ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 18 April 2018 at 20:00 UTC
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an

authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-18apr18-en.mp3

Attendance is located on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/SSy8B

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

Coordinator: Recordings are now started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub team Track 5, Geographic Names at Top Level call taking place on the 18th of April, 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the WebEx room. If you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now? Hearing no one, I would like to remind all…

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Carlos Gutiérrez, I'm on phone only, I'm sorry.

Terri Agnew: That's okay. Thank you, Carlos. I have you noted. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to our coleader, Annebeth Lange. Please begin.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. This is Annebeth Lange, and welcome everybody. I hope that everyone feels a little more comfortable with WebEx now, even if I understand there is a lot of problems still. I think we all miss Adobe, but we have to make the most out of it so let's hope the raising of the hand will be a little easier this time but we have to help each other out when - and try to find out who's in the queue.

So the agenda has been circulated, and I will urge everyone to try to speak to the issues on the agenda when we go ahead. So before we start discussing the slides, does anybody have any items that they would wish to add to the agenda for any other business? No? I don't hear anything. And then is there any changes in the SOIs that could be good to get in now as well. Nothing, no.

Okay, then we go - start with Item Number 2 and this is - Steve is it you that have the slides going? Could you start it? I think we just move on to Number 4 I think, go ahead, yes, Number 4. So what we are going to do now is to have them - in the last meeting the work track coleaders submitted the following proposals for consideration. So this time it's a second reading. And we have been discussing two characters ASCII combinations, three character ISO 3166 codes, long and short form country and territory names deriving from ISO 3166 for many meetings now. And based on discussions both San Juan, teleconferences, input of the spreadsheet and through the email on list, this is far as we get.

So in the last meeting we submitted the following proposals for consideration. The thing you see here is that we start with - for the two character country codes it's a little change. The two character letter combinations country codes, the starting point is still status quo from the Applicant Guidebook 2012 but we are narrowing it down to geo names; that is what we are discussing here in Work Track 5 by reserving all two letter - letter ASCII combinations for existing and future country codes, but two character letter digit and not geo names and are therefore outside the scope of Work Track 5.

However, if two character letter digit combinations were to be recommended, Work Track 2 considering reserve names, for example, would be subject to string similarity review. So then the three character country codes, ISO 2 Work Track 2 considering reserve names, for example, would be subject to string similarity review. So then the three character country codes, ISO 3166, the suggestion is to maintain the status quo, that is not available and we have addition there to defer broader questions about which entity or entities can apply for these strings and how they may be treated, for instance, as a gTLD, a ccTLD or something else, and the same for long and short form for country and territory names.

The recommendations for the three specific lists of geographic terms are summarized as the reflection of the discussions at ICANN 61 as well the historic discussions in different groups prior to Work Track 5 being established. And they state that these three specific terms of geographic related strings should continue to be treated in the same way for future rounds. However, recognizing the discussions that were also presented for releasing of these strings, particularly to local authorities, there was a strong fear towards these being under a different regime than the GNSO. That was the reason why we have included the reference to referring discussions and to ensure any future work beyond the GNSO PDP capture the points raised within Work Track 5.

And because that is the proposal that these names are available as gTLDs, but still perhaps discussed further at a later stage. Has anyone any objection to the three points that I've gone through now that they want to bring forward at this point? And remember, this is the second reading. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Kavouss, your hand is up. It's Cheryl for the record. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, my hand is up. Thank you very much. I'm sorry I cannot follow. Give an example of letter digit such as two letter-letter I know. Am I right that two

letter-letter is such as CH (unintelligible) or US or IR. What is letter digit? Give an example of letter digit please.

Hello? Did you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We hear you better now, Kavouss. It's Cheryl for the record. The sound was a little bit choppy but if I can paraphrase, I think you were asking, and please do also use the chat to write your questions and clarifying questions, that also helps us understand, I think you were asking for examples of the two letter combinations.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, letter digit - two letter-letter I understand would be such as CH, am I right?

Martin Sutton: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: But what about letter digit? Such as what?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be C1 or…

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …C7 or X3. It's Cheryl for the record. The first number being a letter character, the second being a numerical character.

Kavouss Arasteh: Would it be possible that for you put in this document this example in the round bracket that the people like me they don't know they have a clear idea of what is two letter-letter and what is letter digit, put in the round bracket example. And also with respect to the long and short form before it was an example, I don't see that example now so I would be very appreciate it if you kindly put example of any of these A, B, C, D and so on, otherwise I have no difficulty but I wish to understand that. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: This is Martin. I gather Annebeth has had problems and may have dropped off the line. So, Kavouss, that's fine. That's no problem to put in an example. But those that were given were useful too and just explain so thanks for that. Is there anybody else in the queue that has anything else to add or any distinct objections to raise at this stage following all of the conversations that have preceded them? If not, we can move on.

Okay, I can't see any hands raised so we'll move on to the next section, which is to continue the review of the other country and territory names, so if we can move the slide onto this one? So at our last call and what we've just covered now again, is the first three items in this list. All of this list here related to country and territory terms that were not available in the last Applicant Guidebook.

So what we want to continue today is to go through the remaining four items which we started to discuss at a previous meeting, and then there are another set of terms that we'll read through but we'll focus on these first four and I'll just briefly explain some of the comments that we received last time and see if there's anything else to add at this stage.

So if we could move to the next slide please. Thank you. So there were - if we start with the first one here, the short and the long form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved, some of the comments received last time that were circulated on the meeting summary notes was that there is no definitions of this in the standard. So there was a suggestion to remove this particular term from our country and territory names list, so that was one of notable entry for that.

