
MARRAKECH – GNSO - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG (2 of 4)

Monday, June 24, 2019 – 09:30 to 12:00 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MARTIN SUTTON:

Welcome back, everybody, or welcome to those that have joined us for the second session. We just finished the first session earlier. For those that were in the room, just to close off where we got to on Recommendation 8, that's still an open item. So those discussions will continue, but not in this particular session, but we'll catch that back up on the phone calls post-ICANN 65. So just to make sure it's clear that there's no decisions been made on those particular open items. Discussion is still open and will continue.

For this session, we're going to focus in on open items beyond the preliminary recommendations that were included in the Initial Report. So we'll get the slides up in a minute. Right, whilst they're still going through slide preparation, the open topics that we'll be focusing on now are operational and incremental improvements. These are where they won't be substantive in terms of policy changes but more about what tools might be needed the next round and if an advisory panel would be useful to pursue. Those are the types of topics we'll come on to now.

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.

We'll focus on that for about 35 minutes. Then we'll switch to non-AGB terms and pick up that discussion for our meeting today. If we do have time following non-AGB items, as I mentioned in the first session, we'll move back to the translations that have been a topic of conversation on our calls for the last two or three calls. And if we're really good and hammer through all of that, we will I think come back to this discussion on contention items and if there is any particular order that needs to be discussed.

So I think – are we there?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sort of.

MARTIN SUTTON: Excellent. Yeah, I'm sort of there as well. If we can move on a couple of slides, I think, to Open Topic #1, please. Next one, please. I've managed to cover that. Okay, so we're having a few little technical learnings this morning. There we go. Great. You should see that on the Zoom room.

Within the Initial Report, we had several proposals. As I say, these don't really change the policy element in terms of protections, restrictions. It's more about how can we improve processes in support of this particular area of the application process.

Each of these can be in isolation or could be a multiple that we choose to move forward with, depending on what we all think within the group. We'll have an opportunity now today to start exploring further and go into substantive discussion on any of the proposals that were put forward and based on the comments that we received back.

Just as an indicator here as well to make it clear, these aren't the full list of content that we had back. These are very much summarized at a high level. We do have all of that backup documentation, and members probably are familiar with where to find that if they need to dig into specific responses that were given. Could we move to the next slide? Thank you.

Okay, so we'll open up with Proposal 1 which was referring to the development of an online tool so it was easy to search for potential applicants. So they could try and ensure that if it was falling into a geographic term and there were certain restrictions or processes that they then needed to follow, that this would be an indicator that crops up for them early on in their application process or in their application preparation for them to consider, be wary of, and be essentially more predictive.

On the plus side, the supporting comments were a lot to do with it is more understandable from the applicant's point of view how to proceed. There were some other comments coming back in

which were not so keen on this proposal, and that tended to revolve around how complex would it need to be. Surely, if we make the rules clear and understandable, why would we need an online tool to review? And cost and resource type issues were also flagged.

I'm going to stop there. We have a sequence of these different proposals to open up and discuss. From a Work Track 5 perspective, what do you think? Is it worthwhile pursuing? Any questions that might need to be teased out in respect of that further based on any of the comments that we had through?

Alan we'll start with and then Katrin.

ALAN GREENBERG:

First of all, I'd like to apologize. I'm a Work Track 5 member, but I haven't focused on it very much in the recent months due to other commitments.

How is Proposal 1 different from something that would apply to the whole application process as opposed to just geographic?

MARTIN SUTTON:

Good question. I think from my recollection, it's not until you actually go to apply that any restriction will show up. Is that

correct? I can't remember. If there is something in the system that is restrictive.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me be clear with the question. The question was it sounds like a nice idea, but if it's a nice idea, it should apply to the whole application process regardless of the type of TLD. In other words, a place to go to for information not limited to our discussion. So either it should be an overall PDP discussion – if we're going to have the discussion at all, it should be at the wider level, not in this Work Track.

MARTIN SUTTON: Well, it stemmed from Work Track 5 deliberations. Obviously, from that perspective, point taken. If there is scope in terms of pursuing this, then I think we should bear that in mind in terms of progressing that to a wider discussion for anything else that can be captured as restrictions [of guidance online tools]. Thanks, Alan. Katrin?

KATRIN OHLMER: If I recall correctly, we also had the discussion whether or how to respect liability issues for all those [three] proposals. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON: Sorry. I think we had Jim and then Greg. So, Jim and then Greg, thanks. And then Jeff.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Sure. Good morning. Just maybe a couple of questions and an out-loud thought. What this essentially is, is an authoritative database that would contain the terms that would not be allowed to be applied for. Is that...?

MARTIN SUTTON: I think we probably need to go back to any deeper text. I don't know if we had any deeper text than that from Work Track 5 discussions. Steve?

JIM PRENDERGAST: The reason I'm asking is I'm just wondering, how do you develop that in the absence of agreement between countries on what should be included and what shouldn't? And even to the point where during the previous round registry operators are required to block certain geographic names because of Specification 5. Yet, we were never able to get a definitive list from ICANN of what those terms were even though it was in the contract. So I'm confused how you get something that is authoritative and definitive.

MARTIN SUTTON:

I think recollections back in Work Track 5 discussion, this would be something to pick up toward the end when we've figured out what is in terms of restrictions or where you need to flag further requirements to add on to your application. So whether it's a letter of approval/non-objection. It could be extended further, for instance, in terms of what are all the city names. It could be a reference tool for that so that you could actually check. So that's my recollection as to how it was. It's not predefined at this stage. It's still as a result of as the work progresses, what could be contained within that online tool that would be helpful?

So I've got Greg and then Jeff. Or, Steve, did you have a clarification? Okay, Greg?

GREG SHATAN:

My question was similar to Jim's. An online searchable tool of what? It's like deciding what we're going to eat by defining the utensils. That doesn't say anything about the actual meal. So this proposal is basically, I would say it's void for vagueness. There's no point in having a tool if you're not searching something you've agreed on. So the proposal shouldn't even read this really. It should be develop an online database. All online databases should be searchable through a tool if they're databases. What's the point of a database you can't search or reach if it's supposed

to be publicly available information? This kind of just goes off completely in – it really cannot be stated this way.

