PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG) Discussion
Monday, June 25, 2018 – 14:00 to 15:00 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So thank you everyone, and welcome to GAC session on new gTLD subsequent procedures. I would like to start by welcoming Jeff and Cheryl, co-chairs and also Olga, co-chair of Work Track 5. We have been hearing many things about the expected report and the size of the report, so I'm sure we will have so many discussions on Work Track 1-4 but specifically on Work Track 5, I'm sure this is of specific interest to GAC members as well.

So I will keep it short if you want to start first, and then we can open the floor for questions and discussions. Over to you, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you, my name is Jeff Neuman, one of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP Working Group, and to my left is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, also a co-chair of the overall subjects subsequent procedures Working Group. So the good news is I'm not here to talk about GDPR, you will not hear me talk about that at all. But I do want to acknowledge the hard work of -- we have a number of Work Track leaders here in the room. Looking over and I see -- I know from Work Track 1, I see Krista Taylor,

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.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

Karen Day. And a lot of, yes, from Work Track 5 of course we have Olga up here. Oh, hi. And then Anna Beth in the back. A lot of people, a lot of work, thousands of hours of just meetings and even behind the scenes work that the Work Track leaders do just to organize for the meeting, compile the report.

And a general update on the overarching issues of Work Tracks 1-4, to take a step back, subsequent procedures, our group is looking at the evaluating what happened in the 2012 round of new gTLD and then making recommendations on what changes if any should be made with new gTLDs being introduced in the future. Because this involved over 40 large topics and we recognized early on we needed to divide the work into what we called Work Tracks. Work Track 1 dealt with issues like applicant support or financial aid for those that want to apply for new gTLD, overall discussion of the entire process. Should we use something called a applicant guidebook or other tool; how long should the application period be? So those kinds of general issues were discussed in Work Track 1.

Work Track 2 talked about the regulatory and legal aspects of applying for a new gTLD, what is in the registry contact? What name should be reserved? Meaning what names shouldn't be available for applicants to apply for. We talked about an issue called closed generics, another way of saying should domain

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

register industries be able to get a top level domain in a word considered generic and only use that domain for themselves and their affiliates. So instead of selling registration to third parties, should they be allowed to use it for their own company.

Work Track 3 worked on issues like objections, who can file objection to application and how did the process of evaluating communities work. Talked about the role of GAC advice in the entire process and a bunch of other subjects. And Work Track 4 was responsible for the technical details of the program. So what did a registry need to demonstrate technically in order to be approved by ICANN to run a registry but also looked at financial evaluation criteria, looked at issues like internationalized domain names and some of the -- the financial criteria an applicant needed to have in order to get accepted.

Early on we recognized there was a need to discuss the issue of geographic names at the top level in a somewhat different format. So at the beginning of this year, really the end of last year, we created something we called Work Track 5, which Olga is one of the co-leaders and Anna Beth in the back. Four leaders of that Work Track. [indiscernible] Anna Beth. From ALAC, Xavier, and Olga from the GAC. We knew because of the specialized knowledge from that area and the interest in the community, it would be best to take the geographic names issue

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

and move it into the Work Track as the primary issue they're discussing.

First an update on Work Tracks 2-4 and the overarching issues. As mentioned, we do have, now working on finalizing what we call the initial report. The initial report will be, as was hinted at, well over 200 pages long because of the amount of issues. And this is a result of over two years of work from these Work Tracks so we've been doing these for quite awhile now. This week we're working on finalizing the report.

What I want to say, this report is a collection of preliminary recommendations of questions that we have that we want public input on and a discussion of the deliberations that took place in order to get to these preliminary recommendations. We did not do a consensus call before coming out with this report. In other words, we did not go around the room with the full Working Group and say do you agree with all all of these recommendations or not. What we wanted to reflect in this report was a mechanism to account for all the discussions that took place within the Work Tracks and where there were recommendations to list those recommendations out, and where there are options considered -- in other words, we can go through option a with this solution or option b, discuss the

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

positives and negatives about each and then put that out for public comment rather than trying to select one of the options.