With regards to the second item, which is separable component of a country name designated on the separable country names list, I think that one was more about understanding what terms this meant and how it was applied. But there was no distinct demand to remove this. There is - if I could just stop

there for a minute, there's quite a lot of background noise so if you could go on mute if you're not speaking please, that would be helpful. Thank you.

So if we - I'll just continue through here. So there was no particular demand to change anything relevant to the separate component of a country name, separable country names list. The third item was the permutation of transposition of any (unintelligible) in Items 1-5 in the list. And this is where it's removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation and additional or removal of graphical articles the "the" and the transposition is considered changing the sequence of the long or short form name, for example, Republic Czech or Islands Cayman but the transposition element does not apply to three letter codes.

So some of the comments that have been received and put into the spreadsheet in the past include elements of, you know, who is likely to apply for something like this and the examples given, for instance, were Islands Cayman and was it still relevant. But again, no strong indication to adjust this essentially at this stage. And then the last one is countries - a name by which a country is commonly known as, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization. So example here was Holland for the Netherlands.

So I think we've already captured some of the comments previously stated. What I would ask for at this stage for these four particular terms is if anybody else has anything else to add that we haven't heard before but they would like to ensure is included in consideration so that we can add that to the list here. And I've got three in the queue now so I've got Alexander, Kavouss and Christopher. So Alexander, please go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, hi. This is Alexander. The only names that I would like to mention would be three character or three letter permutations that is taken out of consideration so you could not apply for three letter permutation of 3166 element?

Martin Sutton: So if we read the permutation element it says, "Includes removal of spaces, insertion of punctuations and additional or removal of graphical articles like 'the'." So when we refer to…

Alexander Schubert: No, I'm sorry to interrupt you, that seems to be about country names; I'm talking about three letter codes. There are no spaces and punctuation or whatever in three letter codes.

Martin Sutton: Exactly. So it's only the transposition elements that is - doesn't apply to three letter codes and it's therefore also irrelevant in terms of permutations if you consider it for three letter codes because if you start putting spaces in…

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: I don't think so. In the 2012 Applicant Guidebook we are not allowed to apply for a permutation of a three letter code and that's still in this new version. It's written there in clear language, if it is a permutation of an element that is contained in 1.2.5, then later it says transpositions are not applying for three letter codes but permutations like it's written now…

Martin Sutton: Yes…

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: …are included.

Martin Sutton: So permutation - if you look at permutation, so what are you concerned about in terms of a three letter code where any spaces are removed? I don't think…

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: No, there are no spaces in three letter codes.

Martin Sutton: Exactly.

Alexander Schubert: It's ABC and right now you could not apply for BCA if you have ABC, you could not apply for BCA. That's a permutation.

Martin Sutton: No, that's - no, if you read the third item on the list here, the way that the Guidebook has explained transposition is exactly what you've just said there and considered it to be…

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: I'm sorry to interrupt you, a transposition is something different than a permutation. They're two different things. I'm talking about a permutation.

Martin Sutton: Alexander, can I just ask you to…

Alexander Schubert: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: …the Item 3.

Alexander Schubert: I'm there. I'm very familiar with it.

Martin Sutton: I know. So the transposition is considered a change in the sequence.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Whereas a permutation here is classified as something where spaces are removed…

Alexander Schubert: No.

Martin Sutton: …insertion of punctuation and addition or removal of grammatical articles.

Alexander Schubert: There is a definition for permutations and transpositions. A transposition might be a permutation; permutation is that you simply move an ABC, BCA would be a permutation, whereas the transposition is you can change letters however you want.

Martin Sutton: So I'm losing this then. So just explain that one more time, Alexander.

Alexander Schubert: Okay, if you have a country code ABC, let's say there would be one, ABC, then a permutation would be, for example, BCA, so you move the A to the end, BCA. That's a permutation. Whereas a transposition is you can change the letters as you want; you don't have to kind of move the first one to the end.

Martin Sutton: I must admit that that's how I would typically consider permutations…

Alexander Schubert: Yes.

Martin Sutton: …to be. But I - what I'm trying to explain is that the way that it is written in the Guidebook permutations are flagged as being defined differently…

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: Oh okay, so…

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: Yes, I understand you.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: The language is different here so perhaps we just…

Alexander Schubert: Okay.

Martin Sutton: …need to make sure do those definitions still stack up? I must confess that I was surprised to read it that way originally but…

Alexander Schubert: So in other words, I mean, the way we are writing it, it seems to refer to country names. So in country names of course it makes sense to remove punctuations and spaces and so on so forth, so the second sentence, permutations include and so on so forth, that refers also three letter codes, is that right?

Martin Sutton: Well if we could ignore permutation and transposition at the moment and if we look at it in terms of the one that says removal of grammatical articles or insertion of punctuation, that kind of wouldn't apply to a three character code anyway and the transposition as its referred on here is changing the sequence and it specifies here then that as a transposition would not apply to three letter codes.

Alexander Schubert: But could we not simply say neither transposition nor permutation applies to three letter - to three letter codes just to make it more clear?

Martin Sutton: Unless anybody has any objections to that I think that would be a helpful clarification on the descriptions here. So perhaps we do need to…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: …make it all clear. Yes, so well I've got - okay, Jeff, if you're responding to that directly please go ahead and then I'll go to Christopher and then Kavouss.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. On that one, we are saying that if you were to apply for something - it's basically that we would still include removal of spaces and insertion of punctuations and other things as not being allowed as well. So if you're - if you were applying to want - let's say your brand name is M&M&M and you had - and let's say there was a three character on that ISO list that was MMM, that wouldn't be allowed.

