HELSINKI – GAC Protection of Geographic Names Working Group Meeting
Monday, June 27, 2016 – 08:15 to 09:15 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

OLGA CAVALLI: Good morning, everyone.

If the gentlemen could be seated.

Good morning, everyone.

My name is Olga Cavalli. I am the GAC representative of Argentina, and also the GAC vice chair, and I coordinate two working groups in the GAC. One is about protection of geographic names in new gTLDs, which is what covers us this morning in this room, and the other one is about participation of the GAC in the NomCom, which will be presented at this time Thursday.

Hello to the translators there. I hope I am not too fast. So if I am too fast, you just wave me.

And also, you will have to have some patience with me today because I didn't sleep. I have been watching the games, and Chile won and Argentina lost. So it's a kind of sad day this morning, but my congratulations to my Chilean friends and

brothers from the region. They did a very good job. So I'm kind of sad and sleepy, but I'm here with you.

And also, we are competing with the Ethos Award I think. So we will do our best to entertain you this morning.

I will present to you two documents. One is a PowerPoint which contains what we have been doing in the last -- well, since March to here. And previous to the March meeting in Morocco, we were kind of focused in the IANA transition, so we did prepare a document which is about public interest. We were focused in that document, but we did not have many phone calls.

We did start with our conference calls after the Marrakech meeting. So I will let you know what we have been talking about.

And then at 9:15 we will report the summary what we are going to talk about now to the GAC plenary.

So if you have any questions during my presentation, please let me know.

Just a little bit background. To those of you that are new to this process, this working group was created after what was mentioned in GAC Durban communique in July 2013. That stated that ICANN should work with the GAC to refine the rules for new gTLD rounds to avoid some conflicts that we had in the

first round, especially about the use of some country and -- some territory names that are relevant for some communities and some countries in different parts of the world.

We started our work in the Buenos Aires meeting in 2013, and we have produced some documents. One is a document that was presented before the Singapore meeting. Then we opened it for comments as a thing that has never been done before in the GAC. So we opened the document for comments. Not a final document produced by GAC, but just a draft background document.

We received many, many, many comments. We presented the summary of those comments in the meeting in Singapore in 2014.

After that presentation, we read the transcripts and we decided that we should focus in some things that were really stressed during that session, which was what really mean "public interest" in the context of ICANN and in the context of the use of these geographic names in new gTLDs. So this is what I mainly will be presenting this morning.

And also, we developed our first work plan, because the group was not kind of formally established until then.

EN

And also, we developed a group of best practices that I will present them to you today. We also reviewed them before, but I would like to review them again because we received some comments from our members in the working group.

And then we have some inputs from friends from some countries about the use of regional names and related concepts like relevant governments and other things. So it's kind of a lot of things to review. But can we go to the next one, Julia, please.

So very, very quickly. The objectives of this working group is have less uncertainty for the next new round of new gTLDs. We want less conflicts and more success stories. That's the idea.

We want to avoid the misuse of names which are relevant for communities, regions and countries, have less conflicts, and also, if we can, give some background information to the GNSO or to the development process of different documents that are being done in the ICANN environment. So this is the idea of the working group. It's a GAC working group; it's not a cross-community working group. But we have been very open. We have opened the documents for comments for the first time in the GAC story.

Can we go to the next one, please.

EN

So what I will present to you now is the working plan that we have been updating very lately. It has been shared with our colleagues from GAC, so if our GAC colleagues can give us some feedback, perhaps, in the section that it's about the plenary presentation, about the working group to the GAC, that could be great.

Comments about best practices that we received lately. The use of some regional names and related concepts about relevant governments. Then I will make a quick revision of the document about public interest, which is the idea. The idea is to present this document to ICANN as a GAC contribution, if possible. And if not, we won't do that. Maybe it's done by some countries, if we decide so.

It's a document that has reviewed the use of the concept public interest in different documents that are relevant to ICANN. And then I won't talk about reactions to straw woman paper proposed by Cross-Community Working Group on country and territory names. That will be done by my colleague Gema, from Spain, tomorrow, but the document that she will present tomorrow has been prepared by the working group of geographic names.

And then I want to tell you about a request that we had in the meeting we had in Marrakech about including other experts in our working group email list.

