

LONDON – GAC Meeting: New gTLDs - Board Responses to GAC Advice
Saturday, June 21, 2014 – 14:30 to 16:00
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN: So this would be a good opportunity to welcome some of our new members.

We have some changes and additions in representation, but again, we have new additions, new governments, and so forth, that are joining the committee. So I do want to welcome Barbados, Liberia, Venezuela, Israel. And I understand we have a minister from Bangladesh as well, so welcome to the GAC meetings. And I think that's really good news for all of us to see new members coming in.

We also have a new observer to the GAC, and that is the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement. And so we have an observer to report as well joining the GAC.

So this would bring us to, I believe, 142 members and 31 observers in the GAC. So we are still growing, which is great to see.

All right.

So let's continue to move through our agenda, and that is to next discuss the agenda or have an overview of it.

As I mentioned earlier, we do have, as usual, quite a packed agenda. What I hope we can do at these meetings is focus on policy issues, public-policy issues related to domain name matters. So we have a few

remaining things related to generic top-level domains that are outstanding. I don't think we can address all of those in this meeting. I think some are pending with the Board New gTLD Program Committee. But nevertheless, we have, I think, a few things to go through; in particular, in relation to the implementation of safeguards. So it might be useful to touch upon that this week and engage with the Board New gTLD Program Committee on any outstanding issues related to that. As well, we will have an opportunity to discuss the GAC participation or contribution to the IANA stewardship transition and related issues of enhancing ICANN's accountability. I think we do need to have some focus on these particular issues and try to come to decision at these meetings on that. Those processes are getting under way, and so as I say, I think we need to give it some priority at our meetings.

In terms of other policy issues, it's quite timely for us to get engaged in discussions around WHOIS, which invokes perspectives from law enforcement and privacy and so on. And as we will see when we receive a comprehensive overview of all the work happening at ICANN on these issues, I think it will be apparent that this is a matter where the GAC needs to be more engaged and really initiate fuller involvement at these meetings.

So with that, we are also going to have various briefings and information sessions, as well, while we are here. And again, that helps us set our work agenda moving forward to continue our work intersessionally and as well plan for the next meeting in Los Angeles.

There's still quite a bit left on this first part of the agenda, so are there any questions or comments at this point on the agenda? I see none. All right.

So let's move to the next item. This is an update regarding the contract to engage ACIG to provide external Secretariat support to the GAC. And I think we have good news to report here. We have a contract in place. And we are waiting for the final hoop to be jumped through on the ICANN side, but it's really a pro forma thing. And so we are almost in a position to completely conclude that. But de facto, we do have that now in place. It's been a long process. I think it's just great timing for us to have this sorted out for these meetings and able to make full use of the support coming from ACIG, which I think you will agree has been first rate based on our prior experience with that.

In terms of getting information to you about roles and responsibilities and offering clarification, this is now our next priority in relation to this matter. And that way you will all know who to approach about what issue and who will be doing what and so on and so forth.

Tom, did you want to add anything on that?

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Heather. Good afternoon, everybody. Yes. With the process of engaging ACIG in its support function to the GAC now almost complete, we are preparing some information resources for you, the GAC members, to -- and the first of those resources to be available very shortly as a FAQ sheet clarifying the respective responsibilities between Michelle and myself and Julia in the ICANN support team, if you like, a

series of FAQs or frequently asked questions so that you can most quickly find the person in the support group who can help you with your particular question and fix whatever problems you may have at least as they relate to the GAC. So we would see that as the first in a series of FAQ sheets and resources documents. But, obviously, we would like your own feedback through the course of the meeting in what more information you would like to have prepared and to be made available. We would like to think that's the beginning of a process. Thank you, Heather.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. That's very helpful. If I could just add, since we do have new members and new representatives in the GAC, Michelle at the far right is particularly focused on working with new members and assisting them to get up to speed with the GAC and the issues we're working on. And this is part of the briefing material that ACIG will be preparing for us. So please don't hesitate to approach Michelle and introduce yourself and engage Michelle if you have any questions or need support of any kind.

So I think we can perhaps move on to the next agenda item.

Okay.

All right.

So next item is the election of the chair and vice chairs. So I will hand over to Michelle who is managing that process.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you. Good afternoon. In April I sent an email via the GAC list outlining the process for nominating a new GAC chair and vice chairs. On the 11th of June I sent out a second email reiterating that information. Today I intend to repeat that information again for anyone who may have missed it by the email list. And I think it's important to repeat it, too, while we have the translation services available here.

I'm also going to outline the process of nominating a new chair and vice chairs. Today I will also announce the one nomination that I've received so far. And I will also, with the chair's permission, take any questions from the floor about the election process. But, if you don't want to ask questions from the floor, I'm available throughout the meeting for any questions you have about this process as well.

The current GAC chair and vice chairs are approaching the end of their official terms of office. All have served two consecutive terms, so none are available or eligible for re-election in their current role. And the full details of the election process can be found in the GAC operating principles which are available online through the ICANN Web site, through the GAC Web site. You don't even have to -- it's not through the members only part. You can access that through the public part of the GAC Web site.

The election or the nomination process will be managed by the ACIG GAC Secretariat and specifically by me just assure appropriate probity and independence.

During this meeting I encourage you all to talk amongst yourselves because I will be seeking nominations for the positions of the new GAC chair and the three vice chairs. At the end of this meeting, probably on

Wednesday, I think, I'll again announce any nominations that I've received during the process of this meeting. And I will send details of those nominations to the GAC list. And I'll also, I think, post them on the GAC Web site. So all that information is available there for you.

The GAC operating principles are largely silent about the nomination process. So we will accept self-nomination as well as nominations by others.

And the nomination period will officially close on the 27th of August, 2014. I guess at midnight central time on that day.

But I'll be hoping to receive nominations during this meeting as well.

To the extent possible, the vice chairs should appropriately reflect the geographic and development diversity of the membership. So please keep that in mind.

To make a nomination, simply send me an email. My email address is Michelle@acig.com.au. Include the name of your nominee, the country they represent, and the role for which you are nominating them. And, unless you're nominating yourself, it's probably wise to let me know that the person you are nominating has agreed to be nominated.

I will also formally check to ensure that the nominated person is the accredited GAC representative for their country.

In the past a single candidate has generally been nominated for each role and he or she has simply been elected by acclamation. However, if there is more than one position for the position of chair and three for

vice chairs, an election will be held. I don't believe the GAC has ever held one before.

