SAN JUAN – GAC Discussion: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, Work Track 5, Part 1
Saturday, March 10, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:15 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, can you please start taking your seats. We will begin in a minute. Thank you. So, welcome back everyone. Welcome back to the GAC. Session agenda item 3 on new gTLD subsequent procedures work track five that was scheduled 10 March for 60 minutes. Please state your name for transcript purposes. So with this, Tom, can you please take us through the GAC brief on work track five, please?

TOM DALE: Thank you, Manal. The briefing that we circulated a couple of weeks ago focused on two issues that the GAC had particular views on and made some decisions at the Abu Dhabi meeting. The first of those contains procedural issues and the way that the GAC proceeds through work track five, the GAC agreed a month or two ago to a final response to the cochairs of the PDP working group that is looking after all of the new gTLD policy issues including geographic names and that response is included in the briefing document that we circulated. And those points were provided to the PDP as the letter said for the record and for information. So, no further discussion on the terms and

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.

conditions of the GAC's engagement in the work track is expected. Although of course you are free to raise whatever you like. But that is what the GAC agree to say in terms of the work track process and its terms of reference.

The substantive issues that the work track has been dealing with are things that will be mentioned in a moment by Olga Cavalli from Argentina, Olga is the GAC nominated colleague of work track five with geographic names at the top level. The briefing provided a short, very short description of some of the issues that the work track has been dealing with and provided a link to a fairly extensive working document which continues to evolve. And finally to inform the members here in particular, the work track dealing with geographic names not only has a GAC co-lead there are 15 or 16 GAC members who have volunteered to be participants in network track there was a significant amount of interest from GAC members at the issue in the meeting at Johannesburg and the meeting in Abu Dhabi. So quite a substantial number of GAC members are formally in that system. There is an email list. They may participate in the intersessional calls. A number of additional members are also observers who just received the email. So there is a level of GAC involvement at least on paper there which is quite significant and as I say in previous discussions the GAC has indicated interest in this matter.

Finally, I will just draw your attention to the fact that as we have mentioned several times to you in emails over the last few months since the Abu Dhabi meeting, the GAC website contains a special section of resource materials dealing with work track five and the issue of geographic names policy. Please have a look at that. It includes amongst other things a substantial document which contains a history of all the GAC inputs on the geographic names policy issue over the years. Not just communiqués, but also other inputs as well. So I'd encourage you to look at that resource materials which have been available since last year on the website. So that is the overview of the and I think I will leave it to Olga.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, thank you Tom and thank you Olga for all the effort you've been very active in keeping us updated on all several issues not only work track five. So the issue here is the topic, the substance of the topic itself, GAC participation as well as what are the messages we want to convey through our GAC participants to the work track five work. So, Olga you have a presentation too, just to keep us posted on the developments and then we can open the discussion, thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you Manal and thank you Tom for the briefing and inviting me on stage. Good afternoon to colleagues and those participating remotely. As we all know, this issue of geographic names this is a, an important topic for government and we had some conflicts in the past and some of them are still ongoing as we heard some news about the process with Amazon. So it is good that the GNSO has started this work track five about the geographic names and nuance of these so I will explain what has been happening in the group or what is the composition of the group. Somehow what is the participation of the GAC in the group and what we are working right now and see if you have comments or reactions and see how we can move from here on in getting engaged in this, from our perspective I think it's a very important process that the government's should get involved in.

So the work track five is a sub team within the GNSO new subsequent procedures policy development process working group. This is a long name and it reflects that the GNSO has started a policy development process, that is what PDP means in relation with a new round of new gTLD so there are other tracks, one, two, three, four that focuses on different things. This one focuses on geographic names. This work track started in November 2007, 2017 sorry. I'm going backwards. We had a meeting here in 2007. This is what I remember. And the work track has 145 members. So it is quite well populated by

