
HYDERABAD – GAC WG to examine the Protection of Geographic Names in future expansion of gTLDs Meeting
Thursday, November 03, 2016 – 08:30 to 09:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

OLGA CAVALLI: Good morning, everyone. Buenos dias, bonjour, guten morgen.
What else? Help me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone)

OLGA CAVALLI: What is that? It's Swedish. Oh, that's important because the
CEO is from Sweden. So it's -- jet lag is killing me. Swiss, yeah.
How do I say Swiss in English?

Sweden. Thank you so much.

Good morning, everyone. We will start in 30 seconds.

This is the meeting of the GAC Working Group on Protection of
Geographic Names in new gTLDs. Thank you for being with us.
This is the first activity of the GAC this week, and we have an
agenda with several issues.

Hello to the translators. Hola.

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.

I have made a promise to speak slowly to Severina, so if you -- if I don't comply with my promise, just please wave me, desperately. I will do my best to speak slowly.

Okay. We have an agenda. I did share with you a document yesterday because it was okay if you have the chance to see it before, if you are really interested in this issue. If not, we will review it today.

As you may recall, this working group was formed in 2014, and we have produced several draft documents. Many of them have been circulated. One of them was open for public comments, which was something not very useful in the GAC. I think it was the first time that we did that. But we haven't produced a document from the whole working group that should be put in consideration to the GAC.

So we would like to focus on one issue, which is a set of best practices that we have been working on for a while. And the working group has been considering those best practices, and we received some proposals and some comments to them. And this would be the main -- the main content that I would like to share with you this morning and that I sent you yesterday.

The best practices first original draft was prepared by -- by the chair of the group, with -- which is me, with help with -- from other colleagues. And we received recently a different text,

which is interesting, because it brings some elements that we have been thinking about from the beginning of the activity of this working group, which was in 2014, proposed by our colleague Jorge Cancio from Switzerland.

So this is the main -- the main issue for our meeting today. We have one hour, so I would like to start.

In the -- Should I tell you when to change, Julia? Where are you? There?

Go to the next one, please. I cannot -- I cannot do that from here; right? No. Can I?

Okay. No worries.

Just one slide for background. I won't go through all the details, but for those of you who are new in the GAC or those of you who are new to the working group, just you have that information when we started, why we started.

In the GAC Durban communique, there was a specific mandate for creating this working group and we have been working since then. We have several documents, all of them draft documents, but that took the contribution from many members of this working group and other members of the community. And we have a work plan, and we have several documents.

We have worked on a document about public interest, and this -- the focus of this meeting would be the draft best practices.

Bonjour, Tom. Good morning.

Next one, please. Can I? No?

Thank you. So the agenda is this one. And please let me know if you agree with it. We -- We review the best practice document, and the idea would be to refine this best practice document based on your comments and based on the comments of the -- of the list of the working group, and hopefully we could be able to send it to the GAC before the meeting in Denmark. So maybe the GAC have the chance to review it.

And for the next future, we would like to keep on working on the public interest document, but I don't think we will have time for this in this hour.

Is that okay?

Kavouss.

IRAN:

Good morning to all.

You asked whether the -- we have anything to add to the agenda. We thank you very much. The agenda is good, but I would like to add one point, which I think it is necessary. And

that is collaboration with other ICANN community SO/AC dealing with the same issue.

This is very important, that we are part of a family, and we need to work together to a better understanding. And in addition, we need to make every effort to avoid any overlapping within the family. And putting our efforts together rather than having two different path that, at some time, they should have one destination.

I have seen report of other group dealing with the same issue, and I have seen that there is a sort of statement that in spite of every effort, still there is a low or very low or no participations of community other than ccNSO and GNSO. In fact, they also implicitly refer to us.

So I would like to add that as a point. Not at this meeting, but at least it is something to be in my -- in our mind in order to do that collaboration where necessary and as appropriate.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kavouss. Your point is well taken.

Let's have that in mind if we have time for today. And if not, we can discuss it in the list; right? Is that okay?

IRAN:

Please put it in the agenda. If we discuss it today, so far, so good. If we not discuss it, at least it should be in mind of the chair of the group that this is an important element, collaborations and cooperation with other entities or SO/ACs in the ICANN dealing with the same issue. If we don't have time to do it today, no problem, but at least it should appear in our agenda for discussions. We will see to what effect we could take that. At least we could address that, what is the issue and then try to make some steps.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. Let's put it at the end of the agenda. And if -- if not, we can discuss it, and I can make comments about my involvement in other groups.