The reason we chose to do it this way is we really want to be open to community input that we get from this initial report. And we believed if we went around the group and took a poll as to whether each person agreed with every recommendation, we would in essence entrench those people or lock them in to a position even before we got feedback from the public. So we did not do a consensus call. So the language you will see in the report are things like the Work Track generally believed that... and then it would go on. Or members of the Work Track agreed to do something as opposed to these are hard, fast recommendations.

Just trying to think of other things. So the report will go out next week-ish, as Cheryl says, and will be out for a period of 60 days. We understand that it will cover the months of July and August, and we understand that lots of people take vacations and in the northern hemisphere it's the summer but in the summer hemisphere it's the winter. So we absolutely talked about lots of things happen in the months of July and August. But we think with 60 days, that should be a good amount of time to get comments in on the report.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

We are also asking specifically -- in each section, we have a specific list of questions that we're asking for input. We of course want input on the entire report if you have the time and are interested in the entire report. But we're really specifically also seeking input on some of those individual questions where the Working Group had questions and trying to discuss this issue and where in a lot of respects these questions cover either things that you may have -- well, you and the community may have a better idea about than just the members of the Working Group alone. So Work Track 1 will be -- sorry, the overall Working Group will put out this initial report next week, comment period will end in early September. The group will then discuss each of those comments, again break out into different subgroups to discuss these comments and with the goal of getting the full Working Group back together, come up with full recommendations for a final report, the hope is by early the further quarter of 2019 or the calendar year, so at some point between January and March of 2019.

And then as with all policy development processes, the reports then have to go to the GNSO council to approval and then ultimately to the board at which time the board would then ask all the GNSOs and supporting committees and advisory committees for additional input before decisions.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

Work Track 5 is on a little bit different timeline at least for now. When we talk about geographic names at least at the top level the hope is we would get an initial report towards the end of the summer and input on that at some point in the September, October time frame to bring that back to Work Track 5 to discuss and finalize those recommendations.

So that's our schedule. I don't know if there will be specific questions other than the schedule and topics. But we're happy to answer any questions on what will be in the report or what will not be in the report. And Olga --

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Jeff and Cheryl, for being with us, and Manal for inviting me to the stage. So Martin, also co-chair -- oh, Martin, ola. Sorry, but I saw you entering the room and wanted to point you so people get to know us. Please, if this issue about geographic names is of interest, join us in the session, this same room, and we will have two phases of it, some presentation on which is the stage of discussions now in the Work Track 5 and then we will do some different activities, small groups, trying to divide we have some questions prepared for you.

The topic we are discussing right now that had, if you are following the list you must have -- I promise to speak slowly. I

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

know ladies, you asked me for that. I will try to. You are laughing at me.

One of the things we have been discussing in the calls and list is the use of city names which are not capitol city names, so this will be more or less the focus of the session today. So if you are interested in that, please stay with us and try to give us your input. This is very important.

Also, I would like to thank GAC colleagues. Several colleagues commented on some things. Seems to be some convergence in some consensus on not using two character codes of ISO list and three of the ISO list and some already in the list country names as TLDs. Thank you very much for the colleagues from the GAC who responded to the request for comments, and thank you very much to the GAC secretariat who compiled all the comments for us. And I would like to stress the fact that the participation of you, GAC, colleagues in the Work Track 5 is of high importance for us because as you know -- and it has been the intention of the Working Group in the GAC about geographic names, and I think it was the intention of the cross community Working Group on the use of use of country and territory names to diminish problems and give more certain rules for the applicants to bring certainty to the applicants and also to the governments and community.

So this process, and I want to commend the GNSO for opening this Work Track 5, I think it's a fantastic effort to bring the parties together and find hopefully a way to avoid some conflicts that are still own going today.

So I will stop here. Maybe there are questions from the floor, and I invite you to join us in the next session. Don't have to go, you have to stay here.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, very much, Jeff and Cheryl and Olga. Any questions at this point in time? Kavous, please, for Iran.

