
SAN JUAN – GAC: Geographic Names Working Group Meeting
Sunday, March 11, 2018 – 09:30 to 10:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

OLGA CAVALLI:

Dear colleagues, please take your seats. We are about to start agenda item 9 of the geographic names at 9:30 scheduled. Please remember that when called upon state your name and affiliation for transcript purposes. I see many other colleagues joined us. Welcome. I am and please take your seats because we are running a little bit late. Can I share this? Okay. Okay thank you very much for those of you that were early this morning for the NomCom remain with us and for those of you who have joined us in this working group session, if you remember, in the last meeting we had of this working group, we agreed we would use this space to review what was going on in Work Track 5 and see based on the experience and different issues we have been reviewing in this working group how can we give input to the Work Track 5 activities from the GAC side or review issues that are being debated and in the WT Track 5 so what I have done is prepare a kind of detailed power Powerpoint that explains a large file that's shared for those of you in the Work Track 5 mailing list. It's kind of large excel file not easy to navigate. This is not so complicate so my intention is to give you

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

the content of the excel file so maybe afterwards good luck on make your comments if you think that's of your interest. So first of all let me, as we have several new members of the GAC let me tell you why this working group is about. This is an internal GAC working group. This is not a cross community working group, and we had the idea of creating this space because there were several conflicts that some of them still remain because some names that were relevant for communities or had some geographic significance were used as new gTLDs and that brought some confusion and conflicts that has been complicated for the applicants and for the respective communities and governments so we have created this space to think about different ways of of approaching this problem. Now we have this Work Track 5 within the PDP process for the new round of gTLDs. We are using this space to review what it's going on there and perhaps bring our perspectives. So the purposes of this working group were developed practical options to improve protection of geographic names during future expansion of gTLDs. Practical suggestions and rules to lower uncertainties for both governments and communities and applicants once using a geographic term or a community name. Develop best practice rules to avoid misuse of geographic and community names as new gTLDs. And at the same time lower uncertainties for the applicants' trademarks and business involved in the request of a new gTLD ensure that involvement

of local community government and relevant stakeholders in the initial stage to avoid future risk and delays for such a new gTLDs, and focus on those names with geographic significance which are and this is important names that are not included in formal list of ISO or United Nations or regional relevant list. These are names that are not formally described in this list as geographic names but they do have importance for the communities and for the government. The working group has done any documents. None endorsed by the full GAC but it's been a good exercise for thinking about different possibilities. We have talked about a possible repository of names of with geographic significance, and other options. Some ideas of having best practice rules that can be considered by the applicants before submitting application for a term that could have geographic significance so those documents, if you are new to the GAC and want to review them, some of them are in the GAC website or we can send them to you.

As I said they were not GAC agreed documents you this they have been an exercise of exchange in different ideas and opinions about what is an important issue. And the Work Track 5 is focuses on with this and I would go to what is happening in the Work Track 5 so we are informed about it. Any comment. Questions about the working group in general? If you want to join the list, the e mail list of the working group, just let me

know, or let Julia or Gulden know so did I pronounce it correct? Gulden? Thank you.

And they will include you. So let's go to the next one. So what has been done by the Work Track 5? The Work Track 5 it's not a GAC working group. It's a cross community working group. This means that it has a co leadership by the GAC, but the GNSO. The ccNCO and the ALAC. 4 co leads. Co chairs and we are working together with the community in doing this, this revision of geographic terms and PDP and PDP is policy development process a process done by the GNSO. GNSO is the supporting of any decision within ICANN that deals with generic names T started in November 2007. 145 members. 82 observers. From the whole community.

We have agreed in terms of reference, which I will refer right now. And at the moment we are reviewing what is the meaning what constitutes a geographic name and I will go to that but first I will review with you the main the highlights of the terms of reference. And I have a comment in the chart but of course I cannot read because I'm doing another thing,, thank you Gulden. Okay. So something important that you may want to review. It's the webinar organized because we had many consultation from the community of questions. What is the story behind the concept of games and new gTLDs. I encourage you to hear the recordings. I'm not sure if we have tribes and led by Annebeth

Lange and at the end of the webinar I suggested to include the this fact that there names that are not included in the list and the issue of the .amazon case came up and there was a number of comments so if you if you are interested in that you may go and review the recordings of the webinar.