So we can't just say that it doesn't apply at all, what we're saying basically is that if your three character string matches - that you're applying for matches the three characters on that ISO list then you cannot apply for that and that would include the removal of all - we used to call it legal characters, they're not legal like against the law but some people had called those illegal characters or characters that are not allowed in ASCII. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff. I'll - thank you, Alexander. I'll move on to Christopher and then Kavouss. Go ahead please, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello?

Martin Sutton: Hello.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello.

Martin Sutton: Please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, I'm going ahead. I'm on the phone bridge.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Christopher, we can hear you. Please go ahead. Cheryl here.

Terri Agnew: Christopher, this is Terri from staff. Your line is open. Please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay, I'm on the bridge because there's no sound on the WebEx screen. Martin, can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Yes, we can hear you.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay. This may sound a bit of a technicality but first of all in the drafting of this slide I would propose to replace the word "It" with a definite article. It is not at all clear actually what "it" refers to. That's a question of question of drafting, I think I know what it's supposed to refer to because I'm familiar with the debate and the text but anybody who looks at this from the outside would be mystified, that needs to be corrected.

Regarding the first subparagraph to the best of my knowledge, exceptionally reserved names do not necessarily have short or long form names associated with them. I would just make two comments regarding dotEU which is mentioned as an example. The three letter code EUR, is the three letter code for the currency and that is definitely not available in any circumstance. And actually I've mentioned on several occasions and is not - does not appear in any of the GNSO text that the three letter currency codes worldwide should be reserved. You cannot possibly have people applying for…

Martin Sutton: So Christopher, Christopher, Christopher, please. We have asked to go through the list, you're already deviating off as we have had this issue before where we've already got another agenda item to attend to that so please, hold back on that until we get to that point. Thank you for your comment on the "it" element, I'm sure most of the attendees have been familiar with what we've been posting…

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, I'm looking at it from the point of view…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: …Guidebook. This isn't for external viewing at this stage so it's not like the report, it's to help us work through in a reasonable format so that we can see things on one slide and so it's more of a practice purpose. But I understand…

Christopher Wilkinson: For the record I request the PDP address the question of the three letter currency codes.

Martin Sutton: Kavouss, I've got you next. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, first of all one suggestion, in all these four in the page there is something which is neither a bullet but it is circle with a point inside that circle, in order to make it possible to refer to any of these in future we should renumerate it differently either put Roman 1, Roman 2, Roman 3 or put Arabic, 1, 2, 3, 4 or put A, B, C, D little or capital, but this circle with one point in the - inside that it is not referable, otherwise you have to explain the third is not indent, is not bullet, the third circle with the point inside - so is it possible you change that with something which is more easy referable? This is point 1.

Point 2, believe me, the second and the third one, the language is very awkward; the language is unclear. Maybe it's clear for some people, they wrote that, but is no clear for all people that read that. We should not write for ourselves, we should write for everybody. So the second one is not really a good example. It is a separable component of a country name designated on the separable country names list such as what?

Martin Sutton: Okay. Kavouss, thank you. So these are extracted from the Guidebook, that's why we're referring to these. I understand your point though so that's very valid and similar to some of the early points there, in terms of when we start to use this for external reporting that will obviously be made much clearer and we'll have the opportunity to amend these so that we put A, B, C, or 1, 2, 3, to help us go through…

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: One more comment. I fully support Alexander, permutation so not properly mentioned here. And the transposition is also is not properly so we need to improve the language, we need to put it in more clear understandable language so neither the second nor the third is not clear. The first and the fourth is quite clear but the second and third they have difficulty, deficiency and awkward. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Kavouss. Yes, and I think that's a familiar comment that we've had throughout our previous discussions when analyzing these elements so that will be carried through. Final check then, is there anybody on these particular four items that has anything substantive to comment on in regards to treatment - future treatment? Otherwise we'll capture all of this and then summarize those bits to review where we are with those and probably we'll have that considered for the next call.

And I can move forward then. Christopher, is that an old hand or is it a new hand?

Christopher Wilkinson: It's an old hand but I've not found my way back to the WebEx screen to lower my hand.

Martin Sutton: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: If we can move onto the next slide then please?

Steve Chan: Hey, Martin, this is Steve from…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Oh sorry.

Steve Chan: Sorry, Martin, this is - I would just note that Marita Moll has noted she has a question on Item 2 above I guess before we move…

Martin Sutton: Oh sorry, I can't see the chat with the participant pod displayed. Hang on. Where is it? Well if - if Marita could read it out or - it keeps moving. Well could somebody read out the question please, that would be helpful and then we can try and cover that before we move on.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: This is Javier Rúa for the record. So Marita says, "What would happen in the case of names like Vancouver and Vancouver Island? Not countries, I know but different places. Can't think of a country right now." That's what she said.

Martin Sutton: So well cities we'll be moving onto so there's cities we'll be looking at and states so that comes up next, so this is referring to country and territory names. We'll move onto other elements in the next slide. Is that okay? Anything else? No. Okay, let's move onto the next slide please.

                      So these are the other geographical terms to run through. So the ones that we've just been talking about, those in the treatment of the current Applicant Guidebook were unavailable so these treatments the we'll talk through in a minute will be typically referring to elements of support or non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities for the specific categories specified. So if we move onto the next slide.

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. Martin, it's Javier. That's another question by Marita regarding the prior topic. So she asks, "Georgia and Georgia, one is a country and one is a state," so that's a question so I think they're both reserved in ISO but go ahead and comment on that Martin, please.

Marita Moll: Hello, this is Marita. Can you hear me?

Javier Rúa-Jovet:. There she is.

