LONDON – GAC Meeting: Briefing to ICANN Community - Protection of Geographic Names in gTLDs
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 – 09:00 to 10:00
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good morning, everyone. Let's begin this session. So now we have a community session on the topic of geo names. To give you a bit of context, in the GAC we have a working group looking at future issues related to gTLDs. And there's several subgroups within that working group. One of them is looking at the topic of geographic names.

So this morning we're taking an opportunity so that the subgroup can have some interaction with the community about this. And we have a lead of the subgroup, Olga Cavalli from Argentina, who will be running the session this morning.

And there are some documents, I understand, that are relevant to this session that have been made available or posted, since it is a community interaction. So we hope that you have those in front of you to support the discussion.

Okay. So with that, I will hand over to Olga. Please, go ahead.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone.

Thank you to our GAC colleagues here and also to all the community that came to see the presentation. This is very much appreciated.

One of the purposes of this presentation that we wanted to do in Singapore but we ran out of time in that meeting is that we would

welcome comments from the community about the background document that I will present now.

I think it is online, but I'm not sure if it's on our wiki or it's online available for the public. It is? Okay. If you don't have the link, we can provide it for you. The document is under development. We have changed it several times mainly based on comments received from GAC colleagues. So now we will welcome comments from the community about the ideas that we have included in it. And also in my last slide I have some questions to ask to the community. And I will welcome comments about those specific points that we -- it's important that we define to move forward.

So I will start.

First slide, please.

So, in general, I want to tell you about the work that the working group has been doing. I want to explain to you the content of the new version of the draft document. What happened to this document, we were going to present it in Singapore. But, in between Singapore and this meeting, there was an important event for this issue for the geographic names. It was the ICANN board resolution considering the GAC advice for .AMAZON. The relevance of this decision, of course, is important for the countries that were interested in this to happen. But also this decision was based in some documents that the ICANN board requested to external source of advice. So we have been reviewing this information. And we found valuable paragraphs and concepts that are included in this document that it's available online in the ICANN Web site. And some of them we have included in our documents.

So the fact that we didn't present it in Singapore was not so bad because we have the opportunity to present a new document, I think, which is more enhanced than the one previously.

We will welcome comments from you. And also we would like to define next steps. Because this is part of the GAC advice in the Durban communique. So we would like to have interaction with other members of the community and with ICANN to see whether these ideas that we're investigating and thinking about protecting geographic names in new gTLD rounds can be really reflected in documents that will be considered at that time.

So can we go to the next slide, please.

So, as I briefly said a minute ago, this mandate of our work is included in the Durban GAC communique. I just included here the paragraph. I won't read it. It's just for your reference.

This paragraph was included about after extensive discussions we had because of some geographic names were requested by companies to be used as new gTLDs. Some of them were withdrawn. Some of them are now in conversations with applicants, and some of them have received GAC advice after -- from the board. The board has respected the GAC advice about them.

But we noticed that the use of these geographic names in new gTLDs brought some uncertainty for countries and for companies. So we thought that these rules should be enhanced for the next round. This is what the Durban communique says, and this is why we have been working since then in this document.

Next, please.

So the background paper was first prepared by Argentina leading this subworking group. And then circulated among the member, the country members of the working group, we received comments from them. And we presented briefly in Singapore. And then we got comments from the whole GAC that were incorporated in the document.

And now, as I said before, we have included some other concepts that were used by the ICANN board to resolve the GAC advice for .AMAZON.

Next, please.

If you have any questions, you can interrupt me. That's no problem. You can just raise your hand, and I'll explain.

So the document -- I think you have copies of it. It's not very long. It's this one that was distributed in your tables -- has some background. The background is about previous documents that talk about the protection of geographic names. Some of them are already included in the applicant guidebook somehow.

Then it talks about difference between trademarks and new gTLDs. And this is where we have included the analysis of the expert advice document requested by ICANN board in relation with .AMAZON. And then, in order to avoid the misuse of geographic names in new gTLDs, we proposed some courses of action, actions at the national and regional level.