So the present work is comparing the different definitions. I want to review with you the this is already the leadership of the Working Group, and the highlights of the terms of reference. So this 5th work track focuses on the geographic names on the top level domain it's only on the top level. Structured to encourage broad and balanced participation from different parts of the community and includes joint community work track leadership. We are 4 co leaders. It's coordinated by the PDP working group co chairs Jeff Newman and... while it's very open for any one on participate the PDP working group co chairs seeking to structure conversations about geographic names in a way that this is important leads to predictable sustain subsequent procedures for the establishing. ... sensitive to the needs and concerns of all community members, and ensures the participants feel comfortable in a the process is sufficiently inclusive. So in general the idea is somehow the same aim that we had at this Working Group is lowering uncertainties. Lowering conflicts. And the value of this PDP is cross community efforts. It's not only the GAC. It's the GAC and others. It has a different way of

decision making that differs somehow from what we do in the GAC. One comment about terms of reference. Terms of reference are already established. There was some opportunities to make comments or changes. That is gone. It's already agreed. So I'm just letting you know what is it about. We are not discussing text here. Other highlights of the terms of reference, the scope, WT5 will folk on developing recommendations regarding geographic names at the top level including both ASCII and IDM forms. Will consider what constitutes a geographic name in the context of the new gTLD program. This is what the group is doing now analyze 2007 GNSO policy recommendations on the deduction of level domains and relevant rules contained in the 2012 guide book such as geographic names, procedure. Geographic names extended evaluation and objection procedures. And taking into account previous work related to geographic names that the community may have completed and there we can do some input from our work and this Working Group. This is important, the last paragraph. Rather the discussion about of NSC's as well as the location of second and third level of geographic domains are out of folk of this. This is only about top level. The last part from the DOT to the right. Comments? Questions? Highlights we develop a work plan. Time line and deliverables which consensus on policy recommendations implementation guidance. Regarding geographic names at the top level

following the process set out for the existing work track many it will deliver a proposed recommendation and related rationale to the full Working Group for consideration and possible adoption as PDP Working Group recommendations. Remember that this general PDP process has 5 tracks. 4 other tracks that have other focuses on this is the 5th track. So the input will go to the general PDP that the GNSO is developing. Consensus level for recommendations will be determined perfect decision making section established here that I will review right now. In a moment. The full Working Group will publish the initial report for public comment. So the GAC will have the chance to comment, but remember, if we get involved in early stages then it's perhaps easier to have our input considered in the preliminary report that of course will come to the GAC for revision. Work Track 5 final report and recommendations will be delivered to the fully working group. Decision making. This is important. It's not the same way that the GAC makes decision. This is more GNSO style decision makes process. Full consensus. Consensus where only a small minority disagrees but most agree. Strong store but significant opposition, position where there's significant number of those who do not support it. Divergence. Referred as no consensus also. A position where there isn't a strong support for any particular position but many different points of view, and then minority view refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the

recommendation. This can happen. In response to a consensus strong support but significant opposition and no consensus in cases where they... or opposition to a suggestion made by a small number. This is text taken from the terms of reference. Have in mind the process of the Work Track 5 is somehow different from what we do in the GAC. So for having full consensus or strong support or any of the different options there is the activity in the group that keeps this consensus. So this is why it's important that if it's of interest of members of the GAC we really get engaged in the cause and in the discussions. What is the composition? I have some slight different numbers but it's more or less rough idea of the participation, GNSO has several members of its this supporting organization participating. They actively participate. GAC members we are several in the informally appointed in this the group, and GNSO 19 individuals 25 and ASAC one and all the details and you have a link there of the document that I shared with you last night. Okay. So the terms of reference are set. The full document you can review it in the Work Track 5WIKI or I can send you the document. The highlights of the document I have already presented so with that you have a sense of what is the terms of reference about more or less is that. And what I would like to review with you now I think we will have time if not we have the next hour it S for this also? The next hour is for Work Track 5 so if we don't finish we can continue for one hour more. What is the Work Track 5 working

right now? It's reviewing the existing defined geographic names. What does it mean? There is a revision of the geographic names concept included in the applicant guide book and in other previous documents that are related with the first round of new gTLDs. And now I will go step by step. And included some examples. I have taken this information from the slides prepared by the Work Track 5 so thank you very much for them to sharing with me this document. And then if we have time in this hour or the next one, I will go to the excel file. Which is not so compli... it's difficult to navigate. Some colleagues made comments so far. The document is still open for comments, and there will be a session on Wednesday morning if I'm not mistaken about the Work Track 5 so if you're interested how the group will keep on working with this information, then please join us, and I will go into details that I think some of them are important for the GAC in a moment. The issues are the following. There are different definitions and the group has proposed 3 questions about each definition. Is it a valid geographic term for the purpose of the new gTLD? What were the positive impacts or merits based on the treatment applied to the term in the applicant guide book? If you're into you knew to the process the applicant guide book was like the tender document. The document that the applicant had to follow to apply for a new gTLD. This was released in the process ended in 2012 so it must have been done by 2008 or 2010. So that's the reference