Marita Moll: Oh sorry, I'm very sorry. I can't find the hand for - it's crazy. I'm just using Vancouver and Vancouver Island as an example because you used Aland and Aland Island as your example in the Number 2. Right, they were the same thing but supposing they were both countries. I don't understand how that Number 2 section would work if they were both countries. Make any sense?

Martin Sutton: Not easily, but let's go back through. So the Vancouver/Vancouver Island element I mean, we're talking about cities rather than countries there so…

Marita Moll: I know but let's…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: If we've got a - if they're in the 3166 list or the list that was referred to that expands them out, so the one that refer to there, the - hang on, the Aland, separable component, so those are all existing in a list that's specified so those would be unavailable.

Annebeth Lange: Martin? This is Annebeth, could I help out a little?

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Please, Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, the list that we are referring to here's no countries in it but…

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: …it is some territories like Aland, which is on the list. We have another example because Aland is also known as Aland, not only Aland Island. But we have a territory in Norway called Bouvet Island, dotBV, Bouvet Island. But

it's not called only Bouvet, so Bouvet would be three for registration, but not Bouvet Island. But that will differ if it's on the list. But in the list it's no countries per se in the ISO list. So it's not that complicated since we have the list to go off - as a starting point. So I think we should not try to complicate it more than necessary since we have that list already.

Marita Moll: Okay, thank you.

Annebeth Lange: You're welcome.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Okay. So let's now just refer to the other geographic names and we'll start with a capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166 list so for instance, London, Berlin. So the way that these are treated is that these would require support and non-objection from relevant governments and our regular sort of feedback on this is that it was - that it was understandable, it was predictable. There were some elements that related to sort of the implementation, the process to try and obtain relevant support or non-objection.

There's still quite a lot of background noise so if you are able to go on mute please do so. So those were very generalized some of the feedback items that we've had both for that in the past. One thing I will mention at this stage as we go through, I know we've got examples of different languages on here, I would recommend that this point that we take note that we have to address languages in some form or other but we did have some good conversations on our last call relating to languages but because this could refer to a number of the items that we end up feeling that we need to treat in some way or other, we'll revert back to the language element, and IDN element probably, in that respect after we've isolated all the different types of categories that we want to consider treatment for.

So just to make sure that we don't need to raise the element of different languages again on this particular call but the concept of the category types. Do we have any other substantive comments beyond what we've spoken about previously on these categories? So with regards to the capital cities, does anybody have anything else that they'd like to add? And I've got Kavouss in the queue. Kavouss, go ahead. Is that an old hand, Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Yes, go ahead, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, I'm sorry, yes. I hope I'm not the only one have difficulty with this awkward I would say I don't know, language of 300 years ago. It says "but available" okay but challenge mechanisms to government to initiate an objection. What does it mean, challenge mechanism to government to raise objections, that - it is difficult for government to raise objection? There is no mechanism to raise objection? What does it mean? And then continue, "Applicants should be avail of GAC principles," which principle? We should mention number. And then "Applicant must represent that (unintelligible) of the proposal is not in violation of the national law in which the applicant is incorporated." Is quite unreadable, is un-understandable. I don't know…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: So, Kavouss…

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Kavouss?

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Kavouss?

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: Kavouss, can I just quickly respond to that? I mean, we have already gone through a lengthy process of trying to frame these to an extent that that they're easy and visible to see as a quick reminder rather than the full text of everything in the Applicant Guidebook so for the ease of us to be able to work through these. This just gives you an illustration of where the policy that was derived in 2007 ended up versus what was in the Applicant Guidebook.

We have had a lot of comments already when we've raised discussions about these particular terms and I've mentioned already that for cities it was considered that it was - the way it was treated was practical, it was predictable, so there were a lot of advantages that were raised with regards to the way it was treated in the Applicant Guidebook, which I'll refer you therefore to the second item which is as it was treated, was requiring support and non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities.

The other notable items that have been raised is that sometimes it is very difficult to identify and process those letters of non-objection or support. So there's some practical issues that we probably need to focus on, but it's really just to make sure in principle do we still continue to regard this as a satisfactory way to treat this particular category of capital city names? Or is there any strong objections or different alternatives that members of the work track would like to consider.

Kavouss Arasteh: Martin, please listen to me kindly, be patient. You are very, very respectful person but please kindly do not interrupt me. Allow me to express myself even if I'm wrong. Allow me please, everybody - this is the liberty is of expressions, freedom of expressions. Allow me to express. First of all the language whether it is an example or representation it seems not to satisfying me at least.

Second, the implementation is contradicting in the 2007 because it does not require support, non-objections. In what way? Implicit or explicit? Objection could be implicit. You give a deadline, 30 days, 60 days, no answer, agree. This is the problem - the real problem in GAC we had and 42 countries they were not happy with this sort of - that the answer should be explicit or should be implicit. Suppose to be explicit or should be implicit.

And then we say that from the relevant governments, suppose that there is a name and there are 10 governments, six of them they support, four of them they oppose. What do we do? Go to the voting? Voting the majority and so on so forth. We have these things, there are many things that they are even 52 country involves. If you go (unintelligible) eight country are there, which one you are talking about. What this support of objection means? This is the real problem. If we don't solve here they will have difficulty. I think it is better to have a little bit of thinking reflection and try to understand the matter. Thank you very much for your patience.

Martin Sutton: So, Kavouss, do you have any suggestions to put forward?

Kavouss Arasteh: I have suggestions for implementation 2012 (unintelligible) requiring support or objection in an explicit manner.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Okay, so I've got Paul McGrady in the queue. Please go ahead Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady here for the record. So at the risk of being told we've already talked about this, and I think we probably have, I just want to confirm where we ended up. I don't necessarily want to reopen the debate, I'm happy just to be told where we are. But when we look at what the policy was here, the implementation is very different, it's not the policy. And since this is a PDP I guess we have to decide are we - is the question here that we're adopting the implementation of 2012 as the new policy or the implementation of 2012 as modified in some way to make it better as the new policy?

