a city, then that actually meant that you had to follow certain paths and requirements for those letters of nonobjection.

Then also the question is where there's a name that matches, is the same name in multiple countries and locations, which authority do you go to? So there was some really good discussions in relation to that.

The ability to also dissect this process that we have in place to see the different control mechanisms that are set along the way that may actually restrict or not allow you to even apply for a certain string through to different controls post-delegation, as I mentioned earlier, that relies on contractual elements and compliance.

So we're really encouraged on Monday afternoon with the level of interaction, the level of interest from participants through that session. We were given a lot of feedback from those that participated. And overall it seemed to be a very welcomed experience and opportunity for people to discuss, especially in

the smaller groups where they are able to provide information, some ideas, some thoughts about how to tackle some of these questions that we presented.

Now, with that, we captured a lot of information as you'd expect. But in terms of what it actually meant in relation to what we've discussed within the Work Track 5 and the members of that group, a lot of it was very much affirming those opinions that we've previously heard which is a good thing, so we know that -- you know, there's a general feeling of certain thought across the community. And we also benefited by gaining some new ideas and thoughts to feed back into our Work Track 5 deliberations.

So with that feedback, we just want to make sure that you're assured we're not going to lose that. That goes into the Work Track 5 deliberations. We're recording the information that we could extract back from the small breakout groups that we formed. And that will be integrated into the working document that we're building up as we go through and progress Work Track 5 activities.

But where does that leave us now? I think we've heard regularly that, you know, yes, we know what the positions are. And these are those positions, and different components and sectors of the

ICANN community will reiterate and amplify their position in this range.

So just looking at here -- what we're presenting here is a spectrum of options. But as a starting point, this particular slide illustrates the two extremes. And, remember, here we're talking about treatment of noncapital city names as we go through these slides today.

So one extreme, it's very open or free for all apply for any noncapital city, no restrictions applied. So that could be one extreme position that we know.

To the other extreme, which is anything that relates to a noncapital city name must get approval from all relevant governments, public authorities, for all noncapital cities. So if you like, that's our kind of extremities of the spectrum that we're working within.

Now, based on all of the discussions we had within the Work Track 5 to date, together with some of the affirmation of those points of view through the session of the cross-community session that we held on Monday, we can start to see where there is a more closer set of views that bring us more central to this set of extremities.

So it's very unlikely that we would ever agree across the community that there would be simply no restrictions applied for noncapital cities.

To the other extent, there is an unlikelihood that we would ever agree to have approval for every noncapital city string by all relevant governments and public authorities. So I think it's -- it's safe to say that those extremities are going to be extremely hard to push through. We will never come to any agreement between ourselves as a community to actually objectively put one of those options on the table to pursue.

And if you think about the applicant guidebook in 2012, it was very much somewhere in the middle-ish, depending on your point of view.

So here there's a sort of -- as you come closer in to some alignment, there is the point here that approval and nonobjection is dependent upon the use case, that's. The context of the use of that TLD that we also discussed on the session on Monday.

Slightly further up the scale, there could be a limited defined set of noncapital city names where approval for nonobjection is always needed. So those are the kind of discussions that are going on within the Work Track 5 mailing list and our regular

calls. So that's where we seem to be when taking a -- sort of a view of those discussions within the Work Track 5 activities.

So how do we actually move from here? It's -- it's quite difficult and we can see from just even the conversations on Monday with the cross-community session that it's very difficult to move around that space. But actually there's a number of things that we can start to think about where it may improve what we've had within the 2012 guidebook. And that's where we would probably lead on today when we start to talk about perhaps the principles that we'd like to apply to this phase of our discussions.

So how can we meet in the middle? There could be a number of ideas here that come through. On the Work Track 5 list, there's suggestions, for instance, that to improve the process, that there is a time limit for responses from applicable governments or public authorities when a request is made for a letter of nonobjection.

So that's a very practical idea, to put into the slot, which if we move back, if I can -- if we move back to here, it could be a benefit in terms of what we've already got within the 2012 guidebook that slots in here quite effectively. But is it applicable to all applications, or is it only applicable then to those that are applying to be representing a geographical term?

So what we'd like to try and see is where we can take those opportunities and ideas and explore the way that they can improve that guidebook and the process for applicants so that they, one, have better predictability of the process, a better awareness of where they might be able to make a better judgment as to whether there are any risks that they need to understand and mitigate through their application process.

So some of that as well, I suppose, we will try and explore after we have gone through this process of looking at principles.

But please bear this in mind, that the second-to-last bullet point, as we go through this principles, see if you can start to generate thought and ideas here as to other additional things that can be added to or adjusted to make the process support the interest of more parties. So when we hear all of these positions, it's very much in certain areas of the community. How do we actually get something more collective from the community that is amenable to the many?

Before we do that, though, we will now focus in and sort of lift ourselves back from the granular level and just to start working through really some principles that we'd like to work around and get your agreement as we go forward.

Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. Just in terms of finding middles, it seems to me that the slide here focuses on the letter of consent/nonobjection but that as you mentioned briefly at the beginning is not in the middle of potential protections or rights or powers; that there is both a spectrum of -- that includes objections at the time that objections come up in the process of application review. And there's also post-delegation dispute resolution procedures that come up afterwards.

And that also a letter of objection is not really necessarily in the middle of where the rights might come in at that point either, that it could be as strong as an absolute prohibition with no right to even consent or nonobject or ability of nonconsent all the way to, say, a notification procedure or some form of something that does not actually put a preclusive power in the hands of one of more governments.

So there are a number of middles here. I don't mean to make the job more difficult. But what I do want to say is when we talk about what should be protected or what should be given a right, that what might be unacceptable at one point might be acceptable at a different point.