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

participation. And 82 observers from all the community. You have some individuals, you have some participants from GAC, from ALAC, ccNSO and GNSO so it's quite, then I will go into the details of participation of members of the community, but as I have some experience in different working groups, this is a large number. The first thing that the work track did is agreeing on the terms of reference, which is what is expected from the work track. And it is a document that describes the goals and objectives and scope, and what deliverables and rules of engagement does the work track has. Now, after agreeing on the [term of] reference, the work was the discussion and definition, what is a geographic name that for me is the most important thing because when the definition is done then other work refers to that definition. So the first step of this process of defining what is a geographic name is an analysis of one section of some documents that already exist, which is the applicant guidebook of 2012 and other documents. And there is a document which is quite large. I'm preparing a presentation for tomorrow morning for the working group on chair names. To analyze this is quite difficult to navigate so I'm trying to summarize it somehow. And this is still an ongoing process. So if you have not gotten so much involved and you want to get involved you can go to the document. It is online. It is I think it is a Google doc document. And so you can go there and make your comments. Some GAC members have made their contributions in that document.

I would like to now analyze a little bit with you which is the composition of the work track. Any comments, questions so far? nada? no. Okay Work track five is across communities. So that means it has a code leadership by four coleaders, and Annabeth Lange that I see is sitting there, hello Annabeth. And Martin Sutton, I saw him this morning at breakfast. I don't know if he is around. Annabeth represents the ccNSO Martin GNSO Javier Rua... my friend from Puerto Rico are you around? Javier Rua from ALAC before him it was Christopher Wilkinson. Hello Christopher over there. Christopher is participating in the group now not as a member but co-lead of the group. And myself because some of you suggested that it was a good idea. Something that you should know is that co-leads are expected to have a neutral role in the discussion. So we held the discussion. We tried to get ideas and comments and work on documents. But we are not expected to have a biased position in spite of the fact we may have it. But we are expected to remain neutral. Okay so have that in mind. For being myself the co-lead.

The chairs of the general PDP, the policy development process of the GNSO are Jeff Newman and Sherry [lange] and there are some links that I will provide to you tomorrow so you can check or I can send to you today to the GAC list.

One other thing that I would like to mention isHow is the composition today of the group. I counted this maybe not

exactly these names, but it is roughly the names. GNSO has 52 members in the group. The GAC has 23 members in the group, ccNSO 1925, individual members and... I never know how to say this in English. Is... the security and stability advisory committee. How do you say that? RSAC? Thank you so much.

And then there is quite a big list of observers. But something more about this. How the group makes decisions. Let me go to my, my notes. So, there are different levels of decision. It is for consensus when no one speaks against a recommendation. Consensus, only small minority disagrees, but most agree. Strong support, but significant opposition. A position where there are significant number of those who don't support it, divergence or non-consensus, not strong support for any position, but many different points of view and then minority view when a proposal has a small number of people that supports it and others don't support the recommendation.

What I would like to stress is that we have 23 members of the GAC, as members of the group. The fact is in the cause, we have very low participation from the GAC. So when the time comes of decisions it is not the same maybe you are accustomed the way we just made decisions in the GAC which is, this is different. This is more oriented to the style of decisions of the GNSO. So if you're interested in the issue, and you are interested in the outcome of the group, and you have different views or opinions,

I suggest that you participate in the cause. We organize cause every two weeks, Annabeth? Every two weeks, every two weeks. 90 minutes. And we rotate among time zones I always take the one at 2 AM in Argentina because nobody interrupts me at the phone. So I'm not in my office. I'm at home so nobody calls me at that time. And we rotate among co-leads to make it easy for us. But, so you have opportunities to participate. Then there is the recording. Then there is the transcribing and the notes. So, if you think this is an important issue for the GAC we should not expect that the document is finished in a draft version and comes to the GAC. Maybe it could be good if this is an important issue, we participate in the calls, and we do our input during the process. And I would like to say something more. Let me go to my notes.

Comments, questions? Nada?

So, the co-leads I explained to you. One thing that I would like to mention, which could be very useful for some of us, it is a webinar we organized and Annabeth was so good to explain all the content of the webinar and it was great, so there's a recording of the webinar. It is about the history of the geographic names in ICANN. At the end of the webinar some of you may remember if you were there, I think Ashley was in the webinar and she was, by the way, very useful in pointing out the different positions and how the GAC and members of the GAC

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

involved in the Amazon discussion of issue, so at the end of the webinar this came up and some of us were there. But we were few from the GAC. So only a few of us talking about that. But it was a lot of questions and comments from other colleagues and from the community. So thank you, Ashley for being with me that day. And explaining.