It should be develop an online database of blank, searchable through a tool. We need to fill in the blank, which presupposes whatever is in it is a finite and agreed list, not an infinite or unagreed list. In which case, no tool is necessary because there's nothing to search. So the tool is beside the point or after the point that really needs to be discussed. Thanks.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Greg. Jeff and then Olga.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. Just to answer the question that was raised I think by Alan which is, what did the system do the last time? From what I recall with the system, there may have been a couple terms that were blocked from application. But the majority of ones – and I know the three characters and country names and city names, those – there was nothing in the system that prevented you from applying for those. The reason I remember that is because there was the example of Google that applied for three terms that were on the three-character list, so they subsequently had to withdraw those when they realized it was on the list. So there was nothing systemic preventing three characters. Steve thinks there are a

couple of things that they may have blocked, but the majority of terms that the Applicant Guidebook said you couldn't apply for you were still able to submit an application only later to have to withdraw it and lose some money. I think in Google's case, I think they lost something like \$30,000 or \$35,000 per those three applications that they immediate, which was pointed out to them on a reveal day, that they weren't supposed to apply for those.

MARTIN SUTTON: Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Martin. The rationale behind the first sentence perhaps is not well-written and in concept it's that both parties, the applicant and those who care for the geographic name, have a way to express themselves so the applicant has some predictability [in finding] the name somewhere in a database. That's the idea behind it. Maybe we can rephrase it, but we have discussed this many times. It could be difficult to maintain that database. It could be difficult to build it.

But some of the conflicts that we had in the first round were related with names that were not in the lists that were detailed in the Applicant Guidebook but were considered geographic names for some countries and communities and were not considered as

geographic by the applicants. So there was no way for them to check if they were somehow relevant for communities or countries. So that’s the rationale behind. Maybe we can rephrase it. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Olga. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: I think people should just refer back to what is stated in the Supplemental Initial Report. That one-liner on the screen now is just a one-liner. If I may read what’s in the report?

Proposal 1, I’ll read it. “Develop an online tool for prospective applicants. The searchable tool indicates whether a string is eligible for delegation and whether there are issues that require further action (for example obtaining a letter of support or non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities). This could be a stand-alone tool or a function integrated into the application system that flags if a term is geographic and has special requirements/restrictions.”

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Justine. So taking that as read there, you start off with at least a defined list, [so if] there are defined restrictions at all to

refer to pre-application for guidance and as a checkpoint. I suppose as well as we go through and discuss the languages issue at some stage as well, that may actually be another thing that can get rolled into something like an online tool. So if there is a set of restrictive terms plus a selection of languages, they could all be contained in the same database to inquire through.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Would this be inclusive of other reserved names that we've talked about in other aspects of the full working group? Just maybe this isn't the place to discuss that, but it might be something to reference to.

MARTIN SUTTON: That was to Alan's point as well and what Jeff referred to. So there could be options to widen it out. This one sounds as if we should park it for now. I don't think we've got a great wealth of discussions on this but some good points there to flag up. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Martin. I just want to, I don't know, maybe provide a little context. There are a number of proposals that were included in the Supplemental Initial Report, 38 if I recall exactly. And those proposals could be more operation related like the ones that we're looking at right now. They could be expanding the scope of

protections for geographic names. Some of the proposals lessened the protections for geographic names.

But these proposals in most cases did not always receive an extensive level of deliberations, so not all the details were always worked out. The threshold for including them in the Supplemental Initial Report was I guess relatively low you could say. So invariably, there are probably some details missing from [many of these] proposals, so just I guess take it with a little bit of a grain of salt when you think about these. Thanks.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Okay. So the second one on the list here was regarding GAC members and that they could assist applicants in identifying which governments or public authorities would be applicable when letters are required. So just generally support from a variety of respondents. Some qualified support from those that do not believe that letters were needed at all. So if they are, then, yes, this seemed a practical way forward.

Kristina?

KRISTINA ROSETTE:

With regard to Proposal 2, and I'm going way far back in my memory at this point, but my recollection is that this suggestion was put forward back when the existing guidebook, the

geographic names section was originally drafted and that there was a request made to the GAC about revising the GAC membership website pages to indicate for each country who would be the appropriate person to contact in the event this exact scenario. That wasn't something the GAC desired to do. And it would seem to me in the interest of efficiency that perhaps before exploring this further within the Work Track 5 it might be worth seeing if that's something the GAC would even be amenable to do.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Kristina. Is there anyone from the GAC that could talk to that at this stage?

OLGA CAVALLI: Sure. Well, the GAC you know works based on [consensus]. It is something that could be – yeah, we should ask the GAC – but we should have consensus from them. I think there will be a time when the documents are ready they should be reviewed by all the community. So that's the opportunity or before.

MARTIN SUTTON: So do you think is there something useful then to approach the GAC early on? Even perhaps this week as an information we could flag to them and start that discussion?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, we can do that. We have a session about Work Track 5. I think it's Wednesday morning. So we can bring that up that day.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Olga. Edmon and then Greg.

EDMON CHUNG: In terms of options like Proposal 2, do you envision this to pre-application or post submission of application? The reason I ask this is some applicants might feel uncomfortable going to the GAC in general disclosing the string. It makes it more useful that the process could be done both pre-application and post-application.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Edmon. We did have a number of discussions where there would likely be some hesitancy in approaching governments or others about what your intention is to do for applying for particular terms. So this as it's worded is optional. I think pre-application is probably the intention, but there's nothing to suggest that shouldn't be post-application as well. Yeah?

EDMON CHUNG: Just quickly on this, but if this is a mechanism that would be put in place, we need to be clear that post-application is also okay. Because when you submit the application, you have to give the support and those kinds of things, right? But if there is a way, a mechanism to put the application in first knowing that you can then work with the GAC on getting that letter, that needs to be known in the larger context of the policy.