The thing is you -- your comment is very important because if we -- if the working group cannot agree in a document or the GAC cannot produce something concrete, then it's difficult to submit comments or outcomes of our work to other SOs and ACs. So it becomes, perhaps, the contribution of some countries. We have done that in the past. We have contributed with text, but it was

going to be shown from mainly countries from Latin America and others.

So your comment is relevant in the sense of that we should try to produce something, at least for -- from the working group to the GAC for the meeting in -- in Denmark in order to interact more -- more concretely with other SOs and ACs.

Any other comments? Any other comments to the agenda?

I see none.

Good morning.

So let's go to the next one.

So the initial proposed draft best practices had the idea to concile interest of the applicants and the governments or authorities and communities in relation with the use of certain terms, names, geographic names. Important to say had a this work is focused on names that are not in any list, which is different perspective from other efforts that have been done within the ICANN community.

So this is a brief summary of what the initial proposed best practices had in the text. Some best practices for the applicant and some best practices for ICANN. For the applicant, it tried to make previous research and investigation about the meaning of

the applied-for string. If the string has more than one meaning, perhaps it's -- it's a place that is relevant for community, it's a place of a country, it's a place of subregion.

In the case that the applicant have any doubt, it could be a good best practice to encourage him or her or the company or the organization to establish previous contact with the relevant authorities, with the community, with the country, with the region and with the subregion so they may find a way to agree before a conflict is in place, before sending the application.

For ICANN, enhance the outreach efforts. We know how difficult it was in Latin American to explain what the concept of a new gTLD was. I personally did that many times. There was a meeting organized by ICANN in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2010 or '11. So there were many activities, but it was not enough. It was not enough for Latin America -- It's too fast, ladies? Okay.

It was not enough for Africa. So that's something that perhaps those of us in the -- in the community and ICANN should work with to enhance these efforts.

And what we found also is that the mechanisms for -- for placing the concerns about the use of certain geographic names or community names were complicated for government, especially for those governments who do not participates actively in

ICANN. So there should be a way that it's -- that becomes easier for all the countries of the world to have that opportunity. And the steps should be clear for both. So the idea of this best practice is to diminish the conflict among the two parties and have, as I usually say, more success stories and less conflicts.

Apart from this text that has been circulating for a while, and you can find it in the -- in the documents that were circulated to the GAC, and they're also placed in public area of the GAC website for a long time, the -- our colleague from -- Jorge Cancio from Switzerland, did he a very interesting contribution, bringing again some concepts that we have been discussing for a while in the working group.

I will go slowly. I have placed a lot of text. I know this is not good practice to have a PowerPoint with a lot of text. I know that, but I thought it was okay to -- for you to read it. This is why I sent it yesterday, because I think it's a very interesting proposal.

Why these draft principles are being proposed? He says that could serve as inspiration in drafting the rules for possible new categories of terms with geographic significance. And in the other hand, could serve us well an inspiration for establishing a framework, government terms, not feeding in any new specific

category to be established but still having such geographic significance.

Applicants and interested parties would like such geographic significance terms, would benefit from more predictable framework of rules and, therefore, the need for less -- avoid the last-minute interventions and conflicts.

What happened in the first Applicant Guidebook, there were some lists, there were some considerations of defining geographic names, but what happened is that it was not enough. There were some names of places -- rivers, mountains, subregions -- that were not included and then there were conflicts. The countries involved in those regions and communities were not consulted before, and then there were some conflicts with this -- with this applicant and the country. So that's the idea of this best practices. So we'll go to the text proposed.

The principles would apply on a default basis. Whenever there is no specific rule for a concrete type or category of new gTLDs, it doesn't fit in any list, if it doesn't fit in any of the defined group of names that are indicated in the Applicant Guidebook, this would be the rule that would guide what to do with these names.

It would not substitute -- substitute, sorry, other existing general procedures.