Any such election will take place in the lead up to and during our next meeting in Los Angeles.

GAC members who are unable to attend that Los Angeles meeting will have the opportunity to vote via email.

In the case of the tie ballot for two leading candidates, an additional ballot shall be held restricted to those candidates who tied after an interval of at least one hour. And, if a second round of voting is required, only those GAC members who are present at the Los Angeles meeting will participate.

For the elections, the vote shall be taken by secret ballot. Won't be secret to me, but it will be secret to all of you. The votes will come to me, and I will count them and tally them. It will be a matter of each voting member to decide if they wish to make his or her choice public. And this includes the taking of votes in person or ballots transmitted by electronic mail.

And we will organize the voting procedure and count the votes under the supervision of the chair and vice chairs who do not stand for re-election. And, if an election must take place, I'll send out more information about how exactly that will occur.

We have talked in the past about more than three vice chairs, notably, in Durban and within the working methods working group. This issue remains unresolved. But, even if a fully-agreed decision were made, at

any change to the number of vice chairs will require a formal revision of the GAC operating principles.

The process of doing that takes longer than we have for this process that we're undertaking at the moment. So at this meeting I will be seeking nomination for one GAC chair and for three vice chairs.

So far I have received one nomination. And that is from the Deputy Prime Minister and chief executive officer of the government of Montenegro. His name is Minister Vujica Lazovic. He's the minister for Information Society and Telecommunications and the ccTLD manager for dot ME. He's also a professor for information systems and Internet economy at the Faculty of Economics in the Podgorica, University of Montenegro. That's all the information I have for you today. Do you have any questions for me about the election process?

CHAIR DRYDEN: I don't see any hands raised. Okay.

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, Chair. I didn't quite understand, Michelle, for which post the nomination was received.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you. He's been nominated for vice chair.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Follow-up question, U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. It's not really a follow-up question. I don't know if this is the point in the agenda to raise this. But we've had discussions in the European high-level group on Internet governance about the responsibilities of the GAC chair and the skill set, profile, and so on. If it would help colleagues, I could relay our conclusions of that discussion at this point or if you wanted to do it in a later point in the agenda. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: I think this session was intended to simply brief the process as it's being run. So, unless there are any further questions or comments for Michelle to address -- Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Good afternoon to everybody. I do not know the background of three vice chair. However, if there are three vice chairs, there are three vice chairs. We have no difficulty with that. However, if there is any idea to increase the number of vice chairs, we should have some principle for that whether they should be on a regional basis or some other criteria but not increasing the number by increasing the number. We should have some principles how and why we increase the number.

Usually, the vice chairs should have some responsibility given by the chair to assist the chair in performing his or her duty. No doubt vice

chair -- if it is additional vice chair based on some principle perhaps regional or so on.

We should also take into account the rotation procedures, rotation principles. So this should be that rotate among various countries in various regions.

Above that, I do not know what is the regional basis for the GAC. If the same regional basis of ICANN, this is something that we should think it over because currently there are some questions about this regional arrangement in ICANN itself. However, any addition to the vice chair should follow the regional representations, if any, and should be based on the rotation procedures. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Iran. That sounds like a good discussion to have within the working group on working methods that I think is addressing that question. So thank you for that.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

Thank you very much. I'm just filling along on what Mark has said that we do have requirements from the European Union on what we at least would consider to be important skills and how to run it, how to run GAC in the future.

I don't necessarily think we have to discuss it here, but I do think it's worth to circulate that to GAC to see if you can agree with these requirements. Because I think there is a number of things that we

would like to see, for instance, skills, availability of people or the chair, the independence of the chair and et cetera, et cetera.

So I think, if you don't mind, we will circulate those on the GAC list. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, European Commission.

So I believe there will be opportunity as part of the working group on working methods to discuss that issue. And it's probably useful to clarify the role of GAC members and GAC representatives and have some kind of understanding about their interactions and how they interact with each other at meetings.

So certainly aligning understandings, aligning expectations around everybody's role and responsibilities in a setting like this, I think, would be advantageous.

So okay.

Can we move on? I'm seeing more questions, but I -- this item was really meant to be an information bulletin about how the process is being run.

Can we move to the next item? Okay.

All right. Thank you.

All right. So one quick item under agenda item 1 pertains to GAC travel support. And the reason we added this to the agenda is we are

observing that we are now getting quite a few requests for travel funding. And we do have a set of GAC travel guidelines.

The funding comes from ICANN. The decisions about allocating the funding is the task of the chair and the vice chairs. So for each meeting we go through a list and make a decision about those funds based on the guidelines that we have. So I do want to remind everyone that that's the process and that's the approach.

And then, in terms of the volume of requests we're receiving, I think some of you have been funded regularly. And it's not going to be possible to be so assured of receiving funding to each meeting in light of the volume or the level of interest. So I just want to flag that for some of you so that you can anticipate that it's not a certainty as it might have been in the past.

We received 30 fellowships in total for the GAC. This is in addition to the fellowship program that is run by ICANN. As I say, the GAC manages the funding that we receive from ICANN separately.

And, if there is a need to review or revise those guidelines to assist us with this growing challenge of interest and requests for funding, then that's something that we can do in the future is to look at those travel guidelines and revise them accordingly. But, of course, the purpose is to reinforce the ability of developing countries to attend and to engage in the material and participate here along with other colleagues. So it's more of an information note to you regarding the travel fund.

Okay.

So with that, let's move to the second agenda item and begin with the first two bullets that are there. We have IGO protections and Red Cross, Red Crescent protections.

You should all by now have a hard copy of a letter dated June 16th that was sent by the board new gTLD program committee to the Generic Name Supporting Organization outlining where they believe there are differences in view either between the GAC and the advice we have given and the GNSO or between the NGPC and the approach they've been taking and the GNSO.

And so there are two points there -- protections for IGO acronyms and protections for national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies.

So the board has written to the GNSO asking them to consider these issues and to see whether there are any adjustments that they're able to make in order to allow us to conclude on this issue at least for the current round, if not for future rounds.

And so it's important that we take note of this latest step and determine, you know, what, if any, actions we need to take beyond monitoring developments with this.

So I think this is a good reference for us in this discussion to take into account the latest.

You will recall that with protecting IGOs, it was really the acronyms aspect rather than the names where we found there were some remaining issues to address.