MARTIN SUTTON: Yeah. I suppose at this stage though pre-application is the intention I think from what we've put in as the Initial Report. But I think that is something that we could discuss further and see what practical help that does post-application. There is always the fact that you don't need to have these rules written down. You can still approach whoever you like. So we don't have to actually make it explicit that you can/should do these things. But there is the option here to at least reference it within the new process documents to say that this is available to you if you so choose.

Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. As with Proposal 1, it's hard to answer in the abstract until we know what the list of those where a letter is "required" is

going to be. So again, we're kind of operating around a black hole of data.

Secondly, I'd suggest and following on Edmon's that if we are actually going to make rules around it as opposed to just the informal you can always go speak to someone and indeed you need to if you are actually in that category, but if we are going to make rules around it, I would suggest that we add a nondisclosure agreement requirement to it to solve Edmon's and so that the GAC representative would sign an NDA so that it would not be distributed beyond the permitted channels as between the two of them. Thanks.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Greg. Jim?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Just following on that, any GAC reps or government employees, can you sign an NDA on something like that? Is that even legally possible? I'm not a lawyer, but....

MARTIN SUTTON: Any other comments on this particular point? I think, Greg, to your point, there are further discussions after this section. So Open Topic #2, non-AGB terms. So perhaps we bear that in mind

as we go through those discussions and refer back to this. But we've still got existing preliminary recommendations that have been gone through that potentially cover this point as well. They're more clear cut cases and probably, again, the process would have already triggered off engagement with governments, local authorities to seek the appropriate letters.

Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Martin. I could be wrong, but the way I read it is Proposals 1 and 2 aren't necessarily rules. I think we're suggesting resources that may be available for applicants. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah, that's exactly what I was saying, I should say as well. These are meant more or less as a guideline, as a help. We're not talking about rules but resources available for those who need and feel they need it. They are more on the secure side if they use these tools. So I agree with you.

MARTIN SUTTON: But on that basis, as we go through these I think we've got to remember that we've gathered in the comments, we've got some positive responses, some not so positive or negative responses in

some of these proposals. So it's then up to us as Work Track 5 to discuss and work out, what do we want to recommend going forward as a guideline? Beyond the preliminary recommendations, where could we offer some suggestions for process improvement, guidance that we would like to come out of Work Track 5? If we could just keep that in mind as well as we go through these.

Not seeing anymore, we'll move on to third one. This is in a situation where if a letter is needed, provide mediation services to assist if applicant disagrees with the response from the applicable government or public authority. Again, mixed comments coming through here. at a high level, support, some qualified support with concerns about costs and who would serve as a mediator, concerns that mediation is nonbinding and that it does not necessarily increase the willingness to negotiate, and some divergence as well believing that the government or public authority should have the final say. So a good mix of responses there.

Does anybody want to comment or dig deeper on that particular area? On the mediation services? Okay, well, we can park it. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: The only thing I would say is that parties can always mediate. You don't need to give someone permission to mediate. If they're willing to do so, they can do it. So I'm not sure what the purpose would be in setting up some what could potentially be quite complex and an expensive mechanism for something that the parties can readily do if they choose to do so. And the fact that they don't do so is probably because in many cases they don't want to mediate or one party feels that they should have the final say. So requiring people to go through a process which takes time and slows things down for no outcome just seems to me to be unnecessary.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Susan. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: I think this proposal needs to be seen in the context of how long the list of those where a letter will be required will be. Since this is predicated by "if a letter is needed," so this is only where a letter is clearly required, so this is not a mediation over whether or not a letter is required where there's an uncertainty but only where it's clear on its face that a letter is required and the only problem is that the applicant doesn't like the authority's response. So if we have an infinitely long list that doesn't exist and is impossible to

put in a database, part of the problem is going to be was the letter required in the first place or not.

So just to be clear, this proposal doesn't deal with that issue. It only deals with the issue where it's clear on its face that the letter is required. But it think if you want to resolve a dispute, arbitration is a lot more appropriate than mediation. But a lot of it, again, goes back to if there's a clear and finite list of where a letter is definitely required, then this may not be necessary or hardly. If it's unclear, then this proposal doesn't apply. Thanks.

MARTIN SUTTON: Edmon and then Katrin.

EDMON CHUNG: Building on actually what Greg says, this is predicated on that the letter is needed, but how do we define when the letter is needed? Aren't we talking about the situations where it's unclear whether it's needed or not? And again, is this pre-application or post-application? Because there's significant difference there.

MARTIN SUTTON: We have to be a little bit creative, I think, in working through these that we haven't got the established rules for each item. So I think, yes, let's focus on the fact that should a letter be required and you

don't like the response that you've been given, then is there something that we should set up or recommend from Work Track 5 to help out with that situation?

EDMON CHUNG: Just very short, so who decides though? Is it the ICANN community, ICANN process that processes the new gTLD, or is it GAC, is it the particular government? I know we don't have that answer yet, but we have to first think about who makes the decision of this big "if" a letter is needed.

MARTIN SUTTON: Yeah, Edmon, and things like that were picked up in some of the comments. So I think it's just summarized in the who would serve as a mediator. So there's still a lot of items here to pull out and figure out further. I think is the intention useful? Should we progress further to delve into something like this? Because as I said earlier, these aren't preliminary recommendations that were in the Initial Report. They were more broad suggestions that came from parts of Work Track 5 community. It wasn't necessarily the whole group putting forward these suggestions and proposals. So what we wanted to do is get feedback and get an indication and a steer as to should we go and explore this further. If so, those are the exact types of questions we need to dig down to. Thank you.

Katrin?