Or are we reverting back to the old policy and asking essentially saying okay, here's the policy, does this bit of implementation survive? And again, apologies if we've already talked about this; I suspect we have, it's just been a while since I've sort of thought through the implications of having a policy that does not line up with the implementation. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Paul. Good to clarify anyway because the way that we've looked at the others already we've had a chance to go through what options or considerations we could have of future treatment so that's why I've kind of quickly went through the earlier four items because there was quite a lot of conversation and input not only in the last meeting but what we've gathered previously.

This is an opportunity for the remainders that we have not had an opportunity to discuss in greater detail about future treatment. This is open for comments and input to say whether or not, you know, the treatment that was given in the Applicant Guidebook should be changed in any way and why it should be changed and what other options that we could be considering amongst the Work Track 5 members. So if you have got anything that you'd like to submit here and any others that may be queuing up, please, that's what we would be looking for.

Christopher Wilkinson: Martin, my hand is up.

Martin Sutton: Go ahead, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, just as an apology, WebEx has disappeared completely from my computer so I can't actually put my hand up. This is awful system. On Kavouss's comment and the related discussion, first of all, the Applicant Guidebook was dealing with the likelihood of hundreds of geographical terms. As we move forward I think we're potentially dealing with thousands of potential applications for geographical terms. I think we're dealing with an

order of magnitude shift within the next few years and that consequently I think we should delete references to objections and challenges.

There was no opportunity worldwide to inform the relevant local authorities and communities ex post. And I think all geographical terms should be subject to prior authorization of the application, otherwise there will be (rafts) of misunderstandings and difficulties. But the constant references in this community to the Applicant Guidebook as some sort of bible is inappropriate, Martin. We're dealing with a situation with orders of magnitude of change both in terms of quality and quantity. And I don't think it's helpful either to refer to the objection process or to refer to the Applicant Guidebook expectations. We're in a different world. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Is there anybody else? I've got Paul, is that an old hand?

Paul McGrady: No new hand.

Martin Sutton: Go ahead.

Paul McGrady: So, yes, Paul McGrady again for the record. Sorry to take up so much air space, but I understand what Christopher is saying but we've got to start somewhere, right? And so we - what I've heard over the last couple of sides are concerns about when the support or non-objection of various governments would collide, you know, what do you do in the case of you know, if you get support for dotGeorgia from the state of Georgia but the country of Georgia doesn't want you to have it?

What do you do if you get support from - for dotParis, bad example, but, you know, and the capital of France is for you but the Paris, Texas is against you and doesn't want you to have it. So I do think that we do have to sort of think through nonsupport - non objection support in those sorts of contexts so that we can anticipate those kinds of problems because as Christopher notes, you

know, we may end up with gobs more applicants and therefore gobs more collisions than we anticipate.

But I do think we kind of have to decide what the straw man is here for us to talk about this? Is the straw man the policy of 2007 or is the straw man the implementation of 2012? And are we adding things and subtracting things from '07 or are we adding and subtracting from '12? From my point of view I can work with either, I just think we need to decide as a group so that we can fashion solutions around one of these two things. We need to be able to hang stuff and take stuff away from something. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Paul. And, yes, I think what we have got is this mismatch of what is in policy versus the implementation methods for the Applicant Guidebook, so we do need to resolve it one way or the other which is either take one of the items here and move it forward as the recommendation or something else that we consider even better between Work Track 5 deliberations. So I've got Kavouss, is that an old hand or is that a new hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: No, it is a new hand. I think we are now…

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: …on a very, very important core questions. If we don't address that we will have difficulties. This is the earlier that many difficulty arised from here whether we need a prior authorization, whether we need a support or objections, from whom we have to ask objections, dotGeorgia was a good example, whether there's a county of Georgia or whether the state of Georgia. So these are the things that we have to really reflect and you have to find a solution and you have to have alternative options and so on so forth. We could not limit our search, we could not say that support without saying that whether explicit or implicit and we would not give it when we're saying that concern governments, what are those governments, if they are

(unintelligible) government with all of the faction agree or is it 12 governments, majority should agree.

These are the important questions and I request kindly to reflect on that and try to engage in some sort of very constructive discussion to see what are the alternatives to get sight of these very important difficulties and questions. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: And, Jeff, I've got you next, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. And I just want to quickly respond, to anyone who's making a comment on the call about just making I guess assumptions that there are tons of geographic names or that we shouldn't be using some list or we shouldn't be using another list, please wait - come back and try to make a suggestion of what we should be doing, and also please provide support or documentation for that. So to make an assertion, let's say that there are thousands and thousands of geographic terms, or there'll be thousands of applications for geographic terms, that kind of statement makes an assumption that something in your mind is a geographic term.

And so we've been using the ISO lists, at least at this point, up until now, and we've got to get onto the other categories, if you're not using the ISO list in your mind as a geographic term, then when you make a comment please tell us what source you are considering when assuming it is a geographic term. That will help us so that we can all be on the same page when you say that something is or is not a geographic term.

I think Paul's example of Georgia versus Georgia is a great example. In fact it actually came true with one of - because at the second level, I know we're talking about top level now, but at the second level someone wants to use a country name, they have to get approval from the actual country. And in this case a state, the state of Georgia, wanted to use a second level name and

was blocked by the country of Georgia that didn't want the state of Georgia to actually use it.