IRAN: Although it's always dangerous to single out one of many experts, I want to mention Jeff is irreplaceable in this process. You work very, very hard. Devoted, enthusiastic, patient, and many, many good things you deserve. The way you run the meeting, democratic, kindness, friendship, and so on. However, having said that -- this, however is not negative. Let's say, moreover, not however. Let's start from the end. How you will go with consensus call? Do you go [indiscernible] by Work Track or do you go recommendation -- Work Track by Work Track or recommendation by recommendation or do you identify some of the recommendation which are more sensitive? Perhaps you

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

don't have time to go through all the consensus calls -- you don't need to reply right now but if possible, take note of what I am suggesting.

Is it a likelihood that GAC, due to its limited number of participants and limited resources and many other elements, be marginalized during that consensus call? Saying that yes, you are right but you are the only one or a few one so therefore, even if it's critical for the GAC and for the advice of the GAC, we can't take care of that. This has been already a big risk for us. So we would like that you make every possible effort to not immediately go to the majority minority. The chair should make every effort to carefully listen to the minority if it is prudent to the discussions. That minority may have a different [indiscernible] than the majority. But to immediately reject it, a pity. Sorry, we are a government and we have a lot of experience in the UN. If a proposal is not supported, it would be rejected. But if the chair would be so kind, put the proposal before saying there's no [indiscernible], it may become a discussion.

And then the third thing, have you considered all GAC advice given before, during the preparation of that? I have been in some or many of your meetings, but I would like to have this assurance that in many areas we have given advice and we wish

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

that at least the advice is the result of many discussions to be taken into account.

Then my last question, how far you want to go to change? Are you changing for change or changing for real improvement or changing for perfection? I think we should avoid perfection. We should not see what is really causing problems. I have heard and listened to saw many terms called missing the opportunity. For what? For whom? Opportunity for GAC? For GNSO? Any other things? So this missing of opportunity appeared in the Work Track 5 many times, I can count later on, that's something you need to take into account.

And then how far you make the balance between the interest of various groups? I know you are neutral. The one sitting on the chair totally forgets his affiliations, I have seen that many times. When you are acting you forget which group you are affiliated with. You are neutral, listening to the right, left, but using your experience and so on and so forth.

One small thing for myself, please: Can you be more friendly with the participants?   Some of the people are very authoritative.   It may not have good reactions.   The interventions are broken or [indiscernible] you should leave the people even if not right to express his views and understand that the reaction of the others may not be right but if his intervention

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

is interrupted, it will make some other reaction which may not be helpful.

So these are the things that I would like to raise with you and saying that for us GAC is very, very difficult in this PDP, very difficult, because we are limited. In particular some of the time that you put. Sometimes 3:00 UTC is not at a good window, sometimes. And then if we say that it is not good for us, they may complain that we're offending the people. We're not offending anybody; we're saying it's not very useful to us. Why not change it to other times available. Now there are more time frames available in order to make it possible for the people to participate and so on, so forth.

On the record, some of the time frame windows are not very helpful. I'm sorry, it should not be interpreted as criticism. In the beginning I admire your work, and I single you out as [non-English word or phrase], Jeff, and irreplaceable.

JEFF NEUMAN: There were a lot of questions there, I will try respond to some. Some will require a little more thought to get a much better reasoned answer to you. But I want to go on record to say I couldn't do this without Cheryl and all of the Work Track leads and ICANN policy staff, though you hear from me, they do a lot

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

of the real work behind the scenes. So I don't want -- but thank you for the credit, but I share it with everyone.

I thought one of the important questions you asked, will the GAC be marginalized during the consensus called. I think it's an important questions and we've heard the concern for a long time now. All of the Work Track leaders look at consensus not by the number of people that show up but we look at consensus by position. So if there were only two GAC members at a meeting and a hundred registrars, if the two members from the GAC were to state a GAC position and the 100 registrars were to state another position, they would be viewed as being comparable, not because -- they would not be considered 100 people against 2, but they are two well-reasoned opinions from two established groups expressing their views as opposed to pure numbers. So we will not --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not a tally.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right, not tallying votes. Looking at positions and groups and where they come from when measuring consensus. And it's not an easy thing to do. Excellent questions about whether we'll go recommendation by recommendation or, yeah, whether we go

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

EN

by section of the report. We have not finalized that yet but we started the discussions this morning on that. So we will get back to you on that question because I think that was a great question.