And I will stop here. I would like to tell you that the document, it's an ongoing document for the moment. It's a revision of what it has been until now defined as a geographic name. And we go, the document goes step-by-step in the different definitions of what constitutes a geographic name, and the document makes three questions for each of the different possibilities which are the following that I will read to you. Is that a valid geographic term for the purpose of a new gTLD?

And the second question is, there are three questions, what were the positive impact merits based on the treatment applied to the term in the applicant guidebook and the third question is what were the negative impact opportunities lost based in the treatment applied to the term in the applicant guidebook?

So, it is a good opportunity to comment. We, for example, one definition is the two letter codes in the ISO 3166/1 list and other lists and other different types of definitions in the applicant guidebook, what is a geographic name.

Some of us, and I think Jorge Cancio has been active in that, sorry, Jorge to put you on the spot here, and some of us have included the concept that some names were not included in the lists and there was some conflicts because of those names, for some parts of the community were considered geographic names for the applicant guidebook was not so clear that they should be or could be considered as geographic names. So that is something that, if you think that is worth, should be included in the document somehow. And see if there is an outcome related with that concept.

So, this is more or less What I would like to tell you. And I'm preparing a more detailed presentation for tomorrow morning at 930 for the geographic names. If you remember what we agreed is not closing the working group, but having the space for reviewing in detail the documents that were in development in the work track five. So, that will be finished by myself tonight and maybe I'll send you some documents tonight and review it with you tomorrow or you can see them afterwards in the GAC list. So that is more or less what I want to share with you and please let us know your comments or questions. Benedicto. Should I run the queue? Or whatever you want. Should I do the queue, or... you are the chair, you tell me. I cannot hear you Milagros. I can see you, but I cannot hear you.

MILAGROS CATANON: You run the queue.

OLGA CAVALLI: So I will run the queue and Ashley, and Milagros… and sorry I do not know your name, Benedicto please go ahead.

BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you. Brazil is actually one of the governments that expressed interest in participating in these discussions and however it has not been possible for us in the last few weeks to participate so I really appreciate your update and look forward for further discussion on that topic. I have two questions. Actually one is a question and one is a comment. In regard to the definition of geographic names, and maybe I am wrong, but as I listen to you I have impression that upon [working] on the concept of the definition the working group is focusing may be exclusively on what is taking place in the VDI context itself. You have mentioned the applicant guidebook. You have also mentioned, made reference to the history of geographic names in the ICANN context. I think it is relevant of course to make that assessment. Of course we are working in the context of ICANN, but I would be concerned if the group would focus exclusively on what is taking place between ICANN itself that it would be encapsulated in what we are doing here and not involved in what is taking place elsewhere as we have been saying in other

cases and other circumstances we do not think ICANN is isolated from the world. There are important places where these issues are addressed such as [WIPO] and other places. The question is whether the developments and discussions taking place elsewhere would also be taken into account in some form or not. And if it's not the case I would certainly plead, and argue that it should have been. So the discussion should not be encapsulated within the system otherwise we go in circles and trying to improve on what we have, not take into account what is taking place elsewhere which might also be relevant.

The second is not a question. It is more a comment in regard to the working methods. And of course these are not only applied to this working group track, but to the work that is being done within ICANN itself which refers to consensus. Consensus as I mentioned there is just the full consensus, consensus that is objected by a minority and sometimes the way it is applied might be misleading because if you say a consensus is there because as you have said we had only a few governments participating, maybe express they express their opposition in the light of massive opposition in light of, that might give the impression there is a minority of views. But maybe if there would be a way to assess more extensively it would lead to a different kind of conclusion. And if I may add, that there are different standards of consensus that has been applied within this