So the right for Sheboygan, Michigan, to stop anybody from using Sheboygan unless they grant them that letter of consent

or nonobjection might be problematic. The right of Sheboygan to object might be less problematic. The right of Sheboygan to make a dispute resolution procedure if certain things are not as they should have been may be less objectionable still. And Sheboygan is also the name of a popular type of hot dog or frankfurter.

So the right for Sheboygan, Michigan, to stop anybody from using Sheboygan unless they grant them that letter of consent or nonobjection might be problematic. The right of Sheboygan to object might be less problematic. The right of Sheboygan to make a dispute resolution procedure if certain things are not as they should have been may be less objectionable still. And Sheboygan is also the name of a popular type of hot dog or frankfurter. So a Sheboygan brat is -- might be a perfectly good nongeographic use, in which case, you know, that's not even a geo term, I would say.

But in any case, I think that if are looking at the letter of consent, non-objection model, we are going to have more difficulty than if we also can kind of talk about where in the middles of processes we could find ourselves, because there's just going to be -- this is a stickier situation than some might be. So I think we need to look at all the levers we can pull to adjust when things happen, what the level of preclusive power is, et cetera, or -- and kind of figure those things out. Because the way

I see things going right now, looking at it just through this one variable, not being a variable, it's going to make -- it will be a long road with an uncertain end.

Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Greg. I'm using that as an example. So there might be different levers and pulleys that we end up discussing and, as you say, where are they most relevant to be applied in certain circumstances is something that we'd like to address and discuss further. But what we're trying to do here is just show you where we're trying to go in opening up those discussions; that there is a spectrum of use, a spectrum to consider of positions, and where we kind of thing that the discussions are going at this stage. And I think what we want to just do is push -- lift ourselves back again so we can get a more holistic view, understand the process is that there are, you know, a pre-application set of controls. There is an application evaluation and objection set of controls, so even before it gets delegated, and there is a post-delegation set of controls.

So we do have the ability to leverage any of those when we're considering different types of applications, and, in this case, different types of applications that are either specific to a

noncapital city name or match that same name but have different meanings and use cases available to them.

So I think -- yeah, if we move to principles. Oh, sorry, have we got another question?

Yeah, yeah, so we will -- the point here was just to start making you think about these particular items so we come back to this and have a more open discussion and refer back to this at that stage. But before we take any further questions, unless it's more for clarity at this stage. It's clarity? So I have 2, and then -- is it for clarity?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

Suggest a principle.

MARTIN SUTTON: Okay. We're coming to that. Thank you, though. And number 2.

KATRIN OHLMER: This is Katrin Ohlmer. I'm not really sure if this framing of that we have to meet in the middle really reflects what our task is. You mentioned that we are here to support the interest of more people. Actually, my understanding was it's more about which issues arose from the AGB 2012 and what can we do better

rather than making up a wish list of, let's say, thousands of peoples and opinions and finding some -- some middle ground between the left-hand side and the right-hand side. I think we should really focus on the issues of items which are improvable rather than this middle ground of new items we add which weren't in the AGB 2012. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thank you, Katrin. I think this is more of a vehicle to enable those discussions, bearing in mind this is a cross-community session where many would not have been involved with the Work Track 5 deliberations and the granular level of that so far. So we're hoping that will provide opportunities for others to also feed in as we move through the session.

But, please, we're not ignoring that particular aspect. We do want ideas. We do want to improve it. But we're just going to take a step back at this stage and just walk through some principles that we want to see if we can agree amongst ourselves are worthwhile to take forward as high-level principles as we delve deeper and further into the ideas and thoughts collectively on this topic.

So so far -- I'll just move on in this section just to introduce this particular point.

So what we're trying to do here is just to see if -- because of the sort of entrenched positions that start to form and are very difficult to maneuver from, it's just to make sure as a collective we can work through, from a higher level, as to what principles should we be aiming for and how, then, when we look at making improvements and changes, do these actually reflect back properly to those principles that we'd like to consider.

So, for example, for all parties, do we want to make sure that there is a respect and balance of the various interests in the community? And do we want the predictability, fairness and transparency available to assure to the greatest extent possible that that's in place for the applicant and for anybody that wants to review that application?

So I think we've got a set of principles that we're going to go through. So I'll hand at this stage across to Olga. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Martin. Welcome everyone to the room and to the session. And as Martin was explaining, we will try to present to you some principles which has this holistic idea of moving a little bit above the detailed concepts.

What I will do, I will start, and then other colleagues will follow, Annebeth and Javier. So we will present you the principle, and then we will make questions.

As you can see, at the end, at the bottom of the slide, there are two questions. I will present them separated, one from the other one. And once we make the question, we will sense the temperature of the room. We would like you to raise your hand if you don't agree with the principle. So the answer to the question would be, "I don't agree."

So let me go through it.

Principle one. It's about allowing new gTLDs, which is more or less the main issue that we are talking about for such a long time in this group and in other groups.

In alignment with Principle C from the 2007 GNSO recommendations on new gTLDs, the reasons for introducing new top-level domains include that there is demand from potential applicants for new top-level domains in both ASCII and IDN formats. In addition, the introduction of new top-level domain application process has the potential to promote competition in the provision of registry services, to add to consumer choice, market differentiation, and geographic -- geographical and service-provider diversity.

So the two questions are -- I will make one first and then the other one. Can we agree that the program should allow for the introduction of new gTLDs as preliminarily agreed to by the full working group?

So the question is can we agree that the program should allow for the introduction of new gTLDs as agreed by the full working group? If you don't agree, raise your hand.

Sebastien. Okay.

Okay. I will go to the second part of the question, which is can we agree that the program, in relation to Work Track 5, should allow introduction of new gTLDs, particularly in relation to noncapital city names?