KATRIN OHLMER: If I recall correctly, we're talking about improvements to the process. So how often did we have the issue that there was a letter needed? And how often has an applicant had issues with the relevant government? Honestly, I can't remember if that's been more than zero times. So maybe it's a potential or very hypothetical issue we're talking about. And if that's the case, do we really need to take care of very hypothetical issues and find solutions for that? Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah, [good said], Katrin. The reason behind all these proposals, they have been worded by members, and it deserves that the rest of the group we go through it and see is it needed or not. Today, we can actually just say tick, we have discussed it, we don't need it. We have a lot of things to discuss that are important, and we don't have much time. So I agree that if we find here together why do we need this, it didn't create any problem, should we just sign it off? That's up to you, not up to us. Thanks.

MARTIN SUTTON: I think that's Annebeth's very polite way of moving me on a bit and saying, "Time's up. Carry on." But thanks for the time check.

We'll do five more minutes on Topic #1, and then we'll move on.
Was it Greg, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Didn't you say Greg first?

JEFF NEUMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

GREG SHATAN: That's okay. I should probably let you speak because I've been speaking too much. I would just say briefly that this is an actual problem, not a hypothetical problem. I can at least think of TATA as one where there were at least significant concerns and delays. There's a province of Morocco called Tata as well as an Indian company that wished to apply. Well, I shouldn't say Indian. It's a global company originating in India. That's one example that comes to mind off the top of my head, and I'm sure there are others if we go in and delve into the history. So clearly, not a hypothetical problem. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. Sorry, Greg. To add to Greg – and I’m the one usually supporting the notion of if it’s not a problem, let’s move on – I think that’s right if the rules stay the same. But if to the extent you’re going to add requirements for cities that regardless of the use, then you need to starting thinking about this. Because at the end of the day when you looked at the guidebook and someone was applying for a string, if they did not intend to use it with the geographic scope, then that wasn’t an issue. Then they didn’t have to find anyone. But if you’re going to change those – and I’m not saying it’s going to go one way or the other – then in addition to what Greg said, this becomes less of a hypothetical, more of a real problem.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Jeff. So I think we’ve kicked off a few other discussions. If we just go through the next couple of slides quickly, I’ll just make sure people are aware of what we’ve got on the list here. Proposal 4 is about heightening the awareness of governments and other regarding the program. Proposal 5 there is again about when a letter is required, put in a deadline for responses so that it can tidy up that and not leave it open-ended. If we move to the next slide, please.

Proposal 26 there is raising awareness and increasing knowledge on these areas but on the basis for applicants. So this is a different

slant to the earlier awareness increasing. And then 34 is an advisory panel. I was just looking around the room, but Jorge is in the GAC meeting. So he'll be pleased that we've parked that now for our further calls on Work Track 5.

So just to make sure for Work Track 5 members we'll circulate all of these post this meeting, and these will be on our list of discussions in the upcoming Work Track 5 calls. So if you've got particular thoughts or strong opinions about what has come through from public comments that you would like us to consider in those discussions, think about those now, put them to the list, and we can start to discuss those within our calls.

I think that takes us through to the very exciting topic. Oh, did I miss one there? Okay, well, that will be circulated, but you can have a glimpse there on the screen. And we'll move to the exciting topic of non-AGB items, and I'll turn to Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Martin. Well, we haven't discussed these non-AGB terms issues in depth, but we have exchanged some ideas during all these calls and meetings. So this is, again, a high-level report of what we have been recollecting from the comments and the calls.

Divergent views. We all know that there are different perspectives. Some are very polarizing and difficult to find a solution to everybody. But as we said, we still have the old rules as a general basis. So from the public comment, a number of responses in support of increasing the number of terms protected in the Applicant Guidebook. What happened in the first round, and there are some conflicts still remaining, some names that were considered geographic for the communities and for the countries that were not included in the reserved list. So these are some of the things that we would like to solve in the next round if possible, having more predictability for applicants and less conflicts for the whole community.

So there are also a number of responses opposed to that idea. Those who support protecting a larger number of terms, there is some support for requiring a letter of support and nonobjection from a relevant government authority for additional types of terms. And those who support protecting a larger number of terms, the following types of terms have been suggested for inclusion in the Applicant Guidebook: toponyms such as mountains, rivers that are commonly known; names with geographical, national, and/or cultural significance; geographical indications; non-ASCII geographic names.

I will stop here. This has been referred in several of our comments, exchange of ideas. As I said, some of the conflicts still remain. The

parties involved in the conflicts at the time – and I can speak for one of them that I was involved in – one of the parties didn't know that this name was going to be required and the applicant didn't find the name in any of the reserve lists. So that was kind of a gray area that created somehow this conflict, and this could be something that could be avoided or expected to be avoided and having less conflicts in the next round.

Are there comments about these ideas? Alan, go ahead. The floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. You actually alluded to what I was going to say in what you just said. If we expand this, that almost implies a presumption that it is a definitive list. But we have no real knowledge that there isn't someone else who wasn't paying attention this time and didn't put their name in and will have the same objection. So if you can't presume that it is a definitive list you can rely on, is there really any merit? That's the question I'm asking. I'm not sure of the answer. My inclination is to say having a much larger list which is almost definitive but not quite doesn't have a lot of merit.

OLGA CAVALLI:

I have no answer to your question which is very important. I would [I have], but I don't. These are the sort of questions that we still have remaining. Maybe we don't get an answer to that, and maybe – the idea of all this exercise that is taking such a long time for all of us is trying to have a better set of rules that could have more predictability for the applicant and also no surprises for the rest of the community. Not easy. We can see that it's extremely complicated. But this is our exercise.

Any other? Greg, go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. First, I would note that one of the reasons for the new gTLD program is innovation, and innovation involves surprises. So the idea of no surprises goes against the very substance of the new gTLD program and, indeed, the concept of the Internet. So I don't think we can legislate in that direction. Again, the 800-pound gorilla is, what is this list and is it finite? Can we make it finite?

Again, why is this all predicated on preventative rights as opposed to curative rights? Trying to solve a problem if it arises as opposed to creating presumptive rights? At the bottom of this is a difference of opinion on whether the taxonomy of the Internet should be primarily geographic – kind of like the ccNSO just

spreads over everything – or whether the taxonomy of the Internet is what innovation brings it to. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thanks, Greg. More comments? I would add, there are nice surprises and awful surprises. There are different kinds of surprises. And, again, I don't have that answer. No. More comments? Or we go to the next slide? I see no hands. No? Okay.