And that is what we have been working on as the main focus of our efforts between the GAC with the IGOs and with the board new gTLD program committee.

So I know the OECD had expressed an interest in speaking on this. So I'm happy to give you the floor. I don't see any other requests at this point. So, if you would like, please.

OECD:

Thank you very much, chair. Thank you to the GAC. And I think the first thing I would like to say is thank you for continuing with this very important issue for us and I know for our member governments as well.

Regarding the current situation, we, obviously, read this letter with great interest. We are -- we welcome this letter to greatest extent in that the board is -- or the NGPC committee of the board is suggesting to the GNSO to see if they can amend their recommendation to come closer to a solution, a solution which the NGPC has been working on, which we must say is closer to the GNSO recommendation than to the GAC initial recommendation. It is a curative mechanism and a notification mechanism. The GAC, in particular, the chair and vice chairs and a small group of IGOs have made some important concessions. And the NGPC has been very helpful in that.

So, on that side, we do hope that the GNSO sees that, in fact, that this proposal for second level protection of acronyms in this round and, hopefully, as you say, whatever we agree on we don't have to reopen for subsequent rounds and will meet us some -- or the NGPC some way to that.

There is one sentence that concerns the IGOs quite greatly, which is that on the second page at the top, the NGPC writes, "The NGPC will not take any action with respect to the GAC advice and curative rights protections for IGOs and INGOs prior to the conclusion of the IGO's PDP."

For -- there have been discussions for over two years now. And, as we say, this is not the GAC's advice on curative rights protections. This is the compromise which is on curative protections rather than preventive protections.

This is what the NGPC has proposed. And, in their proposal, they stated very clearly that there will be a safeguard which the board, the NGPC will give IGOs and the PDP, which will not take anything away, can only give improvement above those safeguards which the NGPC has given.

This seems to have gone back on that commitment here. And IGOs are extremely concerned about that aspect.

This seems to have gone back on that commitment here, and IGOs are extremely concerned about that aspect.

So we would like some clarity, and if we are reading this wrong, then wonderful. If the NGPC could confirm that, it would be good, because after two years, I know the chair is frustrated, I know the GAC is extremely frustrated. IGOs are extremely frustrated.

The GAC has given its advice on public-policy grounds. There is an interest to protecting IGO acronyms.

Now, this is as far as the second-level is concerned, but I would really -- we would really like to insist that the top level not be forgotten for future rounds.

The GAC advice is very clear and is not -- obviously not in line with what the GNSO has proposed, but we don't know at what point we need to discuss this, but this -- we should not forget that there is standing GAC advice since Toronto which has been continuously repeated regarding protections for the names and the acronyms at the top level as well, which does not -- there is not the same -- the issues are not the same for the top level as for the second level.

And finally, if we may ask something of the Chair and the GAC is to clarify who should we be speaking with? Because the Board decision seems to say that it's the president and CEO of ICANN who should be holding a dialogue on the issues where there is not consensus between the GNSO and the GAC, and whereas it is the NGPC who has been involved up to now and is writing to the GNSO.

So some clarity on that would be, I think, useful for all actors.

And please include IGOs in this discussion because the Board decision mentions GNSO, GAC, ALAC. But we understand that we're not an identifiable constituency in -- in the ICANN processes. We're not a group, but this issue is -- obviously we're the first concerned by it, so it's very important to us.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. So for the two questions, on the first one, can I turn over to Australia regarding future issues or future rounds?

Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to the IGO coalition for those very useful comments on the NGPC's most recent response.

In terms of the question about future rounds, I think it would be -- this is a potential -- potentially useful addition to the future rounds working group, which is currently looking at a limited range of issues, but potentially this is something that could be added as another subissue for that working group. How. I believe the scope was recently clarified and it's broad enough for that to happen. At the moment that working group is operating by having leads for each of the subissues. So we have Argentina leading on geographic names, for example. We could look for someone to take the lead on this issue within that working group. I'm not sure exactly when would be the appropriate time to do that, but I'd be open to it happening now. I look to the Chair.

Just a couple of other things before we move on. In terms of the issue of preventative mechanisms versus curative mechanisms, I understand the concerns of the IGOs in this regard, and this is obviously something that has been discussed a lot, but the GAC itself has moved on towards recommending a curative approach, so the Buenos Aires communique spells out the principles for such an approach very clearly in terms of having a permanent system of notifications, timeliness for ability to respond, et cetera. So I think it's important to take note of that as a

development in this process as it has moved along. And we've tried to find a sort of mutually accommodating or workable solution.

The other thing -- I certainly take the IGO's point and agree. I think this letter from the NGPC is very welcome, and personally I have not been involved in a process like this before, I have not seen a process like this before where the Board has gone back to the GNSO and asked it to reconsider recommendations. I could be wrong, but I think it would be something very useful for the GAC to look at. And potentially, in our meeting with the GNSO or in some discussions with the GNSO, to highlight that we would be very interested to be involved in that work. I think we all agree that -- and we've all been working on this -- is that getting the GAC involved in GNSO policy processes early or more effectively can lead to better outcome.

So I think if the GNSO is to take this up and go back and reconsider its recommendations on this, I think having the GAC or interested GAC members involved at a very early stage could potentially be very useful. But as I say, I haven't been involved in this so I think it would be something for us, useful to explore in the margins of this meeting and see if there's a good way for the GAC to become involved in this.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Australia. Okay. I think those are all good suggestions.

To your second question, I'm just reviewing the letter, and you were asking about the role of the president and the CEO regarding this matter. But as I read this, it's really the NGPC that's leading and

continues to lead on it. So, yeah, if you could elaborate on what the concern was.

OECD:

The April decision from the Board said that, that they -- on the issues which were not -- on the recommendation, the GNSO recommendations which were not adopted because there's a conflict between the GAC and the GNSO, apparently the Board asks the president/CEO to organize a dialogue between, and I quote, "GNSO, GAC, and ALAC." Not IGOs.

So as we had understood up until then, it was the NGPC who was conducting the dialogue. So some clarity on that.

And if I could just very briefly respond to a couple of points which Australia just said.

In terms of the working group on future rounds, we would like some more information; however, there is standing GAC advice on the future round and protection of acronyms at the top level.

Regarding the curative rights. Yes, like I said, this is -- the GAC and IGOs have made great concessions on this, and we would like to see some closure to this.