And as far as have we considered all GAC advice? At the very beginning of the process we had asked, in fact Tom was a big part of this -- it's a good thing -- in gathering all of the GAC advice from past many years, compiling that into a list and making sure that we were able to give all of that advice to the Work Tracks so that they absolutely had to consider that added advice.

Now, you will find certain areas where they have certainly made recommendations in accordance with that advice and in other areas they may raise questions on specific aspects of that advice and there may be one or two areas where it may not 100 percent consistent, but that's where we're expecting your input into this report.

The view on we're not aiming for perfection. We know we're not going to get to perfection. No way we could ever get to perfection, but we're trying to find the areas from a 2012 rounds that were certainly controversial or ones that we can by a consensus agree to make changes to. So we hope we're not introducing changes just for the sake of changes but we hope

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

that we're trying to introduce changes where a lot of members of the group had expressed certain views. But that's also one of the areas or why this initial report is so important. That if you feel the changes being recommended are, you know it was better in 2012, that's what we want to hear.

And the last comment on being able to express your views. We've tried to create an environment where everyone is open to present their ideas and to not disrupt others but with over 200 people in the group, it becomes difficult to prevent that from happening. But certainly, I know Cheryl and I have spoken to certain members of the group when we feel they have overstepped the bounds and tried to get them to participate in a more cooperative manner. It's not that their views aren't important, but just to express them in a way that is much more congenial and fosters collaboration. And I know Cheryl wants to add.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jeff. A couple of points to embellish what Jeff has said. The short one-hour weekly calls we've been going through recently. A number of the Work Track leads have been listening to people who have said they don't want to just hear the same voices for long interventions. They want to have a variety of voice heard and that's one of the reasons we did the interactive

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

session today, to help people who may feel less confident to presenting in the teleconference. We're making effort to ensure all voices heard but in our sessions, the Work Track leads have also asked that we operate in a timed situation.

It's been unfortunate that the technology we've had to work with, the lack of Adobe, and we were forced to use the other system from Zoom -- no, WebEx, didn't have an ability for timing. And since we've had our somewhat beloved Adobe, one of the things we have not had was the timer. So staff has had to say a minute, time, when people making intervention, but we've had to rely on human intervention to act as a timer. Trusting that won't be a problem going forward.

Regarding consensus, while it's the job of Jeff and I as co-chairs to establish consensus, in a GNSO PDP we also state the level of consensus. So unlike the GAC situation where you look at consensus as a whole, within the GNSO [indiscernible] we have several types of consensus we can establish and report upon. And that may be -- we have always welcome minority reports, all voices should be heard and certainly all voice should be respected.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

OLGA CAVALETTI: Thank you, Cheryl and Kavous, for your comments. I think you made an important point, which is the decision-making process of the GAC is different than the GNSO. Not saying good or bad, it's a fact.

This is why it's so important that you sound in the calls, in the list and you make your comments ideas, written or spoken in the calls.   Because then we can have our ideas and concerns expressed and being considered. I really want to commend Jeff and Cheryl that because they try to apply that. But sometimes if many other people show from other interest groups and we are only three or four in the call, it's very difficult even for us.

So I encourage all of you who think this is an important issue and all of you who don't want to face the problems we had to face in the first round -- and I can tell you I had to face that with my own government and it was extremely difficult. I would not like that again. I would like rules that would avoid that and also bring certainty to the companies and applicants investing time and many in that application which have in their interest. So if you show up in our calls and email list, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jeff, Cheryl, and Olga. Just to set the record clear, the previous speaker was Olga and not myself. Thank you.

UNITED STATES: First of all, wanted to thank you all who are involved in organizing Work Track 5 for creating this opportunity for the GAC to be so involved. I know this is novel, and I think it's working quite well.   And I would like to thank you for trying to accommodate everyone. It's hard, but I also wanted to state. In case it's not abundantly clear, there is no GAC advice specific to Work Track 5. The GAC and its participation in Work Track 5 is not with one voice. And I would like to point out something that's often lost, want to make sure this is perfectly clear. You often hear portions of GAC principles with respect to new TLD and that's focused on geographic terms, but one aspect often left out is also recognition that the process for introducing new TLDs but make -- in particular trademark rights. I haven't been very good in reiterating that. So I just wanted to flag that, and thank you again for all of your efforts and help.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Ashley. I have China next?