So to join all the comments together, yes, we need to consider what happens when conflicting governments have different - different governments have different opinions. And I also agree with Kavouss who said that we have to devise procedures for that and come up with new and novel ways to handle this because we are dealing with a public resource that has many different types of uses and to just hold a view of you can't use it unless I say so, from either side or you have to allow it unless somebody provides a good reason, those are the two extremes on two opposite ends, and we need to try to work together to figure out novel ways to try to resolve those situations. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff. And it does speak to an original point that we were trying to drive towards as the coleaders which is wherever we can to identify what it is we are trying to protect and why, or safeguard and why. Now we haven't got through the rest of the items, unfortunately, but we are keen and we know that many of you are all keen to move on beyond what was in the Applicant Guidebook. So I'm sure that we will be able to consider some homework in respect of the remaining geographic names so that we can ask you to populate information back to us if not already done so into the list of comments that we've got for each of these terms already.

So we can then review where we are with the conversations today, anything else that's submitted prior to our next call for the remaining geographic names. This will give us the remaining time or the majority of the remaining time to move onto the next item, so thank you for your input.

And I'll hand over to Javier. Thanks, Javier.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Hello to all. So agenda Item 4, so just move to the next page please. In this topic, you know, seems the most open, you know, category so far. But I think the questions that are posted here, as I think as Martin said, are helpful, you

know, regarding everything. So what we really want to find out in this whole process, you know, is what are the underlying interests that are under, you know, the listing of the geographic names.

You know, the prior sections this list of names and categories in the you know, in the AGB and in the ISO but there's other potentially - potential geographic names that are in no lists that we haven't spoken about. So I guess the floor is open and maybe to people that haven't spoken yet that we could briefly have a, you know, a more open conversation regarding these questions that are posted here. So what are the underlying interests in adding to the list of geographic names? What are the specific additional groupings of geographic terms that should be under consideration for differential treatment? Why do they require protection? What types of protections is envisioned?

So does anybody out there in the phone bridge that hasn't spoken perhaps might have a stab at this on the idea just to have, you know, varying points in the community? Anybody? Anybody on the queue?

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Yes, sorry Javier, I'm on the phone line and it takes a long time to…

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Who is this?

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Carlos Gutiérrez for the record. Thank you very much for the opportunity, Javier. And I just want to make a comparison the way you did it. I mean, we have been talking about political geography so far and I feel compelled to talk about users, Internet users and the possibility that they have to identify themselves as groups living in a geography independently of the political aspect that we have discussed. And I think that in this process of opening the DNS space and this segmentation that has taken place in the first round, there is a fair argument to be made that some communities that are very close to certain language history, etcetera, also gets an opportunity

and don't get bogged down by the political geography discussion. Thank you very much.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Carlos, could you give examples of what you mean?

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Okay.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Yes, I don't want to go into Catalonia because it's politically very hard. But I have to examine from the first one is Brittany, that also got three letter code, (BTH), or Latin America who got LAT or Serbia who decided to prefer a three letter code and also some other derivations like the objectives (unintelligible). Those are, for me, their differentiations that some people can choose, some countries can choose, some communities can choose. Thank you very much.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Interesting, Carlos. Anybody want to reply to Carlos on this topic? Anybody have…

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes.

Liz Williams: …possible to - is it okay to be next in the queue?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Who is this?

Liz Williams: It's Liz Williams speaking.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Please go ahead. Go ahead.

Liz Williams: Thank you. Thank you, Javier. I would like to just raise a couple of points about additional categories. The first is a level of principle about whether we need to be tying off of the knots about additional categories when perhaps the other way of going around it is to make sure that we have explicit guideline for applicants and that we can apply those guidelines and policy and implementation to any potential application for any kind of geographic term.

Because frankly what we're looking at here is a crystal ball and I'd love that crystal ball to be full of exactly as Carlos says, new ideas and new ways of thinking about things that will not be captured in a "no" from the very beginning, it'll be captured in a "yes, apply, make your case" and if everything is correct in your application then do go ahead.

The other - and Greg Shatan and I were discussing that on the list the other day and Greg's point about the - and Greg can speak for himself, I think he's on the call now, but I think I'd like to reiterate the point that he made where ongoing and never ending lists of things and categories of things tends not to be, A, practical, or B, (unintelligible) for a broader ICANN implementation perspective.

And then the element round underlying interests I've been speaking quite clearly on being - this being the opportunity to enable for example I'll use an Australian case, aboriginal communities that speak languages that may wish to sell their art in Australia and then they wish to sell their internationally, they actually don't know perhaps that these opportunities exist and one of the elements of responsibility we've got is to make sure that the (Kananara) or (Kimberly) or in my hometown our local aboriginal groups have the opportunity to apply for geographic terms that are relevant to them and that don't require them to hit hurdles of impossibility before they even get their ideas of the ground.

Those hurdles are expensive to deal with, quite often they're subjective, and quite often they lead to enormous frustration and the sapping of an applicant's financial resources to actually do what they would like to do and I'd like to focus exactly as Carlos says, on end users and new potential users of the Domain Name System that we haven't even thought about yet.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan, I'd like to get in the queue.

Annebeth Lange: Go ahead, Greg. It seems like Javier has fallen out.

Greg Shatan: Okay. This is Greg Shatan for the record. I've - and thanks, Liz, for bringing that up, it's a good segue into what I was going to say. You know, taking another step back and having been at this for a while, not as long as some but longer than others, one of the things that I kind of learned early and repeatedly in setting domain name policy is that reserve names and blocking lists and taking things out of circulation and putting things in a box is generally strongly disfavored.

The idea is that domain names are supposed to available, except for very, very good reasons when they are not; name collisions being one of those, NIC type second level names as another example. Example may be another example. But the - somewhat to the chagrin of the intellectual property community, the idea of never ending block lists hasn't been adopted within ICANN policy, there were other ways perhaps to skin that cat. But, you know, within ICANN policy that is pretty much a nonstarter.