So this question is different. It's about new gTLDs, but in relation to noncapital city names. Can we agree that the program should allow new gTLDs in relation to noncapital city names?

You all agree that we have to allow them, noncapital city names. I see nodding. Nobody is raising hands.

Okay. So I will give the floor to my dear colleague, Annebeth or Javier. Who follows? Javier? Okay. Thank you very much.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: So, thank you. Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. Good afternoon to you all.

So principle 2, next slide, predictability. Principle 2 has been moved.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hard to get good help these days.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you. So this is pretty straightforward. Predictability in alignment with the 2007 GNSO recommendations, it says new generic top-level domains, gTLDs, must be introduced in an orderly, timely, and predictable way.

In a sense, as an attorney, this resonates with us. We want rules in place, preexisting rules in place created by you the community, rules that are well understood, are public, transparent, available, and that those rules also create predictable outcomes.

This is, of course, that we have in place these rules if and when there is a new gTLD round.

So anybody in the room that disagrees with the concept of predictability?

I thought -- I thought so.

Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Good afternoon, everybody. This is Annebeth Lange for the record. And principle 3. It's a little different but it connects with the other things we talked about and also back to what happened after 2012 round.

We should make a system that reduce the reasons for conflict. Can we agree to try and reduce the likelihood for conflicts within the process, as well as after the process concludes and the TLDs are delegated?

What we know from the last round was that we had some really bad conflicts, and that kind of conflicts we want to avoid in the future.

It's not good for applicants, and it's not good for ICANN as a multistakeholder organization. The more conflicts we have in the end, it becomes so they make -- set of rules that will give them predictability and the way to think that gives us less conflicts in the end. It will not be good for ICANN's credibility and not for the future. So that is what we should try to obtain.

So anyone disagrees?

Thought so. Yeah!

JIM PRENDERGAST: It's a long week. Jim Prendergast for the record. No, I'm not disagreeing. I'm just looking for clarification. When you say "conflicts," I mean, are we talking the Amazon situation and things like that? And doesn't this tie into one of the first principles we talked about, which is predictability? So if you have predictability, then you don't have to worry about this, is my guess, but....

ANNEBETH LANGE: Annebeth Lange again. Well, the problem is that even if it is -- I agree, the more predictability it is, the easier it will be and less conflicts. But what we have achieved now and what we experienced in the discussions in Work Track 5, especially for noncapital city names, is that has been described earlier. It's very different views on how this should be achieved. And even if we have a system that is quite clear, you can never stop.

Greg has been talking about rights, and even if it's one party that feel that it have more right than the other party and we find a system that achieves that, you can never stop in the end someone to take out the conflict afterwards.

I would say let us think back and say that in 2012, there was no non-objection rule. Would we have had more or less conflicts after the round had been finished? Would we have had more like Amazon and Patagonia?

We have quite a few success stories of cities that got that non-objection, even if some parties say that you didn't have to have it and the governments doesn't have any right. And that's a valid view, but still, what can we do to obtain as less conflicts as possible? That's our question.

Should we start the discussion now, Martin, or would you just say a few words before we go on?

Come back to you, Greg.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Actually, I wouldn't mind just adding a reply to that because I think principle 1 and 3 is interrelated. But for removing or minimizing the likelihood of conflicts, you know, a lot of that is in relation to making sure it's clear up front so that the applicant understands what risks they are facing with preparing and, you know, it's an arduous task. It is a financial burden. There's a lot of effort that they need to go through to understand whether this is a viable and meaningful process to follow.

So they're the risk takers, if you like. So up front they need to have clear and predictable understanding of what those processes would be and where they potentially might be able to alleviate those risks, whether it is through following any best practices that are learned from prior rounds, potentially -- you know, rather than embed everything in policy, is there some things that we can leverage as best practice that allow an applicant to understand those risks and take options rather than being specifically tasked to do something that may not seem relevant in terms of their use case for that TLD.

So this is an example. Perhaps we'll have an opportunity, in a minute, to expand this out so that we get further ideas and input from the audience.

So, Greg, did you want to go next? Then I've got Paul. Then we'll go through to the next stage of -- I'll cut it off there, though, at that stage so we can move on to open up that discussion. So if it's about clarifying anything on the principles, I'm happy to hear the question now.

Greg, thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record.

Just a clarification or at least an extension of this thought is that one very important, valid way to reduce the likelihood of conflicts is to reduce the number of bases on which conflicts can be initiated. That's perhaps a small government or libertarian view. I'm not particularly a libertarian but for this case I'll play one on TV.

So I think the more ways you can raise a conflict, the more rules you have, all the way up to 613 rules if you want, (indiscernible) then you will have more and more need for conflicts and more and more need for rulings. So the less rules, the less conflicts. That's point one.

The second is maybe more a question for Annebeth. In terms of success stories, can you think of any success stories in relation to letters of consent, non-objection that were related to uses of geographic -- of what may be called geographic terms when the use that was intended was not a geographic use?

ANNEBETH LANGE: I think Paul was first, and then down there, and then you.

PAUL McGRADY: Thank you. Paul McGrady. I think one principle that's missing is the principle of simplicity. We have an old decision-making

notion that the simplest explanation tends to be the right one. Occam's razor. It's been around for a long time; right?

And so as we think about how to apply this, just a few potential examples. An electric company that wants to apply for .EDISON, a university that wants to apply for .DAVENPORT or .ANTIOCH, a geology society that wants to apply for .BOULDER, an accounts receivable firm that wants to .BILLINGS, a cathedral that wants to apply for .WESTMINSTER, a region that wants to break away from an occupying power that wants to apply for .INDEPENDENCE, a jewelry retailer that wants to apply for .SURPRISE, a car company that wants to apply for .LINCOLN, a Native American tribe that wants to apply for .PUEBLO.