organization, for governments to intervene in a meaningful way it is required for government to be in full consensus, otherwise there is no meaningful impact. But on the contrary, when the community gets together, only consensus with minority expression is enough to lead to meaningful action. So it's not something we are solving here. And we're not expect resolution is just to voice a concern about the outcomes there and will certainly lead us to look very carefully at what is being done within that group, because as you have said, that has applications for many things, since particular to the drafting of the new rules for the new applicant guidebook that will guide the next phase of expansion of the gTLD so we think it is of crucial importance that this work would be done in a very thoughtful way, in a very competence of way, taking into account what is taking place beyond the ICANN context and also that the assessment of what is consensus or not will be done in a very, let's say, thoughtful way as well. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you Benedicto. And before giving the floor to other participants that have requested the floor, let me tell you that me and other colleagues did stress that fact in the GAC list, and also we propose to that the group could have a similar scheme that the cross community working group on accountability had, that we had five members per SONSC as the decision numbers

relevant participants in the group and Jorge put this in the list. But that idea unfortunately didn't, was not propose to the working track five and was just an idea in our list. I shared the same concerns that you express it, and I think that is why it is important that those 25 or 20+ members of the GAC that have expressed interest, whichever the interest is, we may have different views, we may have different ideas and different perspectives of the same issue, but it is important that we all take our opinions and input into the process and that it will be reflected in the outcome of the document. And answering your first part, I encourage you to review the online document, I can share the link with the GAC again to put your comments there because I think they are of high relevance. I will give the floor to Milagros.

MILAGROS CASTANON: I absolutely agree with Benedicto's presentation just now. And perhaps we could consider for the following meeting in Panama, we could include in the agenda special presentation from LIPO regarding this issue. The other thing I wanted to mention is that Tom, our Tom from the independent Secretariat, made a very good summary of all the instances in which the issue of geographic names had been registered in the different communiques. And I think that document is very useful right now. And it should be included as an additional column in the

document that you sent us already that has different columns comparing because that has not been taken into account, and I think if Tom has already done the job and it's already identified it would be very helpful to include it. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you Milagros, and United States, Ashley?

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Ashley, for the report on the activities of work track five I just wanted particular note that the GAC participant that the US has participated in every call and we find the work of the group very good and we are heartened by the progress that they have been making, at least starting out to tackle some very thorny issues around defining what a geographic name is. To comment on what Benedicto has said from Brazil I we would agree from a certain extent that this effort cannot operate in isolation of other things that are happening so we would welcome any kind of presentation from WIPO to understand what they are doing and perhaps this group could commit to taking into account any activities that go there but I'm under the impression that work there is also very new and slow.

With respect to decision-making I just wanted to note that we did as a GAC agree to how we would operate in this group and it

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

includes getting some assurance that this work track would work as closely as possible to a cross community effort. And there was commitment to do so. Also, that GAC maintains its primary role, which is at the end of the day, we have the opportunity to have concerns with whatever the final outcome of this group comes up with so we still maintain our right to take issue with what comes out of this group and we have the opportunity to comment on what comes out of this group as well. So while we might have concerns with respect to how decisions are made and isn't necessarily the way we do things and the defined consensus that we use I think it's just important to note to there's quite a bit of willingness in his group to accommodate argues and concerns in the way we operate and it just so happens that way policy is made in ICANN they are rules in the way GNSO follows and they have to be respectful of those rules and while it is a very unique opportunity, we should be grateful for it and participant to the greatest extent possible and recognize at times that perhaps with this new approach we can't boil the ocean at once and expect everyone to operate the same way indiscernible] in ICANN we operate on consensus because we do get special consideration in which the board is understood to act upon our advice. So I just wanted to leave it at that and basically just indicate that we are very pleased with how this work track is going and we hope to see a progress further moving down the road. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Ashley. And I have Morocco next.