So this is part of the things that we have to think about. Topic #2, in support of protecting additional types of terms. Groups of people who identify with a place have a right to be “at the table,” which is not limited to 2012 AGB terms. These rights are particularly important for minority cultures and peoples and indigenous groups associated with a physical place. Brands or other groups should not use names that belong to a particular group of people without their permission.

Comments? Reactions? Susan, comment?

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, thank you. Just in relation to that last bullet, and I'm assuming just for the record that this slide and these bullets are an attempt to summarize some of the points that people have made rather than this isn't a conclusion that we as a Work Track have reached. Because certainly that's not one I would support.

Brands do use names and do adopt names. International trademark law allows that, and it really isn't ICANN's role to be trying to alter what is permissible under international trademark law. Again, this also doesn't take into account the fact that different names have different meanings.

The TATA example that Greg referred to earlier is a prime example. That company is named after the founder of the company. His name is Tata. It's his misfortune that his name also happens to be the name of a place in Morocco. We shouldn't be starting to talk about this in this context of taking the names of people without their permission. And again, to come back to it, trademark law permits this. And so if you want to change trademark law, this isn't the place to do it.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Susan. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: I'd like to ask whoever put this forward on this proposal to define the word "belong" and where that can be found in a third-party source. I'm not sure what the idea of belonging is here and it sounds like it just, again, goes back to something similar to what I heard earlier was that caring about something should be a sufficient reason to have a preemptive right. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: More comments? Some people think that the name belongs to them. That's something that we have to have in mind.

GREG SHATAN: But why and how?

OLGA CAVALLI: I'm not saying that it's right or wrong, I'm just saying the reality of things.

MARTIN SUTTON: We'll now discuss the opposition. We're going to go now to the opposing views in the same slide.

OLGA CAVALLI: If I can move a little further. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My comment is not dissimilar from the previous two ones, but it's a more general comment. I understand these are topics proposed by individuals, but I think we have to be very, very careful to use terms precisely. There are dictionary definitions for "belong," as an example. Whether you care about

something may or may not fit that dictionary definition, I don't know. But I think we have to be very careful.

For instance, if I read those words, it comes back to Susan's comment. We can't change trademark law. I think what they meant was brands should not be able to use other names as TLDs. Because we can't change trademark law here, and no one is claiming. So I think we have to be very careful when we start debating a sentence like this. We have to make sure that it is clear what it means. Otherwise, we will go on forever talking about things which are completely irrelevant because that's not what it meant. So I think a level of precision is really important. And if the person proposing it has not been precise, we need to press them to be precise before we have exhaustive discussions about things. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Alan. My English is limited, so I will defer the preciseness of the words to my native speaker friends and colleagues. Again, this is just general summarize of the comments received by individuals, by organizations. Some are governments.

So we'll go in opposition to protecting additional types of terms. ICANN's mandate is very narrow. It cannot "fill in the blanks" to protect indigenous rights not covered in law. The best

way to ensure predictability is to make sure there are explicit guidelines and consistent implementation and that applicants have a path to success by default. Groups of people associated with a geographic place should be able to apply for a corresponding TLD without facing unnecessary financial and logistical hurdles. Objections processes could be used to address cases where a geographic community opposes an application.

Comments to that set of comments in opposition to protect additional types of terms? Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG:

I think the idea of having some sort of an objections process is probably a good direction to think about. But the challenge there is, of course, the cost. The other challenge there is something that has been brought up both for the communities and brands as well. If there's an objection process, if you lose the objection process, then the original applicant still goes forward. That's a tough thing because the original community whether it's a geo brand or a community might not know about the new gTLD program in the first place.

What we might want to think about if we craft an objection process is if somebody comes in with an objection and there is merit to that objection, even though they might not win the objection, they can then submit an application to contend with

the current application. That might be a useful way to think about it. Then we don't need to have an objection process that is all or nothing. Because a lot of times both communities brands and geographic indicators, people might not know about what we're doing here until that application has come in and, "Wait a minute." Then they get into a problem. But if there is an objection process and if the objection process is neither definitive, they could at that point put in an application to compete. That would, I think, solve a lot of issues here.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Edmon. I would like to add to your comment which is awareness and costs some barriers which are related with language and other things that sometimes make it more difficult for some communities to get to know about all these processes.

More comments about this part of the slide? Justine, go ahead, please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Edmon, thank you very much for elaborating the point that I made in the last session. I think you were out of the room. This talks to what I was saying about ensuring that objection procedures are accessible to people who do not know what ICANN is doing. Just in addition, the thought just came to my

mind whether the possibility of PICs come into the picture as a means of resolving some of these issues. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Good comment. Other comments? Greg, go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN: Just briefly following on Edmon’s suggestion. It seems like what he’s suggesting to take it to its conclusion is instead of a reveal date black box type of procedure as we had the last time is to basically have an open round where all the applications are seen over time and other people can respond to them. It doesn’t seem we should just limit that to kind of a post-objection process.

So I think that’s an interesting proposal, but that’s not a Work Track 5 proposal. And that, of course, would be a radically different way about things. So it would be very interesting to see what would happen if we just everyone’s applications go in and they’re revealed as they come in and they have to remain open. For instance, anything that’s applied for has to be open to contention for, say, six months. Let’s think about it.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Greg. Other comments? I see none. Oh, sorry, Justine. I didn't see you. I'm sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's all right. Thank you, Olga. Just to what Greg was saying and also what I was suggesting is what I am saying is can Work Track 5 draft some language that recommends back to SubPro plenary working group to look at the objection procedures to make sure that they are accessible? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for the suggestion. Jeff, you want to comment on that?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. Certainly, Work Track 5 could make that recommendation. But to use the words I think that Alan said, you need to be very precise as to what does accessible mean. Just coming back with the recommendation of accessible, what we don't want is to open up lots of new discussions within the SubPro overall working group trying to interpret what Work Track 5 may have meant. We really want the overall working group to have clear, concise recommendations that it can incorporate into its overall work product. So that's my recommendation.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Jeff. More comments? Justine, yeah?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Jeff. Which is exactly why I said this group should craft language. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Justine. More comments? No hands. Okay, let's go to the next slide, please, which is several proposals were put forth in the Supplemental Initial Report in relation to this topic. These slides capture input on the proposals at a very high level. Again, we have said this several times. Have in mind, this is a very high-level summary and are intended to merely provide a sense of the input received and support conversations during this session. Public comments included a mix of support for and opposition to each of these proposals as we can see also in this room. Let's move to the next slide.