They're curative rights; however, they are supposed to be, according to the Buenos Aires communique, prevent harms to IGO acronyms.

And again, the discussion with NGPC was very fruitful. And it seems to be interrupted by this line that I read from the letter.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay. So it seems to me that we can look at issues related to protections at the top level for the names -- is that right? -- as part of the Future Issues Working Group? It's the acronyms still. Okay.

The outstanding issues for future rounds I think can be handled as part of the Future Issues Working Group. And then we have things to clarify with the Board and/or NGPC, and we will have an opportunity when we meet with them to raise these questions about next steps and how it will be handled and what precisely the role of the CEO is in convening that particular group and what the meaning of it is relative to this letter. I thought the letter was quite straightforward, but apparently the process going forward isn't as clear as we might have thought initially.

And then we can put these questions to the Board when we meet with them.

Okay. So let's keep track of those.

So next I have the Red Cross, and then the United States, and Iran.

ICRC:

Thank you.

So Charlotte Lindsey. I'm from the International Committee of the Red Cross, on behalf of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement.

Thank you very much, firstly, for the support which has been given by the GAC throughout for the Red Cross and Red Crescent requests. We know this item is often on the agenda, and we appreciate the support.

We hope that this issue will be able to be resolved satisfactorily as quickly as possible.

What is important for us in terms of reading the recent communications in relation to this is, firstly, the point coming out of the ICANN Board's decision to understand exactly how these discussions will be facilitated in terms of with the relevant parties as was outlined in the recommendations. The Board further resolved to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties, and we would just like to understand how those discussions will take place and what will be the role of the GAC in that regard in relation to Red Cross/Red Crescent protections.

Secondly, we also want to know how the -- how the recent resolution from the Board, how it will look at the next steps which could be undertaken, particularly by the GAC, in order to promote the full implementation of the protections that were called for, particularly as outlined in the Singapore communique, confirming the GAC's past advice for a permanent protection of the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement and the required inclusion thereunder of the names and identifiers of the respective components of the movement in relevant languages.

So that's the names of the national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, and also the names and acronyms of the two international components, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the ICRC,

and the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, the IFRC.

And lastly, just to highlight that the elements of risk that have been mentioned in previous -- on previous occasions, and the risk that would occur if these names and terms are not permanently protected. We have many, many instances where there are frauds committed where these names have -- online as well as off-line when these names are misused in relation to disasters, in relation to trying to raise funds. It is very clear it's a name which is highly trusted and highly recognized. We have to be sure that we protect it fully in accordance with international humanitarian law. And we really continue to ask for the GAC's support in this regard.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much. So I have United States next.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'd like to express my appreciation to our colleagues from the IGO coalition and the Red Cross/Red Crescent.

I have to say the United States has a great deal of sympathy for the concerns that have been expressed today. I do, however, would like to reassure you that, of course, as observers, you are members of the GAC and the GAC intends to fully stand by its existing advice. So if that is helpful, I'm happy to offer that reassurance.

I concur with Australia's assessment that this letter, the letter that we are just seeing today, could perhaps be the first time we have seen an overture from the Board to the GNSO to -- sort of suggesting that they might want to reconsider an existing policy. And I think that's certainly a very helpful development. It would be interesting if we can take some time when we meet with the GNSO to ask for their reaction.

I do think that going forward, we could consider making an overture to the GNSO ourselves that this current situation could be a good test case for the current work that is actually under way between the GAC and the GNSO. It's admittedly a smallish working group. We will be getting an update during this meeting. But one of the areas that we are trying to focus on is facilitating early GAC comment on a GNSO scoping of an issue.

And so again, we've been struggling to find a test case. This may well be a test case. Because regrettably, the GAC's work and the GNSO's work on these important issues has been done separately, quite separately and in silos. And this is a clear example of why we need to overcome those problems. This should not continue. And the issue should not go on with separate deliberations in one Supporting Organization and one Advisory Committee.

So I would wholeheartedly support us taking this up affirmatively with the GNSO, indicating quite clearly that we would like to have an exchange. We need to be a part of their deliberation as to whether they feel the need to actually initiate yet another PDP. So I think this is an important issue, and I appreciate that our IGO colleagues and Red Cross/Red Crescent observers have also brought it to our attention.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, United States.

Next I have Iran, then the U.K.

IRAN:

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I think we should not limit ourself to just raising the question in our next round of discussions with the entities in the ICANN which is responsible to these matters. We should take or treat the matter with more serious cause of action. We should write to the ICANN Board describing or addressing our concerns, if not our disappointment or frustrations, of the progress of the work that two entities within the ICANN that have sometimes different views, and these different views continues for unnecessary period or unlimited period, which would not give a good message to the outside world.

In particular, the next items of the agenda when you discuss the accountability of ICANN, this also falls under that issue.

Different point of views between two entities in the ICANN should not result to the frustrations of the entities behind the issue which is under discussions. There should be some time limit and there should be some positive action on that.

Once again, we should write them and give them our concerns or address them our concerns and ask immediate action with a view to

resolve the matter as soon as possible, and possibly with some time limit.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Iran.

Next I have the U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Chair. And I have a lot of sympathy with that view from Iran. In both these cases, the GAC has given advice, and what has happened subsequently has become very contracted and seemly indeterminate. It's not really the way this whole model of discussion and submission of advice should work.

I mean, I agree, first of all, with the OECD and the IGO coalition that that line about awaiting the conclusion of a PDP is very alarming. I mean, that could lead to a very extended period of not resolving what has been GAC advice. And in the case of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, again we seem to be in a sort of very indeterminate situation here. The GAC has been very clear and forthright in its advice, and it's very disappointing and disturbing that the GNSO reaction in respect to the Red Cross protection is to consider or equate names that are protected under convention with trademarks and brands by referring them to -- by referring to trademark clearinghouses as the way to resolve this. That is not our expectation when we submitted that GAC

advice. There should be permanent protection implemented quickly and effectively.

Equating names protected under convention with a trademark process is, in principle, unacceptable, I think. So we should be very strong in our reaction to this current state of play.

If it did lead to some mechanism involving the clearinghouse, that will be a drain on resources for the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, resources that should be directed to humanitarian causes. So this is, again, another aspect of this which I find very disturbing.

So I really think we ought to consider a strong message in the communique on the failure, really, to follow through with the GAC advice with precision and immediacy. So I would hope that we could agree to text along those lines in the communique.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Next I have Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I will speak in French.