Those that you know me, I'm always open -- towards openness, and -- but there are some rules in the GAC that has to be followed, and it's not only what I want but what the rules are. So I will briefly talk about that if I have the time. And if you have any comments, you will let me know.

So Julia, if you can upload the work plan.

Thank you. This is a work plan that has been changing since we started with the formal work plan in 2014.

First is with the public comments that we received in 2014, we prepared the set of best practices that I will review with you. And we decided to revise the concept of public interest, which I will present to you today. So this point 1 is more or less quite developed.

Number 2 is these ideas and these reflections and these comments that we have or some countries have about this issue. The idea is to inject them into the different policy development process in ICANN. We have not done that as GAC, but part of the documents that we have developed have been -- have been sent

EN

as comments to different processes from -- as a contribution from some countries from Latin America. That's point 2.

Can we scroll down a little bit. So I won't go into details. This document is among the information that GAC colleagues have, so it's mainly for GAC information.

Can we go to point 3, Julia, please. And this is the link, up there is the link to the contribution that some countries of Latin America, we did to one of the requests for comments about the policy development process of the new gTLD round. And then as I told you, when we reviewed the transcribes -- transcriptions, transcribes of the Singapore meeting, many delegates and many members of the community request if we could think about and reflect about the use of public interest and public good. So this is what we will do today. And we have some suggestions by EBU also.

Can we scroll?

So this point 3 is already quite developed.

Also, we have a proposal to analyze the situation of some annexed and occupied territory names. This is a suggested action by Ukraine and by Georgia. We have talked about that. We may bring this up today again. So this is half -- halfly made.

And number 5 is, this is -- we would like to collect experiences to learn from previous rounds. We haven't done that as a compilation. We have information about that, but we have not compiled it. And the best practices, which is number 6, is already developed; of course, always ready for improvement.

And then number 7 is we talked about developing a geo names list. We talked many times about that. At the moment, we concluded that it was difficult to prepare. It was difficult to maintain. So we, for moment, we kept it aside. But during the Dublin meeting, we had a meeting with people from UNESCO and from ISO, so this was an idea of our colleague Giacomo Mazzone from EBU. So this may be something we explore in the future. So number 7 is one of our action items still to be developed.

And what is it? I think it's done. Can we scroll down?

The rest is just organization things.

So I will go to the PowerPoint now. Julia, please.

Any comments? Any questions so far?

Kavouss.

IRAN: Thank you very much. Good morning to everybody.

I have few comments. The first comment, let us, to the extent practicable, maintain GAC meetings nonpolitical. So discussing some term of the territories under occupation is a very complex issue. It may take a lot of our times, and we may have some difficulty to have any comments, because views may be different.

So quickly, to the extent possible, take out any political orientations of this document.

Second, I have a question that what is regional names? We don't have regionals names. Are we talking of region one, region two, region three, or Asia or Oceania, Latin America? We are talking of geographic names but not regional names. So I think we have to be very careful about that.

And the third issue, I also suggest, having participated almost actively in 19 months or 18 months of the CCWG, it is better not to talk about public interest. You could refer to that in the inverted comma, guillemets in French, but trying to say what is public interest, we didn't have any success to say what is public interest.

Public interest is referred to in the article of incorporation. It is there as it is. We don't touch it. It is copied in the new bylaw. That's that.

But my fear is that we may get into the piege, into the trap, to see public interest. In view of some people, this would be public interest, the other would not be public interest. So try to streamline the discussions under your leadership to the area which were very sensitive and arise from Durban meeting, and remember what was the reasons for that.

So this is my request to you and to the distinguished colleagues; to concentrate on something that we could do.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss.

Any reactions to that?

(Saying name). Sorry; Mzia. Sorry, sorry, sorry.

GEORGIA: Mzia. thank you, Olga. I just want to make a short comment.

I don't think that this is a political issue because we concern term "relevant." I think that this term, in case of self-declared countries, is not unclear. I think to define this term more clearly, we avoid -- we will avoid political issue. So that's why Ukraine and me propose to define this term.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Mzia. Other comments, other reactions.

Okay. Thank you, Kavouss, very much for your comments. I would tend to disagree with you about regional names. There are regions that have names in some countries that comprise two or three countries. So this is something that I think it's worth to explore. So we have -- we have different opinions about that.