All applicants would be obliged to undertake a due diligence search. I proposed that many times a while ago, and I think it's very interesting. I think if you just go to Google and you put some names, you will find a lot of meetings related to that, apart from some meanings that are relevant for the applicant. So that is a search that should be taken in consideration by the applicant. This due diligence search directed to checking whether the string subject of the application matches or is confusingly similar to a name or acronym with a geographic significance.

And this due diligence obligation would be considered to have been fulfilled in the repository of terms mentioned in the text that I will comment now.

So this is an idea that has been going around, and I think it's a good one. Not easy. I know that everyone thinks that it is very complicated, but I think it's worth thinking about it.

A repository of terms with geographic significance. Search applicants should at least check the terms contained in a repository of databases to be maintained by ICANN.

Let me tell that you this idea was around in 2014, and I check, and there are several repository of different groups of different names. So maybe all of them could be put together, and maybe the countries and regions could contribute with input their names, their significant geographic names to this repository.

So this repository would compile relevant list of terms and discrete terms with geographic significance. Governments, public authorities, and interested public/private companies would be eligible to request the addition of such lists and/or terms to a repository, and the initial sources feeding this repository would be established in a community-wide discussion process.

The immediate comment we always get after this idea is, oh, this is very difficult. Oh, how this database would be maintained. Well, that's something that could be very useful for the community and for the applicant and for the country. So perhaps it's worth thinking about it.

Public consultation requirement. The strings would also be subject to an effective public consultation period in order to give governments, public authorities, and public/private communities an effective opportunity to raise any concerns about any such strings. Such requirements may also entail targeted consultations to previously identified stakeholders

with a potential interest in the geographic significance terms at issue.

Important. I think it would be important to encourage applicants and interested parties, countries, regions, subregions to get in touch before a consultation to avoid conflicts and to perhaps find a way out through a negotiation, if possible.

Obligations for applicant and non-objection.

In case of a match or a confusingly similar name with a name contained in the repository or the filing of any concerns within the named public consultation period, the applicant would be obliged to contact -- to contact the relevant government, public authority, public/private community, inform them about their application and answer relevant questions.

In such cases, the applicant would be required to obtain a non-objection statement from the relevant government, public authority, public/private community subject to the possibility of a dispute resolution as mentioned below. In the case of specific geographic names, if there are multiple legitimate governments, public authorities or public/private communities, the applicant would need a non-objection from all of them.

I would -- I won't go through all the text.

This is an idea that was also presented before. Always encouraging the applicant and the relevant authorities communities to get in touch before and have a non-objections. Perhaps just a contact would not be enough, but having a clear message from the community or the country that they're okay with this application.

I would like to mention, I didn't do this at the beginning. That is a summary of the contribution made by Jorge from Switzerland. It's much more detailed, but I just summarized it for the sake of time and easy to -- and it may be easy to present in a PowerPoint.

Dispute resolution and documentation. In cases that a non-objection is not obtained or cannot be obtained after having effectively contacted and requested the relevant government, public authority or public or private community, or in cases that such relevant government, public authority cannot be identified after bona fide effort to do so, the applicant may bring this case before the Independent Review Panel, IRP, or specific neutral and independent panel.

This may be the case that the applicant is willing to find someone to present this case and they cannot do that. So this is contemplated in the -- in the proposal.

And the former steps and requirements shall be documented in the application form and be subject to control by ICANN as a compulsory requirement before presenting and processing any application.

Comments?

We presented this doc -- Jorge sent this contribution to the working group list, so we had some feedback. Usually the feedback we already had when we presented this idea of the repository is that it's complicated. We received comments from our colleagues from Denmark that they felt that it was an overlapping process, the two of them. The repository and the public consultation, that the repository is difficult to create. It is true, it is a challenge and also to maintain is a challenge, but it could be a very useful tool for ICANN and for the community. And I agree with this idea that the repository is a key element for this best practices as it provides the applicant with bona fide protection and guarantee to proceed. If the applicant is okay checking with the -- with the database, with the repository and he can proceed then, the expectation of having conflicts once the application is presented is much lower.

If there is the consultation allows to integrate those with a good claim that may have missed the opportunity of feeding the repository, if there is disagreement, ICANN, through the

independent panel, would decide, with binding effect on all parties, based ultimately on what is established in its articles of incorporation and bylaws. All these steps are streamlined both applicants and governments and the like and ICANN would see their legal certainty increased and would all have a fair say in the process of delegating new strings with a potential geographic significance. All of this has the idea of avoiding conflicts, of having a previous contact in between the applicant and the relevant authorities and communities.