In each of those examples those are noncapital cities in the U.S. and they would have to go through whatever, 613 rules that we build for them if we choose to build a complex system. If we choose to build a simple system, it will be easier.

I think there's a real danger in ICANN attempting to create rights resulting in letters objections, negotiations, delays, loss, expenses. In other words, fewer noncapital city names, which we've already said as a principle we want to make them available, more conflicts, which we said we don't want, and less predictability, which we said we don't want. That is far less simple of an outcome, applying the principle of simplicity, than

ICANN having local noncapital cities enforced based on content laws and how the TLDs are being used in a way that violate local laws.

In other words, they could take umbrage with police department .LINCOLN if that were being used to impersonate the police department of Lincoln, Nebraska. And that's a great place for that kind of content-based dispute, which is really what we're trying to preempt if we preempt TLDs, that kind of content-based dispute to be taken up by the local authorities rather than ICANN creating a new set of international rights.

Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you. Number 1.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. We have a question from remote participation from Carlos Gutierrez, member of Work Track 5. First he has a comment, he says: The forum is facing questions on the 2007 GAC principles but not the 2012 AGB. Question: Is the Work Track 5 proposing a revision or redrafting or only confirmation of the 2007 principles?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Number 4.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. My name is Eduardo Diaz, I'm from NARALO.

When I read this, reducing the reason for conflict, the first thing comes to my mind is I know we had another principle providing noncapital, noncapital names more. You know, you can take the map and take all the names of mountains, rivers, capitals, anything. Put it there; you cannot use those. Will that apply to reducing conflict if you do that?

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, I would like to respond to several comments that you made. I think nobody is thinking about 613 rules. One basic rule would be, and perhaps responding to two of view and somehow to Greg, would that early contact in between the applicant and the interested parties could be useful.

If you look at the document where we have compiled all the comments that we have received from you and you go to the part that talks about success stories, and doubly it talks about projects where there was a previous early contact in between parties, would that be a way forward? And as Martin said, could

that be a part of a group of best practice rules that the applicant, the governments, and the interested parties could follow in order to diminish conflicts? Because as very well said by Annebeth, we don't want a new round with the same conflicts. We have been going with these conflicts for more than six years. We don't want that. That's not good for ICANN, not good for the applicant, not good for the countries and cities and everyone.

So that's my comment for the moment.

Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Question. Number 2.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, Jorge Cancio from the Swiss government for the record. I think that this is a good principle. What is underlying or at least how I would understand it, that it's underlying is the thought that there are diverse and different kinds of interests converging on a given string, in this case noncapital cit names. And let's say that the experience more generally is that if you want to have solutions that don't lead to conflicts, that means that you take all interests at stake into account from the very beginning.

In Switzerland, we have a lot of experience with that. We have four different languages, 26 cantons in a very small territory. Within the cantons many different traditions, valleys, dialects. And we have this experience that you really have to get together, discuss your interests before you build a road, before you build a big infrastructure, before you take a decision that will affect different stakeholders.

And only if you really acknowledge the existence of different interests and you establish a procedure or a process where all will have a fair say, then you will avoid conflicts during the process or after the process.

So this is not about a zero-sum game where you have winners and losers. This is about creating the incentives for having positive sum games for having winners. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: This is Javier Rua for the record. We had some questions that are on the floor that haven't been touched upon. We have one question, comment by Carlos Raul Gutierrez which goes at the heart of what a PDP is. And he -- I guess he asked something, whether we're looking for -- just looking for reconfirmation of

2007 policies or -- we're looking to move forward. And I say to all and we say to all, we're looking for agreement. If there's some change to 2007, that's part of the mandate, too, of course. There were some principles that were -- that have been proposed here, over here, a simplification or an Occam's razor type of principle. So, of course, we are open to review policies. That's what we're here for.

But this exercise today of confirmation or -- it's just our attempt to keep on setting ground rules and keep on setting things that we can hold onto, to know where the community stands because naturally in the multistakeholder process, sometimes there's a lot of stringent debate and we want that. But we might get confused whether we're still agreeing or disagreeing on principles.

As I said, one participant today proposed a principle. And it's similar to what Greg is saying, a type of libertarian view of less is more. So that's what we're here for.

And on Eduardo Diaz's question/comment, he proposed just looking at the map and seeing what's in a map and then deciding -- and then using that as a sort of reference for what is and isn't geographic. That is an idea.

We have -- we have people that would completely oppose that in the work track. I mean, that's similar to proposals that are just

as valid that have to do with comprehensive listings of what is and what isn't geographic.

Maybe there's some list that has some level of, you know, granularity. Maybe, for example, there have been proposals regarding city size for noncapital cities, right?

So in my territory in Puerto Rico, the second-most important city, Ponce, has very few people because Puerto Rico has very few people. So -- so is that a good norm? So that's up for discussion. But, yes, we're looking for rules that are -- that create predictability.

Lists create predictability. You look at the rule, you look at the list, it's there or it isn't. You look at a map -- but is it -- the next question is: Is it workable? Is it practical? Is it simple? Is it simple? And that's what we're here for. So those are my points on those two very good points -- questions.

Heather.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Terry.

This is Heather Forrest. Thank you very much. I put an answer to Carlos' -- I attempted an answer to Carlos' question in the chat.

And I think that this discussion that we're having now is one that perhaps we should have had from the beginning. And I'm pleased to see that we're having it now.

So ultimately I think our job is made more difficult than the job was in 2007 and 2008.

2007 and 2008, the discussion was all about principles. And if we go back to that original PDP and we look at the recommendations that were approved by the GNSO Council at that time, they are all about the principles. We now have the benefit of hindsight in that following 2007 and '08, those principles were implemented. That policy was implemented in the form of the applicant guidebook.