Proposal 22: Give small cities, towns, and geographic communities the first right to apply for a TLD associated with the place. Concerns: Lack of clarity on the definition of “small cities, towns, and geographic communities” and no indication that these groups have an interest in these TLDs.

Comments? Reactions? Yes?

JACQUES BLANC: Well, from this slide and the other one, I think we're going around an issue with definitions. It's definitions all over: "associated with," "small group," "big group," "geographical place." If we go this way, and the community might want to go this way, I think the first thing – and I will go with Alan on this – will be define, define, define.

OLGA CAVALLI: Well, if you recall in the calls and in the face-to-face meetings, we had long discussions. What is a city, small town, big town? It depends on the national law. In my country, a city is any place with more than 20,000 inhabitants, which is quite small. Some other countries may have different rules. So I agree, this was largely discussed, and we have to have in mind the definitions, I agree.

More comments? Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: The idea of a "first right" seems rather concerning, as well as the idea of the question that was already raised. There is so far no first right for anyone. Are we suggesting kind of a top-level Sunrise here? And if so, how many different types of Sunrises will we give out? I'm sure the line will start on the left. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Greg. No more hands. Okay, Proposal 33: Apply a clear and unambiguous rule that any geographic term that is not explicitly and expressly protected is unprotected. A lack of letter of support/non-objection alone will not be a cause to hinder or suspend an application for such unprotected term.

And some comments in support and opposition. In support: There are potential benefits of increasing clarity and certainty to applicants. Could reduce conflict by creating clear boundaries. May eliminate the chilling effect that objections may cause. In opposition: “Geographic term” cannot be listed or described exhaustively and ICANN has no right to do so. Governments may not be willing to support this proposal. Objection is a fundamental right that should not be limited.

Comments and reactions? No? Okay, well, next slide.

Proposal 35: Maintain a repository of geographic names reflecting terms that governments consider sensitive and/or important as geographic names. Countries and territories could contribute terms to this repository but it would not require binding action on the part of potential applicants. In support: Could help applicants understand government sensitivities. Could act as a resource to bring parties “to the table.” Could prevent conflicts later in the process. In opposition: It is unclear what purpose this list would serve and whether the list could be

used to restrict applications in some way. May have a chilling effect. Could decrease predictability and reliability of the application process, increase costs, and cause unintended legal issues elsewhere.

Comments? Reactions? Again, the issue of the list. Alan, we know about definitions. We all know that. That's a joke.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm not quite sure what we're doing here. Are we simply presenting these so everyone on the room or online has seen these? Because we don't seem to be coming to any conclusions. Are these things staying on the list with a nice argument for and a nice argument against? I'm not quite sure what we're doing other than perhaps education of telling people what people have said.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Well, education always helps. These are high-level summaries of all the inputs received in the comments that were open and summarized by the fantastic help of our staff. I will give the floor to Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. I think for now we're just going over, as Olga said, summarizing it. At some point, we will need to at least get a sense

of whether any of these proposals have support, even support to continue conversations. So for ones that have zero comments to it, at the end of the day we're not going to be able to go through every single issue and every single proposal in excruciating detail. So members of the working group will need to weigh in on whether this is something that should be explored further or not with all of these additional proposals.

OLGA CAVALLI: Go ahead.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Quick question on [the] aspect of repository. Who would fill the repository is a big question. Who would fill it? To what point would it be filled? And does this actually go hand-in-hand with Proposal 1 as well? Does the repository include the aspect of names that might require a letter or not? Could you include that together? Might that be better for implementation in the future?

OLGA CAVALLI: It might be. As far as I understand, this idea is less binding than the other one. [This is just a] reference. And the idea behind it from the comments received is that countries could send a list of names that could fill the repository. Problem with that is not all the countries are aware of this process and some are totally apart

from it. And sometimes it's difficult within the government. People tend to think the governments are monolithic and one point of contact is enough. And it's not like that. There are ministries, different agencies doing different things. So that is also challenging. Getting to know who is the right person, how to decide that at the national level. So these are ideas, but this idea about the list being binding or not is going around.

Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Two quick comments or questions maybe both for Jeff and the Work Track 5 chairs is, when in our work plan do we get to the point of actually making some decisions about these as opposed to hearing about them? Especially given that we're somewhat behind the rest of SubPro. There's been an awful lot of education and very little of decision so far, and we're going to need to get there sooner rather than later. It's one of the reasons perhaps why Alan did not pay so much attention – not to speak for him – to Work Track 5 is that some of the discussions have been interesting but a lot of it has just been listening to the comments for the last six months, I think, or so being read out loud. Which this is a working group, not a listening group. We need to get to the point where we're actually working on these tough issues.

And secondly with regard to this repository, is the standard just whatever any government itself considers sensitive by its own purposes? And why do we limit this list to governments? Should we not also have a place where end users can put in things that they consider sensitive or important that perhaps they would not want to see as terms used as top level domains? This seems to me that we're giving a preferential right to one stakeholder group. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Greg. The idea of this exercise is to review if all the comments received are captured. So this is why we have been reviewing the comments. Jeff, you? Yes, please, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Sorry. I mean, that is most of it, I think. We have gone through all the comments to make sure we understand what they say. So we had copious amounts of comments in from a broad array of the community. So we've done that. And that was a long time and effort to proceed with. So clarifying what they meant, did we understand them, did we categorize them effectively?