This proposal made by Switzerland is somehow similar to many concepts that we have been discussing for a while, and I want to thank Jorge and especially thank our colleague Finn from Denmark, they have been very active in the working group list contributing and exchanging ideas.

So what I would like to have some feedback from you about this -- this text that I distributed yesterday. What's -- what's important for our working group? We have produced many, many, many documents. It could be good that if we can send something agreed to the GAC for the GAC considering the whole, as a whole, and we would like to try to do that before Denmark, before the next meeting in March. So maybe the GAC has a chance to -- to comment and give some concrete opinion about this text by the Denmark meeting. And I would open the floor for comments about this issue. Kavouss.

IRAN:

Thank you, Madam. I remember in Finland we had the open forum, big room, big hall with the five indicators, the one to see various views with respect to how to deal with this and similar issues, whether we should do it separately or whether we should put it all, of course, together and work together in order to resolve the problems -- or at least identify the problems in a common manner with a common understanding from the very beginning rather than each of the concerned entity take his own part and at the end we could face difficulties. We do something. End result, we provide an advice to the ICANN board for this, is GNSO doing their job, they provide the PDP, they go to the two or three public comments, they send it to the ICANN board, recommendation. Recommendation is adopted and then advice also receive and found that there might be some difficulties.

I think among the issue was discussed would it be possible that we concentrate all this work in one single area? It is not the question that we give up -- be subordinate of GNSO or GNSO give up or be subordinate of GAC. It is working together under a -- a shared and collective manner. Can you please brief us, what has happened to that idea? Did we just discuss and forget it or not? I have learned that there are some activities on that. Maybe we are not part of that or we do not participate in that. But if you as the chair of this group have some ideas, it would be very

appreciated if you kindly brief us on that issue. I raised that with you at the last meeting, and you said that yes, but we have not yet discussed it, means that we want to discuss it. Do you want to discuss it sometime during this ICANN 57 or you don't want to discuss or what is the views of GAC, take own private, personal, or separate path or track or avenue and other taking another avenue and then we may have some difficulty. So just want to -- I have no position on that. Just want to have a brief from you that what is you as the chair of the group on this matter. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kavouss. Before giving the floor to Jorge, an important thing for outcomes of any working group is that it's first some outcome from the working group is agreed and then goes to the GAC and then the GAC agrees in a text or something and then it goes to the communique. We haven't had the chance to achieve that until the moment.

What we have done individually and among some countries, we have made comments based on the work of the working group, several processes of open comments from GNSO and other working groups that we have done. But we were not able to concretely produce something from the working group or for the whole GAC until the moment. So your comment is really

important and is well-taken. So this is why we would like to make an effort to have some concrete outcome to propose to the GAC for the Denmark meeting. Jorge. I will open a queue. I have Jorge, Mark, and Milagros. And Yuliya. Jorge, please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Olga, Jorge Cancio, for the record. I first of all want to thank Olga for the presentation for this proposal. As way of further information, I want also to share with you that this proposal is coming after the conversation we had within the working group, I think especially in September, and the proposal was shared with the working group in the last week of September, I think, and then we had some interactions also with our colleague from Denmark where we further discussed some of the aspects of the suggestion. But I also wanted to respond or comment a little bit on what our colleague from Iran, Kavouss, had said, that, of course, I'm absolutely of the opinion that all our efforts should be thought and should be developed in a direction that goes into feeding into the community processes where these matters are being discussed. So we shouldn't come up with a perfect product within the GAC when that product is of no use for the rest of the community. I think it's much better to agree on some principles at the higher level and with that make an input, not only to the board which could be considered but

especially to those community working streams where this is being discussed and especially I think also the GNSO PDP on subsequent procedures. And I'm happy that I saw a while ago the two cultures of that PDP working group here in the room who were interested in following our discussion. And I think it's this -- this suggestion is meant not as a -- only as a GAC product but for -- as a future input and hopefully a not-so-far-in-the-future input into the community processes.