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

CHINA: Guo Feng speaking, for the transcript. Also, thank you to Jeff and Cheryl for coming here. From the expected size of the report we can sense the huge effort which has been put into the work to the processes. And also, Jeff and Cheryl, happy to know you are [indiscernible] and your consensus approach, efficient in producing the report. It's because of your leadership that the achievement can be made.

The report covers many public policy issues which GAC members are concerned about. So I think it is foreseeable that the GAC, we need plenty of time and energy to identify so many public policy issues and discuss those issues and perhaps exchange in depth opinions on those issues and provide you feedback.

So with regard to the [indiscernible] I think the protection is very relevant to public interest. Attracts attention from many GAC members. And I would like to Olga Cavalli and Tom for your work. From the request of the comment on the [indiscernible] some GAC members, I notice that most of the members who have responded to the request of comment are in favor of the existing rules. I think, also think, I believe that the existing name protection rules can be the basis for further discussion for the further debate while appropriate and necessary adjustments to the adjusting rules could be made.

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

And the debates and the consultations should be conducted based on the 2012 applicant guidebook. I think it is the right approach. But I think the geo name protection and issue is a very complicated issue. Developmental processes sometimes quite challenging. As some fact members have stated in the feedback to request for comment, the work plan proposed by Work Track 5 is a little bit ambitious to some extent. We propose that Work Track 5 could come out with a more appropriate work plan and allocate sufficient time to all parties, in particular the GAC, so discuss important public policy issues involved.

So with that, I think this PDP can better reflect the views and the opinions from governments. In the case that if different stakeholders can now reach agreement on the protection geo name in the following consultation, I would like to propose [indiscernible] 2012, [indiscernible] can still serve as the basis to handle those geo name issues.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Feng. Two more requests for the floor.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Manal. When you mentioned the 200 versus 2 GAC members, I think that's very interesting. You are saying it's not 200 versus 2, it's just two points. But my point is how can you

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

take care about those difference? Because the GAC members might not say what they want, they have to conform with looking after many groups in their country -- small groups, big groups, the historical of the country, the political configurations. In Indonesia, 250 million people, not only businesses, And I can imagine registrars, when you think okay, this is good for my business and the two guys might say it's good for 200 businesses but not for 200 million people. So I would like to know how you balance this? Mention this because geo names for example has done a lot of from [indiscernible] Africa, from a nice country like Belgium to a big area like Africa. So how do you balance this type of issues? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Indonesia. I have Switzerland, India, Brazil, Iran. And then I think we need to wrap because there are two other sessions that will be taking place here.

SWITZERLAND: Jorge Cancio, for the record. I will refer to what [indiscernible] said so eloquently about Jeff and the Cheryl and the co-leads of the different Work Tracks. I would try to be brief. You are saying we will have a report in the coming weeks, or week-ish, of about 200 pages. This report is really in the making so we haven't been

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

able to look at it. There are bits and pieces around the place. And what I would like for to underline, even a government as the Swiss one, trying to be more or less active in this field and devoting resources, it's plainly and absolutely impossible to follow the work of all the Work Tracks. Because we have 40 percent of full-time employee dedicated to ICANN and this is just one PDP, and of that you have five Work Tracks, you have the four Working Groups, thousands of emails and so on.

So I think it's absolutely critical that this initial report is subject to a very wide and very let's say sensible and reasonable careful process of discussion. In 60 days in the northern hemisphere coinciding with the summer is really a big problem. Because I don't speak for on my behalf when I speak in the cause. I speak on the behalf of the Swiss government and that means coordinating not only within my office but with other departments, other ministries and also talking to our service society, private sector, and so on and so forth. So that takes a lot of time.