The new thing on this document is that we are thinking about developing best practice guidelines. And I would like to thank .BERLIN staff, especially Dirk Krischenowski. We had a lot of conversations with them. They had interesting documents. I think I have said this before, but I would like to repeat it. Dirk contacted me in 2007 when I was GAC representative of Argentina at that time because he knew there were small town Berlin in the north of Argentina. And that surprised me a lot. He wanted to include all the Berlins in their project. And now they have a very successful new gTLD, and I think they did a great job investigating previously which were the cities or other names that could be conflicting with their own project. And I think it was a good example.

So they provided me some ideas. And one of the ideas that came from one of the documents that he shared with me was developing best practice guidelines that applicants and countries and all involved in this process should perhaps have in consideration before submitting a new request for new gTLD.

Then this comes from the previous version. There is a suggested refined text for the applicant guidebook. I -- honestly, we don't know if we will have the same applicant guidebook, if we will have other relevant documents to establish the new round of new gTLDs. But, in the case that it's similar to the applicant guidebook, we have developed a text that enhances the previous one that I will show to you. And then we should welcome comments about how to move forward.

Next, please.

So, in the analysis of the documents considered from -- by the ICANN board in relation with the GAC advice for .AMAZON, we found some

paragraphs that were interesting about that discussion about trademarks and new gTLDs. And we found some of them that I'm highlighting here. But, if you're really interested in that subject, I will suggest that you go into that document. You have the link as a footnote in the -- in the document we have prepared. So you can review it there. It's quite a long document, but you can review it easily because it's quite structured.

So what basically says -- I will read it, because it's interesting. One of the paragraphs. "An intellectual property right is, like any property, a right to exclude third parties and, in this case, a right to exclude unauthorized third parties from the scope of protection which the law grants to the owner of the intellectual property right. Binding as against third parties, an intellectual property right never affords its owner the right to exploit or to use the subject matter of its right."

So what it means is that the trademark doesn't allow it to be used for other purposes.

And next slide, please.

This text is also interesting.

"An intellectual property right does not grant its owner a right to use the intangible subject matter in question. The right grants him ownership, ownership which is always binding on unauthorized third parties, but not, unless misinterpreting the notion of intellectual property, the possibility to exploit the subject matter of its ownership in any circumstances."

So this is where the gTLDs comes. It's other circumstance different than the trademark was defined by the local regulation.

Next, please.

And, finally, out of paragraph that we thought it was relevant to consider, it says, "The same applies under trademark law. The holder cannot invoke this right as a right to use the sign, even for the products and services specified in the registration, or even as the right to use the sign in particular forms, such as new gTLD."

These concepts were quite similar to the ones that were used by the objection that Argentina presented against .PATAGONIA that was filed in the International Chamber of Commerce and that was part of the early warning and the GAC advice that our country and some other countries like Chile that worked with us and some others that supported our position. So at that time there were some doubts. I think that this text brings more certainty to our position that we used to defend our geographic names.

Next, please.

Then there is the issue of the lists. Should we have lists? We don't have lists.

In the previous document, if you'll recall, that I presented to the GAC in the Singapore meeting -- and that was, honestly, my idea -- to build a repository of Web sites with geo names or references to geo names. And, really, the comments I received from colleagues and some other members of the community, I took that concept outside the document for the moment. It's not included in the document. So that the idea of

a repository of links or Web sites pointing to relevant geographic names is not included in it. So because lists -- the ones included in the applicant guidebook, they were objective in the sense of those lists. But, at the same time, they were somehow confusing because the applicants thought that names not included in this list were totally available. And then we had to go through the process of early warning and GAC advice. And then it brought certain uncertainty and doubts to the whole process.

So the lists any that the next documents will include, should be considered only as a general reference. And the document also considers the right that the governments have to keep -- to oppose the delegation of a new gTLD even when not included in one of these lists.

And what we tried to establish as a clear step before any request to any new gTLD is the dialogue. We are totally convinced, if early dialogue between the applicant and the country is established, then we could have much more success stories now than what we have. But that didn't happen, for different reasons that it's not relevant to review now. But we believe that an early dialogue and early contact with the authorities, whether national, regional, subregional, is the way to move forward and lower uncertainties.

What else? Also, the document enhances the idea of the outreach that must be done by ICANN. This has been said many times. The awareness in Latin-America and Africa, but the new gTLD process is really low. Many companies didn't know. Many countries were not aware of this process. And now we're seeing some consequences. So we think that ICANN also must do a special effort in outreach to regions

that are not so present in this process and that they don't understand so well all the implications of this new gTLDs new rounds.