And now what we've done already is go through the preliminary recommendations. And as you saw earlier, we've mostly closed a lot of those off. So that's what we have done recently after having

gone through that long effort of analyzing the comments. So I think that shows we are making decisions and progress as a group.

What we now need to focus in on is this area or a couple of areas where, certainly, we're picking up proposals that were not 100% of the group backing those suggestions and proposals, but it was a way to seek input from the community to see whether we should delve deeper, should we adjust anything on the preliminary recommendations? Should we add anything new altogether?

So this is important for Work Track 5 members to be engaged at this stage. We have gone through all the comments. It is now time to think about what do you think is good to follow up? What can we ditch as a no-go? We don't feel that there's enough support or convinced amongst Work Track 5 members that we need to progress any of those suggestions. So we can go through an elimination exercise as we talk about these items. We can go through what do we want to discuss further where we think there's merit in progressing.

So I think we are making some good inroads now, but it does need Work Track 5 members to input to that and to start making those decisions and coming forward with what you like and don't like. It won't be for the co-leads to tell you what we think needs to be

the end result. That’s still a matter of the discussion of Work Track 5 members. I hope that helps clarify.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, quickly. Maybe it’s what Jeff was going to say, but Work Track 5 schedule is moving along and will be soon kind of merging with the overall PDP. So our final report is due sometime I think this year soon, second quarter. So, Jeff, maybe you can speak about schedule, Work Track 5, and the main SubPro PDP, how we’re doing.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. That’s actually part of the full working group discussion, so I’m going to save that for then on the overall timeline because to go over it twice doesn’t make too much sense. But one of the things I’d like to add just to this conversation is as we go through this, I mean, Greg, the questions you asked about the repository are fantastic. However, they’re only worth going into if we find that members of the working group are actually in support of having a repository. So if your answer is, “Yeah, I guess a repository is not a bad idea, but it just depends,” then that may be worth going into. But if you’re thinking as a working group member is, “There’s no way I’m ever going to support a repository,” then it’s not really worth going into the details of the great questions you asked.

So I think some of these discussions are trying to, number one, figure out if there's interest of the group to explore further. And then only if there's interest, then to get more specific in terms of definitions and other things. But the hope is, as Martin said, if there's not a good level of support within the group now for any one of these proposals, then we just kind of half to put it aside and move on.

GREG SHATAN: If I could just respond briefly.

OLGA CAVALLI: Sure.

GREG SHATAN: Jeff, I agree with you 100%. Maybe even more than 100%. So I'm just waiting for that time when we get to the point and we make those decisions. I guess one way to have done that would be to do it after each proposal is read out, but I guess we're taking a round the horn approach and reading through them all. And then we'll go through them, I guess, a second time and see where the interest lies. So I'm just looking forward to that point. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: I have Katrin and I don't know your name, but I will give you the floor after Katrin.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you. Maybe with the help of staff, we can do a similar way of progressing like the one Martin did before. So getting all through the proposals and then really calling Work Track members, "Do you support this? Shall we dig deeper into that issue to close that off?" and make progress and really come to a conclusion if we want to debate further on certain topics or not. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Katrin. Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My name is [inaudible] from China. I speak personally. Personally, I supported this Proposal 35: Maintain a repository of geographic names because I think different countries and different governments have their own views about the names. For example, for the [inaudible] name AMAZON. Many countries [inaudible] say their comments about AMAZON [application]. So in the future there may be other names, so this is very sensitive to many governments. So if we don't keep such lists, in the future maybe we'll also cause some controversial issues. If we put this

list, I think it will help ICANN to reduce the controversial issues. That's my point. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much for your comments. Any other reactions? Or we move to the next slide? Okay, let's move to the next slide. I think we are going to the end of the presentation.

Proposal 38: If the applicant is applying for a geographic name, including terms not listed in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, the applicant is required to contact/consult with the relevant government authority and provide evidence that it has done so. In support: Brings different parties to the table and could reduce conflicts later in the process. In opposition: Terms can have alternate meanings, therefore it is important to look at proposed use. Proposal may deter applicants and stifle innovation and speech. There are potential logistical challenges with having applicants contact GAC members. There is no legal basis for the proposal.

Comments? Reactions? Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Once again, we're back to the same core definitional issues without which all of these proposals are mere abstractions. What is a geographic name? And when is a string a geographic name

and when is it not? And when is it the fact that it can also be a geographic name somehow predominant as opposed to coincidental?

If you ask some people, Shatan is a geographic name. It's a province in China and my last name, the way it's spelled, is at least an alternative transliteration of the name of that province. I personally don't think it is a geographic name. At least I'm not feeling it personally.

So we get to this idea that everything is geographic and nothing is geographic and some things are maybe uniquely geographic. And we've also got certain rules about things that we do say are predominantly geographic like countries and capital cities. We've decided those are. We're giving them a geographic preference.

But again, it comes down ultimately to preferences and to the fact that we have strings that have alternate meanings. And we can discuss all of these from different proposals, but I think if we don't get to the root matter at the center of these proposals, we're all dancing around a fire and we're not dealing with the fire. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Greg. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Just kind of speaking on my own. So, Greg, let me turn the question around to you. Are there any circumstances that you would support in any definition that you could think of the notion for non-AGB terms for being required to consult with the relevant government authority? If the answer is what I think it might be, then why does it depend on definitional issues?

GREG SHATAN: Well, I think the idea is to limit the ones on which we have to – where there is a geographical preference or a requirement to consult. Otherwise, if we say it's those not included, then we're basically giving a preference to everything that could possibly be considered a geographic name. So I am opposed to open-ended non-lists of preferences that are given in advance of anybody even really knowing what they are. And whether it's Shatan or Neuman, I'm sure there's someplace called Neuman and all of those other things, I think if it's not definable and it's not clarified, then there should be certainly no requirement. And the question again goes down to what rights or [so far] are happening here. So I guess the short answer is no.