What I want to say is let's be very careful because in this initial report there are many options as you said before. It's reflecting pieces, room agreement, room questions, in the different Work Tracks, and it's really time for the discussion on the different topics. So what I would like to propose is -- or suggest, to be

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

more correct -- is that we also use the Barcelona meeting for really having cross community discussions especially tailored on those topics where we see divergence in the community and meaning where the emerging ideas in the different Work Tracks may contradict what the GAC has said in the past. Which is basically reflected in what Tom prepared some meetings ago in a standing advice and standing principles which have not been changed by a consensus of the whole GAC, so they are still relevant.

So I would really suggest that we use that opportunity and that we build on the experience we are having with the Work Track 5 but we expand that to the other Work Tracks. Because for instance, I would have been very interested in taking part this morning in the subsequent procedures -- no, Working Group meeting, but I was linked to this room because we had our opening. We had other many important -- I think it's more or less 50 points on the GAC agenda that I had to look after. So let's try to expand that positive experience. Use Barcelona, this longer meeting for having full-blown cross community discussions on those aspects where there's potential divergence and that we avoid of course scheduling conflicts between this agenda and the agenda of this working group of utmost

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

important. Although these days, we're the GDPR, we seem to be focused only on that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you.

INDIA: Will try to make three points and stay brief.   This is the [indiscernible] work.   Any agreement would be the express support of all the [indiscernible], including the GAC. Other than that, I would echo the sentiments of my colleague from China. As contained in the applicant guidebook, including country and territory names.   [reading] must be protected in the future applications.

Just as a further reference and a point which is one of our established positions in this matter, reiterate, there must be a [indiscernible] [reading] and the applicants must be obliged to take a due diligent search to ensure that the [indiscernible] not identical to or [indiscernible] so the governments and the public authorities may have names of geographical significance.   So this [indiscernible] and it's imperative here to understand the limitations, the obvious over reliance on the ISO [indiscernible] list which would be detrimental to the purpose.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, India. Brazil?

BRAZIL: Thank you. Taking into account the point that was made by the US so there is no unified position with regard to some aspects of the discussion relating to GAC, I would like to echo concerns made by my colleagues, including China, and I endorse also the assessment that was made by India and the concerns made by Iran and Switzerland. I think there is a lack of clarity, sometimes missed opportunities if rules are not changed, a missed opportunity for who? I would like to have clarity. Because for many of us there seems to be not that clarity of missed opportunity. On the contrary, perhaps established rules that were worked out through the years and have proved -- certainly be proved but there is a lack of clarity. Why a missed opportunity; which assessment leads to that conclusion?

And at one point I've been raising as well, that ICANN shouldn't be seen in isolation of the overall Internet governance system. It concerns me that ICANN, our -- even though working through the bottom up approach and [indiscernible] approach, that we may in some cases, and particularly that case, be preempted, prejudging taking place elsewhere, for example, [indiscernible]

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

exactly how to deal with geographic names in domain systems. So being a representative from a government, it makes me a little bit uncomfortable in working a process that may preempt, prejudge, precipitate some discussion. Would like to make this point, and again, it's not clear why -- I think all this context should maybe lead us to be a little more conservative unless there is a [indiscernible] reason for being so proactive and rush and have working at such speeds. Those are the points I would like to make. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. Iran?

IRAN: I think I have to amend my appreciation. Because [indiscernible] has contributed considerably, effectively, efficiently for this before being a board member. And our distinguished colleague Cheryl, both of them are appreciated together from the one who was the savior from the very beginning. This is number one.

I have suggestion for you too, distinguished co-chair. During the initial report preparations, you have mentioned that the main objective of that was to ensure that the discussions held during the four Work Tracks are appropriately reflected in the report. That's good. However, you expected to allow the participant

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

like me who was not able to attend all those four tracks, using this opportunity, being awake at 2:00 in the morning to make comment, but these comments were not accepted, was told keep your comments for public comment. It is not quite logical. Yes, I agree that the time constraint did not allow to go to the detail and make considerable changes. However, some of the points could have helped in order to prepare the report for final consensus building and so on.