Next, please.

So these are some possible actions that the document is proposing. We welcome comments about them, of course, about the other concepts that I just explained.

And one is, if you go to the ISO 3166-2 list, you will see that some countries, for example, Argentina has 23 provinces and the national capital of the country in that list. But we don't have subregions. We do have it in the country. We have Patagonia and Mesopotamia, Cuyo, (listing regions) but several. But they're not in this list. But some countries do have regions. So, if you review the list, which is online, you can see that.

But, at the national level, you can go to the authority that is in relation with ISO and try to enhance that list. We are working on that in Argentina. That is not a simple process. It takes time.

And this is a comment made by my colleague from Peru. There is no guarantee that this will be successful. It takes time. But it is an effort that it's worth to be done.

Also, the outreach about ICANN that I already mentioned. These are some actions that could be done at the national and regional level. We must remember now that ICANN has more offices all over the world and has staff that is devoted and speaking the language of the region. So that should be -- in this moment should be easier. Next, please.

And this is the new idea in the document. Let's think about best practice guidelines that should be reviewed by applicants and have in mind by applicants and then, if possible, followed.

Who should develop these practice guidelines? My proposal is that GAC and other constituencies. It would be good to do this work with other members of the community in a cross-constituency group, for example, for future rounds of new gTLDs. What should these guidelines include? This is only a rough idea. That the applicants should do a previous research and investigation about different meanings of the applied-for string. If you put Patagonia in Wikipedia in Google, the first thing that comes up is Wikipedia in the region in the south of South America and then the company. So both are there. It's not so difficult.

Also, I checked with spa. The definition of spa in Wikipedia mentions specifically the city in Belgium and also the concept of the nice place where you go and feel relaxed.

But both things are in the first search of any Google search for spa.

So a previous research and investigation should be done by applicant. And then, even if it's different languages. That was one of the confusions or discussions about Patagon -- about Amazon. If it's Amazonia, Amazon, or Amazonus. It doesn't matter. The concept is the same. It's a river.

In case of any doubt, the applicant must establish contact previous to the application with the relevant authorities of the country whether it's a country, a city, a region, or a subregion. For example, Patagonia comprises six provinces of the south of Argentina.

Next, please.

Other things -- also, ICANN should follow the best practice guidelines and enhance outreach. I said it several times, but it's an important thing to say.

There must be a clear process for governments to raise their concerns when their territory names or geo names are used in these new rounds of gTLDs. And also a way forward for governments and applicants in reaching consensus in relation with this applied gTLD.   The embracement of basic principles of international law -- this is a comment made by -- also by my colleague from Peru. And I think it's important to include in the documents.

And, also, this is a concept that I took from other documents from the community. The inclusion of a pre-evaluation or pre-revision process. Maybe this could be weird for some applicants. But, in some cases, it could be part of the process. I'm just explaining -- throwing this idea and seeing your reactions. A pre-evaluation, a pre-revision. Of course, some companies want to keep the idea as a kind of a secret for the company because it has value. And I understand that a pre-evaluation could break that idea. But it could be included somehow.

Next, please.

This text was already in the previous version of the document. This was a proposal made by our colleagues from Chile. And it was agreed by the whole working group and in general by GAC. We don't know how the new applicant guidebook will be. But, in the case that it's similar to this one, there is a text that enhanced the previous one where there is a

reference of geographic names. It enhances the fact that the 2007 GAC principles regarding new gTLDs must be considered. I won't say what they refer to, but in the -- in the draft document you have the link to the document. It was developed and finished in the Lisbon meeting in 2007. Some of us were there that day.

And next, please.

And also, there is a text added to one part of the Applicant Guidebook where it says that, what we said before, in the event of any doubt, the applicant should consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support on nonobjection prior to submission of the application in order to preclude possible objections and pre-address any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirements, because we know that also for the applicant, the process is long, they invest money, they invest time of their human resources, and having uncertainty is not good for anybody.

Next, please, and I'm almost finishing. So how do we embrace this? We have this mandate from the GAC Durban communique. We have been developing this document. The document has been enhanced and changed based on comments and things we are reviewing with the GAC and with the community.

Who should we talk to? Refine the future Applicant Guidebook or relevant documents for future rounds?