There have been I would say some very limited efforts, say, with regard to the Red Cross names. But again, you know, I view that as swimming upstream against a very strong disinclination to make a decision without an applicant or potential registrant in hand that - to whom is the right or the primacy going to go? To my mind generally speaking, it should start, as Liz says, with giving an applicant a path to success and not giving a non-applicant blocking rights. So I think, you know, overall when we talk about adding to lists, if those lists

are going to be used for reservation purposes then there should be a general disinclination to add to those lists or add to the types of lists.

We can talk about, you know, what to do when there may be more than one type of party that has similar claims to a name, but again, by and large where there are multiple legitimate rights to my mind, you know, as a general rule the tie, if you will, should be awarded to that person with the application in hand. And that's the way it works between multiple trademark owners. United can't stop United if when United files for it, they - the other company's trademark rights, you know, are not relevant as long - if they both have rights. Similarly here, without getting into issues of hierarchies of rights, I think overall we need to favor the delegation of top level domains. Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Greg. Thank you for your comments. Can anybody remind me of the queue? I see Kavouss is on but anybody before Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I'm sorry, I cannot share the opinion of Greg. He is looking for total deregulation, total unlimited freedom. They can use whatever they want, they don't respect any regulation, they don't respect any dignity, they don't respect any associations with any countries or any nations at all. I cannot share that view. We cannot step back and so on so forth. We were in a good suggestion saying that what do you ask the support or objection or prior authorization, but now he's looking for something totally - putting everything out so saying that you can use whatever you want. You don't need any rules, no rules at all.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you. Thank you, Kavouss.

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Kavouss. I heard Greg and he has liberal view but I don't think he was saying that he doesn't respect countries, but he does have a liberal view and our job here is to hear everybody out. I think…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: …may I just respond to that…

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Quickly, we have…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Okay I did not say any of those things; that's a mischaracterization of what I said. I was talking about policy preferences and I think what I was stating was a reasonable liberal view. It's certainly - if I had said any of those things that Kavouss said I said, that'd be a very interesting world. It's not a world I live in. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Greg. Thank you, Kavouss. I think we have Yrjö on the queue. Yrjö, please go ahead.

Yrjö Länsipuro: Yes, this is Yrjö Länsipuro. Thank you. I think that we are now entering an area where - which is not so black and white this is also an area when we talk about nonpolitical geographic names and terms where countries different (unintelligible) from each other. In some countries and in some cultures there are nonpolitical geographic terms that are enormously important for the people, for the users. And there are countries there where people couldn't care less. So that I have no recipe for how this could be done but anyway an ideal approach would be - would try to take into account these differences between (unintelligible). Thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Yrjö. Yes, and that - and we're trying to do that and thank you for your comment. In this topic, you know, concepts have been mentioned before - concepts that rivers, mountains, plains, what other concepts - would anybody give a stab of other concepts that could be spoken under this item

here? Anybody want to comment on Yrjö's comments? Or anybody else's comments?

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me, I raised two questions, no answer was given. I asked the question, what (unintelligible) additional categories of geographic names? Such as what? And groupings, such as what? How you group? We need to give some examples.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes, Kavouss, thank you, Kavouss. In this slide we're - we're trying to categories or geographical names or geographical indications that are not included in the AGB or in ISO 3166 but that have, you know, that have different interests and that's why we asked where the underlying interest that should be discussed. So this is an open category in many ways and we're trying to get input from the whole community from you, Kavouss, from Greg, from everybody, Carlos, everybody out there and with very fair points on different sides of the spectrum but, you know, in view of moving this conversation along to do creative and innovative things.

I think in this category we're discussing right now is a great chance to innovate without so much, you know, association to existing lists and that type of discussion. Anybody else have a comment here please? Anybody in the queue?

Liz Williams: Javier, if you have a queue I'd like to be in it please? I put my hand up.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Go ahead, please. Who is this?

Liz Williams: It's Liz Williams speaking.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Please, Liz, go ahead.

Liz Williams: Yes, I just wanted to answer that specific question, Javier, and I wanted to give a couple of examples of Australian rivers so very big rivers that flow

through many states and are of great importance to us from an agricultural perspective. We can have Murray, Darling, Clarence, Brisbane, all of those are geographic terms because they relate to one of our many river systems we have and they would fit into this category. And the other side of that of course is it's family names.

So all of those names relate to former governors or ordinary people that have the same name of Murray or Darling or Clarence. And I think that we're going to find that applications for these kind of geographic terms, which are generic, but also related to place names, is going to cause us a lot of anxiety. And I would like us perhaps to think about this a bit more broadly to first of all address your underlying interest question and then work out some kind of way of having generic geographic words, no generic words, which are geographic terms in some context that could also be terms that are used in many, many different countries.

And Australia has not been in many cases very imaginative how it names its places. We use Perth and Brisbane and Sydney and may other of our geographic terms which are exactly the same as terms in England or Scotland or Wales just because of the way in which our history has fallen.

So if we were to think more clearly about what we could expect in terms of applications for generic words that also have a geographic implication, I think we might be able to come up with a basket of opportunity that is treated objectively in terms of analysis from an applicant's point of view but also might have some additional wrinkles that we would see in implementation which is why I said that in the chat that perhaps the 2007 policy is insufficient because we've moved forward, and certainly the 2012 implementation is insufficient because it doesn't address these name collisions, intention collisions but will come up in a new round of applications.