And as to the specifics of the proposal and as Olga said, this is a summary and you have the proposal in the briefing papers to this meeting is Hyderabad and it was also distributed before in the mailing list of the working group, I'm, of course, available for any clarifications, any discussion, debate, comment, questions. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Jorge. I hope I have captured the spirit of the document in the summary I made for the PowerPoint. Thank you, Jorge. And a comment before giving the floor to Mark, if you can recall, we opened a draft document for public comments, not only comments in the GAC, that was quite disruptive at the moment because it has never been done before. But it went very well. And we captured a lot of attention

from the community and a lot of good ideas. Mark, the floor is yours.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Olga. Mark Carvell, United Kingdom. Thank you very much for running through the current state of play with regard to the best practices document and thank you also for colleagues on the working group for their inputs into the work intersessionally. It's much appreciated.

I guess I have two questions at this time. And that is with regard to what is intended to be covered within the scope of best practices for future rounds beyond the very obvious listings which you had on the slide of cities, countries, regions, subregions. The best practice document also goes on to say other geographic-related spaces. And we've also had references to names with geographical significance. Denmark's comment talked about geographic names that are easy to identify, and then I think Denmark went on to propose limitation to significant geographical names.

So first of all, my question is, how are we going to define the extension of the scope beyond cities, countries, regions, subregions, in a way that's going to be helpful for stakeholders? Is the working group, in finalizing this proposal, going to attempt to define, for example, what is significance? Because it's a very

loose and very open term, what is significant, but the use of the word "significant" I think requires some sort of helpful effort at defining some criteria that would apply. And if -- and this comes on to my second point about the concept of a repository. First of all, with regard to the repository proposal, if this is developed, it will need full scoping out in terms of the management and conduct of it, how it would be updated and this is, as you've indicated and reflecting on reactions to the repository proposal on previous occasions, indicates that this is a major exercise, no doubt about it, and it's going to be -- if it is going to be effective, it will need very careful management and effective sense of direction. And to ensure the use of it is done in a way that is predictable and meets stakeholders' expectations.

So my point really is about defining the way forward for the working group in terms of scoping out the concept of a repository, if there's agreement to do that. And then to make clear what exactly is the purpose of the repository. Is it simply another reference point in addition to all the others, publicly available lists of geographical names, and would it be entirely for the discretion of a public authority, be it a government or regional authority or whatever, to decide well, what is significant or are we going to provide some guidance about that. And if at a later stage where there is a round or subsequent process for receiving applications, if it's not a round, whatever it may be,

what would the course be if, for example, a question arose which -- about a term which was not in the repository? You know, is the repository simply one source but not as an exclusive source. And so there are questions about the purpose and the effect of a repository, which I think the working group does need to consider in order to provide clarity and some sense of predictability and direction. So those are my comments at this stage. I hope that's helpful. With a couple of questions built in there, of course. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Mark. We share the same concerns with you. It's up to the group to see if we move forward with this idea, and if we do, we should work on defining what is significant geographic name and all the details that you have described. But your comments are very -- are very important. Milagros.

PERU:

Milagros, for the record, but I would like to speak in Spanish.

Milagros speaking. I've been following the cross-community working group's work in terms of geographic names and territories. I believe they have done an extraordinary job. They have drafted plenty of documents, they've analyzed issues at several levels and very interestingly. However, they have not

been able to reach an agreement, despite their work. They have not been able to reach what they call a harmonized view. Beyond my personal views or regardless of my personal views, which include the reasons that prevented the group from reaching a harmonized view, I believe that there's an interesting aspect to be taken into consideration and that is the working group has worked upholding a notion that is upheld in international law in terms of geographic names and their protection. However, they do accept the notion or the fact that there are political interests that are advising ICANN to avoid possible issues.

In that sense, there's a notion that future ICANN contracts should include protective elements or safeguards from these political issues that might arise or derive from the use of geographic names without prior consultation.

And this leads me to a comment on Jorge's proposal. I believe that his proposal is great in that it compiles the criteria that we have been discussing for quite a long time now, and the same criteria that we go back to again and again, because they make sense. This is perhaps the most important aspect of his proposal.

In addition, I believe that the beauty of Jorge's proposal is that somehow or other, by means -- either by means of the repository

or by means of a prior consultation instance, there is more thorough control. However, in terms of using the word "significant" in relation to a geographic name, I would like to say that things change in this regard because something may be significant or a name may be significant nowadays and maybe in a year's time, in five years' time, that same place does not have the same significance.

