
HELSINKI – GAC Protection of Geographic Names Working Group Presentation to the GAC

Monday, June 27, 2016 – 09:15 to 09:30 EEST

ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

OLGA CAVALLI:

I'm supposed to report to the GAC now? So I should repeat what I said? That's a little bit strange.

So the working group has finished the session and I will report to the GAC.

Very quickly, what I would like the GAC to have in mind is that among your documents, you have the public interest document. Please review it and give us your feedback. It could be good to know if we are okay in sending it to ICANN, as a GAC contribution, or some countries may be interested in sending it as a contribution from certain countries.

The other thing that we have been discussing is the different definitions of how to use the term of "relevant government" and "internationally recognized governments," so for the GAC information, I will summarize the comments and the transcripts that we have from this meeting and I will present them to the working group first and I can share them with the GAC if you -- if it's needed what else we did.

What else we did. Help me.

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 discussed the relevance of public interest.

As I said, there is a document about the use of three-letter codes as TLDs. It's a very -- it's not a long document. It's among the GAC material to be reviewed for this meeting. Please take a look at it. It will be presented by Gema tomorrow. But the document was prepared by the working group. So I think that that's all I have to say.

Are there any comments from the audience about all we have been doing and any comments towards our work in the next months?

Mark, please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you very much, Olga. Mark Carvell, U.K. government.

Just a question. What is the deadline for comments on the public interest paper? Could you remind me of that? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Well, it was -- it is not a specific deadline. The idea was that the GAC could review it. We have been sharing it for a while. But we can have more time. But it's not a specific deadline. ICANN is working on that on a continuous basis, so if we can have --

maybe perhaps for the next month, if you can send us some comment. It's among the --

By the way, we received comments from Finn and from Gema and from other members of the working --

I don't know if you're in the working group list? Are you? We can include you so maybe you can have that feedback. But I can send it to you as well. Thank you, Mark.

Jorge?

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Olga. My question would be a similar one. We have seen the best practices slide, which I think is a very interesting part of the discussions we have had in the working group, but I was wondering if this part of -- of our work in the working group, as it was taken out of the public interest document, whether it will be subject to a consultation or -- because it would be good to -- to start our work on a document. I don't know whether within the working group as a start, and then to -- to go over to the GAC list to really develop these best practices because they could be very useful for coming rounds of new gTLDs. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Jorge. I didn't take a lot of time for explaining the best practices because we presented them in Dublin or before, but it's good to share again with the GAC. And of course if we -- if the -- if the working group agrees and the GAC agrees, we can open them for public comments, as we did with the first draft document.

You want to take the floor again?

SWITZERLAND: Yes, very shortly. I remember somehow that they were presented at some GAC meeting, but I -- what I was intending to say is that in order to -- to have them adopted at some future moment of time as a GAC document, which may formally go into the processes of the GNSO, for instance, on subsequent rounds, it would be very good to make this a formal procedure of discussing it in the working group and then afterwards in the GAC.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Jorge. Very, very good comment. Ornulf.

NORWAY: Thank you, Olga. Just a question for clarification. I'm sorry of being late in. So it's just a question on this. These comments that you drafted on the -- on this issue, a (indiscernible), a straw woman paper on the protection of three-letter codes for top-level domain. Has that been forwarded? Or when or will it be forwarded into that process? So it's just that I haven't really seen that's been forwarded or not. So just for a question.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Sorry, I'm not sure I understood the question. The document has been forwarded to the whole GAC. It's among the GAC documents to be used in this meeting.

Is that your question?

NORWAY: Yes. Yes, I've seen it on the GAC list. But my question is, actually, will we or has it been forwarded into the process in the Cross-Community Working Group? Or that's probably what we're going to discuss here or not.

Because my question was that specifically because, also, there was no mention of that into the draft communicate that we got on the -- on the GAC list. So that was why my question.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Ornulf. As I said, it will be presented tomorrow. If you can help me with the communique drafting, is it included in the communique draft or -- I think that's the idea; right?

Okay. We will discuss that tomorrow and it's up to the GAC to include it.

Thank you, Tom.

Are we done?

Okay. Any other comments?

Okay. Thank you very much. I will summarize all these comments. I will share them with the working group list.

If some of you are interested in participating in the working group, just let me know, let Julia know, and she will include your email address. And I will summarize all the comments received, and I will take your suggestions to move forward the work in this working group, and thank you very much.

Who got the award? I want to know.

[Applause]

Who got the award?

Thank you, but who got the Ethos Award? I missed that.

Thank you very much to all of you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]