And the public interest revision was -- was requested during the Singapore meeting. It was specially requested by the United States delegate at that meeting, that we should work on trying -- I know it's extremely difficult, but we should try to at least think about different perspectives of the use of best practices. And I think this is the purpose of the document that we -- that we have done in the working group that has been shared with the GAC colleagues. So this is the idea. Any other comments? Yes, Milagros.

PERU: I tend to agree with Olga regarding the regions, Kavouss. Because for example, only in South America, the Mesonean (phonetic) region, it's both a geographic reference and a region. The Andean region is also a geographic reference. On the other

hand, in reference to the public interest issue in the meeting in Marrakech regarding public interest and I participated in, I was told by a lawyer of GAC -- of ICANN that the public interest for ICANN was defined as recorded in the California law. In fact, the wording, the phrase "public interest," was used when the organization was being structured because it had to be done under the California law. So we cannot avoid using that phrase, and perhaps redefining it is also an absurd because it is already defined by the California law. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Milagros. Any other comments? I have a comment from Oleksandr from Ukraine and he is participating remotely. I will read it to you. "About relevant, other GAC members can, of course, bring new ideas, so it's welcome, but we definitely cannot keep current term unchanged." We haven't come to this point so far. Okay. "There's a discussion about relevant government and internationally accepted government. So Oleksandr is making this comment about that. Bring new ideas is still welcome, but we definitely cannot keep current term unchanged, otherwise we will need to set a very clear definition. So we have to change the term or set the definition of the current. I like both ways but I have very strong concerns about keep it as it is now. It is inappropriate because the position of some GAC members committee will never find consensus in any

country territory issue. So I suggest two actions. Request more ideas on terms and definitions of relevant government. Request legal oversight from ICANN lawyers on this term." I would also -- I think it stops there, right? I would also propose to get some advice from United Nations experts regarding this issue. Thank you, Oleksandr. This is very similar to what I've been thinking about this issue of defining relevant governments. We will go to that term in a minute. Any other comments about this definition? And I would like to remind you that ICANN is also -- has opened a space to reflect about the meaning of public interest. There was a wiki and there was a meeting and there was a session in the last meeting in Marrakech. Unfortunately I couldn't attend because it collapsed with other meetings we had in the GAC. But I think at least it's a good idea to talk about it and review it from different perspectives and see how it fits from different environments. Any other comments? Okay. Thank you.

So we will go to the PowerPoint, if you allow me. Julia, can we go to the next one? So this is the best practices that we have developed after receiving the comments in Singapore and analyzing them. I won't go through them because we have presented them before. We have comments from some members in the working group that this best practices ideally should concile interests of applicants in having legal certainty,

which is something we care about. And a clear environment and also should concile interests of governments and public authorities and communities. This is the purpose of this working group, to know uncertainties and to have less conflicts in the next round of new gTLDs.

I will share with you this PowerPoint so I won't go through all the best practices. In generally what we would like to see is early conduct between the applicant and the -- the relevant -- I don't know if authorities or government or whoever it is from the community, the region or subregion or whatever the name is used. So it is not a surprise once the name is used in a new gTLDs and then it's a problem and it's a conflict. So if you have an early contact, which is by the way, it is established in the first version of the Applicant Guidebook. The thing is that for different reasons it didn't work so well in the first round. So we think that in the second it could be somehow established in a different way. So it's more -- I won't say mandatory but it's more -- so the applicant is more keen in get in touch with the relevant region or the relevant community where the -- where this name belongs. So I will keep it for you to review in the Word PowerPoint. Any comments about that? About this slide? This was presented before several times so I won't take a lot of time about this. Okay. I see none. Julia, can we go to the next one, please?

Okay. This is -- this is a proposed idea of revising this use of annexed or occupied territories and also review the term "relevant government" or "government internationally recognized." This is a discussion we had -- not a discussion, a debate we had in some of our conference calls, so I would very much welcome comments from you. And I think Oleksandr did a very, very good suggestion that we could have legal advice from ICANN and also legal advice from some United Nations or internationally law expert. I'm looking at Milagros. She's an expert in international law. I am not. I'm an engineer, so I'm not the one to make this but I'm just helping the work. Because in some documents we found that the use of the term of "relevant governments" and then some others in the working group pointed out that "governments internationally recognized" was the right term to be used. So if someone in the audience could have any -- any other comment or any other idea, and if not, we will try to find more advice about this definition. Any comments. Jorge.