How do we move forward to develop a set of best practice rules for the use of geo names in new gTLDs? How do we work with ICANN to reinforce the outreach initiatives and how do we define fair, effective

and cost neutral dispute resolution procedures for governments to protect their geo names?

And next, please.

So the comments that I have received in this meeting was that international law should be considered. And thank you, Milagros, for that, and we can work enhancing the document with your text.

Also consider the UDRP rules and the ART consumer protection advisory committee and all that work. I am in that group so I can check if there is part of the work of the working group that can be enhanced in our documents and our ideas.

So what I would welcome comments now is the document in general. You think it's okay? You think there are things that are not acceptable? You think it could be enhanced with other ideas, other documents?

You cannot see there.

The two or three words you cannot see, it's this lists. Lists, do we need lists? Are they good? Are they bad? Are they objective? Are they limiting? Are they confusing?

Should we work on having more lists or should we not focus or lists? Or comments about that are also welcome.

How do we feel about the best practices rules? We like the idea? We think it's a good idea? How can we -- We have references. We can take ideas from other best practice rules that are already in place and are working well.

Is the idea of a Cross-Community Working Group good? Do you think that other parts of the community, ACs or Advisory Committees or Supporting Organizations from ICANN could join our effort?

How do we contact ICANN?   Because the mandate from the GAC communique says that GAC will work with ICANN.   Who in ICANN? Which area of ICANN? Who is? It's the Board, it's the staff. Who in the staff is the person to contact and work with? Because we have some base knowledge that we can share.

When is going to be the next round? I have been talking to several people these days, and the versions are totally different. In 2020, next year, very soon, in one year, two months. So how do we move forward?

Also, I didn't include in this version of the document but the problem will come, and as we have some knowledge base, we could think about what will happen with the use of geographic names at the second level. This will come very soon, and we should have that in mind.

Should we include that in this document or not?

So I will stop here and I will welcome comments from the audience. And thank you very much for your attention.

I'll make a list. Do you want me to make it?

CHAIR DRYDEN: If I can assist, I'm happy to.

OLGA CAVALLI: Oh, sure, but I can take the comments, if you allow me.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair. I will make the list. Stefano, Milagros.

ITALY: First of all, let me make my compliments to this very good piece of work. And we should of course mention this as a measure step for the protection of geographic names and mentioning in the communique, no doubt.

I want to make a few comments.

First of all, this is not the solution, because there could not be a complete solution for solving the problem of geographic names, because the number of recognized geographic names is undefined, and it is something that, in any case, may be more duplicated if we consider also relatively small communities.

But this idea of learning from experience in this round of new gTLDs, and preparing the ground for the new call is very important. And so in my opinion, the next round will not be before, let's say, four years from now.

But in any case, also, we'd help our document like this. We define best practices also for cases that could still come out in the present round.

And other to that, elaborating about also the level of -- legal level of protection may, even from cyberspace, teach something to the real

space, let's say, in the sense that the value of the names in the Internet then will also have consequences in the real world. And this is an important aspect.

And let me make an example just to have some idea.

We learned a lot from cases like Patagonia and Amazon. Someone in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to me said why Argentina and Chile didn't object in the '70s when the name of the company Patagonia was created?

If we go ahead with this in the future, perhaps cases like this will be prevented, will be -- might be avoided, let's say, or unless there is an agreement in the real world with the company that wants to have the name of a geographic region.

Another example and I finish. In this call, Mont Blanc. Mont Blanc is the name of a famous maker of pens and is a big mountain, the greatest mountain in Europe between Italy and France. And no objection.

And I don't think that the company asked the local community before making the application, but in the end, the local community didn't think to object. And they could have done, I think, on the French side because in Italy it's called the Monte Bianco. That is a different word.

But these are just example to say how we have to proceed in a best effort. Because as I say, there is not the solution.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Stefano. Two comments from me before giving the floor to other colleagues.

Remember that this is, as our Chair pointed to me, a session for the GAC but also for the community. So if the colleagues also can be brief and allow the other members of the community to speak, that will be very valuable.

I will respond to your comment about Patagonia. Patagonia has a dot com which is okay, but Patagonia is a registered mark under the Argentina trademark law, which is okay for us. And Patagonia, it's a name owned by the government of Argentina to promote Patagonia.