You know that Switzerland has always been concerned about the issue of IGO protections and acronyms.

We are a little bit disappointed because of this complex mechanism, and there have been many ups and downs and different opinions in different fora within ICANN. We are left with impression that we take two steps forwards and one backwards, so I think that it is quite frustrating for IGOs. And for part of the GAC member countries because we have the feeling that we are not going to reach any satisfactory solution in relatively easy manner.

We effectively believe that IGOs need -- require a permanent effective protection as it has been expressed by other colleagues that spoke before me.

We also believe that we need to present a firm message from the GAC in order to find a quick solution to this issue and to avoid misinterpretations, and also to skip taking responsibilities from one place to another, both for protections at the first and at the second level.

INDONESIA:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Having followed the GAC meetings several times, and I think today more and more issues we discuss and also the time is becoming longer and longer and longer, and we have, what you call it, more disagreements between members as well as between the GAC and the other committees in the ICANN. Madam Chair, I just propose that if there is possibilities that we can deliberate ourselves to discuss domain issues that are -- what you call it? Normally discussed in the GAC itself, rather

than in a case-by-case basis. We can discuss the issues which are normally faced by us.

For example, in Singapore we spent a lot of time discussing a name like .WINE, .VIN, and so on.

So clearly, one issue is about names. If there is a need of clearinghouse, then we have to say so, okay, we need a clearinghouse, we have to change the bylaws, and whatever. I mean, there are several options of this.

Now, what else? Do we have to say that a name of TLD is not given to a particular institution? It is owned by ICANN and it is only given to an institution and they can use it as long as ICANN would like to give it, just like (indiscernible) in ITU.

Now there are other kind of issues we can say, and I chair my thought with our friend from Iran and England and the U.K. where there are some -- what you call it? A lot of time needed for discussion within the GAC and the Board of ICANN itself, just like names and so on and so on.

So in this respect we have to be able to discuss more ourselves and of course the Board, and how we would like to see the GAC positions in the Board of ICANN, what kind of things we can give the support to the Board of ICANN to make sure that all the -- all the -- all the discussion in the GAC and among all the members can be clearly heard and considered by the ICANN Board.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Indonesia.

So I have one request from Sri Lanka to speak and then I will close the speaking order, sum up, and then we need to move on through the agenda.

So Sri Lanka, please.

SRI LANKA:

Thank you, Heather. I'll be short and just to emphasize that I concur with all of the points made by the previous country representatives, but emphasize on one aspect that was brought out by Mark from U.K. that I think there's a need for strong message from GAC through our consensus advice, stating very clearly that those names protected by international law should not be brought to the level of other trademark by putting them into the category of those that can be put into the trademark clearinghouse.

So I think that is not acceptable, and a strong message should be conveyed by GAC in relation to the two acronyms that we are discussing at the moment.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Sri Lanka. Okay. So it's clear that we have a few items for clarification to take up with the Board this week on both the IGO protection side of things and the Red Cross/Red Crescent side. And we can also discuss this when we meet with the GNSO to at least flag to them that this is a matter of importance to us still, and that we are

ready to work with them to address these issues and try to have as speedy a conclusion as possible on these matters.

We can also communicate as a GAC our concerns and reaffirm the advice that we have already given. Clearly there is a lot of support for continuing to advance that advice and draw attention to it as we try to resolve these matters with the NGPC and other parts of the community. And we can do that via our communique if not, in fact, a letter. But either way, I see there is clearly an interest in reaffirming the GAC's views and trying to make it clear that we are seeking as rapid a conclusion to these issues as possible. And hopefully, then we will receive confirmation of this process moving along as a consequence of that.

Okay. So just a couple of points now. We are running over time, but we have a staff briefing scheduled for 3:30. I'm not sure whether Christine is here yet.

Okay. Christine is here. Okay.

Is it okay to move to the briefing now? And then we can continue to discuss the other items we have listed.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

The other option is Cyrus and Akram were also going to be joining us. We were told that you were going to be running until 4:00 to have a break. So we don't need -- I don't need to interrupt your session now if you want to continue and have your break. The three of us can join together to answer questions collectively at 4:30. Does that suit your agenda?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yeah. If you could come back after our break, that would be great, and we can continue with our --

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Wonderful. All the GDD team will be here. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Thank you. Great. Thank you, Christine.

Okay. All right. So let's continue.

So our next item is regarding specific strings and whether there are, in fact, any issues to discuss regarding any specific string. So I see Belgium. Please.

BELGIUM: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

First of all, Belgium notes the decision made by the NGPC as regards the string .SPA. We think this decision is very vague.

The further process lacks transparency, and, therefore, we think that in first instance, we should seek further clarification from the NGPC through the GAC, so through the GAC, on what they mean by the combined statement which says "accepts the advice," the GAC advice, and will proceed with the normal process. For us, this needs further clarification.

And our question would be mainly what's, then, the normal process?
What are the next steps? This is very vague.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Belgium.

Okay. So a proposal to seek clarification by the GAC from the NGPC
regarding that aspect of the NGPC's response on .SPA. Okay.

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Chair. I want to come back to the issue of child
protection, which is something the GAC -- an important issue which the
GAC has raised in the past with the Board and I think we've covered it in
previous advice, and that is that there are particular domain -- top-level
domain applications which are addressing that community, community
of children. I'm thinking of examples like .TOYS, .GAMES and .KIDS and
there are others.

I've learned to my dismay today that a letter which the European NGO
alliance for child safety online wrote to the CEO and president has not
had a response after some time. This alliance is known by the acronym
eNACSO, and the U.K. leading experts are members of this alliance, have
made proposals for guidelines or code of practice for these -- for the
registries to implement in respect of these domains, and that would set
out a number of measures that should be implemented under
contractual conditions, I think, in order to ensure that there are

sufficient safeguards to protect children who are going to be accessing companies under these domains, accessing their Web sites and involved in interactive activity, and so on, online through these Web sites. And the letter goes into some detail about the current of safeguards that should be maintained.

So I want to come back to this and highlight this, really, as an example, really, where our message about child protection hasn't appeared to have hit home. This letter hasn't been responded to. We've discussed it in the European group of GAC representatives, and there is shared concern about this and a desire to bring it to the attention of the full committee meeting.