SWITZERLAND: Hello. Good morning, Olga, and sorry for being late. On this issue, although I'm -- I'm not an expert at all, it came to me that in the end we are talking about what ICANN would be interpreting when -- when this concept of relevant government or whatever concept we use is being implemented --

implemented or being useful for any application. And we have to be mindful that ICANN is bound to international law according to its articles of incorporation and the bylaws. So perhaps there's already a link there. And we don't have to reinvent the wheel for the purposes of this working group.

OLGA CAVALLI: Kavouss.

IRAN: Thank you, Olga. I think I should explain that I should not have misunderstood. I had no problem with those names which are associated with multiple countries in particular region. We know the example. But I wanted to avoid to have political problems. This is very important. We do not convert the GAC to the security council of the United Nations. Nor your committee, your group.

Number two, I almost tend to agree with Jorge that I don't think that the GAC -- sorry, ICANN legal team could intervene in the sovereign right of countries, talking about this is the right approach or this is not the right approach. This is sovereignty of the countries. Nor a particular legal entity or also in a general (indiscernible) could have. It could have its own firm, law firm, or whatever it has. But I don't think that we should have

reference. Some internationally agreed entities may be not an issue but not particularly at this legal advisers. They are advisers to those people they are advising. They're not legal advisers to sovereign governments. So I don't think that we could recourse to those sorts of the thing and then put as a stamp that okay, this is approved by legal adviser X or legal adviser Y or by legal office in particular countries. Madam, world is quite strange and people have certain interests. These interests should not intervene or interfere with the national sovereignty of the countries. So to the extent possible once again I use this term, we should avoid this sort of advice from these peoples. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss. Can I ask you a clarifying question? The question came in analyzing several documents where the term "relevant government" is used and it was suggested by other members of the working group that instead of relevant governments we should use the term "government internationally recognized." In my modest opinion this is not interfering with any sovereignty rights. We just are reviewing different ways of defining. So this is why we have been talking about this.

IRAN:

Madam, I'm not referring to that. I'm referring to the legal adviser of the ICANN providing information about something and so on and so forth. That was my question. I'm not talking that. I fully agree internationally recognized countries and so on and so forth. That is the alphabet of our work. But I refer to something else for a particular subject asking legal adviser of ICANN to comment. That was my question. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kavouss. I will open a queue. Have I Yuliya, I have -- I think you were first, and Milagros, I'm sorry I cannot see you very well. You are? Miguel. Oh my God. Yes. I cannot see you from here. And Milagros. So Yuliya first, please.

RUSSIA:

Good morning, everyone. Actually I can agree with Kavouss regarding that. We should not make our discussion political because we are actually -- we are doing very important work. Of course, we have to work on geographical names which is relevant to the territory we are actually recognized as the GAC members. When it comes to the very terms of international law, of course, we don't have a mandate and we don't have enough competence to do that. And so we are coming to U.N. language and how can we say that it's relevant U.N. language or irrelevant right now because as I said, we don't have mandate, we don't

have competence for that. If some wording is proposed, I need to go to my minister of foreign affairs to check whether it's right U.N. language or not. And I, for example, do not have enough competence to say right now that this is acceptable or not. So we are coming to the territory we do not have mandated, first of all.

So when I say I -- I'm just making my own judgment on where it's better to have relevant governments or internationally recognized governments because when we discuss regional territory name, for example, it's the "C" name, the number of countries actually have the access to the "C" and other country used to have historical, for example, access to the "C." All of them internationally recognized who's relevant? What is the -- actually the way out of this situation? It's really very delicate issue. And so first we do not need to -- should be very delicate with political issues. We need to avoid this because we are in a technical territory and we have to -- we are thinking about Internet, not about the how to solve the political things. And U.N. language should be considered in U.N. This is the point.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Julia. I have a queue that's Miguel, please. Go ahead.