document that for the moment we have. It was the guide book for the applicants for applying for new gTLDs so when you see AGB it refers to the applicant guide book. What were the negative impacts... on the treatment applied to the term in the applicant guide book. These are the 3 questions that are included in the document the excel document but I want to debrief them with you knew step by step. So the first definition that its in the applicant guide book is the alpha 2 code listed in the ISO 3166/1. This is a very well known list of the ISO because it's the one used for the ccTLD. What they are for Brazil. What they are PR for Puerto Rico. And so on I have included the example in the, AF for Afghanistan but there are many 2 letter codes. So there are 2 to policy developed text. Policy from 2007 in the PDP by the GNSO. These three letter codes were not available at gTLDs. 2 character ASCII strings are not permitted to avoid conflicts with future and current country codes based on the ISO 3166/1 standards and the applicant guide book of 2012 said this two letter codes were not available as gTLDs. As the way was to avoid conflicts with current and future country codes based in the ISO 3166/1 standards. The two letter codes were not allowed. Would they be allowed in the new one? That's something that is not defined. They are also some two letters that are not in the list, and some two letters that have not been requested as gTLDs so that's the gray space that could something happen there. So we have the 3 questions. I will go

to an excel file in a moment but we do the three questions about this. Also it was the cross community working group and the use of country and territory names that recommended not to use the two letter codes as the gTLD because it may on cause confusion with the gTLDs should I go slower? I speak too much? No? Okay. Okay. The other other existing definition. Alpha 3 listed in the eyes so 3166/1 which is the 3 letter code for example AARG, AFG for Afghanistan and not able to say the other ones because I may make mistakes so what about the policy in 2007 said? Available but challenge mechanism to governments to initiate an objection. Applicants should be aware of GAC principles. You remember that the GAC established some GAC principles for new gTLDs in 2007 and we are finished in the lisbon meeting in 2007. So those are important guidelines and documents for the GAC applicants must arrest represent the use of the string is not in violation ever the national laws in which the applicants is incorporated and the applicant guide book says the three letter codes of this were not available as gTLDs. Would they available for the new one? Comments questions? Let's go to the next one. Long form name in the ISO 3166 standards or translation of the long form name in any language. This is the name of the country. Example the Islamic republic of Afghanistan. What did the PDP 2007. Available where challenge mechanism... applicants should be aware of GAC principles and represent that the use of the proposed string is not in violation

ever the national laws in which the applicants is incorporated. And finally that applicant guide book said it's not available. So on the first round of new gTLDs if someone wanted to supply for republic would not be available to do that. So again the 3 questions. Would that be available in the next round? Country or territory names. Short form name in the ISO 3166 standard or translation of the short form name in any language for Argentina will be Argentina. Here we have Afghanistan as an example. What did the 2007 PDP said? Available with you challenge the same as before. Available but challenge mechanism to governments to issue a... applicant must represent the use of proposed string is not in violation of the national laws in which the applicant is incorporated. So for the 3 letters, for the complete name of the country or for the short name of the country, the 2000 PDP says it's allowed but it could be some objections from the country understand the 2012 applicant guide book they are not allowed so nobody could request the name of the country in the short form nor the long form so that's something that could be reviewed in the future or maintained as it is. Next one this is the country or territory names short or long form in association with the code designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166. And we have some examples. U.K. for United Kingdom document so there are some two letter codes reserved for some countries, the policy of 2007 said the same as for the long name of the country or the short name of the

country, and for the three letter codes and the applicant guide book said these were not available. So the same as before. And next one component of a country named designated in the country name list or its translation of a name appearing in the list in any language according to the annex in applicant guide book. The policy of 2007 and the applicant guide book said both the same for 2007 everything is available. But the it mentions that the objections and for applicant guide book all the names of country names are not available, and there is an example of separated or not. ... transposition of any names before. For example Czech republic. Republic Czech or Cayman Island or Cayman Islands. The same restrictions 2012 not available but in 2007 it was available but considering there could be some conflicts country or territory names some countries have a different designation popular. For example Holland or the Netherlands N this case it is the rules were the same as before in 2007 they were allowed but considering it could be some conflict and applicant guide book did not allow those names by which a country is commonly known. Not the official name of the country but commonly known. An example is the Netherlands and Holland. What else? Representation in any language of a capitol city name. Of any country or entity listed in the ISO 3166/1 list. Examples. London, Berlin. Berlin I don't know how pronounce the middle one. The same restrictions as before in the applicant guide book there is a difference from the previous