We now have to look through the lens of implementation and return back to principles. And I can tell from the discussion here that that's very hard to do. And every example that's been given about a particular city name or a particular place, that's implementation. The examples force us into implementation. And I think we as a community have some clever thinking to do about how to focus the dialogue on principles.

And I would encourage the work track leaders to do some clever thinking. Not to put the pressure on you, but it's lovely this week to put the pressure on someone else.

I think there's some clever thinking on your parts to figure how to get us to focus our attention on principles and away from implementation. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you, Heather. It's Annebeth again.

I think that's very good that you put this in as well because what we have seen the last week, especially since we started to discuss noncapital cit names, we are kind of entrenched in details and all these different views.

What we should do as co-chairs is to try to find out what you want, what will be the policy that we together can be content with in the end and avoid conflicts and have predictability.

And when you see all the discussions on the lists now, it is very different views on how we can achieve that and what we want in the end.

So going -- that was kind of the intent today, to going a little back to basics and think -- if we all agree on some principles, some basic principles -- and every time we suggest something as a member of the group, try to have the principles in your head and say that if this is carried through, will this really fulfill the principles we agree on? So if we can try to think a little more in

that direction, I think it would be good for the way we are thinking.

Any more questions out here? Very silent. Okay.

Martin, should I leave it over to you?

MARTIN SUTTON:

I think still on the principles -- because we have had a challenge, if you like, to what was presented as the principles, to consider about do we want to keep it simple or do we want to make it complicated? I don't -- I don't know if we got a feel for that from the rest of the audience. But, you know, is it important to try and keep it simple? Who would like to keep it simple? Raise your hand, please.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

It's a yes.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Great. Who would like to make it complicated?

[Laughter]

Okay. Great. Because I think then that's a useful addition to the proposed principles that were put forward here today.

Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Annebeth Lange again. But then it's another question of another thought: Will simplicity give predictability?

Can anyone answer that? Because if it's too simple -- when you are a lawyer, you have a very, very wide and not-detailed law, then it's a lot of interpretations. Will that make it simple for you to know what you're going to apply for?

MARTIN SUTTON: Paul.

PAUL McGRADY: Thanks. Paul McGrady, again. So I think the answer to that is yes, right?

In my example, the Pueblo Indian Native American tribe, instead of having to go hat in hand to the City of Pueblo, Colorado, and all the other Pueblos out there -- I don't know how many there are -- that just happens to be one that has over 100,000 people in it. There could be, what, five, 10, 30. Who knows -- going out, asking for letters, maybe getting 29 out of 30. What percentage do you have to get back? Do you have to chase people? How many times do you have to chase them? How long do you have

to wait? You know, all these things. There's an enormous amount of complexity that goes into nonsimplicity, right?

And so instead of -- instead of them being able to act on their tribal name, they would have to wait and wait and be delayed and cost and expense and be worried that somebody would show up at the 13th hour. That to me is far less, you know -- that's far more complex and, therefore, more rife with peril and cost than simply saying they can apply for .PUEBLO. And as long as they use it consistent with the local laws that apply to them, i.e., not firedepartment.pueblo, then that should be fine. If they use it to impersonate the City of Pueblo, Colorado, or one of the other 30 Pueblos, then they can sort that stuff out locally. That's why there's laws. ICANN's not coming into a lawless world, right?

And so I do think that simplicity will, in fact, make it easier for applicants. And I think that it will be easier in terms of this community's work to not build five, 10, 612 rules, however many rules we have. The simpler the better. Thanks.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

If I may comment on Paul's comment. Paul, do you think that for purposes of your example the intended use prerequisite that's used -- that you have to state early on whether it's

geographic or nongeographic use be a simple norm for the purposes of a Native American tribe asking for a TLD?

PAUL McGRADY: I apologize. I'm not sure I understand what you're asking.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: So, okay. You're saying, I think, that it would not be simple, it would be very complex to have a Native American tribe go from place to place to get letters and wait, wait times, et cetera, et cetera.

Do you think a norm like intended use, that early on that native tribe, you know, declares that it's a geographic use and maybe there's other norms that are relevant like community norms, could be -- are existing norms that could be tweaked to make it, you know, particularly applicable to geographic countries?

I just want to know if in the bucket of norms that we already have, there are rules that could help out your example. What do you think?

PAUL McGRADY: Yeah, so I understand now. So you've picked out one of the rules and we're going to apply it to the principle simplicity, right? So let's use -- let's use .ANTIOCH instead, for that's a university or

two or five in the United States, right? Let's step away from the .PUEBLO example because when you actually think of a Native American Indian tribe having to go to a local government, that's already rife with all kinds of other issues, right?

So let's keep it simple. And let's say .ANTIOCH. Should Antioch University in Ohio have to go -- or have to check we will not be using this in a geographic way, right? They are in Yellow Springs. Presumably that would not be a geographic use. But there is, I think, an Antioch, California, that I saw from the list and probably 25 or 30 other Antiochs. I know there is one in Illinois.

I guess my question back to you would be: If there is no preemptive preclusion on them being able to use it in a way that doesn't violate local law, for example, policedepartment.antioch pretending to be Antioch, California's police department, what would be the benefit of making them check that box? Is it just because ICANN wants to collect information and feed that to local governments to give them notice so that they can be concerned or not concerned. What's the purpose of that rule, right?

So my response is unless we have an objective purpose for that rule that fits within the principles, then we should ditch that rule. But if we can think of a good reason for the rule, terrific. Good rules or good rules.

But we have to -- we have to say why we want that. What's ICANN going to do with that information? You know, if it's going to be a box to check and it's a box to check to nowhere, why? If it's a box to check and then the 35 or 50 municipalities around the world called Antioch are going to get a letter from ICANN saying, Just so you know somebody applied for this, I still don't think that's a good reason to check the box. There may be people in the room who think that's a good reason.