MEXICO:	Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everybody.
	I fully agree with the previous speakers in terms that -- about mixing this with political issues.
	When this conversation gets into the working group, I asked to my foreign affairs about this change from "relevant government" to "government internationally recognized." And what they say is we cannot accept "government internationally recognized" because when you are recognizing someone, it's a political issue. So we must try to avoid that.
	I totally agree perhaps "relevant" is not the perfect term. We can work on that. But definitely "government internationally recognized" is not a term good for us. Thank you.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you, Miguel.
	I have Milagros.
PERU:	I agree with Kavouss and with Yuliya regarding the need to keep aside all political debates. I don't think this is the right fora for that. And to that, I have to add that "government internationally recognized" is wrong because there are, as far as I know, two different practices around the world of government recognition.

And we would again be dealing with political ideas in order to reach those practices.

And "relevant government" is also wrong because, you see, the word "relevant" is used over and over again in the bylaws and the articles of incorporation. And who defines what is relevant and what is not?

A government is a government. It's not relevant or irrelevant. That's it. So the word "relevant" should be avoided.

So I would say governments and make a space -- simply governments and making a space to analyze eventually case-by-case situations, no? Because we are thinking here of hypothetical scenarios. There are very few really. In practice, how many scenarios can be presented to this ICANN regarding the situation of governments that are questioned or geographic areas that are questioned? How many scenarios? There are very few in the world. And perhaps they never arrive as a case to ICANN.

So I would say simply "governments" and leave open the door to analyze a case-by-case situation if the need should arise, no? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Milagros.

EN

And I have -- oh, the queue is long. Olof and Mzia, Mzia. Mzia and Olof. And then sorry, Olof, Mzia, and Indonesia. And who else? I don't know your name, I'm sorry. Okay. And Finn. Okay.

Mzia, please.

GEORGIA: Thank you. I don't understand why some members of GAC see in our request to define -- redefine the term "relevant government" a political issue. This is not a political issue.

ICANN is not a political organization, and it should not intervene into (indiscernible) of countries. But ICANN is the organization who grants domain names. If -- how ICANN can't grant domain -- I mean, geographical name of self-declared countries or conflict territories, if term "relevant" will not be -- is not clearly defined. We just want to avoid this problem and just to clear what is it relevant.

I agree that maybe "internationally recognized" is not proper term, but I agree with Miguel and Oleksandr that we should work on it to define this term "relevant." We should involve ICANN lawyers and U.N. lawyers. Maybe we will keep this term in the applicant guidebook, but we have to -- we have to clearly define so we can give it definition, clear definition, what is relevant.

I don't agree to leave only term "government" because I think this is more unclear than "relevant government."

So I just would like to stress that it is not a political issue, no. It's -- it's trying to avoid political disputes. And I agree with Oleksandr and with Miguel to involve -- to work on it further and to make clear the definition of its term to avoid any misunderstandings later.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Mzia.

Olof?

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you. Olof Nordling, ICANN staff and not speaking on my own behalf but trying to channel Oleksandr Tsaruk from Ukraine. Two comments.

First one, and I quote, for regions issue, we need to work on lists like ISO 3166-2 as basic lists regarding protections of geo names, end quote.

Second comment a few minutes later, a comment: We go from politics with capital P to definitions with capital D and oversight with capital O, end quote. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Olof.

Next I have -- and I will close the queue now because then we won't have time to finish. Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Olga. I just want to -- I'm trying to find out, but I couldn't find. Olof could help me and also you. In the ICANN, does ISO organization also sit as an observer or whatever because as far as I'm aware, if you look at the RFC set up by IETF, I have never heard about any comments from the ISO group. That's number one.

So I think we are talking about this. Then we have to see the possibility of ISO to be, what you call it, to be accommodated or sitting here somewhere in the ICANN group where they can exchange information about how important is ID for Indonesia or whatever, MY for Malaysia and so on, how important it is. Perhaps they don't even know how important it is. Of course, some of them, of course, know about that.

Secondly, perhaps it is also time for us to talk with ISO, that the changes in political or geo names based on political or other issues. It's sometimes kind of fast, and it has to be somehow adopted and recognized in the ICANN numbers, ICANN DNS.

Now, if you look at the ISO process, it will take a long time to change something because they have to make a TC, a technical committee, and so on and so on and so on. It has to be agreed in a local meeting and regional meeting and then big meeting and so on and so on. So it takes a lot of time. It is different with RFC because RFC more honest and open standard. I mean, everybody around the world can just give their opinion. And if it is important, they will fix it. And IANA will adopt it. And the protocol is there.