So we are not against having a brand and having a domain name, but having a TLD, it's a different thing.

Thank you, Stefano.

And I had Milagros, and remember that we need some time for the community as well.

PERU: I will speak in Spanish. First of all, I would like to point out that I agree with what Stefano has said. Secondly, I agree with what Stefano has said because, as a matter of fact, the drafting and the inclusion of text in manual, in the Applicant Guidebook regarding this could not be an exhausted subject. We have to have a door open considering the future developments, including what may happen on the WTO and WIPO level.

So this idea should be reflected in the text of any modification that may be included in the future.

We have to be flexible, and we have to consider that this is an evolving issue. It's an issue that should embrace all the developments that take place in the fora I mentioned.

OLGA CAVALLI: Norway.

NORWAY: Thank you. And also thank you for the work that Argentina has been doing on this. As you said, it's a lot of work.

So just we don't think, as a general idea, I think we said it many times before, that we should make lists.

Now, referring to the ISO list standard, the purpose of the ISO list is to establish an international standard of short and unique alphanumeric codes.

So it's probably in the ISO system not suitable for extending this with thousands of geographical names.

Just to say that the ISO list is something outside the GAC and its own system that is created for another purpose.

But we think, of course, we agree that we haven't had the best experience in the past regarding the protection of the use of geographical names. It has been very important for government. We think the only solution for this is to make a stronger and more general text that will protect also the names that we could not foresee that will be important for the countries now.

So just as a working method. Also with the resources that we have to put into making these lists, we think it's not a good idea.

Okay. Thank you.

ARGENTINA: I was reading the transcript, sorry, because I cannot hear very well from here.

Yes, I have on the list someone on the left side of the room.

Yes, you. Are there roving mics? If you can grab a roving mic. And if you could say your name and your affiliation that would be great.

CLARK LACKERT: Thank you. My name is Clark Lackert. I'm an international lawyer from New York, and thank you, Madam Chair, for this opportunity to speak.

I strongly recommend the first item on your list of international law.

As was said by one of the previous speakers, geographical indications are extensively being discussed and regulated in the World Intellectual Property Organization as well as in WTO.

I've spoken and written articles throughout the world on WTO TRIPS agreement. I can assure you that this area is very highly regulated.

I think that the current proposals before us need to take into account these treaties, regulations, and certainly extensive writing on the subject.

I can also say as an international lawyer that Professor Pasa, in his opinion which was cited extensively, in this document, this is only one person's opinion. I don't agree with his opinion. I think many countries give exclusive rights to use a particular right for advertising, for in marketplace, and also for domain names. So I think certainly he's looking in the European context. He's a French professor. But I would suggest that we look beyond that.

And I would also suggest that geographical names, if we let every geographic name to be protected and exempted, this would have a significant impact on the domain name ecosystem we've been talking about at this meeting.

We also talked a lot about the rule of law. So that's why I mentioned we must always come back to let us not overly extend this list of geographical names. Geographical names, for everyone's information, are protected under human rights law, indigenous rights law, intellectual property law, and many forms, including geographical indications, protected denominations of origin, indications of source, trademarks of course, and other types of rights in addition to various regulatory proposals such as protecting wine, viticultural areas under local labeling law.

So in conclusion, I think it's very important that this document be significantly expanded to reflect opposing and different views on protection of the current geographical name system, and before we start tampering with the Applicant Guidebook, which tries to strike a balance between protection of geographical names and other names

which are not really protectable under international law, we think very carefully about taking such a radical step.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for your words.

I have Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Good morning.

I think we have a limited time available. There are a lot of questions. Perhaps the most important issue after expressing our sincere appreciation to you, have done a lot of work, perhaps you continue to develop, first, the number of questions we have raised, and then put those questions to the colleagues to have answers, and then come up with that.

One important thing that I would like to mention, at the beginning of your presentation you refer to some sort of definition, the domain and the scope of the international -- intellectual property. It is very, very delicate matter.

Before you describing something, you need to consult few other organization dealing with that issue. And I thank you very much.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Iran.

Mexico.

MEXICO: Thank you, Olga. Good morning to our colleagues.