MARTIN SUTTON:

I think that's a great example of where we're trying to say by using principles, we can test whether the changes that are proposed fit neatly within those principles or whether there is a debate to be had as to how well they may fit.

So I think in terms of where we've gone with the principles of how to progress these discussions, we've probably gone as far as we can in terms of there's no further suggestions. We've got this simplicity aspect to build in.

I have one more comment. Sorry. One more comment.

REMOTE PARTICIPATION: Thank you. We have a comment from remote participation attendees, from Jorge Cancio, GAC representative: If we use a

discussion on principles just so we choose solutions that lack support, we will not make progress.

MARTIN SUTTON: I'm not sure I understand that.

Is there additional explanation, Jorge?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He can speak for himself. Jorge.

GREG SHATAN: Greg Shatan for the record. I want to point out that I responded to that comment with a comment of my own, which is that suggesting that certain positions lack support unless they are your own position is not going to get us anywhere either.

So at this point, we don't know what lacks support. I think there are a lot of people who wish that things they disagreed with lacked support. We're in -- the fact that there are numerous times when people have attempted to declare victory just like George Bush on an aircraft carrier with a "Mission Accomplished" sign behind him is not going to get us anywhere fast.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Jorge, do you want to extend your question?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. This was a comment on the chat. But actually what we have been hearing now for about ten minutes is the idea of the geo PIC. And I think we have had months of discussions, and we have seen that that idea lacks traction beyond certain number of constituencies.

So -- and it's -- let's say it's not only that, the question of traction, it's only the question that that is a very specific implementation approach that could be considered. But I thought that we were discussing principles. So why don't we stay with a discussion on principles if that is the agenda of this meeting and avoid going for very specific solutions and selling them as the ultimate solution for the problems at stake.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Before making my questions, I have no idea what is George Bush and an aircraft carrier, sorry. My English is limited.

My comment goes to -- I think we oversimplified the thing of a simplicity and complexity. Things are -- life is kind of in the middle. I would like to have a simple life, not paying taxes and going to the airport ten minutes before and not passing through

many scanners. But life is what it is. It's kind of in the middle. I accept complexity because I achieve other things in return.

So I think we oversimplify if we say just yes, we all want simplicity. Yeah, I agree. But we should think that if we want to contemplate different views, different perspectives and we want to avoid conflict, which was the meaning of the last principle, we would have to be more flexible and perhaps accept some kind of complexity which would be kind of in the middle. I just wanted to say that. Thank you, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON:

And I do think it's easier to try and pick at these with examples, so it's very easy to go down the route of actually thinking about particular cases and how they fit into these principles. So it does give us an ability to challenge those principles.

But I think it's time, then, that we can move on really to open this up and just -- in fact, we can go back just to really thinking about where roughly we were suggesting discussions were within the group and where we could perhaps consider different ideas and bring those to the table and see how they fit in, bearing in mind, as Annebeth earlier said, these kind of principles that we were saying would be helpful to follow through with those discussions.

So at this stage, very happy to open the floor up and encourage people, especially those that either within Work Track 5 or not members of Work Track 5 that do not typically have an opportunity to say anything and introduce ideas, to feel free and comfortable to come forward with suggestions on anything related to this topic.

Dirk.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Dirk Krischenowski from .BERLIN and Geo Top-Level Domain Group.

So that principle of intended use that an applicant may sign that he doesn't use the TLD in a fashion or a manner in relationship to a geographic name or city in this case, isn't -- isn't that what the market makes out of this TLD? If a city name is on the market, the registry doesn't have it in its hand anymore because the registrar making the markets, they are selling the domain names and they would sell that term, if it's geographic -- if it's economically interesting, and geographic terms are interesting, they have been shown as a viable business model, they would sell it as a city name and no one can prevent them to sell that as a city name.

We see this in ccTLDs a lot. You see .TV. It's marketed as media top-level domain. You can going to Switzerland. CH is marketed as short abbreviation for China. And so that will happen with names when even there are PICs or they are good-faith intended use not to use that term as a city names comes to the market. And we see it in some TLDs which are there on the market right now that exactly this happened.

I think this should be said that the geo TLDs have some economic value. That's why we are talking about this. If they would be worthless, we don't talk about that.

MARTIN SUTTON:

So just to clarify, Dirk, so that's -- but one of the complications I think that we keep reminding ourselves in the group is that lots and lots of noncapital cities exist around the world. There is a number of them that will be the same name in different places around the world. So there's matching names.

There's also names that also mean -- have multiple meanings that can be used in a generic way, and very meaningful way. There may be brands as well that are marketed and use it to serve broad customer base.

So how does that fit in? I mean, some of those perhaps have restrictions as to who could register a domain? What we see is

quite a number of models emerge in the last round where there are ways to control how a -- how, who a registrant can register a name in those spaces. Some of them are highly restrictive. Some of them have lots of terms embedded with them.

But what you're saying here is that somebody's able to apply saying that it's not going to be used for a geographic term but then it's left to the registrar to market so it will be used as a geographic term? I'm just trying to clarify.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: It's very likely that this will happen in the market if you have terms like Atlanta, Chicago, or other American cities where the government certainly would have a say who registers which domain names and could cause confusion in the domain names like police.chicago or others. But what we as Geo Top-Level Domain Name propose is just to extend this wonderful list of capital city names. There are 200 major cities where we all agree they are important. We say just extend this list a little bit to those cities which the United Nations quoted as -- as important cities. That's a list of nearly 4,000 cities including the capital cities.