We can share that letter with colleagues here with a view, I hope, to concluding that we incorporate some advice at the end of this meeting to the Board endorsing the kind of proposals that eNACSO have set up in these settle of guidelines.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.K.

I have European Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

Thank you very much. I just would like to express our deepest regrets that ICANN so far has completely disregarded the profound concerns that EU and several other members here in GAC has around the issue of WINE and VIN.

Now, I don't have to repeat how important this issue is. But I would like to very much make it clear that these are distinctive signs like trademarks which shows the quality and importation of goods lead to geographical region. They are -- and this I think is the most important issue around here. They're essential assets for interest to save for the interests of certain regions and the livelihood of people in those regions whether that is in Mendoza or whether it is in Rioja or whether it is in Napa Valley. So, for us, this is a reason why we cannot accept that these two gTLDs are actually delegated without proper safeguards.

We have tried through negotiations -- we have tried to actually have -- use the multistakeholder approach by having industry -- and here I'm not talking about only European industry but also American industry from the wine sector to try to deal with the applicants and try to find a solution. Because we know that we are not able in this fora -- and this fora is definitely not the right place to discuss how we interpret the international law that we have in this field so far.

This is not the right place to do it. And, if it is not the right place to do it, if we are not capable of resolving this in a multistakeholder manner, then I think it is clear that those two strings will have to be put on hold until the moment when there are solutions, when there are enough understanding about what we're doing here. The European Union cannot afford at all that we have two strings which would be misused, which would hamper and discredit the names of these regions whether it is, as I said, Rioja in Europe or Champagne or Bordeaux or Tokaj or -- I can continue with all the names that we have in the European Union. I can also, as I mentioned, Napa Valley, Santa Barbara, Long Island in the U.S., Mendoza, et cetera, et cetera.

I would also like to point out that the decision-making process on this issue so far has been completely transparent and opaque. We have sent a number of reconsideration requests. It's very astonishing that, when you actually ask for a redress in an organization like ICANN, you actually get the same people that you actually complain against doing the evaluation of that redress.

That, I think, is -- basic principles in democratic society is that we do have redress procedure which is outside the scope of the people that, actually, you're complaining against. So I think that is very clear. This is -- shows, basically, that ICANN needs profound reform in relation to these issues and that we count on the fact that we have now a revision procedure of ICANN's accountability.

Then I come to the GAC chair. I must say that there has been major flaws also in her way of handling the issue discarding the operation of principles 49 which tells that, when there is not consensus, the full range of views expressed by the different GAC members should be conveyed to the board. This was not done. And it has not been done since ever since she has not been wanting to be part of the process and not informing us what has happened in the board meetings.

I think all of this leads us into a situation where there is a question about the credibility of ICANN as such. And for the European Union, this is clear. We are not going to accept this in the coming years. And, therefore, we need a profound reform of ICANN. I think it is important also that ICANN follows its own bylaws which says clearly that it should defend both international and local laws. So here we in a situation,

which I think is important that we start addressing and that I think GAC needs to start addressing. Okay.

From the European perspective, I must say that, of course, we will continue to protect our geographical indications which are so important for the livelihood of Europeans.

And we will continue to defend that both here at ICANN. But I can tell you that we will not -- we would not at all hesitate to take the legal actions that we would have to take in the European Union.

I stop at that. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, European Commission. Before I go on to the next speaker, I think it's important to state that I stand by the decision to communicate the range of views as I did. And there was also opportunity for GAC members to communicate their views individually following that. And this was done as part of our efforts in Buenos Aires and reflected in the communique. That was one avenue. And the door was deliberately left open for that to happen precisely because I think that a number of GAC members here did feel strongly about these issues. It is very sensitive. And it is really better for individual GAC members, governments, and so on to convey their views directly to the NGPC and for the community as well to see. There's no obstacle to doing that. So, as I say, I think it's really important that you understand I stand fully by my decision. And I think, in terms of the substance, we need to remember that, even though this has been a very difficult process, through this process I think we do understand far better at this point what are the issues. And that

will help us, I think, in the future to maybe come to some kind of resolution. As you pointed out, there are discussions happening in other forums well-suited to dealing with these issues. And I expect that will continue.

Okay. So I see France and United States.

FRANCE:

Thank you, Madam Chair. For this particular issue I'm going to speak in French.

I want to remind everybody on behalf of France that we oppose to delegation of .WINE and .VIN as well as the support we have given to the negotiations about these delegation terms among the delegates. The wine industry and the delegation of strings we also want to remind everybody that the European Commission has asked all stakeholders, all actors, all wine producers, all wine producers around the world to participate in the negotiations. And, fortunately, we have to point out that the board has been neglectful in dealing with this issue. Madam Chair, the government of France has lost its confidence in ICANN as well and on the legitimization of this issue and on the decisions that may certainly have impact on our citizens. And they will not accept these things. What happened in Singapore was very important to us. The board lied. The board lied and omitted to say something. It concealed the process of delegation.

And I have to emphasize on your personal responsibility, Madam Chair, because you committed yourself twice. First as a chair to the GAC. You sent in September 9, 2013, a letter that should have not been sent

because there was no consent among government. And then, as a liaison, a GAC liaison, you should have been present at meetings held by the board. We were not in agreement with that.

But you should have been there to say what the governments thought. And I insist to you, my dearest colleagues, that we will not continue playing in the ICANN's game. We will not continue presenting reconsiderations with some of the countries and with some other agents they are the first in doing so to ICANN. So I'm not inviting you to follow this road because this is something that has been -- has proven useless. So the governments at issue took part of this. The recommendations were accepted by the members. As the European Commission has said, I should say that France has a strong position to take as many measures as needed at a legal level so as to avoid the fraudulent use of these second level domain names in Europe. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Merci, France.

Next I have United States, please.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate being given this opportunity. I won't linger too, too long because I think the U.S. position has been quite clearly advanced over the past -- well, let's see, at least a year we've been having these conversations, perhaps a bit longer. But I would like to speak for the record again. I believe I've had to do this on a number of occasions. And I'm happy to do so again. The three U.S.

wineries that our colleagues in Europe have cited as being privy to the exchanges between the European wine industries and the applicants are, in fact, just three U.S. wineries. If I may emphasize, the United States has thousands and thousands of wineries who are quite interested in this matter and do not support the European model of GI protection. So let's just please put that to bed. Thank you very much.