I'm happy to do more work around this but I think we do need to spend a bit more time and not rough over it because it's clear that is a concern to many

different kinds of, A, geographic terms, and, B, different kinds of applicants. Thank you. Thank you, Javier.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you, Liz, for your thoughtful comments. I think Paul McGrady is in the queue. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady here. So I think we've got a missing question. So I see Questions 1 and 2, but I think we should also be asking why might additional categories of geographic names beyond those in the Applicant Guidebook not be needed? What are the underlying interests in not adding to the list of geographic names? So I think that's an important part of this discussion, and I don't want our questions to presuppose an outcome. Thanks.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: (Unintelligible) thank you. So we'll take that (unintelligible) who do we have? I think we have Kavouss and Susan in that order. Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you see my hand, please?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Kavouss, I saw. Go ahead, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes…

((Crosstalk))

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: …comes to my turn please give me the floor. I wait until you allow me to speak, okay, I'm waiting for your green light.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: You're breaking up (unintelligible) Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Can I talk?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Sorry, I couldn't hear you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Sorry. The geographic and generic are mutually exclusive. I don't understand what you mean by generic geographic names? Could you kindly distinguished lady, give an example of generic geographic? They are not coherent with each other. They are mutually exclusive. Geographic associated to a place. Generic is not associated to a place. So I don't understand what you mean geographic generic geographic? I don't know what…

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Liz Williams: Javier…

Kavouss Arasteh: Give an example please.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Javier, could I give an example to Kavouss if you wouldn't mind?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Liz. It's Cheryl here.

Liz Williams: Thank you, Cheryl. I also answered your question about hands in the WebEx. Kavouss, I gave a couple of examples of - Australian examples and I'm sure there are many in other countries around the world that the word related to our river systems in Australia are named after people. And many people have the same names, so generic terms. I don't mean anything explicit, but they also take on a geographic meaning when they're related to the river or the mountain or the village or the cultural icon.

So I'm not playing a semantic game here, I'm trying to work through examples that you can identify generic words, and Jeff has given some in the chat as well, that can also be applied to a geographic name. And I think that one bucket, one treatment, one way of dealing with it is not going to be dealt with in terms of establishing a list but we have to recognize that many geographic terms have become geographic terms because they've been named after certain people and those names apply to many, many different people. I hope - I'm happy to take that offline for you to step through how that relates to this particular question.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, please communicate with me in the email, I don't understand this concept could not be translated in practical terms, just concept. You have not given any example, I'm very sorry, unless I misunderstood you and I apologize for that.

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth speaking. It seems like Javier has fallen out. So Susan Anthony, you have your hand up.

Susan Anthony: Thank you very much. I do agree with Kavouss. I understand what he is saying that geographic name or geographic term has not been defined, that's really what we're here about to address. And I was also listening very carefully to I believe it was Liz Williams who just spoke about the geographic meaning when related to a river or a mountain. And I was caught by the speaker's words of, "when related to."

So I think the issue for me has always been an applicant could propose a new gTLD and that new gTLD could correspond in appearance to a word or phrase that has geographic significance, geographic meaning. But the applicant does not intend to use, as stated in the applicant's papers, does not intend to use the gTLD in any way to refer to the corresponding geographic name or term or reference.

In other words, if you had a gTLD that incorporated the name of a river in Australia, but in fact when you examine the applicant's application, you discover that the applicant has no intention to use the gTLD in any way that is related to the river, I would say then that takes it off the table for further consideration. That was what I wanted to say. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth, again for the record. Thank you, Susan, I think that is a good way to see it. It's about the same thing that we discussed with cities used for city or not. So this is discussion worth following up but now we have to stop the discussion now and go to the last point on the agenda. So we have a slide about the meeting schedule and how often we should have the meetings. And it has been suggested to get through this to have a current - the current schedule is alternate Wednesdays for 90 minutes at 5 UTC, 1400 UTC and 20 UTC.

But it has been suggested to come through all the things that we are discussing to meet weekly on Wednesday but just for 60 minutes with the same time slot rotation. So we would like to have your comments on that either here or in the chat or in the email exchange afterwards. Is there any immediate reflection from that? I don't hear anything.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Yes, my hand is up.

Annebeth Lange: Good, Kavouss, come on.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, yes, thank you very much. If you ask for immediate reaction I am in favor of the current situation, every other Wednesday for 90 minutes but not every week because sometimes we are in the middle of discussions and we are at minute of 58 and (unintelligible) better at least to have the opportunity to continue the discussion until we have some to continue that at the next meeting. So I'm in favor of the current situation, same time frame except if you can change the 2200, it's not same time frame but every other Wednesday for 90 minutes but not ever week for 60 minutes. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: …because we have other obligations. We have other…

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Kavouss. I think we should take as suggested here to take the discussion to the main list so then we can see what people prefer. So Javier, have you disappeared in your - what happened with your sound? No, I don't hear you. And, Martin, are you still there?

Martin Sutton: I'm still here.

Annebeth Lange: You're still here. Okay, so we're nearing the end of this meeting today. I think that perhaps it's time to just say we quit here and that we would like to have as much comment on the email list as possible for the open categories and continue the discussion there. So anyone has something to add now?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have something to add if you allow me? Instead of…

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: …to the email reflections is it possible to have a Doodle with respect to what you proposed?

Annebeth Lange: I'm sure we can do that.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Emily and Steve, yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes is a good way I think, yes.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. All right, thank you for that suggestion. Anymore comments here? No? All right, I think we then end it for tonight and thanks everyone. Bye for now and thank you for the good discussions and we talk again in two weeks and then we'll see what we - how we continue with the meetings afterwards. Bye-bye.

Martin Sutton: thanks, Annebeth. Bye, all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye, all.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, (Chris), if you could please stop all recordings? To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END