Therefore, perhaps the word "significance" should be withdrawn. We're just speaking about geographic names, about a list or a repository that is to be updated, changed, and adjusted, et cetera.

But I do have a concern regarding that repository, and that cannot be addressed, I believe. My concern is not all the world countries are represented in the GAC and not all the world countries will learn about this repository in time. However, in the long run, we might improve that situation by working with the U.N. Secretary-General who, in addition, has addressed a specific communication on this topic, the topic of acronyms and geographic names to ICANN.

And surely she has also sent a communication to our governments. So along the same lines, our government would be interested in helping and collaborating so that this repository gathers and compiles all the pertinent information on a global

scale. If that is the case, that would be wonderful. And if not, so be it. Because in addition, there will be a requirement by which permission has to be requested in order to use a geographic name.

And finally, this topic is of high relevance for Peru, so the foreign affairs minister in -- ministry in Peru worked with legal counsel that specializes in intellectual property, and on the basis of the advice we received from legal counsel, we reached the conclusion that Peru has to send ICANN a list of all places, districts, towns, territories that in our view should be protected. And we will do that regardless of the repository. So if the repository is put in place, so much the better.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Milagros.

Before giving the floor to Kavouss, I kept on thinking on collaboration with some other international organizations. The United Nations or the OAS.

Okay. I think this is a very good idea. And I think it's a very good proposal to send a list of names, because that would be our first approach. But of course each country is sovereign and may

decide to send whatever list they may decide to send. But I think it's interesting.

Kavouss, you have the floor.

So sorry, Yuliya. So sorry. Yuliya, the floor is yours. My apologies. Please.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION:

Thank you, Olga. First of all, I would like to thank Jorge for this document because it was a good way forward, you know, for this very important issue. And I would like to say that there are some really positive thing in this document I like. For example, to make these public comments more official, this is a really important thing we need to implement.

I also like these contact obligations and no obligation requirement mentioned in best practices. However, we also have some concerns regarding this.

First concern that, you know, we are talking about the processes of receiving an application; however, we think we need to go step by step. We should start with definitions and should try to make as much as possible to work for the definitions, and to use U.N. definitions if it's applicable, because then we have some geographical territory, U.N. applicable definitions related to

domain names, and probably this will solve at least part of the problems.

Another thing as a second step is to work on criteria. And this is important point, and we do not believe that it's the easy story. Of course the criteria is important and complicated things, but our point of view that we do not need to complicate it more than it's already complicated.

For example, you know, it's not the case now because there is a domain already existed, .MOSCOW; however, imagine that we have the collision with Moscow, because Moscow is known capital of Russia and, also, we have more than 20 cities in U.S. also called Moscow. So how we put criteria in one document?

We should also think about common sense first. And then if we really see the complicated issues, we cannot reflect all complicated issues in the general criteria. And after that only to go to the processes, which is very important things.

And now it looks like we're already in the processes and haven't touched 100% of the previous steps.

And regarding repository, also I would like to say about the concern, we do not feel comfortable to support this idea. We actually support Denmark concern that it looks like overlapping activities, and it can be duplicated work with the organizations

who have mandate to do that. And if we try to do something, probably we have a good work; however, will this work be totally applicable for all countries? Like Milagros said, not all countries are part of the GAC, so how can we say that? And so lots of, well, complicated issues can be handled.

So we think repository is very complicated and should be discussed further.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Yuliya. Yes, we understand the implications of preparing such a repository.

I like your comment about other international organizations that are dealing with this repository of names. Maybe -- We did a search once, and we found several. It ended up not being, perhaps, enough detail for the purposes of the new gTLD process, but we can have that in mind. And thank you for your comments. And apologies again for avoiding you in the list.

I have Kavouss and I have Pedro.

Kavouss. And I have Denmark.

IRAN:

Yes. I think the issue of repository database or information may be an issue. But there's still -- I think that we are taking a piecemeal approach, and we are doing it alone ourselves. Thus may not achieve what we expect to achieve. We need to look at the entire process, and if that process requires to have a repository, then how to establish that repository, whom we have consult, and how to maintain that. That is -- could be discussed. But once again, I think we are looking for something.