I would also like to remind colleagues of a letter that -- several letters we have sent. The most recent one was dated May. I circulated it to the GAC list. And, just to refresh the record, we actually do not believe that any ICANN-based enhancements of GI protection would constitute a new international obligation. That would be a serious problem and would create a very serious precedent in an attempt to define what is considered bad faith use of a name. So, again, all of our positions I think have been made quite clear. And I appreciate the opportunity to just refresh the record. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, United States. I have Spain, then the African Union Commission, and then I think we can move to a break. Oh, I'm sorry, yes. Portugal. I believe you were next. And then we have Spain and the African Union Commission. My apologies. Portugal, please.

PORTUGAL:

Thank you very much. And I'm going to speak in Portuguese.

With respect to .VIN and .WINE and the discussion related to .VIN and .WINE, unfortunately, I think it was one of GAC's worst moments. First, it was .AMAZON and .PATAGONIA. And then we had this problem with

.VIN and .WINE. The countries that are really concerned with this delegation of these gTLDs are not here representing the safeguard that should be given. And, otherwise, we should think there is bad faith in this case.

This issue of IGs is certainly something that influences politics and has not been solved with respect to the RTOs.

So we have problems with .VIN and .WINE. And it cannot be solved in other parts of the world.

ICANN has to delegate this name but has no legitimacy to generate economic problems to the countries.

So, starting from the GAC, I know that several governments have already proven that there are some economic problems for their countries, that there will be problems in the public interest. So, unfortunately, it has to be discussed in some other higher level, some other place so as to put a final solution to this problem.

I think that this issue also is reflected in the Internet governance problems. We have to defend the public order, the public interest. But what is public interest? And what is the role of ICANN in public interest? And what is the legitimacy of ICANN so as to generate certain economic problems to some countries? Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Portugal.

Next I have Spain, please.

SPAIN:

Thank you, Heather. I will talk in Spanish.

What we may say is that we concur with the European Commission, Portugal, and France. As a matter of fact, United States has mentioned that we have been discussing about this issue for quite a long time. And I fully agree. I think that we started discussing this in Beijing about the delegation of there's a new top-level domains. And we have failed, unfortunately. We have shown in the GAC that we have not been able to give advice to the ICANN's board. We have proven that our deliberations here in the GAC have been fruitless.

So the appropriate fora regarding Internet property like WIPO should clearly define and say what are the international rules for these topics?

In the meantime, if ICANN is willing to respect the decisions taken in the fora, in the relevant fora, this would be the only solution to protect public interest. ICANN should not delegate these domains, should put them on hold until the appropriate fora agree on something.

Otherwise, ICANN would be committing a serious mistake because, whether it be jumping ahead, the resolutions to be made by some other fora. So here we have to defend public interest. And this is our sole concern right now.

The problem is the delegation of these two domains is growing like a snowball. ICANN, perhaps, is not able to protect public interest within the multistakeholder model. So ICANN is calling for a change not only of the GAC but a change in ICANN based on ICANN's failure of delegation of two strings, of two domains. So, certainly, this is a matter of concern.

The multistakeholder model is supported by us. But we cannot tolerate under any circumstance that ICANN, as a major part to this model, fails to protect the public interest expressed by a wide majority of the people present here. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Spain. Next I have the African Union Commission, please.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Can I speak, Madam Chair? Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, everybody, for giving us this opportunity to speak. Actually, I didn't want to speak now. I wanted to speak after Christine was here. But then, when I heard everybody expressing their frustrations about issues, I say why not me?

[Laughter]

So it is not my style, actually, to add insult to injuries. But I think it is time for me to express also the African and African Union Commission's frustration with regard to the domain name .AFRICA.

First of all, allow me to thank all of you as members of GAC for your kind support with regard to everything you have done to have that domain name accredited to Africa.

We at Singapore have signed a contract, an enforceable contract. And we're about to have a party until something terms IRP comes in. I, frankly, don't know what is yet IRP, which is actually short for Internet

processes. And I'll be glad to understand from Christine what it is about.

But let me tell you something very important with regard to that.

.AFRICA represents very important things for Africa with regard to, for the first time Africa wanted to be part of the digital economy. For the first time Africa is part of the digital economy. For the first time Africa will and is contributing.

And then we get into this process which we haven't understood yet and would love to understand. But what I would like to see here is the accreditation of .AFRICA was based on a decision of the board following a recommendation from the GAC.

Now, without debating anything with regard to the bylaws of ICANN, which we are supporting, by the way, because we followed each and every step that was required during the gTLD process.

We applied. We provided whatever it is needed to be provided. And then we are told now you have to wait until we review our process.

Is the IRP something reviewing the bylaws of ICANN, or will they be -- is it something a big brother watching the board, what they are doing? We so far don't understand.

But let me tell you something about people, frustration. When they don't understand what is going on, that most of the time leads them to do something or to take positions because, simply, they don't understand what's going on.

The issue of .AFRICA is making Africans so frustrated that at any point of time any decision for the further that would be taken or anything else could be -- could not get the African support.

Because they feel that they are kind of mistreated within the process of having their .AFRICA accredited.

As I say, we are supporting very much the bylaws. We are supporting the process.

But this IRP is bringing us to some process that has no ends which terms of reference are not understood and we do not know exactly what is going to happen after.

If the IRP comes in with any decision, we, the GAC, we, the board, and probably ICANN, we don't know what is the alternative to be presented to Africa. And Africa needs to be informed.

And I'm assuring you that many other institutions outside are waiting for this frustration to be used for something else. And we don't like to have Africa being used by other institutions. We as a government most of the time we feel very comfortable in something -- governments wanted sit in a place where they have a voice, where they have their flags, where they can vote, where they can veto.

And today if, they can come to ICANN and start learning the process of sitting in a place where they don't have to vote or veto, and yet they are mistreated in a very -- how can I -- left manner, infringes the first one as it goes, then therefore, they will not be encouraged. You don't see many Africans here, and you will not see them tomorrow in the high-level meetings. And probably you will never see them. Because from

outside, this is not understood. A lack of communication between the ICANN and the member states make the people don't come to a place where they don't think they are getting what they want. And this is very dangerous for the entire continent to be left out simply because you wanted to follow some kind of processes. Probably that makes sense somewhere else. But also doesn't make sense in the big picture.