Thank you for the document presented. Mexico believes that it's a very good approximation for the string of gTLD principles adopted in 2007. In particular, for increased protection of the geo names that, as you mentioned, is not just for trade issues. Also includes cultural aspects and intellectual property rights.

Especially, Mexico are looking for to find more elements to reach an agreement with the applicants try to use a string that could be sensitive for national or regional communities.

I think that it's necessary to continue work in this direction in order to include in the future rounds of the new gTLDs.

Thank you again, Olga, for your very good work.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thanks to you.

There was -- You? Yeah.

EBERHARD BLOCHER: Thank you. My name is Eberhard Blocher. I run a small Web hosting company in Germany, and I have a question regarding the geographic names at the second level, which you mentioned would also be an issue.

I'd just like to know if there has been any discussion within the GAC of also not only the new gTLDs but also current gTLDs.

For example, Olga, you mentioned that it was good practices which have evolved from what Dirk of dot -- of Berlin wrote to you like a couple of years ago. I've just been looking on the Internet. There's a domain called Berlin.com which is not affiliated to the City of Berlin and I was just wondering whether this is something which should also be considered now.

I know this has been around for a long time, but I think this might be a chance to have the AGP now and the Applicant Guidebook for new gTLDs also to look at the current gTLDs and to find out if this is in accordance with international law to have private companies use geographical names.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. I have part of the answer. The protection of second level is included in the 2007 GAC documents about new gTLDs, and we had some discussions -- I don't have all the information in my mind right now. I remember that we -- there is something in the last communique, I think, about that. But I can grab more information for you, if you want.   But I think it's something -- I totally agree with you.   It's something that we have to have in mind because it will come very soon with new gTLDs and also with existing TLDs.

Thank you.

But we should maybe get in touch and move forward.

Thank you very much, and.

Belgium.

BELGIUM: Thank you, Olga. I'll speak French.

I would like to commend Argentina for the work they have done. I would like to thank you for the high quality of your work. Belgium has a very clear position, and we agree with these recommendations to avoid problems with geo names. Belgium believes that the local authorities agreement is required. So an application that has not had the agreement from a local authority should not be accepted.

Nobody wants the city name to be used for illegal activities or for undue activities or activities that could be harmful for its image such as pornography.

So, when a name is searched for in Google like spa, I believe that the public interest expressed by the government of Belgium will prevail over the economic interest. But we need clear rules to avoid lawsuits or legal procedures that are very costly for everyone. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Belgium. I have U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Olga.   And thank you very much for leading off this important work. It's very valuable.

We do need to learn from experience and explore how we can achieve greater clarity and certainty for stakeholders.   I just make one observation. The number brands that applied in the first round was significantly greater than expectations.

And we may see a trend there with future rounds.   And, as the application fee comes down, as has been long trailed, we will see, potentially, opportunities open for small and medium sized businesses.

So we're contemplating the scale of this issue becoming significantly greater. And I don't think we would want -- any of us would want to encourage a sense of foreboding amongst small businesses which often are contributing to local economies in a very productive way and seizing new opportunities in the digital economy, global trading opportunities that the Internet provides and so on.

We shouldn't want any sense of disadvantage being created amongst those that, in the offline era saw, great advantage in having a geographical name or local cultural reference name, which was often, of course, very much supported by the local community. So I just wanted to sort of flag that as a sort of nagging concern I have as we explore these issues further. We have to think about opportunities and so on. And not -- not create undue obstacles. Thanks a lot.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Mark. I have Germany.

GERMANY: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. And also from our side our appreciation for your work you have done. I think it's a very thorough discussion. We're starting -- we have had these discussions a long time ago. And I think we now have some lessons learned after the first round.

Only now I would like to concur with our colleague from Norway in this regard.   I think it will be not possible to come to some exhaustive lists, whatever they may be, defining all geographic names that are globally relevant. And insofar the outcome of this exercise should be really to alert potential applicants that there might be problems if they choose geographic names.   And they should seek and should be prepared to seek some kind of collaboration and talks with relevant governments, if it is coming to use these kinds of names.

And, in many cases, companies can also consider to have changing amending the strings they are applying for just for avoiding these kind of potential conflicts. And I think this is a lessons learned for the GAC but also for other constituencies to see this kind of sensitiveness that was raised amongst governments in this respect. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Other comments? I don't recall your name.

INDONESIA: Yeah, okay.