one. It was possible as we have seen several cities having now their own TLD like Berlin. What is San Paolo it's not complete. I think they have one. Rio has, and Berlin, and for New York London Paris. We have seen several new gTLDs with the city name, in that case the applicant guide book established that the applicant required the support and non-objection from the relevant government and the public authorities of that city so this is why you have seen successful applications of different city names and different cities of the world. Other geographic names. City name used for purposes associated with the city name like Bath, Florence Frankfurt. The 2000 PDP available but it could be, it could be some objections from the government and the applicant guide book says it requires the support and non objection from relevant governments or public authorities. The same as for the city names. Other geographic names city names no this is already said. Sorry. Exact match of a subnational place name such as country, province or state listed in the ISO 3166/2. This is for example provinces or states of countries. If you go to that list, then you have different for Argentina you have all the provinces and you have an example of a state or province with Afghanistan. I don't know how pronounce it. The restriction of 2007 is the same. It's available but it may challenge it. It may be challenging, and in applicant guide book it requires support or non objection from relevant governments of public authorities. For example if someone

would apply the name of one province of Argentina can could go to the list and request it but it would require an authorization from the province, government or perhaps the national government. What else? String listed in the UNESCO, subregions and selected subeconomic or other grouping list. For example Africa. Northern Africa. This was important because some subregional names came up as they are already established brand all over the world but they are not included in this UNESCO list so as they are not in the list that was the job if they it would be available or not, as following the rules of the applicant guide book. The 2007 PDP said it's available but it could be objections. And in 2012 it said that it requires support or non objection from at least 60% of the restrictive national governments in the region. The thing is that there was subnational regions that are not included in the list. So that brought some conflicts. And this is the last one. This is an input from some members of the GAC. Which I think it's of high relevance for the GAC. In the definitions included in the 20 applicant guide book in general work well, yes, but there were problems because some geographic names were geographic for the governments of the community, but they were not included in this list of the applicant guide book that I have just shared with you, so the example is the Amazon it's a conflict it's still unresolved so the suggestion is to include in the definition the discussion the notion that there were names can geographic

meaning not covered by the 2012 applicant guide book. And rules which according to a factual analysis have given rise to problems and therefore a debate would be warranted in order to include them under the definitions to be agreed upon establishing a framework for mutually agreed outcomes amongst all interested parties in such applications. And there was a webinar if you remember in April, and that webinar colleague from Switzerland and myself we presented some ideas that we have been sharing within this Working Group. They don't have the support from the whole GAC, but I think we thought it was worth sharing with the full community about for example creating a way that the applicant may consult or repository of name or reference list, something where the applicant could go and consult and have the chance to check if the desired string to be requested as a TLD could be of interest, of some communities, or countries, and it's not included in any of these lists. Which were the cases that generated more conflicts in the first round. So, this is what it's in analysis right now by the group. I don't know if there are comments or questions. What I want to share with you in a moment is the document that its still not finalized. It's a document where you can go and include your inputs for the moment, the document it's a quite a large excel file that has a first column with all these categories that I have just shared with you. That are mainly related with the 2007 PDP, and the applicant guide book. And

see if they were positive. In they were negative. If there were conflicts so this is in the columns to the right, and if you will see there some comments from colleagues from the community that were gathered from the calls that the Working Group that the Work Track 5 is having by every 2 weeks. The document still open for comments so we have the chance to review it, and comment if needed. And also the Working Group will organize, I think a 2 or 3 hours meeting in the morning of Wednesday. So you can join us there if you want to go and share your views with us. Comments, questions? I talk too much. You should say something. I will take some water. Yes China please go ahead.

CHINA:

Thanks for this comprehensive Powerpoint. This comprehensive document as well as your comprehensive illustration. I have a question regarding the 10th line of this work. The definition has the work track decided a time line on the work of these definition? So, if we have more clear time line here, because I think each GAC member, some of the GAC member may have to do some homework regard to their geographic names within their territory or country, so that is basically my question.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Very good question. The document is already open for comments, and I don't have in mind exactly the date that I don't

think we already have a date to closing maybe Chris cover can help me. Do we have a date for closing comments? No not for the moment. So, we still have an opportunity to make comments and including them in the document, and do you have a follow up comment?