MOROCCO: Yes [speaking French] Morocco speaking. Thank you. Before going to a very important point to me I would like to know whether it is possible today to speak about the content of the recommendations of work stream five of whether we should wait until tomorrow.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for your question. The group doesn't have recommendations so far. We have terms of reference. If you think that is useful I can just summarize what is the terms of reference about and then I can describe what is the working document for the moment. So the working group is, the work track five is still working on outcomes. So if the group, I don't know if we have time we can go through that part of the document that it's open now, and I can go through the contents of the terms of reference if the group thinks it is useful. And I have Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, thank you, Olga. Jorge Cancio for the record. I just wanted to make some comments. The first comment of course is that this work is very important to the GAC I think, to all the individual governments and it would be certainly, be very welcome if everyone interested could take such a active role as Olga, or as Ashley, as others who are participating in the cause of this work track. In the end as has been mentioned by Olga and as by others, the discussion in that work track may lay the ground for very important rules in the next expansion of the gTLD space and these rules me affect things that are as dear to us as the delegation of the country names of our states. In our case,.Switzerland,.Sweiss. Swiss, the names of our capitals of important cities, of our regions, and I think this is of primary importance and we shouldn't wait for final recommendation being made by this work track and perhaps being surprised by what is being recommended there.

And one of the issues of course is what is a geographic name, and they are the work track is basing its work mainly on what was decided in 2012 and looking at whether those definitions are still valid or not. And what is even more important, they are starting to discuss what will be the future treatment of those names. And if you remember in 2012 the country names, for instance, and all its variations were directly excluded from the gTLD process because it was considered by ccNSO and to the

GAC through different flavors that those TLD's were not gTLDs that they needed to attract a different treatment. And I think there are underlying reasons for that which are very important, such as the subsidiarity principle, that each community, each national community should establish the policy for its country at top level domains and for the other gTLDs there was a principle established in the 2012 rules which is the principle of non-objection from the respective national authority or regional authority, so that you could only apply for instance for capital city name if you had the letter of nonobjection and of authorities from the capital of that city. And I think that those rules worked well. But it is not set in stone. This work track is discussing that and we have to remember that the original GNSO policy recommendations of 2008 proposed completely different approach instead of an ex ante letter of nonobjection they proposed an ex post objection procedure. And I think it is a discussion we have to engage as soon as possible and not wait for final interim recommendations coming out of the work track five.

There is another issue, which I think merits attention from colleagues, and we have seen it in the item we discussed before on dot Amazon which was a term not considered formerly as a Geo name under the 2012 AGB. We are still six years later seeing what happens if there is not a framework that establishes

incentives for mutual agreed solutions. We have a various conflict. There are many discussions. It's a lengthy and very difficult process with many implications. So I think it is important that in the new AGB in the new policy framing for the next expansion we establish the right incentives so that applicants and authorities that are linked to geographic names or names with a geographic significance, reach agreements before an application goes forward. And now is the chance, really, to avoid dot Amazons of tomorrow, or dot Patagonia's of tomorrow to avoid the problems attached to that applications. But we will only arrive at such good solutions if there is also a good level of engagement from the government side. Because otherwise, not all the voices, not all the interests will be in that discussion. And I leave it at that. Only with a small question to the leadership. I don't know if to Tom, or to Manal or to Olga if on the conditions for the GAC participation on the work track five which Ashley has referred to there was another email to the leads of the PDP working group in February. Has there been any response acknowledgment or anything?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So thank you Jorge for your intervention and for the question. I think we didn't really ask for a response, but if I can see... some of the co-leads in the room, so if they would like to intervene, but I mean, we tried to make our points in the participation that

we would have liked to see this as a ccWG platform. It is obvious that they acknowledge the merit is going to be so, but they are obliged and mandated to go by the PDP rules. So I mean, I think while we drafted the response we said that probably we are just trying to restate our points and to make our points clear, but we didn't really expect the response because I mean, nothing new to be said, if I understand correctly. But, so would you like to comment further on this okay? So I think we have Norway? And then maybe we can conclude and we still have the session, the item on tomorrow's session as well so we can continue the discussion on the substance prisoner way, please.