But an ISO, it is not the case. Perhaps it is timely for us to talk with ISO.

I have also problem in Indonesia with our national standard decision agency because they adopt the ISO and IEC, the International Electrotechnical Commission process. And it always take a long time. And when we discuss with them about Internet standard, it doesn't -- no, no, it is difficult to get matched, if I can say that appropriately. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thanks to. Before I will continue with the queue, just to let you know we did an informal contact in Dublin with representatives of ISO. And they explained to us that process that you just described. And it takes some time. But we are thinking about that, of course, as an option.

Next in the queue -- oh, I lost my queue. I have -- I think I have -- you and I have Denmark.

Please, go ahead. I don't know your name. I'm so sorry. If you can let us know your name, that would be great.

NIGERIA:

My name is Sonigitu Ekpe, and I'm Cross River State government, Nigeria. It is a national government. We are all aware that today that the Internet of Things could lead to global governance. We can't pretend about it. That is the possibility that will come. So it's a better time to start the dialogue now and see how we can emerge the political dimension of the Internet because if we were not talking about Internet governance, which is already political at some level, then ICANN which is the main holder of the domain name cannot protect governments.

So I see that "relevant governments" should not be there but "government" because you have local governments, you have subnational, and you have national governments. And most time these governments have their various interests even within a system. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thanks to you.

Finn?

DENMARK: Thank you, Olga. It was only a point of order. When Yuliya from Russia spoke, the transcript indicated Denmark. So in order that the transcript is correct, please indicate that it was Russia who spoke.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Finn.   It's Yuliya from Russia, not Julia from Denmark. By the way, is at home with a very beautiful baby. She's okay, right?

DENMARK: I have been told she is okay.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's good to know. Thank you for your clarification, Finn.

Okay. I don't see any more requests for the floor. Kavouss, the last in the queue.

IRAN: Yes, thank you. Just a small question to you and to colleagues. Imagine that in some area of the world an island is called X by country A and the same island is called Y by country B. What is

our role in those two -- within those two countries? Many, many people are far, far, far from those to have any idea, any knowledge, any background and any intervention from legal point. What is our role in that? I'm talking of far, far -- no name. People may know that. But an island, it's called two different names by two different countries, big countries. What is our role there? We say country A is right or country B is right? Can we say that? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Well, about -- some examples about that, there are some United Nations' resolutions that should be stated when referring to some of these names, so -- but that's not the focus of our working group.

So I will stop this discussion here, and I think it's extremely interesting. And I don't know if we reach an agreement, but I think we had a good exchange of reflections and comments. So it's "relevant government," it's "government," or it's "internationally recognized."

Let's keep on working in the working group about this, and we may -- we may bring this to -- I will summarize all the comments in a document for the working group, working on my notes and the transcript -- with the transcript. So I will share with you and

the working group and we may organize a call, maybe in July, and see how we move forward.

Can we go to the next slide?

And I don't know if I will have time. I just want to show you very briefly the contents of the document that we have prepared, some of us in the working group. The idea would be the GAC has already it among the documents for -- for this meeting. If the GAC agrees, this document could be a document sent to the group of people that are gathering information about public interest concept in ICANN or not. It's something up to the GAC to decide.

For me that drafted the first version, the document was quite interesting.

What we used as a source of information were the ICANN strategic plan for fiscal years 2016 to 2020, the high-level meeting of the General Assembly of the World Summit of Information Society, and one of the workshops of the Internet Governance Forum about public interest that happened in Joao Pessoa. I was invited to be a panelist in it.

So we used these documents and we gathered some definitions and some concepts about public interest that we thought it could be interesting for the working group in general.

Can we go to the next one, please, Julia?

One clarification.

The documents about ICANN and the mission and all that information has been used before any changes that will be done now, so we should perhaps review the paper that was prepared like two months ago in the light of the new bylaws.

So, "ICANN defines the global public interest in relation to the Internet as ensuring the Internet becomes and continues to be stable, inclusive, and accessible across the globe. All may enjoy the benefits of a single and open Internet. In addressing its public responsibility, ICANN must build trust in the Internet and its governance ecosystem. This vision is central to ICANN's public responsibility framework; however, there is a need to define particular areas of focus and target topics, regions, and stakeholders that need to be addressed in relation to ICANN's responsibility to serve the global public interest."