I have document of other communities in the ICANN, and I think that in one area, which is views of the geographic -- the country name and territory name, they have a recommendation unanimously. They have two recommendation, and the unanimous recommendation said that the future policy development process must facilitate an all-inclusive dialogue to ensure that all members of the community have the opportunity to participate. And then continue.

Again, we believe that this is the only way to determine whether a harmonized framework is truly achievable.

So they are thinking of a harmonized arrangement, global in the entire community. So once again, I suggest that we discuss at an appropriate time how we could really tackle this problem. Not on a piecemeal basis and not on a separate approach, and not on the last moment consultations.

In one of the comments that they have made, one of the group, the working group dealing with the geographic names, city, country names, and they said despite several efforts to engage the wider community, the working group was mainly driven by ccNSO and GNSO.

Lower or inconsistent level of involvement by other segment of the ICANN community have made it difficult to pursue community-wide solutions yet.

So that is something that we need to really address. If we just doing something for ourself without considering what the other does or do, and if they do something without considering what we do, I think we would not have achieved the objectives that we are looking for.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thanks to you, Kavouss. I would like to ask you a question. You're referring to the Cross-Community Working Group on use of country and territory names as TLDs.

IRAN:

It is a progress report.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, but that group focused on names that are already in lists.

IRAN: Yes, yes.

OLGA CAVALLI: We do focus on names that are not on lists. It's the main difference of the two focus.

IRAN: I am giving you an example of the policy, the process. I didn't say that we are looking at the same thing.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay.

IRAN: Two different things. But the way to look at that one is a harmonized approach.

OLGA CAVALLI: I see your point.

IRAN: Yeah, yeah. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: I just wanted to clarify which group was that. And I participated in it until the -- until the accountability process just kept me out of my free time.

Finn, the floor is yours.

DENMARK: Thank you. And also thank you to Switzerland for producing this idea.

From our point of view, we will agree with the voices that we should step up the interaction with other communities. As Kavouss just has said, we shouldn't have a separate approach, but trying to interact with others.

On the proposal here, we have -- which I have explained previously our doubt on that, to have an overlapping approach a belt and suspenders. I think this is -- this is not a business friendly proposal.

First of all, if we have a -- we might go along with one of the tracks' repository, and that is that, or effective consultation, but not both. At least we will have doubt that the repository will be updated, and actually many countries will use it. They will

probably wait for the consultations procedure, and then I will doubt whether it is appropriate to call it a best practice.

So from our point of view, we would like to look at either the belt or the suspenders but not both.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Finn.

Pedro.

And I will close the queue now because we only have five minutes to -- to wrap up.

BRAZIL:

Yes, thank you. I'm actually taking for the opportunity to introduce myself. I am the new Brazilian delegate, Carlos, working with Pedro, learning from Pedro here.

Just to comment that we think that this proposal that is being under scrutiny here, I think it's a very interesting one, and we thank our friend from Switzerland.

Basically I think that the idea of having a repository and public consultations is interesting in the sense that it's sort of a complementary exercise. One thing complements the other.

The repository would work as kind of an early advice, early action to protect names that are sensitive. So I think it's interesting.

And we understand it might be complicated, but I think it's useful in the sense that it's a kind of warning to any applicants to know that if they want to do something or they want to use a name that they have a list and so they know that if they do that, they will probably find difficulty at some point. So I think it's interesting in that sense.

Whereas the public consultation I think has a different role, different -- which is something that, to use a parallel, what I think was the church of England used to know of bands of marriage. I think in Brazil they use that, too. It's a declaration that allows for people to claim any canonic impediments to marriage. And that's -- in this specifically, it would be a list that would allow for anyone, any government, to claim any impediment to the use of a top-level domain.

So I think it's two different things. One is a very proactive sort of protection, a list, and anyone willing to apply to use a name would know that by using that name they would probably have some trouble at some point. And the other name -- the other -- the other exercise is something that basically ICANN would be

obliged to do and then to publish. And then by doing so, any -- any interested party would be informed.

So I think it's -- they are complementary. I don't see any -- any problems in doing both. And again, we support this idea.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you. Carlos is your name? Thank you.