CHINA:

My question is more about the... procedure regarding the work of the definition. Not only including the comments of undergoing on going documents. The perhaps the close time for the whole bunch of work regarding definition. The geographic definition.

OLGA CAVALLI:

It's a good comment. We have to fit in the general PDP agenda so it's not that we have, eternal al time. I think April, May, we should be doing a summary first draft of something, but I may come back to you with more definition about that after the meeting on Wednesday, and I may consult with my colleagues in the, in the Working Group. In the work track but it's very good comment. Yes Ashley one second. And just have in mind that we have to it's not only a GAC process. We have to stick to the agenda of the GNSO PDP which is a broader agenda. Yes, United States? Sorry I didn't see you before.

UNITED STATES:

I wanted to make sure you saw me. It's not pertinent to the conversation but thank you for giving us this overview of where things stand and we think it's accurate, and just wanted to let you know we are reviewing the documents available now with respect to defining geographic al name but I wanted to ask a procedure questioning and my apologies for not knowing this in reading how the official GAC representatives to this working group are to participate, it's looked like there was only if we were an official GAC representatives to the group that we had to only speak on GAC cleared positions. And I was wondering if there was under any circumstance we could take that hat off and be able to engage and substance where there's not clear GAC positions because on the U.S. perspective we want to be more active but we realize at least how we read the procedures how to engage that we had to be careful not to represent views beyond that agreed by the GAC. Not sure if you have further insight or if this is just a situation where perhaps U.S. needs to consider becoming a member, not necessarily a GAC official representative.

OLGA CAVALLI:

That's a very good question. I would did he ever the answer to perhaps Jeff Newman and... this refers more to the general

GNSO procedure than GAC itself so let me I think we can ask this question. I can ask them in private, but we can perhaps raise this question. Which is quite fair comment. To in the meeting in Wednesday. I can ask if you are busy with other meeting, I can I think it's very good point. But thank you for bringing this up. And sorry I don't see you because there are people in front of you. China you wanted to add something? No. Other comments? Yes, can you remind me of name please?

THAILAND:

This is ThongChai from Thailand. I am now too this. You said there was a question that required objection from relevant governments or public is there a clear definition of who these relevant governments or public authorities are?

OLGA CAVALLI:

That's a major question. And that its usually difficult to define because it's a CT government. It's national government. It's provincial government, and we had a discussion when there was the request from Patagonia, and Patagonia means many things in the country, also inside the country it has different province that is belong or do not belong much it's not exactly defined. It's name but it is well known but it's not exactly defined. So it is extremely challenging for some cases it's easy to know because if the city then you know that the city has a government or

achieve authority, or the government of the country and the name of the country. But in other cases, it may be difficult to define. But it's a good question. I don't have an answer for that.

BENEDICTO FONSECA: Good morning this is Benedicto speaking for the record first of all thank you very much for these updates on the work of the GAC working group on that matter. I have a few maybe very ignorant questions because we have been of course interested in that discussion but not unfortunately we have not been able to be involved to the extent we'd like to be so one maybe one preliminary question then one issue we would like clarity. We understand these GAC working group existed before the working track 5, and now my question is as we look at the agenda, the GAC agenda we have yesterday we had discussion on Work Track 5. We are discussing now the same issues more or less in the context of this Working Group, and then we are resuming the discussion in plenary, so my question is whether the Working Group that precedes the establishment of Work Track 5. That the purpose might have somewhat changed because maybe today the idea would be to resort to the working group as a tool for coordination, or for information. I'd like maybe if you could elaborate on that, how those two efforts relate TODAY. One concern we have and we expressed yesterday is that the discussion of geographic names will not be limited to not be

encapsulated will not take place in a silo within ICANN itself. I notice you have mentioned made reference for ISO. Its of course something that is there but I think the basic parameters are what has been taking place within ICANN itself. The applicant guide book. The PDP so it's concerning for us because I think such a discussion extends beyond, much beyond ICANN. It is it takes place in many other foreign, many other spaces so we would be concerned that maybe a decision taken within the ICANN context does not adequately take into account the wealth of information and discussion that is taking place everywhere. We know sometimes in not a straightforward or in a very decision making approach, maybe there's in some places there is just some discussion, but we are concerned that maybe what is being taking place in ICANN is in a way pre judging or anticipating things that are discussed in a much wider and I say a much more appropriate context so these are concerns maybe if you could also elaborate a bit on that. Even when I look at the questions that are being asked, they are very much focussed on the ICANN context itself. That's of course the as we try to tackle these questions, you can expand the discussion and bring on Board some elements but they refer to things that are taking place within the organization itself. So I think for the moment those are some comments. I was also a bit concerned when you said that the two letter codes is not allowed for delegation now but who knows what will take place next. So I think it's in if the