I'm Ashwin from Indonesia.

First of all, appreciate the work from our friend from Argentina for these geographic names and so on.

As was mentioned in our high-level delegate's speech, I think Indonesia would like to stress again what has been mentioned in the speech.

First of all, it's the second level geographic names. Using ccTLD, for example, should be similarly seen as with the top-level domain under the gTLD. I mean, we have the problem of .VIN, .WINE. Perhaps we can also have a problem of .WINE, dot CO using other ccTLD name or using .AMAZON or .IND whatever. There is a second level that can produce other problems.

Secondly, it's the considerations, Olga, the dynamic of community. Every country has -- Indonesia has so many people, so many cultures, so many languages. So particular names that Indonesian GAC members agree today or the Indonesian government agree today might have to be reversed in one or two years time due to the dynamic in the country which changes from time to time. I can give you a lot of examples of what some problems like .INDONESIA. Of course not in these occasions, but we can talk later.

And the last one is we'd like also to see how a particular name, geographic names or any other names related to cultures, to whatever in a country. Once it is given, because of a problem, how it can be cancelled. Is there any process as how GAC can tell the GNSO, the ICANN board to cancel particular names because of the problem on one or several countries? Because, as far as I know, we have not discussed about this yet. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thanks to you. There is someone behind you that wanted to talk. Yes.

>>   Good morning. I will speak in Spanish.

                                In this 50th meeting of ICANN, ICANN represents -- I represent ALS
                                (saying name) from Peru. ALS (saying name) are representations of the
                                civil society of end users of the Internet. And I thank you for giving me
                                the opportunity to address the government representatives here.

                                I have a question, Olga.   Perhaps in some way you can include a
                                procedure that we as end users, citizens, minister by governments can
                                incorporate -- if you can incorporate some kind of consultation with
                                citizenship. Because some governments have said that they are in favor
                                of granting a domain name. Others are maybe against that. But it
                                would be good that the citizens, the users in the countries would be
                                involved somehow in those government decisions. And democratic
                                governments are just transitory governments. So these are names that
                                will pursue -- a commercial interest will prevail over time much more
                                than the governments. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Olga speaking. Thank you, Johnny, for your comments.

THAILAND: Wanawit Ahkuputra from Thailand. I would like to raise the issue during
                                the time we're working on the geographical names.   There is one

standard that referred in the IDN fast track processes, which is coming from UNGEGN, United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, which is an xmt database (indiscernible) in geographic names. And from the application guidebook from the new gTLD, they're not referred to this manual at all. But in the others works of ICANN like IDN fast track, this has been stated clearly on this UNGEGN. I go back to Thailand, and I found out that I have the Thai language spell, even the gov in Argentina or in Peru, it's almost like a dictionary that contained 20 volumes that the office of the government, that is the sovereign department has to do, according to UNGEGN.

So I do believe that, if we talk about the geographic name at a second level when we come to new gTLDs, that also might include the other strings that are not only limited to the English scripts. UNGEGN might be a very good reference which ICANN already referred in the IDN fast track process. But it's not included in the list. 3166-2 seems to be very limited.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. I think we don't have much time for comments. So my proposal is the following: I will review -- I have taken some notes. I will review the transcript. So I will summarize and share with the group all the comments received.

For those that would like to contribute with other ideas or documents they think are relevant for this issue, my email address is in the GAC list member. It's very simple, Olgacavalli@gmail.com. This is one that works well from my phone and from other devices I have. So send it to

me during the, say, next two weeks. And I will summarize all this and try to compare the new version of the document and continue work.

And in relation with ICANN -- and I would like items from our Madam Chair who, if she can help me in the near future, identify who should we contact, get in touch with ICANN to move forward working with them. Because, if not, it will be just an exercise, interesting exercise among all of us and, luckily, with the community.

But we would like interactions so we can exchange ideas and have our outcomes of the document with ICANN and see how this could be incorporated in future relevant documents for new rounds of new gTLDs. Thank you, everyone, for your attention. And thank you very much for being so early this morning with us today. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much, Olga. And thank you all for coming.

For the GAC, we now have a coffee break until 10:30. So please be back in the room at 10:30 so that we can begin our finalization of the communication at -- the communique at the end of today. So have a good break. Thank you.

(Break)