We have, like, three minutes before closing. I would like to -- I see my friends Alice and Wanawit over there. I don't want to put you on the spot, and I'm doing that, but I would like to call your attention on a document has been circulated, and I think it's a proposal from the -- from the African Union about .AFRICA and the use -- enhancing the 3166/2 list. This is one idea that we had at the beginning of the work of our working group, and I have been working at the national level in Argentina with our national standard organization in order to try to enhance that list that in our case has only the name of the provinces of my country, which are 23. And we tried to include it in subregions and regions of our country, which is something that we're working on.

And this idea, I saw it, it's part of a proposal. Can you share with me, with us, what is the status of that proposal? And I think it's worth having that in mind, because if ICANN doesn't address this

problem for -- for the countries, countries will go and try to find solutions somewhere else. And I think it's -- it's -- This is the place where we have to discuss and try to find solutions to -- to this -- to this -- to avoiding these conflicts in future rounds.

So if -- I don't know if you want to share something or just have that in mind and maybe you can share in the list. Whatever you decide.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you, Olga, and thank you, colleagues. Good morning. Alice Munyua, African Union Commission.

The African Telecommunication proposal on Resolution 47 came from some African member states and was proposed and submitted during the WTCA processes that's ongoing in Tunisia. I'm not sure to what extent that process is because my colleague Moctar has been leading that, but we do know some of our member states did very specifically and explicitly express concerns regarding protection and reservation of our geographic names, and going farther, to have discussions around geographic indicators.

And I wasn't at the WTCA. My colleague Wanawit was there. Maybe he can share more light. And my colleague Moctar is going to speak more about it over the next coming days.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thanks to you.

Wanawit, you want to share something?

THAILAND:

Thank you. Good morning. Wanawit from Thailand. So I also participate in the WTSA just yesterday. (Indiscernible) just back from Tunisia. So the Resolution 47 have two proposal getting in, one from the African Telecommunication Union and one to amend the Resolution 47 to extend beyond the ccTLD. That quite clear.

So because the heading of the resolution is only limited to the ccTLD, and they want to add the geographical names and two characters geographicals, and three-character geographicals.

Another proposal get in is from the U.S. to suppress the whole Resolution 47. So the discussion, three days, cannot find any agreement. So the Resolution 47 still there as it is. There are no amendments, and there are no suppress agree.

So one of the aspect that we have to see, also they try to integrate the geographical in CC, which I think is totally wrong, because CC have nothing to do with geographical names. But

on the details of the proposals, they try to propose the gTLD specifically, which totally out of the scope of the Resolution 47.

Apart from that, I think I also would like to add on the -- about the repository. In the meeting of UNGEGN group of expert on geographical name in Thailand, ICANN also having a presentation, we have found extensive list of the geographical name that also include a (indiscernible) language already there. And it's beyond the (indiscernible) -- the region of 3166 is include all the cliff, the beach, the mountain, the tourist place. It's up to the country to file.

We haven't checked. Thailand did final all the eight U.N. language already which comprise of 10,000 of name, including some beach in Argentina in Thai language. So we want to be sure that geographical name is protect, so that one of the repository we have to be looking at.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Wanawit. We don't have more time. Is it very short, Mark?

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes. Thank you very much, Olga. This is very much in the last minute, I understand, but the discussion here just reminds me that there are points here that we have been looking at, going back to 2014 and the consultation that was undertaken then and the significant number of responses to that consultation. There are new GAC members joining and who may wish to join the working group.

I make this proposal before Copenhagen that the working group issue a summary of those comments received and also the responses to those comments. Remember, there are lots of questions about legal basis for governments to intervene, and so on.

So very important issues there which have been picked up by Brazil and others about governments intervening to issue warnings and so on.

So it would be very useful for the community and for new GAC members to have a resume of the public comments received and the responses to those various comments.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Mark. We will do that. It's a very good idea because time goes by and people change their roles.

Should we keep on working on this idea, on this proposal from Jorge? I think it's worth giving it a try at the list. That's my proposal as chair. And have more feedback from other colleagues.

And I will work on some summary of this -- of this session. I will work on summarizing the previous documents. We share that with you over the list. And let's try to -- to get some outcome from the working group by -- before the Denmark meeting so we can give it to the GAC for consideration.

Thank you very much for being with us this morning, so the room is full of people now, so thank you for that. And see you all during the whole week.

Thank you very much.

Gracias.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]