light of what has taken place in regard to the use of two letter codes. The second level it's very worrisome that maybe some people might even think of opening up for delegation. And that we know that is part of the community would certainly support that, and but we think that again like the we see the dramatic change in the regard to the use of second level in a way affected the balance in the basic parameters we have been working in so it will be very much worrisome for my delegation, and delegations need such niche initiatives or such efforts would also be taking place.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thanks to you, Benedicto. I will start by the last part of your question comments. I would appreciate if you and Milagros and other colleagues that think that other sources of information that would be relevant to be can considered in the PDP help me drafting something because my role is not only trying to coordinate the work and the Work Track 5 within the community but also give feedback from the GAC, so I think this is a relevant input that we can make, and it's a very good moment because we are starting the process of revising the definitions, and reviewing the sources. For the moment we are reviewing what happened in the documents within ICANN in 2007 and 2012 but that doesn't prevent the group for reviewing other sources. So if you help me with some text I can give it formally to the Work

Track 5 in the next meeting I think it's Wednesday morning, and also the suggestion made or question made by the representative from the United States if they have to remain as the GAC members or maybe participate in other role within the group. I think the they both are very important comments that we can give to the process. What we agreed in, in the last meeting we had in Abu Dhabi of this working group is that we would stop what we were reviewing at the Working Group, and stop trying to analyze what was happening in the Work Track 5, and see if the Working Group could give some inputs. I think Jorge has been very good in giving that input during the process. The fact with me is that I have to remain neutral, as I am co chairing, so if I'm the only one in a few of us out there it's somehow complicated because of course I have my own views of different things but as a co chair I have to remain in. .. I appreciate other colleagues join us in that effort. That was the idea of the Working Group and the other slots in the agenda were decided by the full GAC so I can respond for that Belgium you want to say something.

BELGIUM:

[Interpreter Speaking] good morning to you all Olga. I would like to begin by thanking the GAC and all the participants in this Working Group and in particular would like to thank Switzerland for its contribution. I would like to remind you that the

discussion of these issues is a very important for our governments. We need to take into account all the province, and territory and country names, and this requires a significant effort. There is an imbalance in the representation of the members of the Working Group in Work Track 5 but we don't see so many states represented there so I would like to insist on the fact that the lack of participation of the states does not represent the lack of interest, but rather the lack of resources much that is the case of Belgium. We have had an active participation since the Beijing meeting in the protection of geographic names but unfortunately, we cannot participate in all Working Groups. There's important to continue these discussions within the GAC and we shouldn't delay this, leave it only for the Working Group implement it and led by ICANN. I agree that the fact of having minority positions allows us to express ourselves, but a small representation of the countries does not guarantee that our positions will be taken into account. We may have the impression that we are not interested in participating, and that is not the case. We are trying to follow up closely on the developments in this group, and we are interested in ensuring that we have this kind of mechanisms to protect the government's interest, like our China colleague I would like also to have a clearer idea of the time line for the activities of this group. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Extremely challenging, what the timing and the amount of work that we have. This is why we thought it was good to remain with this space for reviewing what was happening in the Work Track 5 within this working group. And I wanted to say something more and I've forgotten. About the time line I will go to the Working Group in general and request information because already China has requested for that. And we have to adjourn this meeting. I have to read a text to close it because we have some formalities. My proposal is the following. We have one hour more PAR? We have one hour more for this? No other thing scheduled so it's us? Okay let's do the following. I have to read the closing of this meeting. Let's take some minutes to go to restroom and come back, oh we have a vice chair that's good. The authority has come. And then we have, we will in the next hour we will try to, and I try to summarize it but honestly. I couldn't summarize what was in the excel file so we will navigate. You will see it's not so difficult but it's a wide document, difficult to review. I will adjourn this meeting. I have to read a text. Wait. The agenda GAC geographic names working group Sunday 11 March is adjourned. We had proceed with the next agenda item once the technical team gives me the sign to go ahead. So, thank you very much. 5 minutes of break and we convene again and we will review the excel file together.

Thank you very much. Actually, it's time for a coffee break. So we will 15 minute break and then continue.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]