So we have a specific reference about public interest that has to be reviewed in a certain context, which is something important. So public interest would not mean the same when we are referring to different things, so this is the first reference that we found.

Can we go to the next one, please.

Of course the document is quite long. This is just a summary.

I don't know if I will have time to go through it.

"ICANN's vision's reference to public interest.

"ICANN's vision is that of an independent, global organization trusted worldwide to coordinate the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers to support a single, open globally interoperable Internet. ICANN builds trust through serving the public interest"-- again -- "incorporating the transparent and effective cooperation among stakeholders worldwide to facilitate its coordination role."

So this -- this inclusion of the public interest here in this paragraph, we see it as building trust. It's not only as a very narrow mission. It is more. It is broader.

Can we go to the next one, please.

In the strategic objectives, I will go just to the last one: "Develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission.

And, "There is a specific reference about ICANN coordinating policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions."

So it is not so, so narrow. It has to be reasonable and appropriately.

So this is all -- all from ICANN documents.

The next one, please.

Strategic objectives.

"The evolution of the domain name marketplace should not create conflicting agendas of key players thwart cooperation and evolution of marketplace to serve the public interest. Promote the role, clarity, and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest. ICANN seeks to develop a public responsibility framework for promoting the global public interest in the coordination of the Internet's unique identifier systems and in furtherance of ICANN's mission. The framework will clarify ICANN's roles, objectives and milestones in promoting the public interest through capacity building, and increasing the base of internationally diverse, knowledgeable, and engaged ICANN stakeholders."

So as you can see --

Oh, many people is coming to -- to the room. That's great.

As you can see, what we found when we analyzed this -- this several times, that the public interest concept is included in the ICANN fundamental documents, is that it really is broader than the concept of a narrow mission. It goes beyond that. And somehow we found this context somehow aligned with what we are trying to do with the working group, in trying to lower uncertainties and preparing a more predictable environment for these policies.

Can we go to the next one, please.

Other parts of the ICANN strategic objectives.

How much time we have?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: Four minutes? I thought -- it's not until 9:30?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: It's not the same people?

EN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: Oh, this is strange. Okay. Two minutes.

So I won't go through the strategic objectives. You have this in the document. You have this in the slides.

What we found in analyzing this is that the term "public interest" is used in a much broader way than what we thought at the beginning, so we found it very interesting to review.

Can we go to the next one.

Julia? Next.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: So as I said --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: To the GAC?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Thank you, Olof. Thank you very much. So as you can see, these references to public interest go beyond what strictly the mission is. It's more. It goes beyond that. And we think it's important to the purpose of our working group and this was requested a while ago that we should review it. This is why we prepared this document.

So the document is among the materials for the GAC to review, and I would welcome comments from our GAC colleagues about the possibility of sending it as a GAC contribution to the public interest work that ICANN is doing, and if not, just say no and we will see what to do.

The next one, please.

Other sources that we used is the high-level meeting that reviewed the WSIS outcomes and, as I had mentioned, a public interest workshop in the last IGF in Joao Pessoa in Brazil.

Hi, Alice.

Next one, please.

And I think we are almost done.

Also would like to stress a contribution by Peru about the difference in between common good and public interest. Thank you, Milagros. That was very enlightening. It's part of the document. It's included in the long document. I won't go through details, but you can review it there.

And can we go to the next one, please, Julia.

So it is difficult to define but we will still work on it, the same that we will do with the definition of "relevant government" and "internationally" -- I don't know, I almost forget all the definitions. We will work on that in the working group, and there will be --

Can we go to the next one, Julia, please.

We will continue with the working plan, with the public interest document.

There will be, tomorrow, a presentation about reactions to a document prepared by the cross-community working group on country and territory names. This was prepared by the working group and will be presented by our colleagues who came up from Spain, but it was -- it's an outcome of the working group. Of course Gema has been fundamental to preparing that document.

And we had a question in Marrakech if we could include experts outside the GAC in the working list -- email working list of our working group. What we have been discussing in the GAC is that the best is that we invite these experts to our meetings or maybe we can invite them to certain calls or certain parts of the calls, but not open in the working list of our working groups. So this is the comment that I wanted to say.

I think this is the last -- Julia, this is the last --

Okay. This is the last slide.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]