So I request you kindly to possibly reconsider your position to allow some sort of comments made by those who were not able to attend the four tracks at the general meeting in order to express their views with respect to any remedial actions or anything. That would be very, very helpful and very much appreciated. And I thank you very much again.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Any final comments from you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think it's important for us to all realize that we are not, as you just asked earlier, Kavous, just making change for change's sake. And I think you should take heart with your concern with standing advice. This is being considered, we're not here to clean sweep an applicant guidebook and create something new.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

It did take us five years between 2007-2012 to get this applicant guidebook; we're trying to avoid that type of experience in the future.

What we're attempting to do is where possible, and where it can be agreed to by the community, to make positive changes to process and improve predictability. So we're not coming in trying to rebuild the whole thing. Trying to learn from experience from the 2012 round and see what can we agree to do that might improve that experience? If we can't come up with any solutions or improvements, we don't make changes for changes' sake.

The other thing I wanted to mention about this interim report is an opportunity for all of the very wide work that's been done to come into a single format. And yes, I realize the formatting is still going on with red lines only getting received before you get on flights. But it is another step for input, so try and see it as a positive thing. This is not a final report, this is an interim report, and we can have full additional reports between now and the final. And we can have topic-based reports. So we're not to an end game here, just a step along the process. I think it's important to understand that. Thanks.

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

Discussion

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Cheryl. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: And to add to what Cheryl said, we did have four Work Tracks working for several years on particular subjects and I know it's impossible to participate in all of them, although somehow we end up in most of them. But for most of the more sane people in the community it's impossible to follow all of them. Because this is just an initial report and because the report really asks for comments back from the community, we took the approach of having this initial report just be a reflection in time or just a stoppage of time of this is where the groups are, public comments to see if we're going in the right direction to see what help we can get before coming to our final recommendations. The balance for us as co-chairs, we didn't want to discuss all of the things in the Work Tracks over again when we knew we were putting out this report for public comment anyway.

I can assure you for the final report, everyone will have an opportunity to have had their say, not as many Work Tracks going forward, done in a much more consolidated fashion. We may come out with some subgroups to help us analyze them but we will spend a lot more time together as a full group working on the recommendation. So I can promise you that you will see a much more tighter process coming out with the final report.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And to perhaps help your thinking about this report as it's coming out, we're ensuring we have annexes in this report selecting out the key points for focus and comments on. Where we have questions in the various sections, that will also be annexed out. So while we would appreciate comments on any of the sections, the actual interactive opportunity, the parts where we believe your voices still need to be heard will be annexed as well, and hopefully that will make it ease to reprocess. And to your point, Jorge, that will hopefully make the job of the [indiscernible] in a department a little saner as well.

JEFF NEUMAN: And one last comment, we're reasonable here. If it does turn out that more time is needed for the comments, we will obviously do our best to accommodate that. We have to initially put a date out there for public comments but if it looks like a few more weeks are needed or the GAC needs until Barcelona, we want to work with you. Not trying to cut off comment, trying to have a collaborative process.

As to Jorge's suggestion to topics in Barcelona, we would love that. We don't have control over the meeting schedule. We would have loved to have you and other GAC members at our session this morning, but so many conflicts in the schedule.

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

I know there's the meetings committee, they meet at the end of each meeting. And I know, Manal, you attend that or some people from the GAC as far as scheduling could certainly bring that up during that session. Because we would love to ignore GDPR and pretend it's all solved and just talk about this, but that's the two of us and not the rest of the community.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, and noted. So thank you very much, Jeff and Cheryl, and thank you for taking the time every time we meet for coming and having this constructive dialogue. And thank you also, Olga, for keeping the GAC updated on this important topic and the colleagues for the participation.

This ends the GAC session, ends the GAC meetings for today but doesn't end of course the dialogue nor the rest of the day because we have two more important sessions. There is the cross community session on geographic names here in this room at quarter past and then followed by another session, a high-interest topic on community input on [indiscernible] GDPR. So I hope you will be present at those sessions. And please participate actively, and we will meet here tomorrow at 8:30 in the same room. Thank you very much.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

PANAMA – GAC: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WT1-5 (incl. GAC Geographic Names WG)

Discussion

EN

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a round of applause to the co-chairs, including [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And of course from the GAC side, interpreters, scribes, to the IT team, thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]