That doesn't solve the problem with smaller cities or like in Puerto Rico example, the second largest city, that's probably not on that list if it hasn't a hundred thousand inhabitants, but it

creates more certainty. And I don't see a problem with extending this list from 200 to 4,000 major cities in the world where the governments want to have certainty that no one uses these important city names in a fashion that's not in line with the city.

And that would also answer your question, Martin, about if there are many cities with the same name. That particular name -- city that is on that United Nations list, it would apply just for this city, if there's an applicant going for this.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks for clarifying, Dirk.

Thank you.

Number 3.

PAUL McGRADY:

Thanks. Paul McGrady again. So thank you for raising the issue of Chicago. It's a fantastic example of a city that I think is most likely precluded under the First Amendment from trying to preempt somebody from attempting to apply for .CHICAGO.

The city of Chicago is a great example of a place that would not get involved in this. And, in fact, you raise the issue of police.chicago, which again, that goes to how it's being used,

not putting something on a black list. So what happens if Sting gets back together with his band and they do a concert in Grant Park in Chicago and their TLD is police.chicago; right?

So again, what we're trying to do is preempt content issues, dealing with content issues at the local level, by putting together, you know, a giant list of cities who we presume would care, most of whom probably wouldn't and, in Chicago's case, probably can't.

Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Paul. So in terms of principles, you know, taking the example that Dirk has put forward there, the group could work through those principles to see where it does align or may not align with some of those principles and debate some of those.

So I think that it's welcome in terms of input. What I was hoping for is if there are others out here who have not been able to speak up before, we could encourage you to participate. Because this is a cross-community session. This is a great opportunity.

Number 2.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Hello? Yes? Nigel Cassimire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union.

I have been sitting here going through in my mind trying to come up with a principle, but maybe I'll just take you through how I'm thinking the.

The "G" in gTLD stands for generic, but once it's assigned to someone, no one else in the world can use it. So it pretty much then becomes global.

So the Applicant Guidebook, as far as geographic names and so on were concerned, tended -- as I understand it, excluded, say, country names, capital city names, and so on. And to my mind, I was saying those are things that maybe have global recognition.

So I have been sitting here trying to think of how can I find a proxy for something that's global -- a principle -- derive a principle that maybe we could find a way to allow names that have global recognition.

When you talk about the examples of the same city name in multiple countries, that's not global. And I feel that's not a good application of a gTLD to give one city in one country this name to use exclusively when you might have other as deserving cities around the world that maybe can use it.

My thinking is if we would tend to favor reserving names that have global recognition as opposed to those that may be have multiple appearances in multiple countries. So Chicago was given there, for example. You might make a case that Chicago has global recognition, but my preference, if we are trying to keep things simple, is that beyond the -- the capital city names, if a city wants to have a gTLD, let it append its country code or something at the end of it.

So Chicago-US, or in my case Tunapuna-TT meaning Trinidad and Tobago, so that it would be clear -- at least that might set some sort of clear rule as to how geographic names could be used in a gTLD sense without maybe disenfranchising other places that have the same name.

Thanks.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thank you. Very interesting. And obviously there are particular ways that can be referenced. You know, it's up to the applicant as to how they might want to reference their string; you know, place-city. Place-country could be an option.

I think there might be some assumptions in what you're saying, is that it's always just going to be one applicant per one city. There could be opportunity for applicants consider creating an

application on behalf of a number of cities which share the same name and co habit that space. There's nothing -- nothing to prohibit somebody, as an applicant, to perhaps achieve a letter of non-objection, a letter of cooperation amongst a number of same city names and make it economically sensible because there's a wider -- potential wider audience of registrants to serve.

So that's great, because it's thinking about ways that this space can be used, and perhaps not being too restrictive in our approach. Thanks for that.

Number 3.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you very much. Just following on Nigel's comment, I come from Kenya in East Africa, and we have a town, I would look at it like a city, on the border of Kenya and Uganda. So this town is called Busia in Kenya where I was born, but we also have Busia in Uganda. Same name.

So I'm thinking it's a very interesting scenario because if I wanted .BUSIA because it's my village town where my grandmother comes from, I don't know how my Ugandan friends are going to treat that.

MARTIN SUTTON:

So again, great examples, and there could be different options available to the applicant. The applicant could approach the one city authority that they are intending to use the TLD for. They may want to approach many that have the same name in different locations to obtain that letter of non-objection to operate that TLD as a geographic-related space.

So I think here, we're not thinking about let's restrict it. There's opportunities where an applicant could actually seek approval and manage the risks ahead of posting their application. Thank you.

Number 5.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Can I speak in French? Thank you very much.

Sebastien Bachollet speaking.

We talked about principles, and I would like to go back to those principles. It would be useful, I think, to identify a list of cities that are protected. So of course you have the U.N. list, you have the option of the airports, you know, cities that have an airport. That list is managed by IANA, but it's not which list, really, but just to be able to find a list that is managed outside of ICANN.

Second thing, wouldn't it be time to try to think about the situation where you have several applicants for the same letters? Isn't it time to ask them to work together as opposed to being in competition?

And then the third thing is let's think about the example of the city between Uganda and Kenya. How can we make it possible for groups to work together with the same -- you know, using the same characters, the same letters, even though they may not have the same objective. That was a question that we had in the previous series, in the previous round with businesses that have the same name. Some applicants lucked out because the cities that had the same name as a fruit and a telecommunications company, that was only one applicant. But it might be a good idea for all three of them to work together.

So how can we share a string in order to move forward in this issue?

Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thank you.

And I think in terms of some of the examples that were referred to previously, there are opportunities for cooperation, and I

think there are options that are available for applicants to, in advance of an application, to consider cohabiting a TLD.

There might be some things to consider as to the intent and purpose if it does differ drastically as to how well would that be possible if -- particularly if it's a closed versus an open type registry.