NORWAY: Thank you chair we'd also like to state that Norway also finds this work import and for the GAC bearing in mind the discussions we had about geographical name on the first round and the problems [that it caused] and a long discussion that it caused, and then as a comment to Brazil and also to underline what the US said in their comment is that the GAC has the expectation I think all the other SO NACS have the expectation that any final outcome must be reviewed and agreed upon by the whole GAC SO. So of course the rules for the consensus rules in the group is of course very important but in the end it would be every SO and ACS that has two agree in the outcome in the way we understand is the guidebook from 2008 is kind of like the

baseline. It is what we have and if we cannot agree and anything else, that is our understanding of it. As it stands now. If anyone has a comment on that of course we are grateful. But this is how we see it. So we will follow the work and look forward to the discussion in the GAC. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Norway. And I think again this was the point that we basically restated in our response. And so to reconfirm our understanding. So Olga yes please.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you chair. I would like to stress the fact that Jorge has been a great contributor to the work of the group as well. Not only Ashley and myself but he has made very good contributions. So I would like to stress that also.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Olga. And as I mentioned, this topic has two parts. One on substance, which we have already started to discuss, and I hope that we continue this discussion tomorrow. We still have one hour tomorrow for this discussion. And we also have the working group on geographic names, the GAC working group on geographic names is also meeting tomorrow. So plenty of time to discuss the substance maybe we can make it like a

working session and get really into substance. And the participation part I think this also leads us very smoothly to the following session because the following session is on GAC participation in cross community working group and PDP's. So we will continue the discussion on the partic part and I hope that the substance part will be continued tomorrow with this is okay with you Olga?

So with this we have to close officially and then... okay we still have 15 minutes? I'm sorry. Okay. My fault. I'm sorry. So we still have 15 minutes. Any further requests for the floor? Olga please?

OLGA CAVALLI: If we don't have more requests for the floor maybe I can quickly go through the work that has been done so far, which is the main important part of the terms of reference and the document about the definition of geographic name. If you agree.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, sure. Also, Tom brought to my attention that I think we have WIPO come into the room so maybe we can also follow on Milagros's request for a presentation from WIPO in Panama. So, Brian, would you be in a position to give us a response or   at least think it and come back to us later if you wish? Brian please.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

BRIAN BECKHAM: Certainly, thank you, chair. Absolutely with respect to the request of a presentation in Panama and as some of you know this issue is also a topic that is being discussed in the WIPO standing committee on trademarks geographical indications and other geographical terms. There are several proposals that are being discussed in the April meeting in Geneva that relate to these various identifiers particularly in respect of the treatment of those identifiers in the DNS. So I think maybe as a practical matter we'd be happy to take this back as the Secretariat, refer to the standing committee on trademarks and of course as the Secretariat for member states we stand ready to make any presentations that would be requested of us.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you WIPO. So back to you, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you Manal. Let me open my notes. So I will go if you allow me to the highlights of the terms of reference, which are already agreed by the working group. No, to the substance. The PDP is open for anyone to participate. All GSNO PDP's working chairs are seeking to structure conversations about geographic names in a way that leads to protectable, reliable and sustainable subsequent procedures for the substantiation of new GDP applications, is sensitive to the needs and concerns of all

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

community members and ensures the participants feel comfortable that the process is inclusive. So this is already in the terms of reference. The work track five will focus, this is abstracting the most important things of course, I can' send you the link to the full text. Work track five will focus on developing proposed recommendations were getting geographic names at the top level including both ASCII and IDM forms. Work track five will consider what constitutes a geographic name in the specific context of the [indiscernible] of the program, analyze the 2007 GSNO policy regulations on the introduction a new generic top-level domains and relevant rules contained in the 2012 applicant guidebooks such as geographic names review procedure, geographic names extended evaluation and objecting procedures and take into account previous work related with geographic names that the community may have completed.

Broader discussion about the [remedy] of supporting organizations and organizer comedies as well as allocation of second and third level geographic domains are specifically out of scope of this working group, work track. And what else is relevant?

So this part of the terms of reference, somehow remits to what ambassador Benedicto was referring. Perhaps we can take the last part of the terms of reference, take into account previous work related to geographic names that the community may

have completed and not stick only to the analysis of what means geographic names in the terms of the guidebook or the 27 GSNO policy recommendations.