Africa is really frustrated. And we need to do something about it. We need to understand what's going on. And we need to make sure that the communication between us and the technical communities are okay. Your support as a GAC is very needed. Because your decisions, your advice on .AFRICA is being challenged. And by being challenged by a process -- I'm repeating myself -- endless. And we need to be sure that tomorrow, if that IRP -- or we make sure that that IRP first will stop somewhere. Not just continue.

We don't have time to have a committee set to discuss an African model without Africans sitting there. The panel that has been considered to be the IRP does not have any African entity. And yet we are discussing an African matter.

And, therefore, we find ourselves having an African matter being discussed by somebody who is not African and yet don't tell us when we can have a process.

We are wasting our resources. We are wasting our time. And, certainly, you will be losing support from our friends.

I am sorry to be very -- sounding very kind of strong on this matter. But I just wanted to express our frustrations again with regard to the

.AFRICA process. We want this process to stop, and we want .AFRICA to be accredited to African Union and to their operators as soon as possible. Thank you, Chair, for being so long. I'm sorry.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that, AUC, for bringing this matter to our attention as an ongoing matter at ICANN. And I heard you emphasizing the importance of communications and, along with that, the inclusivity of the process as far as Africans being represented in it.

So I think these are two really important points that we can take away from that. And I feel confident that, on the basis of the GAC consensus objection, that you have the support of your colleagues in resolving the matter to your satisfaction. And, again, thank you for raising this. And, as I've mentioned earlier, we will be having our exchange with the board. I think that's an opportunity for colleagues here to raise any of the issues that we have just discussed with them and to have a response from them in that setting. Okay.

Thank you.

All right. Next I have Indonesia, then Peru. And then we need to take a break. So Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Very interesting discussion, I believe.

And this reminds me in a discussion during the global discussion on outer space. If you might recall in the last UNDA this kind of outer space is being discussed heavily. Who owns the moon? Who owns the orbits

of light, and so on and so on? Here we're discussing about who owns .AFRICA and .VIN and .WINE. You know, that's more or less similar things.

So, hopefully, this -- we need to discuss how this can be solved. Because, if this cannot be solved, because the countries will do whatever it has to by whatever it has and doing by any means, they have to make sure that what they need is being followed.

And this can be many things. It can limit its access to global Internet. It can block some ccTLD and so on.

And, if this happens, then we have -- then we might have global Internet problems. Madam Chair, I don't want this to happen.

Internet should be here for all countries for all people. So what we should do to make sure that some countries or some regional -- some region will not develop their own system and disconnect or limit connections with the global Internet access.

So I think we have to discuss this to make sure that Internet will be here for many years to come.

And, hopefully, I believe under your chairmanship we can discuss what GAC can do.

Whether it is, like our previous speaker said, the GAC and the board or restructuring ICANN, we can see other global organizations like WTO or WIPO and so on.

So, finally, Madam Chairman, I rely on your chairmanship to ensure that we still have global Internet for years to come. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Indonesia. So I have Peru next and then Italy and Switzerland. And then I really do need to close the speaking order so we can move on. Peru, please.

PERU:

Thank you, Heather.

I would like to speak in Spanish, please. Peru would like to add to the statements made by the European colleagues regarding .WINE and .VIN.

We support the European position not only because it is a matter of fairness and of principle but also because .WINE and .VIN will ultimately have the same impact that .AMAZON will have. We are concerned about the lack of safeguards for generic names.

Recently I saw in the information about the new domains something about .COFFEE. Does any of the board members or you think about what coffee represents for many countries in the world, countries that are sole coffee producers? But there is one company from one single country that believes that it has the right to potentially represent all people who can sell coffee over the Internet. What will happen tomorrow when another company, possibly a Chinese or an American company, will want to register their word "quinoa." Quinoa is our own word. It comes from the Quechuan language. We produce quinoa. No one else produces quinoa. This is produced in the Andes, the Andean countries. Will there be a way for us to claim the right of that word?

And there are many more examples I could bring up here that could perfectly apply to the same discussion and that make it necessary for us to reflect on the urgency of including new safeguards that will enable us to be a much better position when we receive applications for .WINE or .VIN or similar to those.

I believe that all of us represent our countries here. And we bring our country's positions here. But, actually, we have a dual responsibility. We do not only stand up for our country's voice. We also need to find a way to make sure that our voice is heard by all the colleagues. And by these I mean those countries -- those countries that have a smaller representation in this room that hold quite radical positions that prevent us from moving forward not only with regard to .WINE and .VIN. Also with regard to other issues that make ICANN lose space and lose ground and credibility.

So, while we can express our concerns about .WINE and .VIN and other TLDs, I think that it is extremely important for us to think that we need to find a way out of this problem. We cannot wait any more, and we need to include new safeguards. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Peru. Next I have Italy.

ITALY:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Italy strongly supports the intervention of the European Commission, Spain, France, Portugal, and Peru about .WINE and .VIN. Italy remains

deeply concerned about the potential abuse of international recognized geographical indications that today proposed the delegation of these two TLDs made. Now that it appears that a designation is going ahead without the proper safeguards being put in place.

Allowing the application for .WINE or .VIN to proceed through the normal evaluation process without additional safeguards is unacceptable and could seriously undermine the reputation of the consumers worldwide. The protection of GIs also serves a public interest because of the risk, particular risk of fraudulent misuse of these terms. So Italy strongly asks ICANN to not delegate these strings until sufficient additional safeguards are agreed between applicant and the rights holders. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Italy. Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much. And I will be very brief.

In addition to reiterating our previously expressed support to the position of our colleagues on .WINE, I just wanted to have a quick reaction to the frustration as expressed by our colleague from the African Union.

We were one of these delegations that already for years have expressed that the success of ICANN and the new gTLD program will be measured by the way in which developing countries also benefit, also get some value out of this program. And we have also said that we think that

there is still room for improvement in this regard. And, if there are already very few names that came out of these four continents and regions like Africa, we should be very clear that we expect of ICANN that they do everything possible to move these few names forward as a priority number one. And we would just like to express our full support for the African Union. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Okay. I think that's a really good place to pause. Let's have our 30-minute coffee break. We are going to be starting later than we intended for our break.

When we come back, we will have a briefing from ICANN staff to have an overview of the gTLD program, which will touch upon safeguards implementation. So we'll have that discussion and that opportunity for questions and answers with staff. So then we will, as a GAC, have some discussion as well if we do have the time. Okay. So 30 minutes, please. Thank you.

(Break)