But I think being able to have those options and being open for applicants to consider those could be something that is perhaps provided in best practice and guidance for applicants up front so that they can think about how to manage the risks where they do coincide with a geographic noncapital city. But thanks for the input there.

I know we're running out of time in terms of this perspective. We'll take one more question, and then I'll just cover off the end of the session.

Number 2.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. I'll be brief.

With regard to lists of cities, as Sebastien was saying, we spent quite a bit of time discussing lists of cities in the work track. One of the problems is there is no common definition of city,

although there is -- there are concepts around one which -- around which one would think about what is a city and what isn't. But when it comes to legal or political definitions, each state in the United States has a different definition of city, anywhere from -- with population minimums from 1500 to 150,000. At the same time we have things that are called towns that have populations as big as 750,000. It really more depends on the form of government more than anything else, at least in the U.S.

From an urban planner's point of view, a city is something that sits at the middle of a metropolitan area, but I won't even begin to get into that. The point is that -- And then each country has their own definition of what a city is, if in fact they use the word "city," or whatever use they make. Some lists were sent around earlier today, they don't, in fact, use the word "city." One of them says city, town or otherwise populated area. Another one talks about first-level seat of government, second-level seat of government.

There really are -- There's no common definition, there's no common list as far as I can tell. And trying to sort out what is a city could have us here forever.

MARTIN SUTTON:

So we're moving on to the next section. Thank you for that comment. Just a very quick thought, comment in response is that in terms of improving the process, are such lists welcome for people to refer to that want to use it as a geographic space? So at least there could be some help, some options for them to actually refer to and just check; or, indeed, those that may want to use it for a nongeographic purpose to actually refer to and consider the risks of putting in an application for something that is a generic term as well but they may wish as an option to seek approval, nonobjections, from a local authority to manage that risk ahead. So if they feel it's too big a risk, they may not want to proceed with the application. But, you know, there could be different ways of looking at this and considering guidance, best practices, not necessarily embedding everything in a strict policy going forward.

So as I said, we do need to move on to wrap this session up. But I'm very thankful for the input and considerations there.

And what we have welcomed is the new voices that we've heard particularly on the Monday afternoon session but, again, here today. Thank you very much for that input.

We would remind everybody, this is, you know, quite an emotional topic for many and to make sure that -- to encourage participation and encourage others to be able to freely input to

this process, to act in a congenial manner, be respectful of each other and open minded. So we're getting a lot of suggestions on the list. We'd encourage others that perhaps haven't entered into those debates or considerations to be very welcome and appreciate that you will be listened to if you put input through the mailing lists, you speak up on the work track calls. And when we have these open sessions at ICANN for cross-community, again, to be able to listen to others that don't often get involved with the regular sort of Work Track 5 deliberations.

If there is anything else that we can do to encourage voices to be raised and to join those debates, please feel free to let us know. We do welcome suggestions and opportunities to expand there.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Martin, this is Javier for the language. I would like to add, for those that their first language is not English -- I am a Spanish speaker. To Spanish speakers in the room, for example, that might feel some level of barrier to entry to the conversations, you can come to me personally and we can strike up conversations. You can come to Olga.

Come to us, make questions.

We are here as enablers of you in here. So, please, talk to us informally. And then when we get to the point that you feel

comfortable as you should in chiming in, in the different methods we have for conversation, you do so.

And no comment -- this is always said in the multistakeholder process. No comment, no question is a stupid one. I mean, don't -- they are all -- sometimes comments that come out of the blue are the ones that shock us into reality checks.

So I know it looks like a complex work track. A lot of conversation going on. But please chime in. Thanks. Sorry, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: That's great. Thank you, Javier. We have gone through discussions today on principles. And I have really welcomed the ability for us to be able to consider input to ideas and being able to work through a set of principles to make sure they are on the right path for our deliberations and any future output from the group.

The other stuff we've talked about, what I really wanted to just finish on was to make sure people are aware of the time line that we are working through for the Work Track 5, which is separate to work tracks 1 to 4. There we are seeing the delivery of an initial report in the coming days.

Work Track 5 started towards the end of last year and really got going at the beginning of this year for really discussing the ins

and outs of this topic. And we expect still to -- because it is a focused topic and this had many, many discussions in groups before trying to work through this subject, we are still anticipating to deliver an initial report late this summer. Hopefully over time this will start to coincide with the final output of Work Track 1 through 4. That is the hope and intention but don't hold me to that.

And so we'll anticipate that is our target for going forward. And certainly you'll be hearing more at the Barcelona meeting as we progress the work and activities through Work Track 5.

I shall wrap there. Does anybody else have anything to add as we're on the time?

OLGA CAVALLI: If the report is by the summer for me, it's in December, is that right?

[Laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The American way.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you for clarifying that.

ANNEBETH LANGE: It's Annebeth Lange again.

I would like also to add that I think we should thank the staff that is helping us. It's amazing what they do. It comes in so many comments on the working -- on the emails, in the discussions we have every week, and how they manage to get this into a document that we should try to extract that out, that's amazing. So we couldn't do without them. So thank you for that.

And, also, thank you for everyone that comments both in the email lists and elsewhere. Please come.

And Javier talked about Spanish. It's even those for those who have no official language, never translation. So if you speak Nordic, you can come to me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentlemen, Jeff and I would like to make sure that we recognize the work you have put into today. So thank you all, as Annebeth has said. The work track and the work is going on, but this is beyond the work track today.

I'd also like to as we're thanking you thank obviously the support team and the interpretation services. But could I get

you to thank these amazing people. They really are doing an incredible job.

[Applause]

So thank you. Next session, 5:00 p.m. local time. Adios. WHOIS2. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]