And what else? The deliverables, what is expected from this work track five group. Develop a work plan including a timeline for activities and deliverables which consensus and potential policy recommendations or implementation guidance regarding geographic names at the top level following the process set up for the existing work track. It will deliver proposed recommendations and related rationale to the full working group for consideration and possible adoption as a PDP policy development process, working group recommendations.

Consensus levels for all recommendations will be determined Further decision-making section in the terms of reference, which I referred a moment ago. And the full working group will publish the initial report for public comment. All comments received will be passed on work track 5due consideration and any changes as and work track five the final report will be delivered to the full working group. As of course was mentioned in the comments by the US, the document will go to the GAC for comments, but if we can give our inputs during the process, then the impact of reviewing a document is always less than changing it from different perspectives. The decision-making I already referred to that before. So, for consensus, consensus. It is more aligned with

the policy development process of the GNSO, not exactly the same way we work in the GAC. So our role within ICANN is not the same so it has a ground in that and finally let me refer to the document that it is still under, in a draft version. The review of existing defined geographic names. I think I have five minutes to refer to that.

So, for the moment it is reviewing the parts that are in the applicant guidebook, section 2.2.1.3.2. And I would read the different categories. So if you go to the document, if you have the chance to review it, these are the different lines, not columns, lines in the document. Alpha-2 coded in the ISO 3166 – one standard, for example could be AR for Argentine or AF for Afghanistan or all the two letter codes relevant for the CCT LD's for example. And other category is alpha three code listed in the ISO 3166 – one standard for example 3 letter codes AFG for Afghanistan. I'm just reading an example on that. Country or territory names, longform name in the ISO 3166 standard or translation of the longform name in any language, for example the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Other considerations, short form Name in the ISO 66 standard of the short form name in any language, for example Afghanistan. Short or long form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally served by the ISO 61 maintenance agency. We have some examples here. We reserve for a

particular use of request of a national ISO member body governance or international organizations. Example, United Kingdom, UK reserved for United Kingdom. Other categories [indiscernible] component for the country name indicated in the country list or designation of a name appearing in the name of the language according to the Annex in the applicant guidebook example island [indiscernible] of islands has a different script. Permutation of transposition of any names included involved. Czech Republic, Republic Czech or Cayman Island, name by which a country is commonly known as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that gnome in an intergovernmental or Treaty organization. For example, Holland for the Netherlands.

I still have two or three more. Representation in any language of a capital city name of any country. This is what Jorge was referring to. Territory listed in the ISO 3166 examples landed, Londres… Berlin, Buenos Aires, city name used for purposes as a city with a city name. Florence, Bath, Frankfurt. City name used for other purposes but Florence, Barh [indiscernible] country province or state designated in ISO 3166 – two. Pakistan and Afghanistan for example. Strings listed in UNESCO region and appearing in the composition of micro geographic or continental regions, geographic subregions and selected economic and other groups list, for example Africa, northern Africa. And then

finally, this is a comment from that members, the definitions included in the 2012 applicant guide would in general work well, however problems in the application in the applicant guidebook 2012 related to geo-names that top-level domains arise in simulation to those names which a geographic meaning or significance that were not covered under the applicant guidebook rules. Amazon. Patagonia. So that it's also included in the document. So we will stop here because we don't have much time. A detailed document, I'm finishing it. I will send it to you hopefully at the end of today. So we can go into detailed analysis of it. Maybe we can start in the morning and if we don't have that much time we can keep on working in the afternoon thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olga. And thanks to all active GAC members who participated to this important discussion. It is obvious that it is a topic of interest to the GAC. It is important that we participate as early as possible. And I think even if for new GAC representatives or members who got distracted by other things, we can try to keep updates and information so that people can catch up, and please don't be embarrassed to ask what you have missed so that you can catch up easily and get into the discussion. I really sympathize with everyone with everything else that is going on the same time, at the same time,

so it is very hard to follow everything. But again, a government cannot make other government speak for them, but we can share information and exchange information so that we are all up to date and then we can voice our views individually.

So with this, if there are no requests for the floor, we can conclude the discussion. So this concludes the GAC discussion a new gTLD procedures on track five on Saturday, March 10 and we will proceed with the next agenda item once the technical team gives me the signal to go ahead. So.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]