JEFF NEUMAN: Actually, I'm trying to do this in a different way here.

GREG SHATAN: Okay.

JEFF NEUMAN: Because I don't think it does matter. Because you're saying – if I can just kind of interpret this, and this is trying to get down to the practical – according to Greg that it needs to be on a list, and if it's not on an agreed list, then there should be no requirement to consult with a government authority.

GREG SHATAN: Correct.

JEFF NEUMAN: Then why would we need to answer the other questions you raised?

GREG SHATAN: Because we're trying to raise the question of what is, in fact, on this list.

JEFF NEUMAN: That's the question. Okay.

GREG SHATAN: That’s the question. I guess also I would have somewhat different answers if we were discussing curative rights as opposed to preventive rights. Or at least the ability to raise a curative objection. But since we seem to be fixated on preventative rights, I’m answering all these questions in the context that we are only really talking about preventative rights. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: And I wasn’t, not to pick on anyone, but that’s the kind of discussions we need to get through because both in this Work Track as well as in the full group we get a lot of theoretical, kind of academic, “Well, the answer to this depends on that, depends on that.” And then you ask the ultimate question, “Well, does it really depend on that?” And some are like, “No. I would oppose it anyway.” So let’s get down to the practical discussions. Stop asking questions as if we’re an academic society. We’re not. We’re trying to get down to the practicalities. And then try to move it forward. I think that’s how we’ll progress.

I’m not one of the co-leads of this group. That’s just my own personal view and the way I try to take it with the full working group is that, to get away from all [that]. Because a lot of people love to ask a lot of questions and they’re all really good questions. But the real thing is does it matter what the answer to the question is if you never supported it in the first place? Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Jeff. Susan, go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Hi. Okay, to answer Jeff's question on my own behalf as well then, I would say the same. To me, the answer to this is always no. And it's because if the answer is yes, we are setting all applicants up for potential failure because they have no possibility of knowing whether the name that they want to apply for is geographic somewhere in the world – if we're talking about things that are not included in the lists – of indeed whether it's geographic in multiple locations around the world. And so we set them up for failure because how could they possibly know and therefore contact the relevant governmental authorities and provide evidence that they've done so?

OLGA CAVALLI: I would like to ask a question from a personal point of view. Say, for example, that you are an applicant and that you know that it is a well-known geographic name and that it's not on any list. Would it help for the applicant to reach to any related authority government to avoid conflicts or just go for it and then see if there are objections? What would be the best from the applicant's side?

Just to have your reflections. So it would be the other side of your comment.

GREG SHATAN: I mean, the first question is what is the basis – I’m sorry, Susan. Go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, so I was going to answer the question in a way by asking you the question in that you say to avoid conflict, but what do you actually mean by that? What you mean is go and ask you for permission and you say no and then what? I don’t believe that this is to avoid conflict. I believe that this is to go and ask for permission is what you’re really saying. And so to my mind, I think we need to have terms, lists. We need to have lists and it’s like if it’s on the list, you know you have an issue and you have to do X. You either can’t have it, or you have to go get permission. If it’s not on the list, then you’re okay and you’re good to go.

OLGA CAVALLI: Just one comment. Maybe you don’t get a no as an answer. Maybe you get, okay, let’s go together. Or you go ahead. Or let’s go together somehow. So you’re presuming that you would have a no.

Okay, Greg, you wanted to add something.

GREG SHATAN:

Yeah, I think Susan covered what I was going to say, but I just would say that I have found perhaps it's our holy grail. GeoNames.org contains a database over 11 million geographic names. And for Jeff, there is Maria Reiche Neuman Airport which is in Peru; San Juan Neuman in Paraguay; Monte Newman in Chile; Neuman Neck in Virginia; Neuman Gap in Oregon; Neuman Catholic School – I don't know if we're going to go to that level of geographic names. They seem to consider it. I guess that's how you get to 11 million. Seno Newman in Chile; Neuman Falls in Canada. Neuman apparently only historical in Louisiana, so I guess they got sick and tired of that. The Neuman Golf Course in Ohio; the Neuman Number 2 Dam. There's also Neuman Dam which must be the Number 1. Neuman Lake and Neuman Drain, which seems to be nowhere near the lake or the dam, so I don't know how this works. Then there's Neuman Creek in New York but nowhere near where I live in New York; and then the Neuman-Scott Ranch. And then the place where we're going to go after this is all done, the Sarah Neuman Center for Healthcare and Rehabilitation.

[JEFF NEUMAN]:

Been there; done that.

OLGA CAVALLI: So we have the list. We have the list. We have no more problems, no more discussions. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Olga. So I think this illustrates – because the main question here about non-AGB terms is what else should be included that we haven’t already specified within lists and in the preliminary recommendations. So just as a reminder, we struggled through Work Track 5 on this topic. There was no clear way through from multiple discussions and any ideas put forward. The initial report didn’t convey any particular recommendation on what else should be included. It just included these proposals and left it fairly open in terms of accumulating any responses. So as a Work Track 5 group, we need to be thinking, does this change where we were? Does it mean that we’ve got any other influences here from the comments back that should create something in addition or not? So if we can try and clearly focus back to there, is there any willingness from Work Track 5 to create another recommendation of other terms that are not already included in the guidebook is probably where we need to be focused on. At the same time, some of these are helpful proposals to refer back to,

to see if there is any merit in investigating them further and digging deeper. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Martin. I think we are reaching the hour. Any final comments? Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was just going to comment that if we go the direction we've been talking about now, it's not only the definitive list of names but also permutations and similar names. I don't know if there's a place called Greenberg spelled this way, but I'm damned sure there's one spelled BURGH. And of course, the state of Vermont can complain because that's the translation of it. So it's a real interesting world we're talking about.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay, final comments? No? Well, I want to thank all of you and thank to my dear colleagues and staff for this second session. I don't know if Martin, Annebeth, or Javier, do you want to add something? Nada? Okay, have a good meeting, and we'll keep in touch. Keep on working. Thank you very much, all of you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]